# Reconstruction analysis of global ionospheric outflow patterns

Michael W. Liemohn<sup>1</sup>, Jorg-Micha Jahn<sup>2</sup>, Raluca Ilie<sup>3</sup>, Natalia Yu Ganushkina<sup>4</sup>, Daniel T Welling<sup>5</sup>, Heather Alison Elliott<sup>2</sup>, meghan burleigh<sup>6</sup>, Kaitlin Doublestein<sup>7</sup>, Stephanie Colon-Rodriguez<sup>5</sup>, Pauline Dredger<sup>8</sup>, and Philip Valek<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Michigan-Ann Arbor <sup>2</sup>Southwest Research Institute <sup>3</sup>University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign <sup>4</sup>Finnish Meteorological Institute <sup>5</sup>University of Michigan <sup>6</sup>Naval Research Laboratory <sup>7</sup>University of Michigain <sup>8</sup>The University of Texas at Arlington

November 3, 2023

#### Abstract

Ionospheric outflow supplies nearly all of the heavy ions observed within the magnetosphere, as well as a significant fraction of the proton density. While much is known about upflow and outflow energization processes, the full global pattern of outflow and its evolution is only known statistically or through numerical modeling. Because of the dominant role of heavy ions in several key physical processes, this unknown nature of the full outflow pattern leads to significant uncertainty in understanding geospace dynamics, especially surrounding storm intervals. That is, global models risk not accurately reproducing the main features of intense space storms because the amount of ionospheric outflow is poorly specified and thus magnetospheric composition and mass loading could be ill-defined. This study defines a potential mission to observe ionospheric outflow from several platforms, allowing for a reasonable and sufficient reconstruction of the full outflow pattern on an orbital cadence. An observing system simulation experiment is conducted, revealing that four well-placed satellites are sufficient for reasonably accurate outflow; relate outflow patterns to geomagnetic activity level; and determine the spatial and temporal nature of outflow composition. The science objectives could be focused to be achieved with minimal instrumentation (only a low-energy ion spectrometer to obtain outflow reconstructions) or with a larger scientific scope by including contextual instrumentation. Note that the upcoming Geospace Dynamics Constellation mission will observe upwelling but not ionospheric outflow.

# **Reconstruction analysis of global ionospheric outflow patterns**

2 Michael Liemohn<sup>1</sup>, Jörg-Micha Jahn<sup>2</sup>, Raluca Ilie<sup>3</sup>, Natalia Y. Ganushkina<sup>1,4</sup>, Daniel T.

- Welling<sup>1</sup>, Heather A. Elliott<sup>2</sup>, Meghan Burleigh<sup>5</sup>, Kaitlin Doublestein<sup>1</sup>, Stephanie Colon Rodriguez<sup>1</sup>, Pauline Dredger<sup>1</sup>, and Philip W. Valek<sup>2</sup>
- <sup>5</sup> <sup>1</sup> Department of Climate and Space Sciences and Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann
- 6 Arbor, MI, USA
- <sup>7</sup> <sup>2</sup> Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio, TX, USA
- <sup>8</sup> <sup>3</sup>Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign,
- 9 IL, USA
- <sup>4</sup>Finnish Meteorological Institute, Helsinki, Finland
- <sup>11</sup> <sup>5</sup>Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, DC, USA
- 12
- 13 Corresponding author: Michael Liemohn (<u>liemohn@umich.edu</u>)
- 14
- 15 In preparation for/Submitted to Journal of Geophysical Research Space Physics
- 16
- 17

# 18 Key Points:

- A simulation study is conducted to determine the number of spacecraft needed for
   accurate reconstruction of 2D ionospheric outflow patterns
- Determining the global pattern of ionospheric outflow is needed to understand the geospace system, especially during geomagnetic storms
- A potential ionospheric outflow mission concept is defined that could address this
   unresolved key issue of space physics and space weather

# 25

26 AGU Index Terms:

27	•	2431	Ionosphere/magnetosphere interactions (2736)
28	٠	2736	Magnetosphere/ionosphere interactions (2431)
29	٠	2776	Polar cap phenomena
30	٠	2788	Magnetic storms and substorms (4305, 7954)
31	•	2794	Instruments and techniques
22			

32

# 33 Keywords:

- ionospheric outflow, spaceflight hardware, space mission, magnetosphere-ionosphere coupling,
- ion composition, high-latitude ionosphere

36

# 37 Abstract

Ionospheric outflow supplies nearly all of the heavy ions observed within the magnetosphere, as 38 39 well as a significant fraction of the proton density. While much is known about upflow and outflow energization processes, the full global pattern of outflow and its evolution is only known 40 statistically or through numerical modeling. Because of the dominant role of heavy ions in several 41 key physical processes, this unknown nature of the full outflow pattern leads to significant 42 uncertainty in understanding geospace dynamics, especially surrounding storm intervals. That is, 43 global models risk not accurately reproducing the main features of intense space storms because 44 the amount of ionospheric outflow is poorly specified and thus magnetospheric composition and 45 mass loading could be ill-defined. This study defines a potential mission to observe ionospheric 46 outflow from several platforms, allowing for a reasonable and sufficient reconstruction of the full 47 outflow pattern on an orbital cadence. An observing system simulation experiment is conducted, 48 49 revealing that four well-placed satellites are sufficient for reasonably accurate outflow reconstructions. The science scope of this mission could include the following: reveal the global 50 structure of ionospheric outflow; relate outflow patterns to geomagnetic activity level; and 51 determine the spatial and temporal nature of outflow composition. The science objectives could 52 be focused to be achieved with minimal instrumentation (only a low-energy ion spectrometer to 53 obtain outflow reconstructions) or with a larger scientific scope by including contextual 54 instrumentation. Note that the upcoming Geospace Dynamics Constellation mission will observe 55 upwelling but not ionospheric outflow. 56

57

# 58 Plain Language Summary

59 Earth's upper atmosphere above 500 km altitude constantly loses charged particles to outer space

in a process called ionospheric outflow. This outflow is important for the dynamics of the near-

61 Earth space environment ("space weather") yet is poorly understood on a global scale. A mission

62 is needed to observe the global patterns of ionospheric outflow and its relation to space weather

driving conditions. The science objectives of such a mission could include not only the

reconstruction of global outflow patterns but also the relation of these patterns to geomagnetic

activity and the spatial and temporal nature of outflow composition. A study is presented to show

66 that four well-placed spacecraft would be sufficient for reasonable outflow reconstructions.

67

#### 68 **1. Introduction**

The Earth's ionosphere constantly loses material to deep space. This "ionospheric 69 outflow" can be on the order of  $10^{25}$  to  $10^{26}$  ions/s, which is about 1-10 kg/s (e.g., Moore et al., 70 1997). This outflow is not steady but rather reacts to changes in the solar EUV photon flux 71 72 striking the upper atmosphere, as well as to the electromagnetic driving from the solar wind after it has been processed through Earth's magnetosphere. A pivotal feature of intense space storms 73 74 is a change in near-Earth plasma composition from a dominance of protons (e.g., Lui & Hamilton, 1992; Pulkkinen et al., 2001) to heavy ions like O<sup>+</sup> that flows out of Earth's 75 ionosphere at these times (e.g., Chappell et al., 1987; Young et al., 1982). The ionosphere 76 essentially supplies most of the heavy ions that exist in many parts of the magnetosphere (all 77 78 except for  $He^{2+}$ , which originates in the solar wind), such as to the lobe, the plasma sheet, in the far tail, and even to the magnetosheath (Hamilton et al., 1988; Christon et al., 2000, 2002; Mall 79 et al., 2002; Liu et al., 2005; Kistler et al., 2010a, c; Mouikis et al., 2010;). Figure 1 is an artist's 80 rendering of ionospheric outflow, shown here as being dominated by outflow from the cusp (as 81 found by, e.g., Moore et al., 1999a; Lund et al., 2018) with many of the ions escaping into the 82 magnetotail lobes. Seki et al. (2015) provides an excellent review of the processes leading to 83 outflow and Welling et al. (2015b) is a comprehensive examination of the fate of this outflow 84 throughout geospace. 85

86

The presence of heavy ionospheric-origin ions in the magnetosphere has multiple

influences including the following: 87 enhance system inertia; lower the 88 Alfvén speed; modify plasma 89 90 turbulence; control micro-processes like reconnection; and slow the system 91 response time to disturbances. Given 92 the significance of these effects, a 93 number of global magnetospheric fluid 94 models (often magnetohydrodynamic, 95 96 or MHD, codes) have incorporated them to some extent (e.g., Winglee et 97 al., 2002, 2009; Glocer et al., 2009a, b; 98



**Figure 1.** Artist's concept of high latitude ionospheric outflow.

Brambles et al., 2010, 2011; Garcia et al., 2010; Wiltberger et al., 2010; Welling et al., 2011; Ilie 99 et al., 2013, 2015; Liemohn and Welling, 2016). Results from these multifluid simulations show 100 that the presence of heavy ions may slow the magnetospheric convection, reduce the cross-cap 101 potential, influence the dayside reconnection, alter the behavior of the plasma sheet, stimulate 102 substorms, and magnify the storm time Dst. MHD models with ionospheric outflow as an inner 103 magnetospheric boundary condition do not include known kinetic physics effects, though, and 104 such models typically adopt either uniformly distributed outflow or localized (usually near the 105 cusp) upflowing ion fluxes computed, often, from the Strangeway et al. (2005) model. The 106 Strangeway relationship, however, is derived from relatively limited observational data and 107 therefore suffers from several severe drawbacks. For instance, the predicted flux does not depend 108 on season, solar activity, or local time, or universal time. The solar activity needs to be included 109 110 to reproduce the amount of ionization at lower altitudes – that is, the supply of ionospheric ions available for outflow. Moreover, this model does not include a specification of density, velocity, 111 112 and temperature needed as boundary conditions for the MHD simulations; only outflow flux is provided by the Strangeway relationship. 113

Global magnetospheric MHD models reveal that this outflow mass loads the 114 magnetosphere, leading to reactive feedback processes and emergent phenomena not seen during 115 quiescent times (e.g., Wiltberger et al., 2010). However, such global models do not accurately 116 reproduce the observed Dst time series during intense space storms because the global dynamics 117 and amount of ionospheric outflow are only poorly characterized. Figure 2 shows results from 118 the "Dst challenge" (Rastätter et al., 2013), in which several global models were used to 119 reproduce Dst for several very different storms (four shown here). Each model produced 120 dramatically different results, with some codes overestimating the depth of Dst and others barely 121 registering any Dst signature. While the grid resolutions and numerical solvers play a role in 122 these differences, a key critical input is the ionospheric outflow setting, as illustrated by the 123 124 widely different results even from the same model.



**Figure 2.** From Rastätter et al. (2013), Dst data-model comparison from several global models of 4 storm events. One of the reasons that the simulation results are so different from each other, even from the same model, is the assumed ionospheric outflow specification.

Modeling alone cannot properly quantify the global outflow patterns. An in situ mission 125 is needed that would discover how Earth's ionosphere dynamically and globally feeds plasma to 126 its magnetosphere by quantifying the ionospheric outflow intensity, composition, and 127 acceleration variability over both regional and global scales. Some of the ionospheric outflow 128 escapes directly into deep space, but much of it initially circulates within the magnetosphere. 129 This extra mass and dissimilar motion (e.g., the vastly different gyroradii of light and heavy ions) 130 alters the dynamics of the magnetic field, it slows down plasma flow speeds, and it changes the 131 global interaction of the solar wind with the magnetosphere. It can even influence future 132 ionospheric outflow rates. As a result, a natural feedback loop exists. Solar wind conditions 133 govern the outflow, which mass loads the magnetosphere and in return modifies the nature of 134 how the solar wind regulates outflow. Present knowledge of these processes only reveal the 135 spatial structure of the high-latitude ionospheric outflow through long-term statistical 136 compilations of single-spacecraft missions. This is inadequate for describing and fully 137 understanding the dynamics of this feedback system. A mission to measure global ionospheric 138 outflow – in conjunction with upstream measurements of solar wind driving conditions from 139

other spacecraft – would examine this nonlinear connection with multi-point observations
leading to large-scale reconstructions of the ionospheric outflow pattern.

142

#### 143 **2. The need for additional investigation**

144 The polar wind and energetic ion outflow processes have been studied for more than forty years via a variety of both experimental and modeling techniques (cf. reviews by Banks & 145 Holzer, 1968; Moore, 1984; Moore and Delcourt, 1995; Ganguli, 1996; Yau et al., 1997; 146 Hultqvist et al., 1999; Yau et al., 2007; Moore & Horwitz, 2007; Schunk and Nagy, 2009; Moore 147 148 and Horwitz, 2009; Kronberg et al., 2014; Wiltberger, 2015). Past missions – such as the International Satellites for Ionospheric Studies (ISIS), in particular ISIS-1 (e.g., Brinton et al., 149 150 1971; Hoffman & Dodson, 1980), or the Dynamics Explorer satellites, notably DE-1 (e.g., Gurgiolo & Burch, 1982; Nagai et al., 1984, Chandler et al., 1991), as well as Akebono (e.g., 151 152 Abe et al., 1993; Yau et al., 1995), Polar (e.g., Su et al., 1998b; Moore et al., 1999a, b; Liemohn et al., 2005, 2007), the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program (DMSP) spacecraft (e.g., Colev 153 154 et al., 2003); the Fast Auroral SnapShoT (FAST) mission (e.g., Strangeway et al., 2000, 2005), and the Cluster mission (e.g., Kistler et al., 2010a; Liao et al., 2015; Dandouras, 2021) - have 155 156 observed ionospheric outflow with one or two spacecraft. Sometimes these are well-instrumented to observe energy input and ionospheric outflow response, leading to input-outflow correlations. 157 Based on this work, the basic physics of outflow of thermal plasma from the terrestrial 158 ionosphere at high latitudes is well known. Figure 3 shows a schematic that summarizes the 159 major processes of outflow. Shown here are Joule heating in the thermosphere and ionosphere 160 (e.g., Foster et al., 1983; Gombosi & Killeen, 1987; Pollock et al., 1990; Liu et al., 1995), 161 ponderomotive or transverse ion acceleration by plasma waves (e.g., Whalen et al., 1991; Miller 162 et al., 1995; Lundin & Guglielmi, 2006), acceleration by parallel electric fields (e.g., Cladis, 163 1986; Schunk, 2000; Chaston et al., 2016), and high-altitude centrifugal energization (e.g., 164 Horwitz et al., 1994; Demars et al., 1996; Winglee, 2000). Various populations of energetic 165 electrons are also possible channels for heating or accelerating ions to escape velocities, such as 166 atmospheric photoelectrons (e.g., Lemaire, 1971; Khazanov et al., 1997; Tam et al., 2007; Glocer 167 et al., 2017), polar rain (e.g., Waite et al., 1985; Wilson et al., 1997; Su et al., 1998a), and soft 168 electrons in the dayside cusp (e.g., Nilsson et al., 1994; Valek et al., 2002; Fuselier et al., 2003; 169



Yizengaw et al., 2006; Wiltberger et al., 2010) or nightside auroral zone (e.g., Wahlund et al.,
1992; Richards, 1995; Barakat et al., 1998; Wu et al., 1999; Lynch et al., 2007; Zeng & Horwitz,
2007).

As the outflowing ions drift through the different regions (e.g., Elliott et al., 2007), the 173 plasma is energized by mechanisms that operate with different levels of intensity at different 174 175 altitudes and in different high-latitude regions. Most of the outflow comes from the dayside cusp and nightside auroral zones. A particularly difficult confounding element, however, is the transit 176 177 of upflowing ions from the topside ionosphere to higher altitudes where additional acceleration converts these populations into outflow. That is, observed outflow can be related to energization 178 179 processes, but the spatial distribution of outflow is only known statistically or from numerical modeling. The inherent time delay in the outflow process obscures correlations between driving 180 factor and outflow intensity. 181

Figure 4 shows two ionospheric outflow patterns (of ion radial velocity), from Akebono
measurements (Abe et al., 2004) and from numerical modeling (Glocer et al., 2012). The

observed pattern was assembled from many years of data, yet it still reveals significant meso-184 scale structure in the outflow pattern. This is most likely due to statistical noise as the radial 185 velocity changes considerably from pass to pass. The modeled pattern has several features in 186 common with the statistical pattern, including meso-scale patches of intense outflow speeds, but 187 other aspects are not the same. For a global modeling simulation of a particular event, it is not 188 fully adequate to use either of these approaches for the outflow specification, leading to 189 uncertainty in the magnetospheric fate and consequences, introducing a large caveat to any large-190 191 scale geospace simulation study and the analysis and prediction of space weather.



**Figure 4.** Examples of the spatial complexity inherent in  $O^+$  outflow velocity in the polar (>60° invariant latitude) ionosphere. The left frame is constructed from nearly a decade of Akebono satellite observations (Abe et al., 2004), yet still shows a highly structured outflow pattern. The right frame is constructed from Polar Wind Outflow Model (adapted from the results of Glocer et al., 2012) when 392 flux tubes are simulated under moderate solar driving. Note that the two colorscales are different.

192 Importantly, the current statistically-known spatial structure does not reveal the dynamics of outflow. While *in situ* measurements have revealed important statistical properties of ion 193 194 outflow, measurements are made at a given magnetic local time (MLT) and altitude. Since they 195 are taken over some period of time (a few minutes), it does not allow the determination of the temporal and spatial variation of ion outflow in response to variable solar wind and 196 197 interplanetary magnetic field (IMF) conditions during the progression of geomagnetic storms. As argued by Liemohn et al. (2022), it is important to understand event-specific spatial and temporal 198 199 variability in order to quantify the impact of outflow on the geospace system. The community lacks this capability with respect to the structure of outflow for any particular disturbed time. 200 All of this uncertainty about the spatial pattern of outflow consolidates in our estimates of 201

202 fluence, or the global outflow rate from the ionosphere into the magnetosphere. Currently,

fluence is estimated only to order-of-magnitude accuracy (Yau et al., 1988; Cully et al., 2003; Lennartsson et al., 2004). All estimations are based on statistical studies from single-spacecraft missions. Estimates from models vary wildly (e.g., Welling et al., 2016), providing limited insight on the true value. After decades of investigations, we still cannot confidently state the spatial distribution and amount of ionospheric plasma that enters the magnetosphere.

Note that the upcoming Geospace Dynamics Constellation (GDC) mission is not 208 designed to achieve the objective considered here of a global map of ionospheric outflow. While 209 the payload of its six spacecraft includes a low-energy ion instrument, its target altitude below 210 211 400 km is significantly too low for the task proposed here. That is, it might see ionospheric *upwelling*, but does not distinguish the portion that becomes ionospheric *outflow*. Much of the 212 213 acceleration for heavy ions to reach escape velocity occurs at higher altitude than where GDC will be located. To observe outflow, the satellite should be, at a minimum, above 1000 km, and 214 2000 km would be even better to ensure that most of the ions have reached escape velocity and 215 are therefore actually leaving the atmosphere. 216

217

# 3. Potential science objectives of this mission

There are three main science objectives that should be targeted for a mission devoted to observing the pattern of high-latitude ionospheric outflow:

- 220
- Reveal the global structure of ionospheric outflow
- 221
- Relate outflow patterns to solar wind driving and geomagnetic activity
- 222
- Determine the spatial and temporal nature of outflow composition

An ancillary modeling task that should be associated with this mission is mapping the outflow through the magnetosphere and connecting the outflow patterns to any available relevant measurements elsewhere in geospace.

226

#### 3.1. Reveal the global structure of ionopsheric outflow

Ionospheric outflow is a time-varying source of plasma for the near-Earth space
 environment. Outflow forms complex and spatially detailed patterns. The composition,
 magnitude, and spatial distribution of outflowing fluxes vary strongly as a function of solar and
 magnetospheric activity. Outflowing plasma feeds the magnetosphere, playing a role in almost

all global processes. In order to understand magnetospheric dynamics, it is critical to understand
the complicated and non-linear dynamics of outflow. Ionospheric outflow is a mosaic of many
different populations, creating a complicated spatial structure that cannot be captured by singlespacecraft missions.

235 Ionospheric outflow organizes into distinct regions, including polar cap, auroral zone, and cusp outflow. Nested within these regions are distinct populations, such as bulk cold outflows 236 with temperatures below 1 eV and suprathermal flows (10 eV up to low keV), such as ion beams 237 and conics. The distributions are highly non-Maxwellian, forming pancake, conic, toroid, bi-238 239 Maxwellian, double-peaked, counter-streaming, and elongated-tail distributions (Andre and Yau, 1997; Schunk and Nagy, 2009). These flows contain both light and heavy ions: H<sup>+</sup>, He<sup>+</sup>, N<sup>+</sup>, and 240 O<sup>+</sup>. While outflow regions can be expansive (e.g., the polar cap), they are often localized and 241 overlapping (Giles et al., 1994; Abe et al., 2004). Of particular interest is the cusp, which is 242 limited in area (typically a few hundred kilometers in any direction at ionospheric altitudes, as 243 found by Newell and Meng (1994)), but yields strong outflowing fluxes to the magnetosphere 244 (Lockwood et al., 1988; Kistler et al., 2010b). Meso-scale outflow "hotspots" also exist, with 245 spatial scales of several hundred kilometers. Figure 4 shows different illustrations of the complex 246 spatial pattern, both statistically observed (left panel) and simulated (right panel). Both large and 247 meso-scale outflow features are apparent in both panels of Figure 4. The characteristics of each 248 outflow population, including energy, pitch angle, and source location, all determine how that 249 population will be transported into and throughout the magnetosphere (Delcourt et al., 1989; 250 251 Cully et al., 2003; Huddleston et al., 2005).

Beyond an understanding that this complexity exists, we know little concerning the 252 global distribution of specific ionospheric outflow populations. Coarse maps are constructed 253 statistically using single-spacecraft observations aggregated over long periods (Abe et al., 2004; 254 Peterson et al., 2006). These studies yield only an initial idea of flux distributions. When 255 segregated by energy or distribution shape, the available statistics are too low to be useful. 256 257 Though strong east-west oriented IMF can drive pronounced interhemispheric asymmetries in ionospheric dynamics (e.g., Weimer, 2001a, b), such asymmetries are rarely considered in 258 259 outflow because of observation limitations, particularly in the southern hemisphere.

260

### **3.2. Relate outflow patterns to geomagnetic activity level**

Compounding the spatial complexity of outflow is its temporal nature. Outflow regions 261 follow the magnetospheric geometry: as the cusp (e.g., Farrell and Van Allen, 1990; Fung et al., 262 1997; Zhou et al., 2000; Pitout et al., 2006) and auroral oval move as a function of solar driving 263 and magnetospheric activity, and corresponding ionospheric plasma sources. Many acceleration 264 processes are also the result of energy inputs from the solar wind and magnetosphere. This 265 results in outflow patterns that are tied not only to the solar cycle (e.g., Yau et al., 1985, 1998; 266 Abe et al., 2004), but also to specific solar wind conditions (Lennartsson et al., 2004; Elliott et 267 al., 2001; Cully et al., 2003), geomagnetic storm phase (Nosé, et al., 2003; Moore et al., 1999; 268 Kitamura et al., 2010), and magnetospheric transients, such as substorms (Øieroset et al., 1999; 269 Wilson et al., 2004; Kistler et al., 2006). The resultant outflowing fluxes at 2000 km altitude vary 270 from  $1 \times 10^5$  cm<sup>-2</sup>s<sup>-1</sup> to  $5 \times 10^8$  cm<sup>-2</sup>s<sup>-1</sup> as a function of season, species, and geomagnetic and 271 solar activity (Yau et al., 2007). 272

Single satellite missions have not been able to resolve time dynamics of outflow. 273 Statistical studies can only quantify outflow variability via total fluence as a function of simple 274 indices (Yau et al., 1988) or binned by average solar wind conditions (Cully et al., 2003). Such 275 276 studies cannot illustrate important details across storm timescales. What outflow regions and populations are most prominent during different storm phases? How does outflow compare 277 between different types of storms, such as coronal mass ejection (CME) or corotating interaction 278 region (CIR) driven events? How does the occurrence, size, and intensity of outflow hotspots 279 depend on storm phase and intensity? These questions cannot be answered with traditional, 280 single-point measurements, limiting our understanding of how dynamic outflow affects the 281 active magnetosphere. 282

Researchers cannot understand the highly time dynamic nature of ionospheric outflow without frequent, distributed observations. This mission concept would provide these measurements and solve the question about how outflow evolves over the course of a geomagnetic storm. 287

## **3.3.** Determine the spatial and temporal nature of outflow composition

The proposed mission should have the capability to separately measure the outflowing 288 plasma population and identify its major constituents. Measuring composition provides an 289 avenue to distinguish between energization and transport mechanisms (e.g., Ilie and Liemohn, 290 2016). For instance, in spite of only 12% mass difference, nitrogen and oxygen have different 291 ionization energies (15.6 eV and 12.1 eV respectively) as well as different scale heights 292 (Chappell et al., 1982). The cross section for charge transfer between atomic hydrogen and 293 nitrogen ions is significantly different than the cross section for charge transfer between atomic 294 295 hydrogen and oxygen ions (Stebbings et al., 1960). Because the peak production rates for those two ionospheric heavy ions usually happen at different altitudes, their abundance in the outflow 296 297 serves as a tracer for the altitude dependent energization processes. Theoretical studies predict significant densities of N<sup>+</sup> (e.g., Schunk and Raitt, 1980; Sojka et al., 1982; Lin et al., 2020; Lin 298 and Ilie, 2022), showing a strong dependence on diurnal, seasonal, and geomagnetic activity as 299 well as universal time. 300

Since the production of N<sup>+</sup> increases with increased energy input, it is expected that it is 301 more prevalent in the auroral regions. Observation of enhanced N<sup>+</sup> fluxes outside the auroral 302 303 region would reveal new insight into latitudinal transport of heavy ions and consequently the overall ionospheric dynamics. Because the mass distribution of accelerated ionospheric ions 304 reflects the source region of the low altitude ion composition, any measurement of a minor ion 305 constituent of the accelerated plasma serves as a tracer of ionospheric and energization processes 306 307 (e.g., Winningham & Gurgiolo, 1982; Glocer & Daldorff, 2022). Ion velocity space measurements alone reveal the basic breakdown of these processes, separating classic polar wind 308 (heating only, allowing the high-energy tail to escape) from potential-driven outflow (various E 309 contributions) and wave heating (transversely accelerated ions and conics). 310

Enhancement of ion outflow is also associated with an increase in the solar wind dynamic pressure (Moore et al., 1999a; Elliott et al., 2001; Cully et al., 2003; Ogawa et al., 2009) and in the solar wind electric field (Lennartsson, 1995; Elliott et al., 2001). The amount of outflowing ion flux and the interplay between different energization mechanisms are largely governed by changes in the solar wind density, velocity, and IMF because it is these parameters that control the precipitation into the ionosphere and the convection electric field (Moore and Horwitz,

2007). Furthermore, the enhancement of ionospheric outflow becomes larger with increasing 317 geomagnetic activity as the auroral oval (where the largest ionospheric outflow occurs) moves 318 equatorward (Ogawa et al., 2009). At higher altitudes, the curvature of the magnetic field in the 319 polar cap produces a centrifugal acceleration of the convecting plasma and this effect becomes 320 important during times of strong convection. However, centrifugal acceleration affects 321 predominantly the lowest energy ions by increasing their parallel velocity (Cladis, 1986). To 322 measure outflow, the satellites should be above the acceleration region that pushes them above 323 324 escape velocity (at least 1000 km altitude, and perhaps much higher).

325

#### **3.4.** Map outflow throughout the magnetosphere

Our understanding of outflow's role throughout the magnetosphere is tempered by our tenuous understanding of outflow itself. A combination of global outflow observations with numerical modeling is necessary to completely reveal how ionospheric outflow maps throughout the magnetosphere.

An example of this is presented in Figure 5. The main graphic shows trajectory traces of 330 H<sup>+</sup> and O<sup>+</sup> ions through a multifluid global simulation that resolves velocities for each ion 331 species. It is seen that the locations of initial contact with the plasma sheet are vastly different for 332 the two species, which could modify magnetotail dynamics. The inset in Figure 5 shows the 333 "fate" of ionospheric outflow as a function of initial location within the high-latitude ionosphere. 334 This is similar to the fate maps from Huddleston et al. (2005), except that, instead of an empirical 335 field description, this uses results from an MHD model (Gombosi et al., 2021; with setup like 336 337 that of Liemohn & Welling, 2016, and Glocer et al., 2018). For this particular model configuration and driving condition (nominal southward IMF), a pattern can be obtained 338 revealing which ionospheric locations contribute to which magnetospheric regions. 339

The temporal and spatial complexities of ionospheric outflow propagate through the magnetosphere, affecting system-level dynamics. Observations paint a clear dependence between solar wind/magnetospheric activity and heavy ion composition in the magnetosphere. In the lobes, different populations disperse by energy and species (Chappell et al., 1987). O<sup>+</sup> beams from the cusp distinguish themselves from isotropic nightside auroral O<sup>+</sup> (Kistler et al., 2010b; Liao et al., 2010; Kistler et al., 2016). Very cold ion populations indicate cold, classical polar wind outflow (Engwall et al., 2009; Andre et al., 2015). Faster populations can escape the



**Figure 5.** Streamline traces of ionospheric outflow from 5 locations on the model inner boundary along the noon-midnight meridian in the northern hemisphere (view is from dawn). The orange curves are for  $O^+$  and the green curves are for  $H^+$ . The thin white lines show closed magnetic field lines and the thin red lines are the last closed field lines on the dayside and nightside. The inset panel shows the fate of mapping outflow from a starting grid in the northern hemisphere (noon at the top), with their first crossings of the equatorial plane indicated by color: central plasma sheet (red); dayside inner magnetosphere (yellow); nightside inner magnetosphere (light blue); precipitation back into the model inner boundary (dark blue); and loss to deep space (white).

347 geospace domain all the way to deep space, while slower (and typically heavier) populations

arrive at the plasma sheet (Young et al., 1982; Lennartsson and Shelley, 1986; Moore et al.,

- 2005a, b; Nosé et al. 2005; Mouikis et al., 2010). Here, they are accelerated sunward, feeding the
- partial and symmetric ring current hot ion populations (e.g., Gloeckler et al., 1985; Daglis et al.,
- 1999; Denton et al., 2005). Figure 6 (from Nosé et al., 2003) shows the energy density ratio in
- the inner magnetosphere and near-Earth plasma sheet, between  $O^+$  and  $H^+$  (in red) and between
- He<sup>+</sup> and H<sup>+</sup> (in blue). In these ratios, the numerator species is supplied only by the ionosphere
- 354 while protons could be sourced from either the ionosphere or the solar wind. It is clear that the

energy density of the ring current becomes increasingly carried by O<sup>+</sup> as a function of storm
 intensity.

Although ionospheric outflow is a major source of magnetospheric plasma, recent studies suggest a more complicated connection. Numerical models have repeatedly demonstrated that the characteristics of outflow at its source, including mass, pitch angle, and energy, help dictate the fate of the plasma inside the magnetosphere (Huddleston et al., 2005; Brambles et al., 2010; Garcia et al., 2010; Yu and Ridley, 2013a, b). Within the plasma sheet, characteristics like composition, distance down tail, and pitch angle distribution dictate the amount of acceleration of the plasma (Delcourt et al., 1989, 1993; Kronberg et al., 2012). The characteristics of outflow

10.00

throughout the plasma sheet control how 364 effectively it will energize the ring current (e.g., 365 Welling et al., 2011). Further, as outflow affects 366 magnetospheric dynamics, such as substorm 367 development (Wiltberger et al., 2010; Welling et 368 al., 2016) and cross polar cap potential (Winglee 369 et al., 2002; Welling and Zaharia, 2012; Ilie et al., 370 371 2013, 2015), it is also affecting the energy input into the ionosphere, creating non-linear 372 magnetosphere-ionosphere feedback loops 373 (Moore et al., 2014; Welling and Liemohn, 2016). 374 375 These have been linked to sudden ring current intensifications (Welling et al., 2015a) and the 376 development of global sawtooth oscillations 377

(Brambles et al., 2011, 2013). The geopauses –

378

5. Greenspan & Hamilton et al. (2002) 1. Gloecker et al. (1985) 2. Krimigis et al. (1985) 6. Roeder et al. (1996) 3. Hamilton et al. (1988) 7. Daglis et al. (1997) 4. Fieldstein et al. (2000) 8. Daglis et al. (2000) .6 1.00 Energy Density Ratio 3 •6 0.10 . 3 06 He<sup>\*</sup>/ 10 383 0.0 Quiet Storm -300 -100 -200 0 Dst or SYM-H (nT) TA009981-ExHAIL

**Ring Current and Plasma Sheet Ion Composition** 

**Figure 6.** The energy density ratio between  $O^+$  and  $H^+$  (in red) and between  $He^+$  and  $H^+$  (in blue) of the ring current and plasma sheet as a function of geomagnetic activity, as indexed by Dst or SYM-H (Nosé et al., 2003). Note the logarithmic scale on the y axis.

those surfaces in near-Earth space where the contribution from solar and ionospheric origin
plasma are equal (in density, mass, or pressure) – are boundaries that define changes in the

physical processes governing plasma flow (e.g., Trung et al., 2019; 2023). The community now

recognizes that magnetospheric dynamics rely critically on outflow dynamics.

The source of most of the uncertainties regarding geospace dynamics are caused by the limitations of our current understanding of the spatial and temporal variation of ionospheric outflow. Observational studies of ion composition in geospace must rely on inference to connect the source population to the magnetospheric observations (e.g., Kistler et al., 2016). Numerical

simulations depend on the inherently flawed statistical outflow distributions to seed models,

propagating error throughout the magnetosphere (e.g., Huddleston et al., 2005; Peroomian et al.,

2006). Scientists are simply unable to definitively answer critical questions connecting outflow

and the magnetosphere.

### **4. Determining the optimal number of spacecraft**

While it would be ideal to know ionospheric outflow everywhere at all times, this would require a Starlink-level constellation of hundreds of satellites. Instead, there is a trade space of cost versus reconstruction accuracy that needs to be assessed to determine the optimal number of spacecraft that would provide reasonable reconstructions most of the time. Therefore, an observing system simulation experiment is useful to provide some constraints on the constellation configuration.

398 This exploration was conducted using several existing outflow patterns, represented here by results from a high-resolution single-fluid MHD simulation, specifically those from Welling 399 & Liemohn (2014). For more on the numerical code, please see the latest summary of the Space 400 Weather Modeling Framework (SWMF) (Gombosi et al., 2021). Using values extracted from the 401 402 original outflow pattern, a reconstruction is generated from these "observations" through binning and interpolation. Each virtual spacecraft takes 401 samples per orbit per hemisphere. These 403 values are then sorting into 51 eually-spaced latitude bins per hemisphere and each latitude ring 404 of values are then interpolated into 45 equally-spaced longitude bins using the Piecewise Cubic 405 Hermite Interpolating Polynomial (PCHIP; Fritsch and Carlson, 1980). The PCHIP method 406 conducts a cubic spline fit on a one-dimensional data set (in this case, the extracted outflow 407 fluxes for a specific latitude band), with an extra filter that blends in linear interpolation to both 408 preserve monotonicity of the resulting reconstruction and minimize overshoots near steep 409 gradients within the data. The result is continuous but not necessarily smooth. 410

Latitudes above the available data are pruned, leaving an unreconstructed region at the pole. The reconstruction is a function of the number of satellites, the inclination of the orbit crossing point from the geomagnetic pole, the magnetic local time of the orbit crossing point, and the longitudinal separation of the orbit planes. Two solar wind input conditions (IMF northward and southward) are used for the statistical study, and a time series of drivingconditions are used for a real-event case study.

417

#### 4.1. Example reconstruction patterns

Figure 7 illustrates the product of the reconstruction algorithm. For this example, the 418 419 MHD result was produced using steady driving with an IMF Bz of -10 nT, taken from the simulation at 3  $R_E$  geocentric distance (the inner boundary of the MHD model was set at 2.5  $R_E$ ) 420 and mapped down to 1800 km altitude using flux conversation along assumed dipole field lines. 421 For this reconstruction, three satellite passes were used with a crossing at 80° at local dawn (the 422 sun is to the right in each of the plots), with a nodal separation of the orbit planes of 60°. While 423 some meso-scale outflow features are missed because an orbit plane did not pass through them, 424 the overall pattern in the reconstruction is qualitatively similar to that of the original. Listed at 425 the top of the original and reconstructed outflow maps is the total escaping ion fluence, which 426 are only ~1% different. 427

To assess the appropriateness and quality of the selected reconstruction method, Figure 8 428 429 shows a PCHIP fit at the highest latitude band from the example in Figure 7. The red dots are the extracted data values. Because this is the highest latitude band, the satellite trajectories are 430 moving on a very shallow arc (i.e., nearly horizontally) through the band, so even though there 431 are only three satellites, each one contributes many points to the reconstruction. To enforce 432 periodicity of the reconstruction, the data are repeated three times within to ensure continuity of 433 the fit at  $\pm 180^{\circ}$ . The PCHIP result is shown in blue. Figure 8 shows that the PCHIP algorithm is 434 435 excellent at reconstructing the functional form of the data in regions where data exists, while also







**Figure 8.** Example of a PCHIP fitting calculation of outflow flux as a function of longitude at a specific latitude band, specifically the highest latitude ring of the reconstruction example shown in Figure 7. The red dots are the MHD values extracted as "observations" within a particular colatitude band, repeated three times to ensure continuity of the fit. Values from the The blue curve is the PCHIP reconstruction.

creating a smooth curve through regions with no data points. It also does not introduce any new

437 extrema beyond the observed maximum and minimum values.

438 Extending this example, Figure 9 shows reconstructions of that same MHD outflow

439 pattern using one through five spacecraft passes for the reconstruction. To provide a different

example from that shown in Figure 7, the crossing location in Figure 9 is at 85° at local midnight

and the maximum orbit plane separation is set to  $90^{\circ}$ . The reconstruction with a single spacecraft

442 marginally reproduces a few of the global features but none of the meso-scale hotspots of

443 outflow. This is to be expected as there are only two extracted values for each latitude ring, so

each band in the reconstruction has a rather sinusoidal form. With two spacecraft, the global

445 pattern is better, but the local features are still missing. Although patterns created from two or



**Figure 9.** Reconstruction from a known spatial pattern of ionospheric outflow (upper left) using one through five spacecraft passes.

one spacecraft capture the large-scale features, these patterns reproduce essentially none of the localized outflow peaks and troughs. The pattern from three spacecraft is good but lacks some of the details of the hot spot structure within the outflow map. With four or five spacecraft, the localized features become resolved. Furthermore, it is seen that the interpolated pattern from four spacecraft is quite similar to that from five spacecraft.

451

# 4.2. Outflow reconstruction optimization

To quantify this, goodness of fit values for the 2D outflow map reconstructions were produced for constellations of one to six satellites. To further explore different mission phases, reconstructions were made using different orbit geomagnetic inclinations (from 65° to 90° in 5° increments), azimuths (i.e., local time) of orbit crossing points (full 360° at 14.4° increments) and spread of orbit planes (from 2° to 100° between the most distant satellites, in 10 settings, with any additional satellites above two equally spaced between these end members of the set). In all, over 10,000 spatial reconstructions were produced per MHD outflow spatial pattern plot. For the results in this section, two such MHD patterns are considered, for a southward and northward IMF condition. These were taken from Welling & Liemohn (2014) from singlefluid MHD simulations. As seen in the first panels of Figures 7 and 9, the large-scale features of these initial ionospheric outflow patterns consist of outflow from the auroral oval (around all local times with a latitudinal extent of 5-10°) with embedded "hot spots" of higher-intensity outflow flux (spanning 1-2 hours in local time and 3-5° in latitude). These are the scale of the features for which the reconstruction is being optimized.

The quality of reconstruction was then quantified. The fluxes at each latitude and 466 longitude were compared between the reconstruction and the original pattern, resulting in a 467 scatterplot of these paired values. This scatterplot was distilled to metric scores using root-mean-468 469 squared error (RMSE) and correlation coefficient (R), comparing each point within the reconstruction to the same point in the original outflow map. While two metrics are not enough 470 for a robust analysis, these particular two metrics are from the accuracy and association 471 categories (see, e.g., Liemohn et al., 2021) and provide a balanced overview of the goodness of 472 fit between the patterns. This is only an initial conceptual study assessing the trade space 473 between constellation configuration and reconstruction accuracy; a more thorough investigation 474 of parameter space should be conducted for specific flight opportunities to justify the concept for 475 that particular mission. 476

These two metrics are shown as a function of the number of satellites in Figure 10. These 477 box-and-whisker plots were compiled using all combinations of the other inputs for both IMF 478 479 settings. The box shows the interquartile range and the whiskers present the full range of the metric scores. The median R exceeds 0.7 by three satellites, and rises to 0.75 by six satellites. 480 Surpassing this 0.7 level is useful because this corresponds to coefficient of determination score 481 (defined as  $R^2$ ) of 0.5.  $R^2$  is a measure of how much of the variance in one parameter is captured 482 by similar variance in the other parameter (the two parameters, in this case, being the outflow 483 fluxes). Therefore, a median  $R^2$  of 0.5 indicates that 50% of the variance in the original outflow 484 flux number sets is reproduced by the reconstructed number sets. To put it another way, passing 485 an R of 0.7 means that the reconstructions contain a majority of the features in the original 486 487 pattern.



**Figure 9.** Correlation (R) and root mean square error (RMSE) as a function of the number of satellites used in the reconstruction. All reconstructions as a function of local time of orbit crossing, magnetic latitude of the crossing, nodal separation of the spacecraft, and geomagnetic activity are included. The red bar shows the median metric score, the box shows the interquartile range, and the whiskers extend to the extremes of the distributions.

There are two other features to note in Figure 10. The metrics medians appear to level off by three or four satellites in the constellation, and essentially asymptote at six satellites (i.e., no discernible no change from five satellites). The boxplot presentation also reveals asymmetries in the underlying histogram of values, showing a skew in all of the distributions with an elongated tail towards poorer reconstructions. This is because all of the parameter settings were included in the plot creation, including those with small satellite separation or badly aligned orbit plane crossing locations (relative to outflow features in the MHD patterns).

To investigate the spread in the boxplots of Figure 10, Figure 11 shows median RMSE scores and correlation coefficients as a function of two constellation parameters, the number of satellites and the magnetic latitude of the orbit plane crossing. Each white grid crossing in the plots is a constellation configuration setting for these two parameters, the color is smoothed to fill in each panel. All settings for the other two parameters are included in the number sets leading to the median values presented in Figure 11. Note that the colorscales for both of the metrics are optimized for the values in the plot and do not start at zero. 502 Magnetic latitude of the crossing is analogous to inclination of the orbit planes, but not 503 the same, of course, because the magnetic poles are not aligned with the geographic poles, 504 introducing a systematic diurnal variation to the magnetic latitude of the orbit crossing. That is, 505 this is not a parameter of a real satellite mission, which would require weighted averaging of a 506 span of magnetic latitude crossings to determine the accuracy for a given inclination. That said, 507 this presentation is informative to help guide the choice of an optimal inclination for the 508 constellation.

The clear feature of Figure 11 is that there is a peak in the metric scores (maximum R, minimum RMSE) at 80°. Both metrics are noticeably worse for lower crossing latitudes; this is expected as the satellites spend little time in the auroral zone and therefore miss most of the outflow. The interesting result is that the metrics are worse for an 85° and 90° magnetic latitude crossing than for the optimal crossing of 80°. This is because, at these high-inclination settings, the orbits are cutting through the auroral zone – where most of the outflow occurs – with a more



**Figure 11.** Metrics versus number of satellites and the magnetic latitude of the crossing point. The median metric is shown from the distribution of values from the remaining parameters in the reconstruction analysis.



**Figure 12.** Left: Correlation coefficient as a function of number of spacecraft in the constellation (x axis) and the maximum orbit plan separation angle (y axis). The median score is shown from the distribution created by the other parameters in the analysis. Right: median correlation coefficient as a function of orbit plane separation for a four satellite constellation.

- 515 meridional trajectory. With a meridional trajectory, the satellites spend less time in the auroral
- zone and contribute fewer values to the reconstruction. There appears to be an optimal
- reconstruction for which the crossing is just poleward of the auroral zone, providing a maximal
- orbital path length through the entire latitude band of the high outflow flux.
- Figure 12 shows median correlation coefficients as a function of the maximum orbit plane separation and number of satellites. Only correlation is shown here in order to present a different kind of second panel; the right plot is a slice through the other for the four-satellite constellation configuration. As with Figures 10 and 11, the RMSE results (not shown) reveal the same trends as the correlation plots included in the figure.

In Figure 12, it is seen that the best correlations are located in the upper right corner of 524 the left panel. The reconstruction improves with both number of satellites and orbit plane 525 separation. The right panel reveals a limit to this improvement, though, as the peak correlation is 526 found at  $\sim 90^{\circ}$  separation. As the maximum separation expands past 90°, the inter-orbit separation 527 of the constellation becomes large enough to start to miss meso-scale features (at least in some of 528 529 the constellation configurations), and the median reconstruction slightly decreases. The drop in median correlation from 90° to 100° is not significant, but it is the start of a trend that will 530 continue as the maximum orbit plane separation increases to 180°. At that point, the two end 531

members of the constellation are flying along nearly the same trajectory but in opposite directions, therefore they are not contributing two satellites' worth of information to the reconstruction.

Also shown in the right panel of Figure 12 is that the median correlation coefficient for a 4-satellite constellation exceeds 0.7 for a maximum separation of 55° or more. This can be considered a cutoff threshold for producing reasonable reconstructions (in which most of the variation in the original pattern is captured by the reconstruction) with a reasonable number of satellites (four).

The magnetic local time of the orbit plane crossing did not show a trend in either RMSE or R. The spread is large and the differences in the median values were not significant and do not need to be shown. Parsing the study results further, this parameter only mattered for small orbit plane separation. For this case, very few of the reconstructions are of high quality, but a crossing on the nightside was marginally better than one on the dayside.

545

#### **4.3. Outflow during a storm interval**

The above analysis showed that 4 satellites with a  $>55^{\circ}$  orbit plane separation between 546 547 the end-member spacecraft produces fairly accurate reconstructions. That assessment, however, was conducted with only two outflow patterns, a nominal southward IMF case and a nominal 548 549 northward IMF case, with standard solar wind parameters. It is useful to test the reconstruction method and the ability of a constellation to reconstruct outflow during a storm interval. Using the 550 same SWMF model configuration as above, the "St. Patrick's Day Storm" of 17-18 March 2015 551 was simulated. For reference, the Dst time series for this storm is shown in the upper panel of 552 Figure 13. 553

554 Outflow patterns were obtained from the SWMF every minute. Reconstructions were 555 then compiled on a 2-hour cadence, which would be the cadence of a 2000 km altitude 556 constellation presumably taking these outflow measurements. The number of spacecraft was set 557 to four and the maximum orbit plane separation set to 90° (i.e., 30° separation between each of 558 the orbit planes). To build up statistics, the local time and magnetic latitude of the crossing were 559 varied, using four local times (00, 06, 12, and 18) and four latitudes (65°, 75°, 85°, and 95°). In 560 all, 1920 reconstructions were conducted for each two-hour period throughout the storm interval.



**Figure 13.** The top panel shows the Dst index time series during the 17-18 March 2015 magnetic storm interval. The bottom panel shows the northern hemisphere ionospheric outflow fluence from the MHD model (blue line) and the box-and-whisker distribution of fluences from the reconstructions.

To provide an overall assessment of the reconstructions, Figure 13 shows the time series 561 of the integrated outflow fluence (lower panel), both from the SWMF model (on a one-minute 562 cadence) and from the reconstructions (on a two-hour cadence as boxplots). Of the 26 boxplots 563 in this figure, 19 have model values passing through the interquartile range of the reconstructed 564 fluences (the "box" of the boxplot). The reconstructed fluences are usually at or below the 565 original values, indicating that the reconstruction method usually captures the basic pattern of the 566 outflow but not all of the meso-scale "hot spots" of elevated flux. There were a few times where 567 the reconstructed fluences were entirely below the 120 original MHD fluences in that two-hour 568 window, but for most of the intervals, the reconstructions are doing reasonably well. 569

570

# 5. Discussion on implementation

It is expected that a mission fulfilling the orbital requirements defined in section 4 above would consist of several identically-instrumented, longitudinally-separated, high-inclination spacecraft observing the low-energy ion velocity distribution above 1000 km altitude (in order to observe outflow, not upwelling) and below 3000 km altitude (to minimize orbital period and surface area of the orbit shell). Initial cost estimates suggest that such a mission could be achieved within the constraints of the Heliophysics Small Explorer mission line with minimalinstrumentation.

In its simplest configuration with only an ion spectrometer, this type of mission concept 578 579 represents an important measurement paradigm that is ideally suited for the Explorer mission line. Instead of measuring "everything" at one or two locations, this constellation would 580 "globally" measure one key plasma property. The satellites in the constellation would relate 581 different portions of the high latitude ionospheric outflow with each other, connecting dayside 582 with nightside outflow rates and revealing storm-sequence time lags and correlations. Significant 583 584 progress in our understanding of ion outflow would be achieved with only the low-energy ion velocity space measurement at several locations, moving our understanding of system science of 585 geospace as a whole to the next level. Note that if the full  $4\pi$  field of view of the ion velocity 586 distribution is measured by this ion instrument, then the downflowing low-energy ions would 587 also be observed and subsequently constructed into maps every orbit period. 588

An alternative mission concept to the single instrument payload would be to design the spacecraft with additional instrumentation to provide observations that complement and contextualize the ion data. This would most likely need to be proposed at the Heliophysics Midsized Explorer level (or larger) to maintain the four-satellite constellation. With only one wellinstrumented spacecraft, the mission would repeat the findings of the FAST or Akebono missions and would not be particularly innovative without some other major design augmentation to make it worthy of the investment.

A limitation of this study is that it is assumed that the outflow pattern is steady for the 596 duration of the high-latitude passage of the constellation, i.e., 20 to 30 minutes. This is a 597 598 somewhat reasonable assumption, given that the outflowing ions are moving at only a few to tens of kilometers per second, and therefore take many minutes to flow from the ionosphere (let's say 599 the starting altitude is in the topside ionosphere at 300 km altitude) to a nominal observation 600 altitude of around 2000 km. If an ion is accelerated along the field line with just enough force to 601 602 barely overcome gravity and maintain a 1 km/s upward velocity, then it would take 28 minutes for this ion to traverse this 1700 km distance and reach the satellite. If, however, the outflowing 603 604 ions maintain a velocity of 10 km/s, then this trip would only take 3 minutes. Furthermore, the outflow pattern can only be constructed once per orbit (per hemisphere), so the cadence of the 605

patterns would be on the order of 2 hours. This mission concept, therefore, is not suitable for
investigating prompt outflow events, but rather for the investigation of longer-term outflow and
its consequences on the magnetosphere. If proposed to the Heliophysics Mid-sized Explorer
program, or if a very inexpensive miniaturized ion instrument is used, then a fleet of small
satellites could be deployed with several along each of the four orbit planes, allowing for a faster
cadence of the reconstructed outflow patterns.

#### 612 **6. Conclusion**

613 This study addressed the question of how many satellites would be needed to accurately reconstruct the high-latitude ionospheric outflow pattern. An observing system simulation 614 experiment was conducted to quantify and constrain the requirements for a reasonable 615 reconstruction of the outflow pattern. With "accurate" defined as a median correlation coefficient 616 617 of 0.7 for a sensitivity study spanning several orbital configuration parameters and IMF settings, the answer is four. Three might work, but one or two satellites is inadequate for the task. Five or 618 619 six satellites produce slightly better reconstructions, but the marginal improvement might not be worth the cost unless the focus is on the meso-scale features of ionospheric outflow. It is best to 620 621 maximize auroral zone dwell time for the constellation, so an inclination between 75° and 85° is best. Higher than this and the orbit planes would cut too quickly through the high outflow flux 622 623 region, and lower than this and they would likely miss the outflow regions on many passes. The orbit planes should spread across a wide swath of local times, with a separation between the end-624 625 member spacecraft of at least 60°, and 90° would be even better. More than this separation produces marginal improvement or even diminished accuracy. The local time of the orbital plane 626 crossings was not significant in controlling the accuracy of the reconstructed outflow pattern. 627

This study provides a starting point for future mission concept development on measuring 628 the global pattern of ionospheric outflow. Because of the heavy mass of O<sup>+</sup>, N<sup>+</sup> and other 629 constituents in this outflow, understanding the full high-latitude spatial structure and temporal 630 variability of the escaping ions is vital for scientific progress on the ionosphere-magnetosphere 631 relationship and nonlinear feedback loop. Ionospheric outflow mass loads the magnetosphere and 632 significantly impacts many physical processes, to the point of reshaping the magnetosphere and 633 altering the large-scale dynamics of near-Earth space. This is a critical unresolved question in 634 635 space physics and a dedicated mission would substantially advance our community's

understanding of geospace system dynamics and space weather predictions. This proposed
mission would reveal the temporal change in ionospheric outflow on the timescales of substorm
and storm phases and the relationship of this change to solar wind and IMF driving conditions. It
would resolve both small scale outflows (early mission) and global outflow conditions (mid- to
late-phase). Spatial outflow maps will be created every orbit, providing continuous coverage
across storms. These observations would unlock the dynamic relationship between ionospheric
outflow, solar wind drivers, and geomagnetic activity.

643

#### 644 Acknowledgments and Data

645 The authors thank the University of Michigan and Southwest Research Institute for support of this project. The authors would like to thank the University of Michigan for its 646 financial support, Southwest Research Institute for its financial support, and the US government, 647 in particular research grants from NASA (specifically, grant numbers 80NSSC19K0077, 648 80NSSC21K1127, and 80NSSC21K1405) and NSF (specifically, grant AGS-1414517). MB was 649 supported by the Office of Naval Research. All authors listed have made a substantial, direct, and 650 intellectual contribution to the work and approved it for publication. The simulations were 651 conducted by DTW and analyzed by DTW and MWL. An undergraduate student, Joshua Adam, 652 also contributed to the plots and calculations. The datasets generated and analyzed for this study 653 can be found in the University of Michigan Deep Blue DataSets repository [DOI LINK TBD 654 upon manuscript acceptance and finalization]. 655

656

#### 657 **References**

- Abe, T., B.A. Whalen, A.W. Yau, S. Watanabe, E. Sagawa, and K.I. Oyama (1993). Altitude
  profile of the polar wind velocity and its relationship to ionospheric conditions, Geophys.
  Res. Lett. (ISSN 0094-8276), 20 (24), 2825–2828.
- Abe, T., A.W. Yau, S. Watanabe, M. Yamada, and E. Sagawa (2004). Long-term variation of the
  polar wind velocity and its implication for the ion acceleration process:
  Akebono/suprathermal ion mass spectrometer observations, J. Geophys. Res., 109 (A9),
  A09,305, doi: 10.1029/2003JA010223.
- André, M., and A. Yau (1997). Theories and Observations of Ion Energization and Outflow in
   the High Latitude Magnetosphere, Space Science Reviews, 80 (1), 27–48.
- André, M., K. Li, and A.I. Eriksson (2015). Outflow of low-energy ions and the solar cycle, J.
   Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, doi:10.1002/2014JA020714.

- Banks, P. M., & Holzer, T. E. (1968). The polar wind. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 73(21),
   6846-6854.
- Barakat, A. R., Demars, H. G., & Schunk, R. W. (1998). Dynamic features of the polar wind in
  the presence of hot magnetospheric electrons. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 103(A12), 29289-29303.
- Brambles, O.J., W. Lotko, P.A. Damiano, B. Zhang, M. Wiltberger, and J. Lyon (2010). Effects
  of causally driven cusp O+ outflow on the storm time magnetosphere-ionosphere system
  using a multifluid global simulation, J. Geophys. Res., 115, A00J04,
  doi:10.1029/2010JA015469.
- Brambles, O.J., W. Lotko, B. Zhang, M. Wiltberger, J. Lyon, and R.J. Strangeway (2011).
  Magnetosphere sawtooth oscillations induced by ionospheric outflow, Science, 332 (6034), 1183–6, doi:10.1126/science.1202869.
- Brambles, O.J., W. Lotko, B. Zhang, J. Ouellette, J. Lyon, and M. Wiltberger (2013). The effects
  of ionospheric outflow on ICME and SIR driven sawtooth events, J. Geophys. Res.:
  Space Physics, 118 (10), 6026–6041, doi:10.1002/jgra.50522.
- Brinton, H.C., J.M. Grebowsky, and H.G. Mayr (1971). Altitude Variation of Ion Composition in
   Midlatitude Trough Region Evidence for Upward Plasma Flow, J. Geophys. Res.: Space
   Physics, 76 (16), 3738–&.
- Chandler, M.O., T.E. Moore, and J.H. Waite (1991). Observations of polar ion outflows, J.
  Geophys. Res. (ISSN 0148-0227), 96 (A2), 1421–1428.
- Chappell, C.R. (2015). The Role of the Ionosphere in Providing Plasma to the Terrestrial
   Magnetosphere: An Historical Overview, Space Science Reviews, 192 (1-4), 5–25,
   doi:10.1007/s11214-015-0168-5.
- Chappell, C.R., T.E. Moore, and J.H. Waite, Jr. (1987). The ionosphere as a fully adequate
  source of plasma for the earth's magnetosphere, J. Geophys. Res., 92, 5896–5910, doi:
  10.1029/JA092iA06p05896.
- Chappell, C. R., R. C. Olsen, J. L. Green, J.F.E. Johnson, and J. H. Waite, Jr. (1982). The
   discovery of nitrogen ions in the earth's magnetosphere, Geophys. Res. Lett., 9, 937-940.
- Chaston, C. C., Bonnell, J. W., Reeves, G. D., & Skoug, R. M. (2016). Driving ionospheric
   outflows and magnetospheric O<sup>+</sup> energy density with Alfvén waves. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 43(10), 4825-4833.
- Christon, S. P., *et al.* (2000). Low charge state heavy ions upstream of Earth's bow shock and
   sunward flux of ionospheric O<sup>+1</sup>, N<sup>+1</sup>, and O<sup>+2</sup> ions: Geotail observations, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 27, 2433–2436.
- Christon, S.P., U. Mall, T.E. Eastman, G. Gloeckler, A.T.Y. Lui, R.W. McEntire, and E.C.
   Roelof (2002). Solar cycle and geomagnetic N<sup>+1</sup>/O<sup>+1</sup> variation in outer dayside
   magnetosphere: Possible relation to topside ionosphere, Geophys. Res. Lett., 29 (5), 2–1–
   2–3.
- Cladis, J. B. (1986). Parallel acceleration and transport of ions from polar ionosphere to plasma
   sheet. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *13*(9), 893-896.

- Coley, W.R., R.A. Heelis, and M.R. Hairston (2003). High-latitude plasma outflow as measured
   by the DMSP spacecraft, J. Geophys. Res., 108(A), 1441.
- Cully, C.M., E. Donovan, A.W. Yau, and G.G. Arkos (2003). Akebono/Suprathermal Mass
  Spectrometer observations of low-energy ion outflow: Dependence on magnetic activity
  and solar wind conditions, J. Geophys. Res., 108 (A2), 1093,
  doi:10.1029/2001JA009200.
- Daglis, I.A., R.M. Thorne, W. Baumjohann, and S. Orsini (1999). The terrestrial ring current:
  Origin, formation, and decay, Reviews of Geophysics, 37, 407–438,
  doi:10.1029/1999RG900009.
- Dandouras, I. (2021). Ion outflow and escape in the terrestrial magnetosphere: Cluster advances.
   *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, *126*(10), e2021JA029753, doi:
   10.1029/2021JA029753
- Delcourt, D.C., C.R. Chappell, T.E. Moore, and J.H. Waite (1989). A three-dimensional
   numerical model of ionospheric plasma in the magnetosphere, J. Geophys. Res., 94 (A9),
   11,893,doi:10.1029/JA094iA09p11893.
- Delcourt, D.C., J.A. Sauvaud, and T.E. Moore (1993). Polar wind ion dynamics in the
   magnetotail, J. Geophys. Res., 98 (A6), 9155, doi:10.1029/93JA00301.
- Demars, H. G., Barakat, A. R., & Schunk, R. W. (1996). Effect of centrifugal acceleration on the
   polar wind. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, *101*(A11), 24565-24571.
- Denton, M.H., M.F. Thomsen, H. Korth, S. Lynch, J.C. Zhang, and M.W. Liemohn (2005). Bulk
   plasma properties at geosynchronous orbit, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 110 (A9),
   723-+, doi:10.1029/2004JA010861.
- Elliott, H.A., R.H. Comfort, P.D. Craven, M.O. Chandler, and T.E. Moore (2001). Solar wind
   influence on the oxygen content of ion outflow in the high-altitude polar cap during solar
   minimum conditions, J. Geophys. Res., 106 (A4), 6067, doi:10.1029/2000JA003022.
- Elliott, H. A., Jahn, J. M., Pollock, C. J., Moore, T. E., & Horwitz, J. L. (2007). O<sup>+</sup> transport
  across the polar cap. *Journal of atmospheric and solar-terrestrial physics*, 69(13), 15411555.
- Engwall, E., A.I. Eriksson, C.M. Cully, M. Andre, P.A. Puhl-Quinn, H. Vaith, and R. Torbert
  (2009). Survey of cold ionospheric outflows in the magnetotail, Annales Geophysicae,
  27(8), 3185–3201, doi:10.5194/angeo-27-3185-2009.
- Farrell, W.M., and J.A. Van Allen (1990). Observations of the Earth's polar cleft at large radial
  distances with the Hawkeye 1 Magnetometer, J. Geophys. Res., 95 (A12), 20,945, doi:
  10.1029/JA095iA12p20945.
- Foster, J. C., St.-Maurice, J. P., & Abreu, V. J. (1983). Joule heating at high latitudes. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 88(A6), 4885-4897.
- Fritsch, F. N., & Carlson, R. E. (1980). Monotone piecewise cubic interpolation. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, *17*(2), 238-246.

- Fung, S.,T. Eastman, S. Boardsen, and S.-H. Chen (1997). High-altitude cusp positions sampled
  by the Hawkeye satellite, Physics and Chemistry of the Earth, 22 (7-8), 653–662, doi:
  10.1016/S0079-1946(97)88121-9.
- Fuselier, S. A., Mende, S. B., Moore, T. E., Frey, H. U., Petrinec, S. M., Claflin, E. S., & Collier,
   M. R. (2003). Cusp dynamics and ionospheric outflow. *Magnetospheric Imaging—The Image Prime Mission*, 285-312.
- Ganguli, S. B. (1996), The polar wind, *Rev. Geophys.*, 34(3), 311–348,
   doi:10.1029/96RG00497.
- Garcia, K.S., V.G. Merkin, and W.J. Hughes (2010). Effects of nightside O<sup>+</sup> outflow on
   magnetospheric dynamics: Results of multifluid MHD modeling, J. Geophys. Res.: Space
   Physics, 115, A00J09, doi:10.1029/2010JA015730.
- Giles, B.L., C.R. Chappell, T.E. Moore, R.H. Comfort, and J.H. Waite (1994). Statistical survey
  of pitch angle distributions in core (0-50 eV) ions from Dynamics Explorer, 1: Outflow in
  the auroral zone, polar cap, and cusp, J. Geophys. Res., 99 (A9), 17,483,
  doi:10.1029/94JA00864.
- Glocer, A., & Daldorff, L. K. S. (2022). Connecting energy input with ionospheric upflow and
   outflow. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 127,
   e2022JA030635. https://doi.org/10.1029/2022JA030635
- Glocer, A., G. Toth, T. Gombosi, and D. Welling (2009a). Modeling ionospheric outflows and
   their impact on the magnetosphere, initial results, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 114
   (A13), 5216-+, doi:10.1029/2009JA014053.
- Glocer, A., G. Toth, Y. Ma, T. Gombosi, J.-C. Zhang, and L.M. Kistler (2009b). Multifluid
   Block-Adaptive-Tree Solar wind Roe-type Upwind Scheme: Magnetospheric
   composition and dynamics during geomagnetic storms: Initial results, J. Geophys. Res.:
   Space Physics, 114(A13), A12203, doi:10.1029/2009JA014418.
- Glocer, A., N. Kitamura, G. Toth, and T. Gombosi (2012). Modeling solar zenith angle effects
  on the polar wind, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 117 (A16), A04318, doi:
  10.1029/2011JA017136.
- Glocer, A., G. V. Khazanov, and M. W. Liemohn (2017), Photoelectrons in the quiet polar wind, *J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics*, *122*, 6708-6726, doi: 10.1002/2017JA024177.
- Glocer, A., Toth, G., & Fok, M.-C. (2018). Including kinetic ion effects in the coupled global
   ionospheric outflow solution. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics, 123,* 2851–2871. https://doi.org/10.1002/2018JA025241
- Gloeckler, G., F.M. Ipavich, B. Wilken, W. Stuedemann, and D. Hovestadt (1985). First
  composition measurement of the bulk of the storm-time ring current (1 to 300 keV/e)
  with AMPTE-CCE, Geophys. Res. Lett., 12, 325–328, doi:10.1029/GL012i005p00325.
- Gombosi, T. I., & Killeen, T. L. (1987). Effects of thermospheric motions on the polar wind: A
   time-dependent numerical study. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*,
   92(A5), 4725-4729.
- Gombosi, T. I., Chen, Y., Glocer, A., Huang, Z., Liemohn, M. W., Manchester, W. B.,
   Pulkkinen, T., Schdeva, N., Shidi, Q., Sokolov, I. V., Szente, J., Tenishev, V., Toth, G.,

788	van der Holst, B., Welling, D. T., Zhao, L., & Zou, S. (2021). What sustained multi-
789	disciplinary research can achieve: The Space Weather Modeling Framework. <i>Journal of</i>
790	<i>Space Weather and Space Climate</i> , <i>11</i> , 42. <u>https://doi.org/10.1051/swsc/2021020</u>
791 792	Gurgiolo, C., & Burch, J. L. (1982). DE-1 observations of the polar wind—A heated and an unheated component. <i>Geophysical Research Letters</i> , 9(9), 945-948.
793	Hamilton, D.C., G. Gloeckler, F.M. Ipavich, B. Wilken, and W. Stuedemann (1988). Ring
794	current development during the great geomagnetic storm of February 1986, J. Geophys.
795	Res., 93, 14,343–14,355,doi:10.1029/JA093iA12p14343.
796 797	Hoffman, J.H., and W.H. Dodson (1980). Light ion concentrations and fluxes in the polar regions during magnetically quiet times, J. Geophys. Res., 85(A2), 626–632.
798	Horwitz, J. L., Ho, C. W., Scarbro, H. D., Wilson, G. R., & Moore, T. E. (1994). Centrifugal
799	acceleration of the polar wind. <i>Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics</i> , 99(A8),
800	15051-15064.
801	Huddleston, M.M., C.R. Chappell, D.C. Delcourt, T.E. Moore, B.L. Giles, and M.O. Chandler
802	(2005). An examination of the process and magnitude of ionospheric plasma supply to
803	the magnetosphere, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 110 (A9), A12202, doi:10.1029/
804	2004JA010401.
805 806 807	<ul> <li>Hultqvist, B., André, M., Christon, S. <i>et al.</i> (1999). Contributions of different source and loss processes to the plasma content of the magnetosphere. <i>Space Science Reviews</i> 88, 355–372. <u>https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1005260002333</u></li> </ul>
808	Ilie, R., and M. W. Liemohn (2016), The outflow of ionospheric nitrogen ions: a possible tracer
809	for the altitude dependent transport and energization processes of ionospheric plasma, J.
810	Geophys. Res. Space Physics, 121, 9250-9255, doi: 10.1002/2015JA022162.
811	Ilie, R., R.M. Skoug, P. Valek, H.O. Funsten, and A. Glocer (2013). Global view of inner
812	magnetosphere composition during storm time, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 118 (1),
813	7074–7084.
814	Ilie, R., M.W. Liemohn, G. Toth, N. Yu Ganushkina, and L.K.S. Daldorff (2015). Assessing the
815	role of oxygen on ring current formation and evolution through numerical experiments, J.
816	Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 120 (6), 4656–4668, doi:10.1002/2015JA021157,
817	2015JA021157.
818	Khazanov, G. V., M. W. Liemohn, and T. E. Moore (1997). Photoelectron effects on the self-
819	consistent potential in the collisionless polar wind, <i>J. Geophys. Res.</i> , <i>102</i> , 7509.
820	Kistler, L.M., et al. (2006). Ion composition and pressure changes in storm time and nonstorm
821	substorms in the vicinity of the near-Earth neutral line, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics,
822	111(A), A11,222.
823	Kistler, L.M., C.G. Mouikis, B. Klecker, and I. Dandouras (2010a). Cusp as a source for oxygen
824	in the plasma sheet during geomagnetic storms, J. Geophys. Res., 115 (A3), A03,209,
825	doi:10.1029/2009JA014838.
826 827	Kistler, L.M., et al. (2010b). Escape of O <sup>+</sup> through the distant tail plasma sheet, Geophys. Res. Lett., 37(21), doi:10.1029/2010GL045075.

- Kistler, L.M., et al. (2010c). Escape of O<sup>+</sup> through the distant tail plasma sheet, Geophys. Res.
   Lett., 37(2), L21,101.
- Kistler, L.M., et al. (2016). The source of O<sup>+</sup> in the storm time ring current, J. Geophys. Res.:
   Space Physics, 121 (6), 5333–5349, doi:10.1002/2015JA022204, 2015JA022204.
- Kitamura, N., et al. (2010). Observations of very-low-energy (<10 eV) ion outflows dominated</li>
  by O<sup>+</sup> ions in the region of enhanced electron density in the polar cap magnetosphere
  during geomagnetic storms, J. Geophys. Res., 115, A00J06, doi:10.1029/2010JA015601.
- Kronberg, E.A., S.E. Haaland, P.W. Daly, E.E. Grigorenko, L.M. Kistler, M. Fränz, and I.
  Dandouras (2012). Oxygen and hydrogen ion abundance in the near-Earth
  magnetosphere: Statistical results on the response to the geomagnetic and solar wind
  activity conditions, J. Geophys. Res., 117 (A12), A12,208, doi:10.1029/2012JA018071.
- Kronberg, E.A., et al. (2014). Circulation of Heavy Ions and Their Dynamical Effects in the
   Magnetosphere: Recent Observations and Models, Space Science Reviews, 184 (1-4),
   173-235, doi: 10.1007/s11214-014-0104-0.
- Lemaire, J. (1971). Effect of escaping photoelectrons in a polar exospheric model.
- Lennartsson, O.W. (1995). Statistical investigation of IMF Bz effects on energetic (0.1- to 16keV) magnetospheric O<sup>+</sup> ions J. Geophys. Res., 100 (A), 23,621–23,636.
- Lennartsson, W., and E.G. Shelley (1986). Survey of 0.1- to 16-keV/e plasma sheet ion
  composition, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics (1978–2012), 91 (A3), 3061–3076.
- Lennartsson, O. W., Collin, H. L., and Peterson, W. K. (2004), Solar wind control of Earth's H<sup>+</sup>
  and O<sup>+</sup> outflow rates in the 15-eV to 33-keV energy range, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 109,
  A12212, doi:10.1029/2004JA010690.
- Liao, J., L.M. Kistler, C.G. Mouikis, B. Klecker, I. Dandouras, and J.-C. Zhang (2010).
  Statistical study of O<sup>+</sup> transport from the cusp to the lobes with Cluster CODIF data, J.
  Geophys. Res., 115(September),A00J15, doi:10.1029/2010JA015613.
- Liao, J., Kistler, L. M., Mouikis, C. G., Klecker, B., & Dandouras, I. (2015). Acceleration of O+
  from the cusp to the plasma sheet. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, *120*(2), 1022-1034.
- Liemohn, M. W., T. E. Moore, P. D. Craven, W. Maddox, A. F. Nagy, and J. U. Kozyra (2005).
   Occurrence statistics of cold, streaming ions in the near-Earth magnetotail: Survey of
   Polar-TIDE observations, J. Geophys. Res., 110, A07211, doi: 10.1029/2004JA010801.
- Liemohn, M. W., T. E. Moore, and P. D. Craven (2007). Geospace activity dependence of cold,
   streaming ions in the near-Earth magnetotail, *J. Atmos. Solar-Terr. Phys.*, 69, 135.
- Liemohn, M. W., and D. T. Welling (2016), Ionospheric and solar wind contributions to
  magnetospheric ion density and temperature throughout the magnetotail, in *Magnetosphere-Ionosphere Coupling in the Solar System, Geophys. Monogr. Ser., vol.*222, edited by C. R. Chappell, R. Schunk, P. Banks, J. Burch, and R. Thorne, John Wiley
  and Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA, doi: 10.1002/9781119066880.ch8, 101-114.

# Liemohn, M. W., Shane, A. D., Azari, A. R., Petersen, A. K., Swiger, B. M., & Mukhopadhyay, A. (2021). RMSE is not enough: guidelines to robust data-model comparisons for

868 869	magnetospheric physics. <i>Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics</i> , 218, 105624. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jastp.2021.105624</u>
870 871 872	Liemohn, M. W., Jörg-Micha Jahn, Raluca Ilie, Natalia Ganushkina, and Daniel Welling (2022). Science case for a global ionospheric outflow mission. White paper to the Decadal Survey for Solar and Space Physics 2024-2033. Paper # <u>409</u> .
873 874 875	Lin M-Y and Ilie R (2022). A Review of Observations of Molecular Ions in the Earth's Magnetosphere-Ionosphere System. Front. Astron. Space Sci. 8:745357. doi: 10.3389/fspas.2021.745357
876 877	Lin. M. Y., R. Ilie, and A. Glocer (2020), The Contribution of N <sup>+</sup> ions to Earth's Polar Wind. Geophysical Research Letters, 47, <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL089321</u>
878 879 880	Liu, C., Horwitz, J. L., & Richards, P. G. (1995). Effects of frictional ion heating and soft- electron precipitation on high-latitude F-region upflows. <i>Geophysical Research Letters</i> , 22(20), 2713-2716.
881 882	Liu, W.L., S.Y. Fu, Q.G. Zong, Z.Y. Pu, J. Yang, and P. Ruan (2005). Variations of N <sup>+</sup> /O <sup>+</sup> in the ring current during magnetic storms, Geophys. Res. Lett., 32(1), L15,102.
883 884 885	Lockwood, M., M.F. Smith, C.J. Farrugia, and G.L. Siscoe (1988). Ionospheric ion upwelling in the wake of flux transfer events at the dayside magnetopause, J. Geophys. Res. (ISSN 0148-0227), 93 (A6), 5641–5654.
886 887 888	Lund, E. J., Nowrouzi, N., Kistler, L. M., Cai, X., & Frey, H. U. (2018). On the role of ionospheric ions in sawtooth events. <i>Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics</i> , 123, 665–684. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JA024378</u>
889 890	Lundin, R., & Guglielmi, A. (2006). Ponderomotive forces in cosmos. <i>Space Science Reviews</i> , 127, 1-116.
891 892	Lui, A. T. Y., and Hamilton, D. C. (1992), Radial profiles of quiet time magnetospheric parameters, <i>J. Geophys. Res.</i> , 97(A12), 19325–19332, doi: <u>10.1029/92JA01539</u> .
893 894 895	<ul> <li>Lynch, K. A., Semeter, J. L., Zettergren, M., Kintner, P., Arnoldy, R., Klatt, E., &amp; Samara, M. (2007). Auroral ion outflow: Low altitude energization. In <i>Annales Geophysicae</i> (Vol. 25, No. 9, pp. 1967-1977). Göttingen, Germany: Copernicus Publications.</li> </ul>
896 897 898	Mall, U., S. Christon, E. Kirsch, and G. Gloeckler (2002). On the solar cycle dependence of the N <sup>+</sup> /O <sup>+</sup> content in the magnetosphere and its relation to atomic N and O in the Earth's exosphere, Geophys. Res. Lett., 29 (1), 1593–34–3.
899 900 901	Miller, R. H., Rasmussen, C. E., Combi, M. R., Gombosi, T. I., & Winske, D. (1995). Ponderomotive acceleration in the auroral region: A kinetic simulation. <i>Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics</i> , 100(A12), 23901-23916.
902 903	Moore, T. E. (1984). Superthermal ionospheric outflows. <i>Reviews of Geophysics</i> , 22(3), 264-274.
904 905	Moore, T. E., & Delcourt, D. C. (1995). The geopause. <i>Reviews of Geophysics</i> , 33(2), 175–209. https://doi.org/10.1029/95RG00872
906 907	Moore, T. E., and Horwitz, J. L. (2007), Stellar ablation of planetary atmospheres, <i>Rev. Geophys.</i> , 45, RG3002, doi: <u>10.1029/2005RG000194</u> .
- Moore, T.E., Chappell, C.R., Chandler, M.O., Fields, S.A., Pollock, C.J., Reasoner, D.L., Young,
  D.T., Burch, J.L., Eaker, N., Waite Jr., J.H., McComas, D.J., Nordholdt, J.E., Thomsen,
  M.F., Berthelier, J.J., Robson, R., Mozer, F.S. (1997). High altitude observations of the
  polar wind. Science, 277, 349–351.
- Moore, T.E., et al. (1999a). Ionospheric mass ejection in response to a CME, Geophys. Res.
   Lett., 26 (1), 2339–2342.
- Moore, T. E., Chandler, M. O., Chappell, C. R., Comfort, R. H., Craven, P. D., Delcourt, D. C.,
  ... & Su, Y. J. (1999b). Polar/TIDE results on polar ion outflows. *Geophysical Monograph-American Geophysical Union*, 109, 87-102.
- Moore, T. E., M.-C. Fok, M. O. Chandler, S.-H. Chen, S. P. Christon, D. C. Delcourt, J. Fedder,
  M. Liemohn, W. K. Peterson, and S. Slinker (2005a). Solar and ionospheric plasmas in
  the ring current, *Inner Magnetosphere Interactions: New Perspectives from Imaging, AGU Monogr. Ser.*, vol. 159, ed. by J. L. Burch, M. Schulz, and H. Spence, p. 179, Am.
  Geophys. Un., Washington, D. C..
- Moore, T. E., M.-C. Fok, M. O. Chandler, C. R. Chappell, S. Christon, D. Delcourt, J. Fedder,
  M. Huddleston, M. Liemohn, W. Peterson, S. P. Slinker (2005b). Plasma sheet and (nonstorm) ring current formation from solar and polar wind sources, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *110*,
  A02210, doi: 10.1029/2004JA010563.
- Moore, T., M.-C. Fok, and K. Garcia-Sage (2014). The ionospheric outflow feedback loop,
  Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics, 115-116, 59–66,
  doi:10.1016/j.jastp.2014.02.002.
- Mouikis, C.G., L.M. Kistler, Y.H. Liu, B. Klecker, A. Korth, and I. Dandouras (2010). H<sup>+</sup> and O<sup>+</sup>
   content of the plasma sheet at 15-19 Re as a function of geomagnetic and solar activity, J.
   Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 115, A00J16, doi:10.1029/2010JA015978.
- Nagai, T., J.H. Waite, J.L. Green, C.R. Chappell, R.C. Olsen, and R.H. Comfort (1984). First
   measurements of supersonic polar wind in the polar magnetosphere, Geophys. Res. Lett.,
   11 (7), 669–672.
- Newell, P.T., and C.-I. Meng (1994). Ionospheric projections of magnetospheric regions under
  low and high solar wind pressure conditions, J. Geophys. Res., 99 (A1), 273, doi:
  10.1029/93JA02273.
- Nilsson, H., Kirkwood, S., Eliasson, L., Norberg, O., Clemmons, J., & Boehm, M. (1994). The
   ionospheric signature of the cusp: A case study using Freja and the Sondrestrom radar.
   *Geophysical research letters*, 21(17), 1923-1926.
- Nosé, M., R.W. McEntire, and S.P. Christon (2003). Change of the plasma sheet ion composition
   during magnetic storm development observed by the Geotail spacecraft, J. Geophys.
   Res.: Space Physics, 108 (A), 1201.
- Nosé, M., S. Taguchi, K. Hosokawa, S.P. Christon, R.W. McEntire, T.E. Moore, and M.R.
  Collier (2005). Overwhelming O<sup>+</sup> contribution to the plasma sheet energy density during
  the October 2003 superstorm: Geotail/EPIC and IMAGE/LENA observations. Journal of
  Geophysical Research Space Physics, 110 (A).

Øieroset, M., M. Yamauchi, L. Liszka, S.P. Christon, and B. Hultqvist (1999). A statistical study 948 of ion beams and conics from the dayside ionosphere during different phases of a 949 substorm, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 104 (A4), 6987–6998, doi:10.1029/ 950 1998JA900177. 951 Ogawa, Y., S.C. Buchert, R. Fujii, S. Nozawa, and A.P. van Eyken (2009). Characteristics of ion 952 upflow and downflow observed with the European Incoherent Scatter Svalbard radar, J. 953 Geophys. Res., 114 (A), A05,305-n/a. 954 955 Peroomian, V., El-Alaoui, M., Ashour Abdalla, M., & Zelenyi, L. (2006). A comparison of solar wind and ionospheric plasma contributions to the September 24-25, 1998 magnetic 956 storm. Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics, 69, 212-222. 957 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jastp.2006.07.025 958 Peterson, W.K., H.L. Collin, O.W. Lennartsson, and A.W. Yau, Quiet time solar illumination 959 effects on the fluxes and characteristic energies of ionospheric outflow, J. Geophys. Res.: 960 Space Physics, 111 (A), A11S05, 2006. 961 Pitout, F., C.P. Escoubet, B. Klecker, and H. R'eme, Cluster survey of the mid-altitude cusp: 1. 962 size, location, and dynamics, Annales Geophysicae, 24 (11), 3011–3026, doi:10.5194/ 963 angeo-24-3011-2006, 2006. 964 Pollock, C. J., M. O. Chandler, T. E. Moore, J. H. Waite Jr., C. R. Chappell and D. A. Gurnett 965 (1990). A Survey of Upwelling Ion Event Characteristics, J. Geophys. Res. 95, 18969. 966 Pulkkinen, T. I., N. Yu. Ganushkina, D. N. Baker, N. E. Turner, J. Fennell, J. Roeder, T. A. Fritz, 967 M. Grande, B. Kellett, G. Kettmann (2001). Ring current ion composition during solar 968 minimum and rising solar activity: Polar/CAMMICE/MICS results, Journal of 969 Geophysical Research, 106, 19131-19147. 970 971 Rastätter, L., et al. (2013), Geospace environment modeling 2008–2009 challenge: D<sub>st</sub> index, Space Weather, 11, 187–205, doi:10.1002/swe.20036. 972 973 Richards, P. G. (1995). Effects of auroral electron precipitation on topside ion outflows. Cross-Scale Coupling in Space Plasmas, 93, 121-126. 974 Schunk, R. W. (2000). Theoretical developments on the causes of ionospheric outflow. Journal 975 of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics, 62(6), 399-420. 976 Schunk, R., and A. Nagy, *Ionospheres*, second ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 977 Books Online, 2009. 978 Schunk, R.W., and W.J. Raitt, Atomic Nitrogen and Oxygen Ions in the Daytime High-Latitude 979 F-Region, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 85 (NA3), 1255–1272, 1980. 980 Seki, K., A. Nagy, C. M. Jackman, F. Crary, D. Fontaine, P. Zarka, P. Wurz, A. Milillo, J. A. 981 982 Slavin, D. C. Delcourt, M. Wiltberger, R. Ilie, X. Jia, S. A. Ledvina, M. W. Liemohn, and R. W. Schunk (2015), A review of general physical and chemical processes related to 983 984 plasma sources and losses for solar system magnetospheres, *Space Sci. Rev.*, 1-63, doi: 10.1007/s11214-015-170-y. 985 Sojka, J.J., R.W. Schunk, and W.J. Raitt, Seasonal-Variations of the High-Latitude F Region for 986 Strong Convection, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 87 (NA1), 187–198, 1982. 987

- Stebbings, R.F., W.L. Fite, and D.G. Hummer, Charge Transfer between Atomic Hydrogen and
   N<sup>+</sup> and O<sup>+</sup>, The Journal of Chemical Physics, 33(4), 1226–1230, 1960.
- Strangeway, R. J., Russell, C. T., Carlson, C. W., McFadden, J. P., Ergun, R. E., Temerin, M.,
  Klumpar, D. M., Peterson, W. K., and Moore, T. E. (2000), Cusp field-aligned currents
  and ion outflows, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 105(A9), 21129–21141,
  doi:10.1029/2000JA900032.
- Strangeway, R.J., R.E. Ergun, Y.-J. Su, C.W. Carlson, and R.C. Elphic, Factors controlling
   ionospheric outflows as observed at intermediate altitudes, J. Geophys. Res.: Space
   Physics, 110 (A3), doi: 10.1029/2004JA010829, a03221, 2005.
- Su, Y. J., Horwitz, J. L., Wilson, G. R., Richards, P. G., Brown, D. G., & Ho, C. W. (1998a).
  Self-consistent simulation of the photoelectron-driven polar wind from 120 km to 9 RE
  altitude. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 103(A2), 2279-2296.
- Su, Y.-J., Horwitz, J. L., Moore, T. E., Giles, B. L., Chandler, M. O., Craven, P. D., Hirahara,
   M., and Pollock, C. J. (1998b), Polar wind survey with the Thermal Ion Dynamics
   Experiment/Plasma Source Instrument suite aboard POLAR, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 103(
   A12), 29305–29337, doi:10.1029/98JA02662.
- Tam, S.W.Y., T. Chang, V. Pierrard (2007). Kinetic modeling of the polar wind. Journal of
   Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics, 69(16), 1984–2027.
   doi:10.1016/j.jastp.2007.08.006.
- Trung, H.-S., M. W. Liemohn, and R. Ilie (2019). Steady state characteristics of the terrestrial
   geopauses. *Journal of Geophysical Research Space Physics*, 124, 5070-5081,
   <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JA026636</u>.
- Trung, H.-S., Liemohn, M. W. & Ilie, R. (2023). Momentum sources in multifluid MHD and their relation to the geopauses. Journal of Geophysical Research – Space Physics, 128, e2023JA031415. <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2023JA031415</u>
- Valek, P. W., Perez, J. D., Jahn, J. M., Pollock, C. J., Wüest, M. P., Friedel, R. H. W., ... &
  Peterson, W. K. (2002). Outflow from the ionosphere in the vicinity of the cusp. *Journal* of *Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 107(A8), SMP-13.
- Wahlund, J. E., Opgenoorth, H. J., Häggström, I., Winser, K. J., & Jones, G. O. L. (1992).
   EISCAT observations of topside ionospheric ion outflows during auroral activity:
   Revisited. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, *97*(A3), 3019-3037.
- Waite Jr, J. H., Nagai, T., Johnson, J. F. E., Chappell, C. R., Burch, J. L., Killeen, T. L., ... &
  Shelley, E. G. (1985). Escape of suprathermal O<sup>+</sup> ions in the polar cap. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 90(A2), 1619-1630.
- Weimer, D.R., An improved model of ionospheric electric potentials including substorm
   perturbations and application to the Geospace Environment Modeling November 24,
   1996, event, J. Geophys. Res., 106, 407–416, doi:10.1029/2000JA000604, 2001a.

# Weimer, D.R., Maps of ionospheric field-aligned currents as a function of the interplanetary magnetic field derived from Dynamics Explorer 2 data, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 106 (A7), 12,889–12,902, doi:10.1029/2000JA000295, 2001b.

- Welling, D.T., and S.G. Zaharia, Ionospheric outflow and cross polar cap potential: What is the role of magnetospheric inflation?, Geophys. Res. Lett., 39 (23), doi: 10.1029/2012GL054228, 2012.
  Welling, D. T., and M. W. Liemohn (2014). Outflow in global magnetohydrodynamics as a
- 1031 Weining, D. 1., and W. W. Elemonn (2014). Outflow in global magnetohydrodynamics as a
   1032 function of a passive inner boundary source, J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics, 119, 2691 1033 2705, doi: 10.1002/2013JA019374.
- Welling, D.T., and M.W. Liemohn (2016). The ionospheric source of magnetospheric plasma is
  not a black box input for global models J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 121 (6), 5559–
  5565.
- Welling, D.T., V.K. Jordanova, S.G. Zaharia, A. Glocer, and G. Toth (2011). The effects of
   dynamic ionospheric outflow on the ring current, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 116
   (A15), A00J19, doi:10.1029/2010JA015642.
- Welling, D.T., V.K. Jordanova, A. Glocer, G. Toth, M.W. Liemohn, and D.R. Weimer (2015a).
  The two-way relationship between ionospheric outflow and the ring current, J. Geophys.
  Res.: Space Physics, 120 (6), 4338–4353. doi:10.1002/2015JA021231
- Welling, D.T., et al., (2015b). The Earth: Plasma Sources, Losses, and Transport Processes,
  Space Science Reviews, 192 (1-4), 145–208. doi:10.1007/s11214-015-0187-2
- Welling, D.T., Barakat, A.R., Eccles, J.V., Schunk, R.W. and Chappell, C.R. (2016). Coupling
  the Generalized Polar Wind Model to Global Magnetohydrodynamics. In *Magnetosphere-Ionosphere Coupling in the Solar System* (eds C.R. Chappell, R.W.
  Schunk, P.M. Banks, J.L. Burch and R.M. Thorne).
  https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119066880.ch14
- Whalen, B.A., S. Watanabe, A.W. Yau (1991). Observations in the transverse ion energization
   region. Geophys. Res. Lett. 18(4), 725–728. doi:10.1029/90GL02788
- Wilson, G. R., Khazanov, G., & Horwitz, J. L. (1997). Achieving zero current for polar wind
   outflow on open flux tubes subjected to large photoelectron fluxes. *Geophysical research letters*, 24(10), 1183-1186.
- Wilson, G.R., D.M. Ober, G.A. Germany, and E J. Lund (2004). Nightside auroral zone and
   polar cap ion outflow as a function of substorm size and phase, J. Geophys. Res.: Space
   Physics, 109 (A2), doi:10.1029/2003JA009835.
- Wiltberger, M. (2015).Review of Global Simulation Studies of Effect of Ionospheric Outflow on
   Magnetosphere-Ionosphere System Dynamics, Magnetotails in the Solar System. A.
   Keiling (ed.), 207, 373–392.
- Wiltberger, M., W. Lotko, J.G. Lyon, P. Damiano, and V. Merkin (2010). Influence of cusp O<sup>+</sup>
   outflow on magnetotail dynamics in a multifluid MHD model of the magnetosphere, J.
   Geophys. Res., 115 (1), A00J05.
- Winglee, R. M. (2000). Mapping of ionospheric outflows into the magnetosphere for varying
   IMF conditions. *Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics*, 62(6), 527-540.
- Winglee, R.M., D. Chua, M. Brittnacher, G.K. Parks, and G. Lu (2002). Global impact of
   ionospheric outflows on the dynamics of the magnetosphere and cross-polar cap
   potential, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 107, 1237, doi:10.1029/2001JA000214.

- Winglee, R.M., E. Harnett, and A. Kidder (2009). Relative timing of substorm processes as
  derived from multifluid/multiscale simulations: Internally driven substorms, J. Geophys.
  Res.: Space Physics, 114 (A), A09,213.
- Winningham, J.D., and C. Gurgiolo (1982). De-2 photoelectron measurements consistent with a
   large scale parallel electric field over the polar cap, Geophys. Res. Lett., 9 (9), 977–979.
- Wu, X. Y., Horwitz, J. L., Estep, G. M., Su, Y. J., Brown, D. G., Richards, P. G., & Wilson, G.
   R. (1999). Dynamic fluid-kinetic (DyFK) modeling of auroral plasma outflow driven by
   soft electron precipitation and transverse ion heating. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, *104*(A8), 17263-17275.
- Yau, A.W., P.H. Beckwith, W.K. Peterson, and E.G. Shelley (1985). Long-term (solar cycle) and
   seasonal variations of upflowing ionospheric ion events at DE 1 altitudes, J. Geophys.
   Res., (ISSN 0148-0227), 90 (A7), 6395–6407.
- Yau, A.W., W.K. Peterson, and E.G. Shelley (1988). Quantitative parameterization of energetic
   ionospheric ion outflow, Washington DC American Geophysical Union Geophysical
   Monograph Series, pp. 211–217.
- Yau, A. W., Whalen, B. A., Abe, T., Mukai, T., Oyama, K. I., & Chang, T. (1995). Akebono
   observations of electron temperature anisotropy in the polar wind. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 100(A9), 17451-17463.
- Yau, A. W., & André, M. J. S. S. R. (1997). Sources of ion outflow in the high latitude
   ionosphere. *Space Science Reviews*, 80(1-2), 1-25.
- Yau, A.W., E. Drakou, M.J. Greffen, D.J. Knudsen, and E. Sagawa (1998). Radio-Frequency Ion
   Mass Spectrometer Measurements of Ion Composition, Velocity and Temperature: the
   EXOSD Suprathermal Mass Spectrometer, Geophysical Monograph Series, vol. 102,
   American Geophysical Union, Washington, D.C.
- Yau, A.W., T. Abe, and W. Peterson (2007). The polar wind: Recent observations, Journal of
   Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics, 69 (16), 1936–1983,
   doi:10.1016/j.jastp.2007.08.010.
- Yizengaw, E., Moldwin, M. B., Dyson, P. L., Fraser, B. J., & Morley, S. (2006). First
   tomographic image of ionospheric outflows. *Geophysical research letters*, 33(20).
- Young, D.T., H. Balsiger, and J. Geiss (1982). Correlations of magnetospheric ion composition
  with geomagnetic and solar activity, J. Geophys. Res., 87, 9077–9096,
  doi:10.1029/JA087iA11p09077.
- Yu, Y., and A.J. Ridley (2013a). Exploring the influence of ionospheric O<sup>+</sup> outflow on
   magnetospheric dynamics: Dependence on the source location, J. Geophys. Res.: Space
   Physics, 118(4), 1711–1722, doi:10.1029/2012JA018411.
- Yu, Y., and A.J. Ridley (2013b). Exploring the influence of ionospheric O+ outflow on
   magnetospheric dynamics: The effect of outflow intensity, J. Geophys. Res.: Space
   physics, 118(9), 5522–5531, doi:10.1002/jgra.50528.
- Zeng, W., & Horwitz, J. L. (2007). Formula representation of auroral ionospheric O+ outflows
   based on systematic simulations with effects of soft electron precipitation and transverse
   ion heating. *Geophysical research letters*, 34(6).

- Zhou, X.W., C.T. Russell, G. Le, S.A. Fuselier, and J.D. Scudder (2000). Solar wind control of
  the polar cusp at high altitude, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 105 (A1), 245–251,
  doi:10.1029/1999JA900412.
- 1113

# **Reconstruction analysis of global ionospheric outflow patterns**

2 Michael Liemohn<sup>1</sup>, Jörg-Micha Jahn<sup>2</sup>, Raluca Ilie<sup>3</sup>, Natalia Y. Ganushkina<sup>1,4</sup>, Daniel T.

- Welling<sup>1</sup>, Heather A. Elliott<sup>2</sup>, Meghan Burleigh<sup>5</sup>, Kaitlin Doublestein<sup>1</sup>, Stephanie Colon Rodriguez<sup>1</sup>, Pauline Dredger<sup>1</sup>, and Philip W. Valek<sup>2</sup>
- <sup>5</sup> <sup>1</sup> Department of Climate and Space Sciences and Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann
- 6 Arbor, MI, USA
- <sup>7</sup> <sup>2</sup> Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio, TX, USA
- <sup>8</sup> <sup>3</sup>Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign,
- 9 IL, USA
- <sup>4</sup>Finnish Meteorological Institute, Helsinki, Finland
- <sup>11</sup> <sup>5</sup>Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, DC, USA
- 12
- 13 Corresponding author: Michael Liemohn (<u>liemohn@umich.edu</u>)
- 14
- 15 In preparation for/Submitted to Journal of Geophysical Research Space Physics
- 16
- 17

# 18 Key Points:

- A simulation study is conducted to determine the number of spacecraft needed for
   accurate reconstruction of 2D ionospheric outflow patterns
- Determining the global pattern of ionospheric outflow is needed to understand the geospace system, especially during geomagnetic storms
- A potential ionospheric outflow mission concept is defined that could address this
   unresolved key issue of space physics and space weather

# 25

26 **AGU Index Terms:** 

27	•	2431	Ionosphere/magnetosphere interactions (2736)
28	٠	2736	Magnetosphere/ionosphere interactions (2431)
29	٠	2776	Polar cap phenomena
30	٠	2788	Magnetic storms and substorms (4305, 7954)
31	•	2794	Instruments and techniques
22			

32

# 33 Keywords:

- ionospheric outflow, spaceflight hardware, space mission, magnetosphere-ionosphere coupling,
- ion composition, high-latitude ionosphere

36

# 37 Abstract

Ionospheric outflow supplies nearly all of the heavy ions observed within the magnetosphere, as 38 39 well as a significant fraction of the proton density. While much is known about upflow and outflow energization processes, the full global pattern of outflow and its evolution is only known 40 statistically or through numerical modeling. Because of the dominant role of heavy ions in several 41 key physical processes, this unknown nature of the full outflow pattern leads to significant 42 uncertainty in understanding geospace dynamics, especially surrounding storm intervals. That is, 43 global models risk not accurately reproducing the main features of intense space storms because 44 the amount of ionospheric outflow is poorly specified and thus magnetospheric composition and 45 mass loading could be ill-defined. This study defines a potential mission to observe ionospheric 46 outflow from several platforms, allowing for a reasonable and sufficient reconstruction of the full 47 outflow pattern on an orbital cadence. An observing system simulation experiment is conducted, 48 49 revealing that four well-placed satellites are sufficient for reasonably accurate outflow reconstructions. The science scope of this mission could include the following: reveal the global 50 structure of ionospheric outflow; relate outflow patterns to geomagnetic activity level; and 51 determine the spatial and temporal nature of outflow composition. The science objectives could 52 be focused to be achieved with minimal instrumentation (only a low-energy ion spectrometer to 53 obtain outflow reconstructions) or with a larger scientific scope by including contextual 54 instrumentation. Note that the upcoming Geospace Dynamics Constellation mission will observe 55 upwelling but not ionospheric outflow. 56

57

# 58 Plain Language Summary

59 Earth's upper atmosphere above 500 km altitude constantly loses charged particles to outer space

in a process called ionospheric outflow. This outflow is important for the dynamics of the near-

61 Earth space environment ("space weather") yet is poorly understood on a global scale. A mission

62 is needed to observe the global patterns of ionospheric outflow and its relation to space weather

driving conditions. The science objectives of such a mission could include not only the

reconstruction of global outflow patterns but also the relation of these patterns to geomagnetic

activity and the spatial and temporal nature of outflow composition. A study is presented to show

66 that four well-placed spacecraft would be sufficient for reasonable outflow reconstructions.

67

#### 68 **1. Introduction**

The Earth's ionosphere constantly loses material to deep space. This "ionospheric 69 outflow" can be on the order of  $10^{25}$  to  $10^{26}$  ions/s, which is about 1-10 kg/s (e.g., Moore et al., 70 1997). This outflow is not steady but rather reacts to changes in the solar EUV photon flux 71 72 striking the upper atmosphere, as well as to the electromagnetic driving from the solar wind after it has been processed through Earth's magnetosphere. A pivotal feature of intense space storms 73 74 is a change in near-Earth plasma composition from a dominance of protons (e.g., Lui & Hamilton, 1992; Pulkkinen et al., 2001) to heavy ions like O<sup>+</sup> that flows out of Earth's 75 ionosphere at these times (e.g., Chappell et al., 1987; Young et al., 1982). The ionosphere 76 essentially supplies most of the heavy ions that exist in many parts of the magnetosphere (all 77 78 except for  $He^{2+}$ , which originates in the solar wind), such as to the lobe, the plasma sheet, in the far tail, and even to the magnetosheath (Hamilton et al., 1988; Christon et al., 2000, 2002; Mall 79 et al., 2002; Liu et al., 2005; Kistler et al., 2010a, c; Mouikis et al., 2010;). Figure 1 is an artist's 80 rendering of ionospheric outflow, shown here as being dominated by outflow from the cusp (as 81 found by, e.g., Moore et al., 1999a; Lund et al., 2018) with many of the ions escaping into the 82 magnetotail lobes. Seki et al. (2015) provides an excellent review of the processes leading to 83 outflow and Welling et al. (2015b) is a comprehensive examination of the fate of this outflow 84 throughout geospace. 85

86

The presence of heavy ionospheric-origin ions in the magnetosphere has multiple

influences including the following: 87 enhance system inertia; lower the 88 Alfvén speed; modify plasma 89 90 turbulence; control micro-processes like reconnection; and slow the system 91 response time to disturbances. Given 92 the significance of these effects, a 93 number of global magnetospheric fluid 94 models (often magnetohydrodynamic, 95 96 or MHD, codes) have incorporated them to some extent (e.g., Winglee et 97 al., 2002, 2009; Glocer et al., 2009a, b; 98



**Figure 1.** Artist's concept of high latitude ionospheric outflow.

Brambles et al., 2010, 2011; Garcia et al., 2010; Wiltberger et al., 2010; Welling et al., 2011; Ilie 99 et al., 2013, 2015; Liemohn and Welling, 2016). Results from these multifluid simulations show 100 that the presence of heavy ions may slow the magnetospheric convection, reduce the cross-cap 101 potential, influence the dayside reconnection, alter the behavior of the plasma sheet, stimulate 102 substorms, and magnify the storm time Dst. MHD models with ionospheric outflow as an inner 103 magnetospheric boundary condition do not include known kinetic physics effects, though, and 104 such models typically adopt either uniformly distributed outflow or localized (usually near the 105 cusp) upflowing ion fluxes computed, often, from the Strangeway et al. (2005) model. The 106 Strangeway relationship, however, is derived from relatively limited observational data and 107 therefore suffers from several severe drawbacks. For instance, the predicted flux does not depend 108 on season, solar activity, or local time, or universal time. The solar activity needs to be included 109 110 to reproduce the amount of ionization at lower altitudes – that is, the supply of ionospheric ions available for outflow. Moreover, this model does not include a specification of density, velocity, 111 112 and temperature needed as boundary conditions for the MHD simulations; only outflow flux is provided by the Strangeway relationship. 113

Global magnetospheric MHD models reveal that this outflow mass loads the 114 magnetosphere, leading to reactive feedback processes and emergent phenomena not seen during 115 quiescent times (e.g., Wiltberger et al., 2010). However, such global models do not accurately 116 reproduce the observed Dst time series during intense space storms because the global dynamics 117 and amount of ionospheric outflow are only poorly characterized. Figure 2 shows results from 118 the "Dst challenge" (Rastätter et al., 2013), in which several global models were used to 119 reproduce Dst for several very different storms (four shown here). Each model produced 120 dramatically different results, with some codes overestimating the depth of Dst and others barely 121 registering any Dst signature. While the grid resolutions and numerical solvers play a role in 122 these differences, a key critical input is the ionospheric outflow setting, as illustrated by the 123 124 widely different results even from the same model.



**Figure 2.** From Rastätter et al. (2013), Dst data-model comparison from several global models of 4 storm events. One of the reasons that the simulation results are so different from each other, even from the same model, is the assumed ionospheric outflow specification.

Modeling alone cannot properly quantify the global outflow patterns. An in situ mission 125 is needed that would discover how Earth's ionosphere dynamically and globally feeds plasma to 126 its magnetosphere by quantifying the ionospheric outflow intensity, composition, and 127 acceleration variability over both regional and global scales. Some of the ionospheric outflow 128 escapes directly into deep space, but much of it initially circulates within the magnetosphere. 129 This extra mass and dissimilar motion (e.g., the vastly different gyroradii of light and heavy ions) 130 alters the dynamics of the magnetic field, it slows down plasma flow speeds, and it changes the 131 global interaction of the solar wind with the magnetosphere. It can even influence future 132 ionospheric outflow rates. As a result, a natural feedback loop exists. Solar wind conditions 133 govern the outflow, which mass loads the magnetosphere and in return modifies the nature of 134 how the solar wind regulates outflow. Present knowledge of these processes only reveal the 135 spatial structure of the high-latitude ionospheric outflow through long-term statistical 136 compilations of single-spacecraft missions. This is inadequate for describing and fully 137 understanding the dynamics of this feedback system. A mission to measure global ionospheric 138 outflow – in conjunction with upstream measurements of solar wind driving conditions from 139

other spacecraft – would examine this nonlinear connection with multi-point observations
leading to large-scale reconstructions of the ionospheric outflow pattern.

142

#### 143 **2. The need for additional investigation**

144 The polar wind and energetic ion outflow processes have been studied for more than forty years via a variety of both experimental and modeling techniques (cf. reviews by Banks & 145 Holzer, 1968; Moore, 1984; Moore and Delcourt, 1995; Ganguli, 1996; Yau et al., 1997; 146 Hultqvist et al., 1999; Yau et al., 2007; Moore & Horwitz, 2007; Schunk and Nagy, 2009; Moore 147 148 and Horwitz, 2009; Kronberg et al., 2014; Wiltberger, 2015). Past missions – such as the International Satellites for Ionospheric Studies (ISIS), in particular ISIS-1 (e.g., Brinton et al., 149 150 1971; Hoffman & Dodson, 1980), or the Dynamics Explorer satellites, notably DE-1 (e.g., Gurgiolo & Burch, 1982; Nagai et al., 1984, Chandler et al., 1991), as well as Akebono (e.g., 151 152 Abe et al., 1993; Yau et al., 1995), Polar (e.g., Su et al., 1998b; Moore et al., 1999a, b; Liemohn et al., 2005, 2007), the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program (DMSP) spacecraft (e.g., Colev 153 154 et al., 2003); the Fast Auroral SnapShoT (FAST) mission (e.g., Strangeway et al., 2000, 2005), and the Cluster mission (e.g., Kistler et al., 2010a; Liao et al., 2015; Dandouras, 2021) - have 155 156 observed ionospheric outflow with one or two spacecraft. Sometimes these are well-instrumented to observe energy input and ionospheric outflow response, leading to input-outflow correlations. 157 Based on this work, the basic physics of outflow of thermal plasma from the terrestrial 158 ionosphere at high latitudes is well known. Figure 3 shows a schematic that summarizes the 159 major processes of outflow. Shown here are Joule heating in the thermosphere and ionosphere 160 (e.g., Foster et al., 1983; Gombosi & Killeen, 1987; Pollock et al., 1990; Liu et al., 1995), 161 ponderomotive or transverse ion acceleration by plasma waves (e.g., Whalen et al., 1991; Miller 162 et al., 1995; Lundin & Guglielmi, 2006), acceleration by parallel electric fields (e.g., Cladis, 163 1986; Schunk, 2000; Chaston et al., 2016), and high-altitude centrifugal energization (e.g., 164 Horwitz et al., 1994; Demars et al., 1996; Winglee, 2000). Various populations of energetic 165 electrons are also possible channels for heating or accelerating ions to escape velocities, such as 166 atmospheric photoelectrons (e.g., Lemaire, 1971; Khazanov et al., 1997; Tam et al., 2007; Glocer 167 et al., 2017), polar rain (e.g., Waite et al., 1985; Wilson et al., 1997; Su et al., 1998a), and soft 168 electrons in the dayside cusp (e.g., Nilsson et al., 1994; Valek et al., 2002; Fuselier et al., 2003; 169



Yizengaw et al., 2006; Wiltberger et al., 2010) or nightside auroral zone (e.g., Wahlund et al.,
1992; Richards, 1995; Barakat et al., 1998; Wu et al., 1999; Lynch et al., 2007; Zeng & Horwitz,
2007).

As the outflowing ions drift through the different regions (e.g., Elliott et al., 2007), the 173 plasma is energized by mechanisms that operate with different levels of intensity at different 174 175 altitudes and in different high-latitude regions. Most of the outflow comes from the dayside cusp and nightside auroral zones. A particularly difficult confounding element, however, is the transit 176 177 of upflowing ions from the topside ionosphere to higher altitudes where additional acceleration converts these populations into outflow. That is, observed outflow can be related to energization 178 179 processes, but the spatial distribution of outflow is only known statistically or from numerical modeling. The inherent time delay in the outflow process obscures correlations between driving 180 factor and outflow intensity. 181

Figure 4 shows two ionospheric outflow patterns (of ion radial velocity), from Akebono
measurements (Abe et al., 2004) and from numerical modeling (Glocer et al., 2012). The

observed pattern was assembled from many years of data, yet it still reveals significant meso-184 scale structure in the outflow pattern. This is most likely due to statistical noise as the radial 185 velocity changes considerably from pass to pass. The modeled pattern has several features in 186 common with the statistical pattern, including meso-scale patches of intense outflow speeds, but 187 other aspects are not the same. For a global modeling simulation of a particular event, it is not 188 fully adequate to use either of these approaches for the outflow specification, leading to 189 uncertainty in the magnetospheric fate and consequences, introducing a large caveat to any large-190 191 scale geospace simulation study and the analysis and prediction of space weather.



**Figure 4.** Examples of the spatial complexity inherent in  $O^+$  outflow velocity in the polar (>60° invariant latitude) ionosphere. The left frame is constructed from nearly a decade of Akebono satellite observations (Abe et al., 2004), yet still shows a highly structured outflow pattern. The right frame is constructed from Polar Wind Outflow Model (adapted from the results of Glocer et al., 2012) when 392 flux tubes are simulated under moderate solar driving. Note that the two colorscales are different.

192 Importantly, the current statistically-known spatial structure does not reveal the dynamics of outflow. While *in situ* measurements have revealed important statistical properties of ion 193 194 outflow, measurements are made at a given magnetic local time (MLT) and altitude. Since they 195 are taken over some period of time (a few minutes), it does not allow the determination of the temporal and spatial variation of ion outflow in response to variable solar wind and 196 197 interplanetary magnetic field (IMF) conditions during the progression of geomagnetic storms. As argued by Liemohn et al. (2022), it is important to understand event-specific spatial and temporal 198 199 variability in order to quantify the impact of outflow on the geospace system. The community lacks this capability with respect to the structure of outflow for any particular disturbed time. 200 All of this uncertainty about the spatial pattern of outflow consolidates in our estimates of 201

202 fluence, or the global outflow rate from the ionosphere into the magnetosphere. Currently,

fluence is estimated only to order-of-magnitude accuracy (Yau et al., 1988; Cully et al., 2003; Lennartsson et al., 2004). All estimations are based on statistical studies from single-spacecraft missions. Estimates from models vary wildly (e.g., Welling et al., 2016), providing limited insight on the true value. After decades of investigations, we still cannot confidently state the spatial distribution and amount of ionospheric plasma that enters the magnetosphere.

Note that the upcoming Geospace Dynamics Constellation (GDC) mission is not 208 designed to achieve the objective considered here of a global map of ionospheric outflow. While 209 the payload of its six spacecraft includes a low-energy ion instrument, its target altitude below 210 211 400 km is significantly too low for the task proposed here. That is, it might see ionospheric *upwelling*, but does not distinguish the portion that becomes ionospheric *outflow*. Much of the 212 213 acceleration for heavy ions to reach escape velocity occurs at higher altitude than where GDC will be located. To observe outflow, the satellite should be, at a minimum, above 1000 km, and 214 2000 km would be even better to ensure that most of the ions have reached escape velocity and 215 are therefore actually leaving the atmosphere. 216

217

# 3. Potential science objectives of this mission

There are three main science objectives that should be targeted for a mission devoted to observing the pattern of high-latitude ionospheric outflow:

- 220
- Reveal the global structure of ionospheric outflow
- 221
- Relate outflow patterns to solar wind driving and geomagnetic activity
- 222
- Determine the spatial and temporal nature of outflow composition

An ancillary modeling task that should be associated with this mission is mapping the outflow through the magnetosphere and connecting the outflow patterns to any available relevant measurements elsewhere in geospace.

226

#### 3.1. Reveal the global structure of ionopsheric outflow

Ionospheric outflow is a time-varying source of plasma for the near-Earth space
environment. Outflow forms complex and spatially detailed patterns. The composition,
magnitude, and spatial distribution of outflowing fluxes vary strongly as a function of solar and
magnetospheric activity. Outflowing plasma feeds the magnetosphere, playing a role in almost

all global processes. In order to understand magnetospheric dynamics, it is critical to understand
the complicated and non-linear dynamics of outflow. Ionospheric outflow is a mosaic of many
different populations, creating a complicated spatial structure that cannot be captured by singlespacecraft missions.

235 Ionospheric outflow organizes into distinct regions, including polar cap, auroral zone, and cusp outflow. Nested within these regions are distinct populations, such as bulk cold outflows 236 with temperatures below 1 eV and suprathermal flows (10 eV up to low keV), such as ion beams 237 and conics. The distributions are highly non-Maxwellian, forming pancake, conic, toroid, bi-238 239 Maxwellian, double-peaked, counter-streaming, and elongated-tail distributions (Andre and Yau, 1997; Schunk and Nagy, 2009). These flows contain both light and heavy ions: H<sup>+</sup>, He<sup>+</sup>, N<sup>+</sup>, and 240 O<sup>+</sup>. While outflow regions can be expansive (e.g., the polar cap), they are often localized and 241 overlapping (Giles et al., 1994; Abe et al., 2004). Of particular interest is the cusp, which is 242 limited in area (typically a few hundred kilometers in any direction at ionospheric altitudes, as 243 found by Newell and Meng (1994)), but yields strong outflowing fluxes to the magnetosphere 244 (Lockwood et al., 1988; Kistler et al., 2010b). Meso-scale outflow "hotspots" also exist, with 245 spatial scales of several hundred kilometers. Figure 4 shows different illustrations of the complex 246 spatial pattern, both statistically observed (left panel) and simulated (right panel). Both large and 247 meso-scale outflow features are apparent in both panels of Figure 4. The characteristics of each 248 outflow population, including energy, pitch angle, and source location, all determine how that 249 population will be transported into and throughout the magnetosphere (Delcourt et al., 1989; 250 251 Cully et al., 2003; Huddleston et al., 2005).

Beyond an understanding that this complexity exists, we know little concerning the 252 global distribution of specific ionospheric outflow populations. Coarse maps are constructed 253 statistically using single-spacecraft observations aggregated over long periods (Abe et al., 2004; 254 Peterson et al., 2006). These studies yield only an initial idea of flux distributions. When 255 segregated by energy or distribution shape, the available statistics are too low to be useful. 256 257 Though strong east-west oriented IMF can drive pronounced interhemispheric asymmetries in ionospheric dynamics (e.g., Weimer, 2001a, b), such asymmetries are rarely considered in 258 259 outflow because of observation limitations, particularly in the southern hemisphere.

260

### **3.2. Relate outflow patterns to geomagnetic activity level**

Compounding the spatial complexity of outflow is its temporal nature. Outflow regions 261 follow the magnetospheric geometry: as the cusp (e.g., Farrell and Van Allen, 1990; Fung et al., 262 1997; Zhou et al., 2000; Pitout et al., 2006) and auroral oval move as a function of solar driving 263 and magnetospheric activity, and corresponding ionospheric plasma sources. Many acceleration 264 processes are also the result of energy inputs from the solar wind and magnetosphere. This 265 results in outflow patterns that are tied not only to the solar cycle (e.g., Yau et al., 1985, 1998; 266 Abe et al., 2004), but also to specific solar wind conditions (Lennartsson et al., 2004; Elliott et 267 al., 2001; Cully et al., 2003), geomagnetic storm phase (Nosé, et al., 2003; Moore et al., 1999; 268 Kitamura et al., 2010), and magnetospheric transients, such as substorms (Øieroset et al., 1999; 269 Wilson et al., 2004; Kistler et al., 2006). The resultant outflowing fluxes at 2000 km altitude vary 270 from  $1 \times 10^5$  cm<sup>-2</sup>s<sup>-1</sup> to  $5 \times 10^8$  cm<sup>-2</sup>s<sup>-1</sup> as a function of season, species, and geomagnetic and 271 solar activity (Yau et al., 2007). 272

Single satellite missions have not been able to resolve time dynamics of outflow. 273 Statistical studies can only quantify outflow variability via total fluence as a function of simple 274 indices (Yau et al., 1988) or binned by average solar wind conditions (Cully et al., 2003). Such 275 276 studies cannot illustrate important details across storm timescales. What outflow regions and populations are most prominent during different storm phases? How does outflow compare 277 between different types of storms, such as coronal mass ejection (CME) or corotating interaction 278 region (CIR) driven events? How does the occurrence, size, and intensity of outflow hotspots 279 depend on storm phase and intensity? These questions cannot be answered with traditional, 280 single-point measurements, limiting our understanding of how dynamic outflow affects the 281 active magnetosphere. 282

Researchers cannot understand the highly time dynamic nature of ionospheric outflow without frequent, distributed observations. This mission concept would provide these measurements and solve the question about how outflow evolves over the course of a geomagnetic storm. 287

## **3.3.** Determine the spatial and temporal nature of outflow composition

The proposed mission should have the capability to separately measure the outflowing 288 plasma population and identify its major constituents. Measuring composition provides an 289 avenue to distinguish between energization and transport mechanisms (e.g., Ilie and Liemohn, 290 2016). For instance, in spite of only 12% mass difference, nitrogen and oxygen have different 291 ionization energies (15.6 eV and 12.1 eV respectively) as well as different scale heights 292 (Chappell et al., 1982). The cross section for charge transfer between atomic hydrogen and 293 nitrogen ions is significantly different than the cross section for charge transfer between atomic 294 295 hydrogen and oxygen ions (Stebbings et al., 1960). Because the peak production rates for those two ionospheric heavy ions usually happen at different altitudes, their abundance in the outflow 296 297 serves as a tracer for the altitude dependent energization processes. Theoretical studies predict significant densities of N<sup>+</sup> (e.g., Schunk and Raitt, 1980; Sojka et al., 1982; Lin et al., 2020; Lin 298 and Ilie, 2022), showing a strong dependence on diurnal, seasonal, and geomagnetic activity as 299 well as universal time. 300

Since the production of N<sup>+</sup> increases with increased energy input, it is expected that it is 301 more prevalent in the auroral regions. Observation of enhanced N<sup>+</sup> fluxes outside the auroral 302 303 region would reveal new insight into latitudinal transport of heavy ions and consequently the overall ionospheric dynamics. Because the mass distribution of accelerated ionospheric ions 304 reflects the source region of the low altitude ion composition, any measurement of a minor ion 305 constituent of the accelerated plasma serves as a tracer of ionospheric and energization processes 306 307 (e.g., Winningham & Gurgiolo, 1982; Glocer & Daldorff, 2022). Ion velocity space measurements alone reveal the basic breakdown of these processes, separating classic polar wind 308 (heating only, allowing the high-energy tail to escape) from potential-driven outflow (various E 309 contributions) and wave heating (transversely accelerated ions and conics). 310

Enhancement of ion outflow is also associated with an increase in the solar wind dynamic pressure (Moore et al., 1999a; Elliott et al., 2001; Cully et al., 2003; Ogawa et al., 2009) and in the solar wind electric field (Lennartsson, 1995; Elliott et al., 2001). The amount of outflowing ion flux and the interplay between different energization mechanisms are largely governed by changes in the solar wind density, velocity, and IMF because it is these parameters that control the precipitation into the ionosphere and the convection electric field (Moore and Horwitz,

2007). Furthermore, the enhancement of ionospheric outflow becomes larger with increasing 317 geomagnetic activity as the auroral oval (where the largest ionospheric outflow occurs) moves 318 equatorward (Ogawa et al., 2009). At higher altitudes, the curvature of the magnetic field in the 319 polar cap produces a centrifugal acceleration of the convecting plasma and this effect becomes 320 important during times of strong convection. However, centrifugal acceleration affects 321 predominantly the lowest energy ions by increasing their parallel velocity (Cladis, 1986). To 322 measure outflow, the satellites should be above the acceleration region that pushes them above 323 324 escape velocity (at least 1000 km altitude, and perhaps much higher).

325

#### **3.4.** Map outflow throughout the magnetosphere

Our understanding of outflow's role throughout the magnetosphere is tempered by our tenuous understanding of outflow itself. A combination of global outflow observations with numerical modeling is necessary to completely reveal how ionospheric outflow maps throughout the magnetosphere.

An example of this is presented in Figure 5. The main graphic shows trajectory traces of 330 H<sup>+</sup> and O<sup>+</sup> ions through a multifluid global simulation that resolves velocities for each ion 331 species. It is seen that the locations of initial contact with the plasma sheet are vastly different for 332 the two species, which could modify magnetotail dynamics. The inset in Figure 5 shows the 333 "fate" of ionospheric outflow as a function of initial location within the high-latitude ionosphere. 334 This is similar to the fate maps from Huddleston et al. (2005), except that, instead of an empirical 335 field description, this uses results from an MHD model (Gombosi et al., 2021; with setup like 336 337 that of Liemohn & Welling, 2016, and Glocer et al., 2018). For this particular model configuration and driving condition (nominal southward IMF), a pattern can be obtained 338 revealing which ionospheric locations contribute to which magnetospheric regions. 339

The temporal and spatial complexities of ionospheric outflow propagate through the magnetosphere, affecting system-level dynamics. Observations paint a clear dependence between solar wind/magnetospheric activity and heavy ion composition in the magnetosphere. In the lobes, different populations disperse by energy and species (Chappell et al., 1987). O<sup>+</sup> beams from the cusp distinguish themselves from isotropic nightside auroral O<sup>+</sup> (Kistler et al., 2010b; Liao et al., 2010; Kistler et al., 2016). Very cold ion populations indicate cold, classical polar wind outflow (Engwall et al., 2009; Andre et al., 2015). Faster populations can escape the



**Figure 5.** Streamline traces of ionospheric outflow from 5 locations on the model inner boundary along the noon-midnight meridian in the northern hemisphere (view is from dawn). The orange curves are for  $O^+$  and the green curves are for  $H^+$ . The thin white lines show closed magnetic field lines and the thin red lines are the last closed field lines on the dayside and nightside. The inset panel shows the fate of mapping outflow from a starting grid in the northern hemisphere (noon at the top), with their first crossings of the equatorial plane indicated by color: central plasma sheet (red); dayside inner magnetosphere (yellow); nightside inner magnetosphere (light blue); precipitation back into the model inner boundary (dark blue); and loss to deep space (white).

347 geospace domain all the way to deep space, while slower (and typically heavier) populations

arrive at the plasma sheet (Young et al., 1982; Lennartsson and Shelley, 1986; Moore et al.,

- 2005a, b; Nosé et al. 2005; Mouikis et al., 2010). Here, they are accelerated sunward, feeding the
- partial and symmetric ring current hot ion populations (e.g., Gloeckler et al., 1985; Daglis et al.,
- 1999; Denton et al., 2005). Figure 6 (from Nosé et al., 2003) shows the energy density ratio in
- the inner magnetosphere and near-Earth plasma sheet, between  $O^+$  and  $H^+$  (in red) and between
- He<sup>+</sup> and H<sup>+</sup> (in blue). In these ratios, the numerator species is supplied only by the ionosphere
- 354 while protons could be sourced from either the ionosphere or the solar wind. It is clear that the

energy density of the ring current becomes increasingly carried by O<sup>+</sup> as a function of storm
 intensity.

Although ionospheric outflow is a major source of magnetospheric plasma, recent studies suggest a more complicated connection. Numerical models have repeatedly demonstrated that the characteristics of outflow at its source, including mass, pitch angle, and energy, help dictate the fate of the plasma inside the magnetosphere (Huddleston et al., 2005; Brambles et al., 2010; Garcia et al., 2010; Yu and Ridley, 2013a, b). Within the plasma sheet, characteristics like composition, distance down tail, and pitch angle distribution dictate the amount of acceleration of the plasma (Delcourt et al., 1989, 1993; Kronberg et al., 2012). The characteristics of outflow

10.00

throughout the plasma sheet control how 364 effectively it will energize the ring current (e.g., 365 Welling et al., 2011). Further, as outflow affects 366 magnetospheric dynamics, such as substorm 367 development (Wiltberger et al., 2010; Welling et 368 al., 2016) and cross polar cap potential (Winglee 369 et al., 2002; Welling and Zaharia, 2012; Ilie et al., 370 371 2013, 2015), it is also affecting the energy input into the ionosphere, creating non-linear 372 magnetosphere-ionosphere feedback loops 373 (Moore et al., 2014; Welling and Liemohn, 2016). 374 375 These have been linked to sudden ring current intensifications (Welling et al., 2015a) and the 376 development of global sawtooth oscillations 377

(Brambles et al., 2011, 2013). The geopauses –

378

5. Greenspan & Hamilton et al. (2002) 1. Gloecker et al. (1985) 2. Krimigis et al. (1985) 6. Roeder et al. (1996) 3. Hamilton et al. (1988) 7. Daglis et al. (1997) 4. Fieldstein et al. (2000) 8. Daglis et al. (2000) .6 1.00 Energy Density Ratio 3 •6 0.10 . 3 06 He<sup>\*</sup>/ 10 383 0.0 Quiet Storm -300 -100 -200 0 Dst or SYM-H (nT) TA009981-ExHAIL

**Ring Current and Plasma Sheet Ion Composition** 

**Figure 6.** The energy density ratio between  $O^+$  and  $H^+$  (in red) and between  $He^+$  and  $H^+$  (in blue) of the ring current and plasma sheet as a function of geomagnetic activity, as indexed by Dst or SYM-H (Nosé et al., 2003). Note the logarithmic scale on the y axis.

those surfaces in near-Earth space where the contribution from solar and ionospheric origin
plasma are equal (in density, mass, or pressure) – are boundaries that define changes in the

physical processes governing plasma flow (e.g., Trung et al., 2019; 2023). The community now

recognizes that magnetospheric dynamics rely critically on outflow dynamics.

The source of most of the uncertainties regarding geospace dynamics are caused by the limitations of our current understanding of the spatial and temporal variation of ionospheric outflow. Observational studies of ion composition in geospace must rely on inference to connect the source population to the magnetospheric observations (e.g., Kistler et al., 2016). Numerical

simulations depend on the inherently flawed statistical outflow distributions to seed models,

propagating error throughout the magnetosphere (e.g., Huddleston et al., 2005; Peroomian et al.,

2006). Scientists are simply unable to definitively answer critical questions connecting outflow

and the magnetosphere.

### **4. Determining the optimal number of spacecraft**

While it would be ideal to know ionospheric outflow everywhere at all times, this would require a Starlink-level constellation of hundreds of satellites. Instead, there is a trade space of cost versus reconstruction accuracy that needs to be assessed to determine the optimal number of spacecraft that would provide reasonable reconstructions most of the time. Therefore, an observing system simulation experiment is useful to provide some constraints on the constellation configuration.

398 This exploration was conducted using several existing outflow patterns, represented here by results from a high-resolution single-fluid MHD simulation, specifically those from Welling 399 & Liemohn (2014). For more on the numerical code, please see the latest summary of the Space 400 Weather Modeling Framework (SWMF) (Gombosi et al., 2021). Using values extracted from the 401 402 original outflow pattern, a reconstruction is generated from these "observations" through binning and interpolation. Each virtual spacecraft takes 401 samples per orbit per hemisphere. These 403 values are then sorting into 51 eually-spaced latitude bins per hemisphere and each latitude ring 404 of values are then interpolated into 45 equally-spaced longitude bins using the Piecewise Cubic 405 Hermite Interpolating Polynomial (PCHIP; Fritsch and Carlson, 1980). The PCHIP method 406 conducts a cubic spline fit on a one-dimensional data set (in this case, the extracted outflow 407 fluxes for a specific latitude band), with an extra filter that blends in linear interpolation to both 408 preserve monotonicity of the resulting reconstruction and minimize overshoots near steep 409 gradients within the data. The result is continuous but not necessarily smooth. 410

Latitudes above the available data are pruned, leaving an unreconstructed region at the pole. The reconstruction is a function of the number of satellites, the inclination of the orbit crossing point from the geomagnetic pole, the magnetic local time of the orbit crossing point, and the longitudinal separation of the orbit planes. Two solar wind input conditions (IMF northward and southward) are used for the statistical study, and a time series of drivingconditions are used for a real-event case study.

417

#### 4.1. Example reconstruction patterns

Figure 7 illustrates the product of the reconstruction algorithm. For this example, the 418 419 MHD result was produced using steady driving with an IMF Bz of -10 nT, taken from the simulation at 3  $R_E$  geocentric distance (the inner boundary of the MHD model was set at 2.5  $R_E$ ) 420 and mapped down to 1800 km altitude using flux conversation along assumed dipole field lines. 421 For this reconstruction, three satellite passes were used with a crossing at 80° at local dawn (the 422 sun is to the right in each of the plots), with a nodal separation of the orbit planes of 60°. While 423 some meso-scale outflow features are missed because an orbit plane did not pass through them, 424 the overall pattern in the reconstruction is qualitatively similar to that of the original. Listed at 425 the top of the original and reconstructed outflow maps is the total escaping ion fluence, which 426 are only ~1% different. 427

To assess the appropriateness and quality of the selected reconstruction method, Figure 8 428 429 shows a PCHIP fit at the highest latitude band from the example in Figure 7. The red dots are the extracted data values. Because this is the highest latitude band, the satellite trajectories are 430 moving on a very shallow arc (i.e., nearly horizontally) through the band, so even though there 431 are only three satellites, each one contributes many points to the reconstruction. To enforce 432 periodicity of the reconstruction, the data are repeated three times within to ensure continuity of 433 the fit at  $\pm 180^{\circ}$ . The PCHIP result is shown in blue. Figure 8 shows that the PCHIP algorithm is 434 435 excellent at reconstructing the functional form of the data in regions where data exists, while also







**Figure 8.** Example of a PCHIP fitting calculation of outflow flux as a function of longitude at a specific latitude band, specifically the highest latitude ring of the reconstruction example shown in Figure 7. The red dots are the MHD values extracted as "observations" within a particular colatitude band, repeated three times to ensure continuity of the fit. Values from the The blue curve is the PCHIP reconstruction.

creating a smooth curve through regions with no data points. It also does not introduce any new

437 extrema beyond the observed maximum and minimum values.

438 Extending this example, Figure 9 shows reconstructions of that same MHD outflow

439 pattern using one through five spacecraft passes for the reconstruction. To provide a different

example from that shown in Figure 7, the crossing location in Figure 9 is at 85° at local midnight

and the maximum orbit plane separation is set to  $90^{\circ}$ . The reconstruction with a single spacecraft

442 marginally reproduces a few of the global features but none of the meso-scale hotspots of

443 outflow. This is to be expected as there are only two extracted values for each latitude ring, so

each band in the reconstruction has a rather sinusoidal form. With two spacecraft, the global

445 pattern is better, but the local features are still missing. Although patterns created from two or



**Figure 9.** Reconstruction from a known spatial pattern of ionospheric outflow (upper left) using one through five spacecraft passes.

one spacecraft capture the large-scale features, these patterns reproduce essentially none of the localized outflow peaks and troughs. The pattern from three spacecraft is good but lacks some of the details of the hot spot structure within the outflow map. With four or five spacecraft, the localized features become resolved. Furthermore, it is seen that the interpolated pattern from four spacecraft is quite similar to that from five spacecraft.

451

# 4.2. Outflow reconstruction optimization

To quantify this, goodness of fit values for the 2D outflow map reconstructions were produced for constellations of one to six satellites. To further explore different mission phases, reconstructions were made using different orbit geomagnetic inclinations (from 65° to 90° in 5° increments), azimuths (i.e., local time) of orbit crossing points (full 360° at 14.4° increments) and spread of orbit planes (from 2° to 100° between the most distant satellites, in 10 settings, with any additional satellites above two equally spaced between these end members of the set). In all, over 10,000 spatial reconstructions were produced per MHD outflow spatial pattern plot. For the results in this section, two such MHD patterns are considered, for a southward and northward IMF condition. These were taken from Welling & Liemohn (2014) from singlefluid MHD simulations. As seen in the first panels of Figures 7 and 9, the large-scale features of these initial ionospheric outflow patterns consist of outflow from the auroral oval (around all local times with a latitudinal extent of 5-10°) with embedded "hot spots" of higher-intensity outflow flux (spanning 1-2 hours in local time and 3-5° in latitude). These are the scale of the features for which the reconstruction is being optimized.

The quality of reconstruction was then quantified. The fluxes at each latitude and 466 longitude were compared between the reconstruction and the original pattern, resulting in a 467 scatterplot of these paired values. This scatterplot was distilled to metric scores using root-mean-468 469 squared error (RMSE) and correlation coefficient (R), comparing each point within the reconstruction to the same point in the original outflow map. While two metrics are not enough 470 for a robust analysis, these particular two metrics are from the accuracy and association 471 categories (see, e.g., Liemohn et al., 2021) and provide a balanced overview of the goodness of 472 fit between the patterns. This is only an initial conceptual study assessing the trade space 473 between constellation configuration and reconstruction accuracy; a more thorough investigation 474 of parameter space should be conducted for specific flight opportunities to justify the concept for 475 that particular mission. 476

These two metrics are shown as a function of the number of satellites in Figure 10. These 477 box-and-whisker plots were compiled using all combinations of the other inputs for both IMF 478 479 settings. The box shows the interquartile range and the whiskers present the full range of the metric scores. The median R exceeds 0.7 by three satellites, and rises to 0.75 by six satellites. 480 Surpassing this 0.7 level is useful because this corresponds to coefficient of determination score 481 (defined as  $R^2$ ) of 0.5.  $R^2$  is a measure of how much of the variance in one parameter is captured 482 by similar variance in the other parameter (the two parameters, in this case, being the outflow 483 fluxes). Therefore, a median  $R^2$  of 0.5 indicates that 50% of the variance in the original outflow 484 flux number sets is reproduced by the reconstructed number sets. To put it another way, passing 485 an R of 0.7 means that the reconstructions contain a majority of the features in the original 486 487 pattern.



**Figure 9.** Correlation (R) and root mean square error (RMSE) as a function of the number of satellites used in the reconstruction. All reconstructions as a function of local time of orbit crossing, magnetic latitude of the crossing, nodal separation of the spacecraft, and geomagnetic activity are included. The red bar shows the median metric score, the box shows the interquartile range, and the whiskers extend to the extremes of the distributions.

There are two other features to note in Figure 10. The metrics medians appear to level off by three or four satellites in the constellation, and essentially asymptote at six satellites (i.e., no discernible no change from five satellites). The boxplot presentation also reveals asymmetries in the underlying histogram of values, showing a skew in all of the distributions with an elongated tail towards poorer reconstructions. This is because all of the parameter settings were included in the plot creation, including those with small satellite separation or badly aligned orbit plane crossing locations (relative to outflow features in the MHD patterns).

To investigate the spread in the boxplots of Figure 10, Figure 11 shows median RMSE scores and correlation coefficients as a function of two constellation parameters, the number of satellites and the magnetic latitude of the orbit plane crossing. Each white grid crossing in the plots is a constellation configuration setting for these two parameters, the color is smoothed to fill in each panel. All settings for the other two parameters are included in the number sets leading to the median values presented in Figure 11. Note that the colorscales for both of the metrics are optimized for the values in the plot and do not start at zero. 502 Magnetic latitude of the crossing is analogous to inclination of the orbit planes, but not 503 the same, of course, because the magnetic poles are not aligned with the geographic poles, 504 introducing a systematic diurnal variation to the magnetic latitude of the orbit crossing. That is, 505 this is not a parameter of a real satellite mission, which would require weighted averaging of a 506 span of magnetic latitude crossings to determine the accuracy for a given inclination. That said, 507 this presentation is informative to help guide the choice of an optimal inclination for the 508 constellation.

The clear feature of Figure 11 is that there is a peak in the metric scores (maximum R, minimum RMSE) at 80°. Both metrics are noticeably worse for lower crossing latitudes; this is expected as the satellites spend little time in the auroral zone and therefore miss most of the outflow. The interesting result is that the metrics are worse for an 85° and 90° magnetic latitude crossing than for the optimal crossing of 80°. This is because, at these high-inclination settings, the orbits are cutting through the auroral zone – where most of the outflow occurs – with a more



**Figure 11.** Metrics versus number of satellites and the magnetic latitude of the crossing point. The median metric is shown from the distribution of values from the remaining parameters in the reconstruction analysis.



**Figure 12.** Left: Correlation coefficient as a function of number of spacecraft in the constellation (x axis) and the maximum orbit plan separation angle (y axis). The median score is shown from the distribution created by the other parameters in the analysis. Right: median correlation coefficient as a function of orbit plane separation for a four satellite constellation.

- 515 meridional trajectory. With a meridional trajectory, the satellites spend less time in the auroral
- zone and contribute fewer values to the reconstruction. There appears to be an optimal
- reconstruction for which the crossing is just poleward of the auroral zone, providing a maximal
- orbital path length through the entire latitude band of the high outflow flux.
- Figure 12 shows median correlation coefficients as a function of the maximum orbit plane separation and number of satellites. Only correlation is shown here in order to present a different kind of second panel; the right plot is a slice through the other for the four-satellite constellation configuration. As with Figures 10 and 11, the RMSE results (not shown) reveal the same trends as the correlation plots included in the figure.

In Figure 12, it is seen that the best correlations are located in the upper right corner of 524 the left panel. The reconstruction improves with both number of satellites and orbit plane 525 separation. The right panel reveals a limit to this improvement, though, as the peak correlation is 526 found at  $\sim 90^{\circ}$  separation. As the maximum separation expands past 90°, the inter-orbit separation 527 of the constellation becomes large enough to start to miss meso-scale features (at least in some of 528 529 the constellation configurations), and the median reconstruction slightly decreases. The drop in median correlation from 90° to 100° is not significant, but it is the start of a trend that will 530 continue as the maximum orbit plane separation increases to 180°. At that point, the two end 531

members of the constellation are flying along nearly the same trajectory but in opposite directions, therefore they are not contributing two satellites' worth of information to the reconstruction.

Also shown in the right panel of Figure 12 is that the median correlation coefficient for a 4-satellite constellation exceeds 0.7 for a maximum separation of 55° or more. This can be considered a cutoff threshold for producing reasonable reconstructions (in which most of the variation in the original pattern is captured by the reconstruction) with a reasonable number of satellites (four).

The magnetic local time of the orbit plane crossing did not show a trend in either RMSE or R. The spread is large and the differences in the median values were not significant and do not need to be shown. Parsing the study results further, this parameter only mattered for small orbit plane separation. For this case, very few of the reconstructions are of high quality, but a crossing on the nightside was marginally better than one on the dayside.

545

#### **4.3. Outflow during a storm interval**

The above analysis showed that 4 satellites with a  $>55^{\circ}$  orbit plane separation between 546 547 the end-member spacecraft produces fairly accurate reconstructions. That assessment, however, was conducted with only two outflow patterns, a nominal southward IMF case and a nominal 548 549 northward IMF case, with standard solar wind parameters. It is useful to test the reconstruction method and the ability of a constellation to reconstruct outflow during a storm interval. Using the 550 same SWMF model configuration as above, the "St. Patrick's Day Storm" of 17-18 March 2015 551 was simulated. For reference, the Dst time series for this storm is shown in the upper panel of 552 Figure 13. 553

554 Outflow patterns were obtained from the SWMF every minute. Reconstructions were 555 then compiled on a 2-hour cadence, which would be the cadence of a 2000 km altitude 556 constellation presumably taking these outflow measurements. The number of spacecraft was set 557 to four and the maximum orbit plane separation set to 90° (i.e., 30° separation between each of 558 the orbit planes). To build up statistics, the local time and magnetic latitude of the crossing were 559 varied, using four local times (00, 06, 12, and 18) and four latitudes (65°, 75°, 85°, and 95°). In 560 all, 1920 reconstructions were conducted for each two-hour period throughout the storm interval.



**Figure 13.** The top panel shows the Dst index time series during the 17-18 March 2015 magnetic storm interval. The bottom panel shows the northern hemisphere ionospheric outflow fluence from the MHD model (blue line) and the box-and-whisker distribution of fluences from the reconstructions.

To provide an overall assessment of the reconstructions, Figure 13 shows the time series 561 of the integrated outflow fluence (lower panel), both from the SWMF model (on a one-minute 562 cadence) and from the reconstructions (on a two-hour cadence as boxplots). Of the 26 boxplots 563 in this figure, 19 have model values passing through the interquartile range of the reconstructed 564 fluences (the "box" of the boxplot). The reconstructed fluences are usually at or below the 565 original values, indicating that the reconstruction method usually captures the basic pattern of the 566 outflow but not all of the meso-scale "hot spots" of elevated flux. There were a few times where 567 the reconstructed fluences were entirely below the 120 original MHD fluences in that two-hour 568 window, but for most of the intervals, the reconstructions are doing reasonably well. 569

570

# 5. Discussion on implementation

It is expected that a mission fulfilling the orbital requirements defined in section 4 above would consist of several identically-instrumented, longitudinally-separated, high-inclination spacecraft observing the low-energy ion velocity distribution above 1000 km altitude (in order to observe outflow, not upwelling) and below 3000 km altitude (to minimize orbital period and surface area of the orbit shell). Initial cost estimates suggest that such a mission could be achieved within the constraints of the Heliophysics Small Explorer mission line with minimalinstrumentation.

In its simplest configuration with only an ion spectrometer, this type of mission concept 578 579 represents an important measurement paradigm that is ideally suited for the Explorer mission line. Instead of measuring "everything" at one or two locations, this constellation would 580 "globally" measure one key plasma property. The satellites in the constellation would relate 581 different portions of the high latitude ionospheric outflow with each other, connecting dayside 582 with nightside outflow rates and revealing storm-sequence time lags and correlations. Significant 583 584 progress in our understanding of ion outflow would be achieved with only the low-energy ion velocity space measurement at several locations, moving our understanding of system science of 585 geospace as a whole to the next level. Note that if the full  $4\pi$  field of view of the ion velocity 586 distribution is measured by this ion instrument, then the downflowing low-energy ions would 587 also be observed and subsequently constructed into maps every orbit period. 588

An alternative mission concept to the single instrument payload would be to design the spacecraft with additional instrumentation to provide observations that complement and contextualize the ion data. This would most likely need to be proposed at the Heliophysics Midsized Explorer level (or larger) to maintain the four-satellite constellation. With only one wellinstrumented spacecraft, the mission would repeat the findings of the FAST or Akebono missions and would not be particularly innovative without some other major design augmentation to make it worthy of the investment.

A limitation of this study is that it is assumed that the outflow pattern is steady for the 596 duration of the high-latitude passage of the constellation, i.e., 20 to 30 minutes. This is a 597 598 somewhat reasonable assumption, given that the outflowing ions are moving at only a few to tens of kilometers per second, and therefore take many minutes to flow from the ionosphere (let's say 599 the starting altitude is in the topside ionosphere at 300 km altitude) to a nominal observation 600 altitude of around 2000 km. If an ion is accelerated along the field line with just enough force to 601 602 barely overcome gravity and maintain a 1 km/s upward velocity, then it would take 28 minutes for this ion to traverse this 1700 km distance and reach the satellite. If, however, the outflowing 603 604 ions maintain a velocity of 10 km/s, then this trip would only take 3 minutes. Furthermore, the outflow pattern can only be constructed once per orbit (per hemisphere), so the cadence of the 605

patterns would be on the order of 2 hours. This mission concept, therefore, is not suitable for
investigating prompt outflow events, but rather for the investigation of longer-term outflow and
its consequences on the magnetosphere. If proposed to the Heliophysics Mid-sized Explorer
program, or if a very inexpensive miniaturized ion instrument is used, then a fleet of small
satellites could be deployed with several along each of the four orbit planes, allowing for a faster
cadence of the reconstructed outflow patterns.

#### 612 **6. Conclusion**

613 This study addressed the question of how many satellites would be needed to accurately reconstruct the high-latitude ionospheric outflow pattern. An observing system simulation 614 experiment was conducted to quantify and constrain the requirements for a reasonable 615 reconstruction of the outflow pattern. With "accurate" defined as a median correlation coefficient 616 617 of 0.7 for a sensitivity study spanning several orbital configuration parameters and IMF settings, the answer is four. Three might work, but one or two satellites is inadequate for the task. Five or 618 619 six satellites produce slightly better reconstructions, but the marginal improvement might not be worth the cost unless the focus is on the meso-scale features of ionospheric outflow. It is best to 620 621 maximize auroral zone dwell time for the constellation, so an inclination between 75° and 85° is best. Higher than this and the orbit planes would cut too quickly through the high outflow flux 622 623 region, and lower than this and they would likely miss the outflow regions on many passes. The orbit planes should spread across a wide swath of local times, with a separation between the end-624 625 member spacecraft of at least 60°, and 90° would be even better. More than this separation produces marginal improvement or even diminished accuracy. The local time of the orbital plane 626 crossings was not significant in controlling the accuracy of the reconstructed outflow pattern. 627

This study provides a starting point for future mission concept development on measuring 628 the global pattern of ionospheric outflow. Because of the heavy mass of O<sup>+</sup>, N<sup>+</sup> and other 629 constituents in this outflow, understanding the full high-latitude spatial structure and temporal 630 variability of the escaping ions is vital for scientific progress on the ionosphere-magnetosphere 631 relationship and nonlinear feedback loop. Ionospheric outflow mass loads the magnetosphere and 632 significantly impacts many physical processes, to the point of reshaping the magnetosphere and 633 altering the large-scale dynamics of near-Earth space. This is a critical unresolved question in 634 635 space physics and a dedicated mission would substantially advance our community's

understanding of geospace system dynamics and space weather predictions. This proposed
mission would reveal the temporal change in ionospheric outflow on the timescales of substorm
and storm phases and the relationship of this change to solar wind and IMF driving conditions. It
would resolve both small scale outflows (early mission) and global outflow conditions (mid- to
late-phase). Spatial outflow maps will be created every orbit, providing continuous coverage
across storms. These observations would unlock the dynamic relationship between ionospheric
outflow, solar wind drivers, and geomagnetic activity.

643

#### 644 Acknowledgments and Data

645 The authors thank the University of Michigan and Southwest Research Institute for support of this project. The authors would like to thank the University of Michigan for its 646 financial support, Southwest Research Institute for its financial support, and the US government, 647 in particular research grants from NASA (specifically, grant numbers 80NSSC19K0077, 648 80NSSC21K1127, and 80NSSC21K1405) and NSF (specifically, grant AGS-1414517). MB was 649 supported by the Office of Naval Research. All authors listed have made a substantial, direct, and 650 intellectual contribution to the work and approved it for publication. The simulations were 651 conducted by DTW and analyzed by DTW and MWL. An undergraduate student, Joshua Adam, 652 also contributed to the plots and calculations. The datasets generated and analyzed for this study 653 can be found in the University of Michigan Deep Blue DataSets repository [DOI LINK TBD 654 upon manuscript acceptance and finalization]. 655

656

#### 657 **References**

- Abe, T., B.A. Whalen, A.W. Yau, S. Watanabe, E. Sagawa, and K.I. Oyama (1993). Altitude
  profile of the polar wind velocity and its relationship to ionospheric conditions, Geophys.
  Res. Lett. (ISSN 0094-8276), 20 (24), 2825–2828.
- Abe, T., A.W. Yau, S. Watanabe, M. Yamada, and E. Sagawa (2004). Long-term variation of the
  polar wind velocity and its implication for the ion acceleration process:
  Akebono/suprathermal ion mass spectrometer observations, J. Geophys. Res., 109 (A9),
  A09,305, doi: 10.1029/2003JA010223.
- André, M., and A. Yau (1997). Theories and Observations of Ion Energization and Outflow in
   the High Latitude Magnetosphere, Space Science Reviews, 80 (1), 27–48.
- André, M., K. Li, and A.I. Eriksson (2015). Outflow of low-energy ions and the solar cycle, J.
   Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, doi:10.1002/2014JA020714.

- Banks, P. M., & Holzer, T. E. (1968). The polar wind. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 73(21),
   6846-6854.
- Barakat, A. R., Demars, H. G., & Schunk, R. W. (1998). Dynamic features of the polar wind in
  the presence of hot magnetospheric electrons. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 103(A12), 29289-29303.
- Brambles, O.J., W. Lotko, P.A. Damiano, B. Zhang, M. Wiltberger, and J. Lyon (2010). Effects
  of causally driven cusp O+ outflow on the storm time magnetosphere-ionosphere system
  using a multifluid global simulation, J. Geophys. Res., 115, A00J04,
  doi:10.1029/2010JA015469.
- Brambles, O.J., W. Lotko, B. Zhang, M. Wiltberger, J. Lyon, and R.J. Strangeway (2011).
  Magnetosphere sawtooth oscillations induced by ionospheric outflow, Science, 332 (6034), 1183–6, doi:10.1126/science.1202869.
- Brambles, O.J., W. Lotko, B. Zhang, J. Ouellette, J. Lyon, and M. Wiltberger (2013). The effects
  of ionospheric outflow on ICME and SIR driven sawtooth events, J. Geophys. Res.:
  Space Physics, 118 (10), 6026–6041, doi:10.1002/jgra.50522.
- Brinton, H.C., J.M. Grebowsky, and H.G. Mayr (1971). Altitude Variation of Ion Composition in
   Midlatitude Trough Region Evidence for Upward Plasma Flow, J. Geophys. Res.: Space
   Physics, 76 (16), 3738–&.
- Chandler, M.O., T.E. Moore, and J.H. Waite (1991). Observations of polar ion outflows, J.
  Geophys. Res. (ISSN 0148-0227), 96 (A2), 1421–1428.
- Chappell, C.R. (2015). The Role of the Ionosphere in Providing Plasma to the Terrestrial
   Magnetosphere: An Historical Overview, Space Science Reviews, 192 (1-4), 5–25,
   doi:10.1007/s11214-015-0168-5.
- Chappell, C.R., T.E. Moore, and J.H. Waite, Jr. (1987). The ionosphere as a fully adequate
   source of plasma for the earth's magnetosphere, J. Geophys. Res., 92, 5896–5910, doi:
   10.1029/JA092iA06p05896.
- Chappell, C. R., R. C. Olsen, J. L. Green, J.F.E. Johnson, and J. H. Waite, Jr. (1982). The
   discovery of nitrogen ions in the earth's magnetosphere, Geophys. Res. Lett., 9, 937-940.
- Chaston, C. C., Bonnell, J. W., Reeves, G. D., & Skoug, R. M. (2016). Driving ionospheric
   outflows and magnetospheric O<sup>+</sup> energy density with Alfvén waves. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 43(10), 4825-4833.
- Christon, S. P., *et al.* (2000). Low charge state heavy ions upstream of Earth's bow shock and
   sunward flux of ionospheric O<sup>+1</sup>, N<sup>+1</sup>, and O<sup>+2</sup> ions: Geotail observations, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 27, 2433–2436.
- Christon, S.P., U. Mall, T.E. Eastman, G. Gloeckler, A.T.Y. Lui, R.W. McEntire, and E.C.
   Roelof (2002). Solar cycle and geomagnetic N<sup>+1</sup>/O<sup>+1</sup> variation in outer dayside
   magnetosphere: Possible relation to topside ionosphere, Geophys. Res. Lett., 29 (5), 2–1–
   2–3.
- Cladis, J. B. (1986). Parallel acceleration and transport of ions from polar ionosphere to plasma
   sheet. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *13*(9), 893-896.
- Coley, W.R., R.A. Heelis, and M.R. Hairston (2003). High-latitude plasma outflow as measured
   by the DMSP spacecraft, J. Geophys. Res., 108(A), 1441.
- Cully, C.M., E. Donovan, A.W. Yau, and G.G. Arkos (2003). Akebono/Suprathermal Mass
  Spectrometer observations of low-energy ion outflow: Dependence on magnetic activity
  and solar wind conditions, J. Geophys. Res., 108 (A2), 1093,
  doi:10.1029/2001JA009200.
- Daglis, I.A., R.M. Thorne, W. Baumjohann, and S. Orsini (1999). The terrestrial ring current:
  Origin, formation, and decay, Reviews of Geophysics, 37, 407–438,
  doi:10.1029/1999RG900009.
- Dandouras, I. (2021). Ion outflow and escape in the terrestrial magnetosphere: Cluster advances.
   *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, *126*(10), e2021JA029753, doi:
   10.1029/2021JA029753
- Delcourt, D.C., C.R. Chappell, T.E. Moore, and J.H. Waite (1989). A three-dimensional
   numerical model of ionospheric plasma in the magnetosphere, J. Geophys. Res., 94 (A9),
   11,893,doi:10.1029/JA094iA09p11893.
- Delcourt, D.C., J.A. Sauvaud, and T.E. Moore (1993). Polar wind ion dynamics in the
   magnetotail, J. Geophys. Res., 98 (A6), 9155, doi:10.1029/93JA00301.
- Demars, H. G., Barakat, A. R., & Schunk, R. W. (1996). Effect of centrifugal acceleration on the
   polar wind. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, *101*(A11), 24565-24571.
- Denton, M.H., M.F. Thomsen, H. Korth, S. Lynch, J.C. Zhang, and M.W. Liemohn (2005). Bulk
   plasma properties at geosynchronous orbit, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 110 (A9),
   723-+, doi:10.1029/2004JA010861.
- Elliott, H.A., R.H. Comfort, P.D. Craven, M.O. Chandler, and T.E. Moore (2001). Solar wind
   influence on the oxygen content of ion outflow in the high-altitude polar cap during solar
   minimum conditions, J. Geophys. Res., 106 (A4), 6067, doi:10.1029/2000JA003022.
- Elliott, H. A., Jahn, J. M., Pollock, C. J., Moore, T. E., & Horwitz, J. L. (2007). O<sup>+</sup> transport
  across the polar cap. *Journal of atmospheric and solar-terrestrial physics*, 69(13), 15411555.
- Engwall, E., A.I. Eriksson, C.M. Cully, M. Andre, P.A. Puhl-Quinn, H. Vaith, and R. Torbert
  (2009). Survey of cold ionospheric outflows in the magnetotail, Annales Geophysicae,
  27(8), 3185–3201, doi:10.5194/angeo-27-3185-2009.
- Farrell, W.M., and J.A. Van Allen (1990). Observations of the Earth's polar cleft at large radial
  distances with the Hawkeye 1 Magnetometer, J. Geophys. Res., 95 (A12), 20,945, doi:
  10.1029/JA095iA12p20945.
- Foster, J. C., St.-Maurice, J. P., & Abreu, V. J. (1983). Joule heating at high latitudes. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 88(A6), 4885-4897.
- Fritsch, F. N., & Carlson, R. E. (1980). Monotone piecewise cubic interpolation. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, *17*(2), 238-246.

- Fung, S.,T. Eastman, S. Boardsen, and S.-H. Chen (1997). High-altitude cusp positions sampled
  by the Hawkeye satellite, Physics and Chemistry of the Earth, 22 (7-8), 653–662, doi:
  10.1016/S0079-1946(97)88121-9.
- Fuselier, S. A., Mende, S. B., Moore, T. E., Frey, H. U., Petrinec, S. M., Claflin, E. S., & Collier,
   M. R. (2003). Cusp dynamics and ionospheric outflow. *Magnetospheric Imaging—The Image Prime Mission*, 285-312.
- Ganguli, S. B. (1996), The polar wind, *Rev. Geophys.*, 34(3), 311–348,
   doi:10.1029/96RG00497.
- Garcia, K.S., V.G. Merkin, and W.J. Hughes (2010). Effects of nightside O<sup>+</sup> outflow on
   magnetospheric dynamics: Results of multifluid MHD modeling, J. Geophys. Res.: Space
   Physics, 115, A00J09, doi:10.1029/2010JA015730.
- Giles, B.L., C.R. Chappell, T.E. Moore, R.H. Comfort, and J.H. Waite (1994). Statistical survey
  of pitch angle distributions in core (0-50 eV) ions from Dynamics Explorer, 1: Outflow in
  the auroral zone, polar cap, and cusp, J. Geophys. Res., 99 (A9), 17,483,
  doi:10.1029/94JA00864.
- Glocer, A., & Daldorff, L. K. S. (2022). Connecting energy input with ionospheric upflow and
   outflow. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 127,
   e2022JA030635. https://doi.org/10.1029/2022JA030635
- Glocer, A., G. Toth, T. Gombosi, and D. Welling (2009a). Modeling ionospheric outflows and
   their impact on the magnetosphere, initial results, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 114
   (A13), 5216-+, doi:10.1029/2009JA014053.
- Glocer, A., G. Toth, Y. Ma, T. Gombosi, J.-C. Zhang, and L.M. Kistler (2009b). Multifluid
   Block-Adaptive-Tree Solar wind Roe-type Upwind Scheme: Magnetospheric
   composition and dynamics during geomagnetic storms: Initial results, J. Geophys. Res.:
   Space Physics, 114(A13), A12203, doi:10.1029/2009JA014418.
- Glocer, A., N. Kitamura, G. Toth, and T. Gombosi (2012). Modeling solar zenith angle effects
  on the polar wind, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 117 (A16), A04318, doi:
  10.1029/2011JA017136.
- Glocer, A., G. V. Khazanov, and M. W. Liemohn (2017), Photoelectrons in the quiet polar wind, *J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics*, *122*, 6708-6726, doi: 10.1002/2017JA024177.
- Glocer, A., Toth, G., & Fok, M.-C. (2018). Including kinetic ion effects in the coupled global
   ionospheric outflow solution. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics, 123,* 2851–2871. https://doi.org/10.1002/2018JA025241
- Gloeckler, G., F.M. Ipavich, B. Wilken, W. Stuedemann, and D. Hovestadt (1985). First
  composition measurement of the bulk of the storm-time ring current (1 to 300 keV/e)
  with AMPTE-CCE, Geophys. Res. Lett., 12, 325–328, doi:10.1029/GL012i005p00325.
- Gombosi, T. I., & Killeen, T. L. (1987). Effects of thermospheric motions on the polar wind: A
   time-dependent numerical study. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*,
   92(A5), 4725-4729.
- Gombosi, T. I., Chen, Y., Glocer, A., Huang, Z., Liemohn, M. W., Manchester, W. B.,
   Pulkkinen, T., Schdeva, N., Shidi, Q., Sokolov, I. V., Szente, J., Tenishev, V., Toth, G.,

788	van der Holst, B., Welling, D. T., Zhao, L., & Zou, S. (2021). What sustained multi-
789	disciplinary research can achieve: The Space Weather Modeling Framework. <i>Journal of</i>
790	<i>Space Weather and Space Climate</i> , <i>11</i> , 42. <u>https://doi.org/10.1051/swsc/2021020</u>
791 792	Gurgiolo, C., & Burch, J. L. (1982). DE-1 observations of the polar wind—A heated and an unheated component. <i>Geophysical Research Letters</i> , 9(9), 945-948.
793	Hamilton, D.C., G. Gloeckler, F.M. Ipavich, B. Wilken, and W. Stuedemann (1988). Ring
794	current development during the great geomagnetic storm of February 1986, J. Geophys.
795	Res., 93, 14,343–14,355,doi:10.1029/JA093iA12p14343.
796 797	Hoffman, J.H., and W.H. Dodson (1980). Light ion concentrations and fluxes in the polar regions during magnetically quiet times, J. Geophys. Res., 85(A2), 626–632.
798	Horwitz, J. L., Ho, C. W., Scarbro, H. D., Wilson, G. R., & Moore, T. E. (1994). Centrifugal
799	acceleration of the polar wind. <i>Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics</i> , 99(A8),
800	15051-15064.
801	Huddleston, M.M., C.R. Chappell, D.C. Delcourt, T.E. Moore, B.L. Giles, and M.O. Chandler
802	(2005). An examination of the process and magnitude of ionospheric plasma supply to
803	the magnetosphere, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 110 (A9), A12202, doi:10.1029/
804	2004JA010401.
805 806 807	<ul> <li>Hultqvist, B., André, M., Christon, S. <i>et al.</i> (1999). Contributions of different source and loss processes to the plasma content of the magnetosphere. <i>Space Science Reviews</i> 88, 355–372. <u>https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1005260002333</u></li> </ul>
808	Ilie, R., and M. W. Liemohn (2016), The outflow of ionospheric nitrogen ions: a possible tracer
809	for the altitude dependent transport and energization processes of ionospheric plasma, J.
810	Geophys. Res. Space Physics, 121, 9250-9255, doi: 10.1002/2015JA022162.
811	Ilie, R., R.M. Skoug, P. Valek, H.O. Funsten, and A. Glocer (2013). Global view of inner
812	magnetosphere composition during storm time, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 118 (1),
813	7074–7084.
814	Ilie, R., M.W. Liemohn, G. Toth, N. Yu Ganushkina, and L.K.S. Daldorff (2015). Assessing the
815	role of oxygen on ring current formation and evolution through numerical experiments, J.
816	Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 120 (6), 4656–4668, doi:10.1002/2015JA021157,
817	2015JA021157.
818	Khazanov, G. V., M. W. Liemohn, and T. E. Moore (1997). Photoelectron effects on the self-
819	consistent potential in the collisionless polar wind, <i>J. Geophys. Res.</i> , <i>102</i> , 7509.
820	Kistler, L.M., et al. (2006). Ion composition and pressure changes in storm time and nonstorm
821	substorms in the vicinity of the near-Earth neutral line, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics,
822	111(A), A11,222.
823	Kistler, L.M., C.G. Mouikis, B. Klecker, and I. Dandouras (2010a). Cusp as a source for oxygen
824	in the plasma sheet during geomagnetic storms, J. Geophys. Res., 115 (A3), A03,209,
825	doi:10.1029/2009JA014838.
826 827	Kistler, L.M., et al. (2010b). Escape of O <sup>+</sup> through the distant tail plasma sheet, Geophys. Res. Lett., 37(21), doi:10.1029/2010GL045075.

- Kistler, L.M., et al. (2010c). Escape of O<sup>+</sup> through the distant tail plasma sheet, Geophys. Res.
   Lett., 37(2), L21,101.
- Kistler, L.M., et al. (2016). The source of O<sup>+</sup> in the storm time ring current, J. Geophys. Res.:
   Space Physics, 121 (6), 5333–5349, doi:10.1002/2015JA022204, 2015JA022204.
- Kitamura, N., et al. (2010). Observations of very-low-energy (<10 eV) ion outflows dominated</li>
  by O<sup>+</sup> ions in the region of enhanced electron density in the polar cap magnetosphere
  during geomagnetic storms, J. Geophys. Res., 115, A00J06, doi:10.1029/2010JA015601.
- Kronberg, E.A., S.E. Haaland, P.W. Daly, E.E. Grigorenko, L.M. Kistler, M. Fränz, and I.
  Dandouras (2012). Oxygen and hydrogen ion abundance in the near-Earth
  magnetosphere: Statistical results on the response to the geomagnetic and solar wind
  activity conditions, J. Geophys. Res., 117 (A12), A12,208, doi:10.1029/2012JA018071.
- Kronberg, E.A., et al. (2014). Circulation of Heavy Ions and Their Dynamical Effects in the
   Magnetosphere: Recent Observations and Models, Space Science Reviews, 184 (1-4),
   173-235, doi: 10.1007/s11214-014-0104-0.
- Lemaire, J. (1971). Effect of escaping photoelectrons in a polar exospheric model.
- Lennartsson, O.W. (1995). Statistical investigation of IMF Bz effects on energetic (0.1- to 16keV) magnetospheric O<sup>+</sup> ions J. Geophys. Res., 100 (A), 23,621–23,636.
- Lennartsson, W., and E.G. Shelley (1986). Survey of 0.1- to 16-keV/e plasma sheet ion
  composition, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics (1978–2012), 91 (A3), 3061–3076.
- Lennartsson, O. W., Collin, H. L., and Peterson, W. K. (2004), Solar wind control of Earth's H<sup>+</sup>
  and O<sup>+</sup> outflow rates in the 15-eV to 33-keV energy range, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 109,
  A12212, doi:10.1029/2004JA010690.
- Liao, J., L.M. Kistler, C.G. Mouikis, B. Klecker, I. Dandouras, and J.-C. Zhang (2010).
  Statistical study of O<sup>+</sup> transport from the cusp to the lobes with Cluster CODIF data, J.
  Geophys. Res., 115(September),A00J15, doi:10.1029/2010JA015613.
- Liao, J., Kistler, L. M., Mouikis, C. G., Klecker, B., & Dandouras, I. (2015). Acceleration of O+
  from the cusp to the plasma sheet. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, *120*(2), 1022-1034.
- Liemohn, M. W., T. E. Moore, P. D. Craven, W. Maddox, A. F. Nagy, and J. U. Kozyra (2005).
   Occurrence statistics of cold, streaming ions in the near-Earth magnetotail: Survey of
   Polar-TIDE observations, J. Geophys. Res., 110, A07211, doi: 10.1029/2004JA010801.
- Liemohn, M. W., T. E. Moore, and P. D. Craven (2007). Geospace activity dependence of cold,
  streaming ions in the near-Earth magnetotail, *J. Atmos. Solar-Terr. Phys.*, 69, 135.
- Liemohn, M. W., and D. T. Welling (2016), Ionospheric and solar wind contributions to
  magnetospheric ion density and temperature throughout the magnetotail, in *Magnetosphere-Ionosphere Coupling in the Solar System, Geophys. Monogr. Ser., vol.*222, edited by C. R. Chappell, R. Schunk, P. Banks, J. Burch, and R. Thorne, John Wiley
  and Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA, doi: 10.1002/9781119066880.ch8, 101-114.

## Liemohn, M. W., Shane, A. D., Azari, A. R., Petersen, A. K., Swiger, B. M., & Mukhopadhyay, A. (2021). RMSE is not enough: guidelines to robust data-model comparisons for

868 869	magnetospheric physics. <i>Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics</i> , 218, 105624. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jastp.2021.105624</u>
870 871 872	Liemohn, M. W., Jörg-Micha Jahn, Raluca Ilie, Natalia Ganushkina, and Daniel Welling (2022). Science case for a global ionospheric outflow mission. White paper to the Decadal Survey for Solar and Space Physics 2024-2033. Paper # <u>409</u> .
873 874 875	Lin M-Y and Ilie R (2022). A Review of Observations of Molecular Ions in the Earth's Magnetosphere-Ionosphere System. Front. Astron. Space Sci. 8:745357. doi: 10.3389/fspas.2021.745357
876 877	Lin. M. Y., R. Ilie, and A. Glocer (2020), The Contribution of N <sup>+</sup> ions to Earth's Polar Wind. Geophysical Research Letters, 47, <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL089321</u>
878 879 880	Liu, C., Horwitz, J. L., & Richards, P. G. (1995). Effects of frictional ion heating and soft- electron precipitation on high-latitude F-region upflows. <i>Geophysical Research Letters</i> , 22(20), 2713-2716.
881 882	Liu, W.L., S.Y. Fu, Q.G. Zong, Z.Y. Pu, J. Yang, and P. Ruan (2005). Variations of N <sup>+</sup> /O <sup>+</sup> in the ring current during magnetic storms, Geophys. Res. Lett., 32(1), L15,102.
883 884 885	Lockwood, M., M.F. Smith, C.J. Farrugia, and G.L. Siscoe (1988). Ionospheric ion upwelling in the wake of flux transfer events at the dayside magnetopause, J. Geophys. Res. (ISSN 0148-0227), 93 (A6), 5641–5654.
886 887 888	Lund, E. J., Nowrouzi, N., Kistler, L. M., Cai, X., & Frey, H. U. (2018). On the role of ionospheric ions in sawtooth events. <i>Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics</i> , 123, 665–684. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JA024378</u>
889 890	Lundin, R., & Guglielmi, A. (2006). Ponderomotive forces in cosmos. <i>Space Science Reviews</i> , 127, 1-116.
891 892	Lui, A. T. Y., and Hamilton, D. C. (1992), Radial profiles of quiet time magnetospheric parameters, <i>J. Geophys. Res.</i> , 97(A12), 19325–19332, doi: <u>10.1029/92JA01539</u> .
893 894 895	<ul> <li>Lynch, K. A., Semeter, J. L., Zettergren, M., Kintner, P., Arnoldy, R., Klatt, E., &amp; Samara, M. (2007). Auroral ion outflow: Low altitude energization. In <i>Annales Geophysicae</i> (Vol. 25, No. 9, pp. 1967-1977). Göttingen, Germany: Copernicus Publications.</li> </ul>
896 897 898	Mall, U., S. Christon, E. Kirsch, and G. Gloeckler (2002). On the solar cycle dependence of the N <sup>+</sup> /O <sup>+</sup> content in the magnetosphere and its relation to atomic N and O in the Earth's exosphere, Geophys. Res. Lett., 29 (1), 1593–34–3.
899 900 901	Miller, R. H., Rasmussen, C. E., Combi, M. R., Gombosi, T. I., & Winske, D. (1995). Ponderomotive acceleration in the auroral region: A kinetic simulation. <i>Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics</i> , 100(A12), 23901-23916.
902 903	Moore, T. E. (1984). Superthermal ionospheric outflows. <i>Reviews of Geophysics</i> , 22(3), 264-274.
904 905	Moore, T. E., & Delcourt, D. C. (1995). The geopause. <i>Reviews of Geophysics</i> , 33(2), 175–209. https://doi.org/10.1029/95RG00872
906 907	Moore, T. E., and Horwitz, J. L. (2007), Stellar ablation of planetary atmospheres, <i>Rev. Geophys.</i> , 45, RG3002, doi: <u>10.1029/2005RG000194</u> .

- Moore, T.E., Chappell, C.R., Chandler, M.O., Fields, S.A., Pollock, C.J., Reasoner, D.L., Young,
  D.T., Burch, J.L., Eaker, N., Waite Jr., J.H., McComas, D.J., Nordholdt, J.E., Thomsen,
  M.F., Berthelier, J.J., Robson, R., Mozer, F.S. (1997). High altitude observations of the
  polar wind. Science, 277, 349–351.
- Moore, T.E., et al. (1999a). Ionospheric mass ejection in response to a CME, Geophys. Res.
   Lett., 26 (1), 2339–2342.
- Moore, T. E., Chandler, M. O., Chappell, C. R., Comfort, R. H., Craven, P. D., Delcourt, D. C.,
  ... & Su, Y. J. (1999b). Polar/TIDE results on polar ion outflows. *Geophysical Monograph-American Geophysical Union*, 109, 87-102.
- Moore, T. E., M.-C. Fok, M. O. Chandler, S.-H. Chen, S. P. Christon, D. C. Delcourt, J. Fedder,
  M. Liemohn, W. K. Peterson, and S. Slinker (2005a). Solar and ionospheric plasmas in
  the ring current, *Inner Magnetosphere Interactions: New Perspectives from Imaging, AGU Monogr. Ser.*, vol. 159, ed. by J. L. Burch, M. Schulz, and H. Spence, p. 179, Am.
  Geophys. Un., Washington, D. C..
- Moore, T. E., M.-C. Fok, M. O. Chandler, C. R. Chappell, S. Christon, D. Delcourt, J. Fedder,
  M. Huddleston, M. Liemohn, W. Peterson, S. P. Slinker (2005b). Plasma sheet and (nonstorm) ring current formation from solar and polar wind sources, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *110*,
  A02210, doi: 10.1029/2004JA010563.
- Moore, T., M.-C. Fok, and K. Garcia-Sage (2014). The ionospheric outflow feedback loop,
   Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics, 115-116, 59–66,
   doi:10.1016/j.jastp.2014.02.002.
- Mouikis, C.G., L.M. Kistler, Y.H. Liu, B. Klecker, A. Korth, and I. Dandouras (2010). H<sup>+</sup> and O<sup>+</sup>
   content of the plasma sheet at 15-19 Re as a function of geomagnetic and solar activity, J.
   Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 115, A00J16, doi:10.1029/2010JA015978.
- Nagai, T., J.H. Waite, J.L. Green, C.R. Chappell, R.C. Olsen, and R.H. Comfort (1984). First
   measurements of supersonic polar wind in the polar magnetosphere, Geophys. Res. Lett.,
   11 (7), 669–672.
- Newell, P.T., and C.-I. Meng (1994). Ionospheric projections of magnetospheric regions under
  low and high solar wind pressure conditions, J. Geophys. Res., 99 (A1), 273, doi:
  10.1029/93JA02273.
- Nilsson, H., Kirkwood, S., Eliasson, L., Norberg, O., Clemmons, J., & Boehm, M. (1994). The
   ionospheric signature of the cusp: A case study using Freja and the Sondrestrom radar.
   *Geophysical research letters*, 21(17), 1923-1926.
- Nosé, M., R.W. McEntire, and S.P. Christon (2003). Change of the plasma sheet ion composition
   during magnetic storm development observed by the Geotail spacecraft, J. Geophys.
   Res.: Space Physics, 108 (A), 1201.
- Nosé, M., S. Taguchi, K. Hosokawa, S.P. Christon, R.W. McEntire, T.E. Moore, and M.R.
  Collier (2005). Overwhelming O<sup>+</sup> contribution to the plasma sheet energy density during
  the October 2003 superstorm: Geotail/EPIC and IMAGE/LENA observations. Journal of
  Geophysical Research Space Physics, 110 (A).

Øieroset, M., M. Yamauchi, L. Liszka, S.P. Christon, and B. Hultqvist (1999). A statistical study 948 of ion beams and conics from the dayside ionosphere during different phases of a 949 substorm, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 104 (A4), 6987–6998, doi:10.1029/ 950 1998JA900177. 951 Ogawa, Y., S.C. Buchert, R. Fujii, S. Nozawa, and A.P. van Eyken (2009). Characteristics of ion 952 upflow and downflow observed with the European Incoherent Scatter Svalbard radar, J. 953 Geophys. Res., 114 (A), A05,305-n/a. 954 955 Peroomian, V., El-Alaoui, M., Ashour Abdalla, M., & Zelenyi, L. (2006). A comparison of solar wind and ionospheric plasma contributions to the September 24-25, 1998 magnetic 956 storm. Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics, 69, 212-222. 957 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jastp.2006.07.025 958 Peterson, W.K., H.L. Collin, O.W. Lennartsson, and A.W. Yau, Quiet time solar illumination 959 effects on the fluxes and characteristic energies of ionospheric outflow, J. Geophys. Res.: 960 Space Physics, 111 (A), A11S05, 2006. 961 Pitout, F., C.P. Escoubet, B. Klecker, and H. R'eme, Cluster survey of the mid-altitude cusp: 1. 962 size, location, and dynamics, Annales Geophysicae, 24 (11), 3011–3026, doi:10.5194/ 963 angeo-24-3011-2006, 2006. 964 Pollock, C. J., M. O. Chandler, T. E. Moore, J. H. Waite Jr., C. R. Chappell and D. A. Gurnett 965 (1990). A Survey of Upwelling Ion Event Characteristics, J. Geophys. Res. 95, 18969. 966 Pulkkinen, T. I., N. Yu. Ganushkina, D. N. Baker, N. E. Turner, J. Fennell, J. Roeder, T. A. Fritz, 967 M. Grande, B. Kellett, G. Kettmann (2001). Ring current ion composition during solar 968 minimum and rising solar activity: Polar/CAMMICE/MICS results, Journal of 969 Geophysical Research, 106, 19131-19147. 970 971 Rastätter, L., et al. (2013), Geospace environment modeling 2008–2009 challenge: D<sub>st</sub> index, Space Weather, 11, 187–205, doi:10.1002/swe.20036. 972 973 Richards, P. G. (1995). Effects of auroral electron precipitation on topside ion outflows. Cross-Scale Coupling in Space Plasmas, 93, 121-126. 974 Schunk, R. W. (2000). Theoretical developments on the causes of ionospheric outflow. Journal 975 of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics, 62(6), 399-420. 976 Schunk, R., and A. Nagy, *Ionospheres*, second ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 977 Books Online, 2009. 978 Schunk, R.W., and W.J. Raitt, Atomic Nitrogen and Oxygen Ions in the Daytime High-Latitude 979 F-Region, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 85 (NA3), 1255–1272, 1980. 980 Seki, K., A. Nagy, C. M. Jackman, F. Crary, D. Fontaine, P. Zarka, P. Wurz, A. Milillo, J. A. 981 982 Slavin, D. C. Delcourt, M. Wiltberger, R. Ilie, X. Jia, S. A. Ledvina, M. W. Liemohn, and R. W. Schunk (2015), A review of general physical and chemical processes related to 983 984 plasma sources and losses for solar system magnetospheres, *Space Sci. Rev.*, 1-63, doi: 10.1007/s11214-015-170-y. 985 Sojka, J.J., R.W. Schunk, and W.J. Raitt, Seasonal-Variations of the High-Latitude F Region for 986 Strong Convection, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 87 (NA1), 187–198, 1982. 987

- Stebbings, R.F., W.L. Fite, and D.G. Hummer, Charge Transfer between Atomic Hydrogen and
   N<sup>+</sup> and O<sup>+</sup>, The Journal of Chemical Physics, 33(4), 1226–1230, 1960.
- Strangeway, R. J., Russell, C. T., Carlson, C. W., McFadden, J. P., Ergun, R. E., Temerin, M.,
  Klumpar, D. M., Peterson, W. K., and Moore, T. E. (2000), Cusp field-aligned currents
  and ion outflows, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 105(A9), 21129–21141,
  doi:10.1029/2000JA900032.
- Strangeway, R.J., R.E. Ergun, Y.-J. Su, C.W. Carlson, and R.C. Elphic, Factors controlling
   ionospheric outflows as observed at intermediate altitudes, J. Geophys. Res.: Space
   Physics, 110 (A3), doi: 10.1029/2004JA010829, a03221, 2005.
- Su, Y. J., Horwitz, J. L., Wilson, G. R., Richards, P. G., Brown, D. G., & Ho, C. W. (1998a).
  Self-consistent simulation of the photoelectron-driven polar wind from 120 km to 9 RE
  altitude. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 103(A2), 2279-2296.
- Su, Y.-J., Horwitz, J. L., Moore, T. E., Giles, B. L., Chandler, M. O., Craven, P. D., Hirahara,
  M., and Pollock, C. J. (1998b), Polar wind survey with the Thermal Ion Dynamics
  Experiment/Plasma Source Instrument suite aboard POLAR, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 103(
  A12), 29305–29337, doi:10.1029/98JA02662.
- Tam, S.W.Y., T. Chang, V. Pierrard (2007). Kinetic modeling of the polar wind. Journal of
   Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics, 69(16), 1984–2027.
   doi:10.1016/j.jastp.2007.08.006.
- Trung, H.-S., M. W. Liemohn, and R. Ilie (2019). Steady state characteristics of the terrestrial
   geopauses. *Journal of Geophysical Research Space Physics*, 124, 5070-5081,
   <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JA026636</u>.
- Trung, H.-S., Liemohn, M. W. & Ilie, R. (2023). Momentum sources in multifluid MHD and their relation to the geopauses. Journal of Geophysical Research – Space Physics, 128, e2023JA031415. <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2023JA031415</u>
- Valek, P. W., Perez, J. D., Jahn, J. M., Pollock, C. J., Wüest, M. P., Friedel, R. H. W., ... &
  Peterson, W. K. (2002). Outflow from the ionosphere in the vicinity of the cusp. *Journal* of *Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 107(A8), SMP-13.
- Wahlund, J. E., Opgenoorth, H. J., Häggström, I., Winser, K. J., & Jones, G. O. L. (1992).
   EISCAT observations of topside ionospheric ion outflows during auroral activity:
   Revisited. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, *97*(A3), 3019-3037.
- Waite Jr, J. H., Nagai, T., Johnson, J. F. E., Chappell, C. R., Burch, J. L., Killeen, T. L., ... &
  Shelley, E. G. (1985). Escape of suprathermal O<sup>+</sup> ions in the polar cap. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 90(A2), 1619-1630.
- Weimer, D.R., An improved model of ionospheric electric potentials including substorm
   perturbations and application to the Geospace Environment Modeling November 24,
   1996, event, J. Geophys. Res., 106, 407–416, doi:10.1029/2000JA000604, 2001a.

## Weimer, D.R., Maps of ionospheric field-aligned currents as a function of the interplanetary magnetic field derived from Dynamics Explorer 2 data, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 106 (A7), 12,889–12,902, doi:10.1029/2000JA000295, 2001b.

- Welling, D.T., and S.G. Zaharia, Ionospheric outflow and cross polar cap potential: What is the role of magnetospheric inflation?, Geophys. Res. Lett., 39 (23), doi: 10.1029/2012GL054228, 2012.
  Welling, D. T., and M. W. Liemohn (2014). Outflow in global magnetohydrodynamics as a
- 1031 Weining, D. 1., and W. W. Elemonn (2014). Outflow in global magnetohydrodynamics as a
   1032 function of a passive inner boundary source, J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics, 119, 2691 1033 2705, doi: 10.1002/2013JA019374.
- Welling, D.T., and M.W. Liemohn (2016). The ionospheric source of magnetospheric plasma is
  not a black box input for global models J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 121 (6), 5559–
  5565.
- Welling, D.T., V.K. Jordanova, S.G. Zaharia, A. Glocer, and G. Toth (2011). The effects of
   dynamic ionospheric outflow on the ring current, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 116
   (A15), A00J19, doi:10.1029/2010JA015642.
- Welling, D.T., V.K. Jordanova, A. Glocer, G. Toth, M.W. Liemohn, and D.R. Weimer (2015a).
  The two-way relationship between ionospheric outflow and the ring current, J. Geophys.
  Res.: Space Physics, 120 (6), 4338–4353. doi:10.1002/2015JA021231
- Welling, D.T., et al., (2015b). The Earth: Plasma Sources, Losses, and Transport Processes,
  Space Science Reviews, 192 (1-4), 145–208. doi:10.1007/s11214-015-0187-2
- Welling, D.T., Barakat, A.R., Eccles, J.V., Schunk, R.W. and Chappell, C.R. (2016). Coupling
  the Generalized Polar Wind Model to Global Magnetohydrodynamics. In *Magnetosphere-Ionosphere Coupling in the Solar System* (eds C.R. Chappell, R.W.
  Schunk, P.M. Banks, J.L. Burch and R.M. Thorne).
  https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119066880.ch14
- Whalen, B.A., S. Watanabe, A.W. Yau (1991). Observations in the transverse ion energization
   region. Geophys. Res. Lett. 18(4), 725–728. doi:10.1029/90GL02788
- Wilson, G. R., Khazanov, G., & Horwitz, J. L. (1997). Achieving zero current for polar wind
   outflow on open flux tubes subjected to large photoelectron fluxes. *Geophysical research letters*, 24(10), 1183-1186.
- Wilson, G.R., D.M. Ober, G.A. Germany, and E J. Lund (2004). Nightside auroral zone and
   polar cap ion outflow as a function of substorm size and phase, J. Geophys. Res.: Space
   Physics, 109 (A2), doi:10.1029/2003JA009835.
- Wiltberger, M. (2015).Review of Global Simulation Studies of Effect of Ionospheric Outflow on
   Magnetosphere-Ionosphere System Dynamics, Magnetotails in the Solar System. A.
   Keiling (ed.), 207, 373–392.
- Wiltberger, M., W. Lotko, J.G. Lyon, P. Damiano, and V. Merkin (2010). Influence of cusp O<sup>+</sup>
   outflow on magnetotail dynamics in a multifluid MHD model of the magnetosphere, J.
   Geophys. Res., 115 (1), A00J05.
- Winglee, R. M. (2000). Mapping of ionospheric outflows into the magnetosphere for varying
   IMF conditions. *Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics*, 62(6), 527-540.
- Winglee, R.M., D. Chua, M. Brittnacher, G.K. Parks, and G. Lu (2002). Global impact of
   ionospheric outflows on the dynamics of the magnetosphere and cross-polar cap
   potential, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 107, 1237, doi:10.1029/2001JA000214.

- Winglee, R.M., E. Harnett, and A. Kidder (2009). Relative timing of substorm processes as
  derived from multifluid/multiscale simulations: Internally driven substorms, J. Geophys.
  Res.: Space Physics, 114 (A), A09,213.
- Winningham, J.D., and C. Gurgiolo (1982). De-2 photoelectron measurements consistent with a
   large scale parallel electric field over the polar cap, Geophys. Res. Lett., 9 (9), 977–979.
- Wu, X. Y., Horwitz, J. L., Estep, G. M., Su, Y. J., Brown, D. G., Richards, P. G., & Wilson, G.
   R. (1999). Dynamic fluid-kinetic (DyFK) modeling of auroral plasma outflow driven by
   soft electron precipitation and transverse ion heating. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, *104*(A8), 17263-17275.
- Yau, A.W., P.H. Beckwith, W.K. Peterson, and E.G. Shelley (1985). Long-term (solar cycle) and
   seasonal variations of upflowing ionospheric ion events at DE 1 altitudes, J. Geophys.
   Res., (ISSN 0148-0227), 90 (A7), 6395–6407.
- Yau, A.W., W.K. Peterson, and E.G. Shelley (1988). Quantitative parameterization of energetic
   ionospheric ion outflow, Washington DC American Geophysical Union Geophysical
   Monograph Series, pp. 211–217.
- Yau, A. W., Whalen, B. A., Abe, T., Mukai, T., Oyama, K. I., & Chang, T. (1995). Akebono
   observations of electron temperature anisotropy in the polar wind. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 100(A9), 17451-17463.
- Yau, A. W., & André, M. J. S. S. R. (1997). Sources of ion outflow in the high latitude
   ionosphere. *Space Science Reviews*, 80(1-2), 1-25.
- Yau, A.W., E. Drakou, M.J. Greffen, D.J. Knudsen, and E. Sagawa (1998). Radio-Frequency Ion
   Mass Spectrometer Measurements of Ion Composition, Velocity and Temperature: the
   EXOSD Suprathermal Mass Spectrometer, Geophysical Monograph Series, vol. 102,
   American Geophysical Union, Washington, D.C.
- Yau, A.W., T. Abe, and W. Peterson (2007). The polar wind: Recent observations, Journal of
   Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics, 69 (16), 1936–1983,
   doi:10.1016/j.jastp.2007.08.010.
- Yizengaw, E., Moldwin, M. B., Dyson, P. L., Fraser, B. J., & Morley, S. (2006). First
   tomographic image of ionospheric outflows. *Geophysical research letters*, 33(20).
- Young, D.T., H. Balsiger, and J. Geiss (1982). Correlations of magnetospheric ion composition
  with geomagnetic and solar activity, J. Geophys. Res., 87, 9077–9096,
  doi:10.1029/JA087iA11p09077.
- Yu, Y., and A.J. Ridley (2013a). Exploring the influence of ionospheric O<sup>+</sup> outflow on
   magnetospheric dynamics: Dependence on the source location, J. Geophys. Res.: Space
   Physics, 118(4), 1711–1722, doi:10.1029/2012JA018411.
- Yu, Y., and A.J. Ridley (2013b). Exploring the influence of ionospheric O+ outflow on
   magnetospheric dynamics: The effect of outflow intensity, J. Geophys. Res.: Space
   physics, 118(9), 5522–5531, doi:10.1002/jgra.50528.
- Zeng, W., & Horwitz, J. L. (2007). Formula representation of auroral ionospheric O+ outflows
   based on systematic simulations with effects of soft electron precipitation and transverse
   ion heating. *Geophysical research letters*, 34(6).

- Zhou, X.W., C.T. Russell, G. Le, S.A. Fuselier, and J.D. Scudder (2000). Solar wind control of
  the polar cusp at high altitude, J. Geophys. Res.: Space Physics, 105 (A1), 245–251,
  doi:10.1029/1999JA900412.
- 1113