

Transient Upstream Mesoscale Structures: Drivers of Solar-Quiet Space Weather

Primož Kajdič^{1,*}, Xóchitl Blanco-Cano¹, Lucile Turc², Martin Archer³, Savvas Raptis⁴, Terry Z. Liu⁵, Yann Pfau-Kempf², Adrian T. LaMoury³, Yufei Hao⁶, Philippe C. Escoubet⁷, Nojan Omid⁸, David G. Sibeck⁹, Boyi Wang¹⁰, Hui Zhang¹¹ and Yu Lin¹²

November 12, 2024

- ¹ Departamento de Ciencias Espaciales, Instituto de Geofísica, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico City, Mexico
- ² Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland
- ³ Blackett Laboratory, Imperial College London, London, UK
- ⁴ The Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory, Laurel, MD, USA
- ⁵ Department of Earth, Planetary, and Space Science, University of California, Los Angeles, USA
- ⁶ Key Laboratory of Planetary Sciences, Purple Mountain Observatory, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Nanjing, People's Republic of China
- ⁷ ESA/ESTEC, Noordwijk, The Netherlands
- ⁸ Solana Scientific Inc., Solana Beach, CA, USA
- ⁹ NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD, USA
- ¹⁰ Institute of Space Science and Applied Technology, Harbin Institute of Technology (Shenzhen), Shenzhen, China
- ¹¹ School of Space Science and Physics, Shandong University, Weihai, China
- ¹² Physics Department, Auburn University, Auburn, AL, USA

Abstract

In recent years, it has become increasingly clear that space weather disturbances can be triggered by transient upstream mesoscale structures (TUMS), independently of the occurrence of large-scale solar wind (SW) structures, such as interplanetary coronal mass ejections and stream interaction regions. Different types of magnetospheric pulsations, transient perturbations of the geomagnetic field and auroral structures are often observed during times when SW monitors indicate quiet conditions, and have been found to be associated to TUMS. In this mini-review we describe the space weather phenomena that have been associated with four of the largest-scale and the most energetic TUMS, namely hot flow anomalies, foreshock bubbles, travelling foreshocks and foreshock compressional boundaries. The space weather phenomena associated with TUMS tend to be more localized and less intense compared to geomagnetic storms. However, the quiet time space weather may occur more often since, especially during solar minima, quiet SW periods prevail over the perturbed times.

1 Introduction

For decades, space weather phenomena have been thought to be strictly related to solar activity. This is mainly due to the fact that the strongest magnetospheric and ionospheric disturbances, geomagnetic storms and substorms [e.g., 2], occur during the passage of large-scale structures (of the order of $\gtrsim 1$ a.u.) in the solar wind (SW), such as interplanetary coronal mass ejections, stream interaction regions and interplanetary shocks [e.g., 28]. During such events, most extreme conditions conducive for space weather, such as large southward IMF, high speed solar wind, and large dynamic pressure (P_{dyn}) fluctuations, may be met. This in turn drives strong magnetopause motion and reconnection.

Geomagnetic storms and substorms have been a subject of extensive research for a long time because they can interfere with our technologies by disrupting the proper functioning of, for example, electric grids, GPS signals, and artificial satellites [e.g., 15].

However, in recent years it has become clear that some space weather phenomena, such as bursts of large-amplitude magnetospheric ultra-low-frequency (ULF) pulsations, transient (nonperiodic) geomagnetic disturbances, auroras, etc. may occur in the absence of known space weather drivers [71]. Since their origin is not related to solar disturbances, we here refer to them as solar-quiet space weather.

Such phenomena may be caused by transient upstream mesoscale structures (TUMS). These form in the region upstream of the bow-shock of Earth. The term mesoscale refers to their typical scale sizes ranging from ~ 2000 km to more than 10 Earth radii ($1 R_E \sim 6400$ km) [71]. The sizes of the largest TUMS are thus comparable to but smaller than the transverse diameter of the dayside magnetosphere [$\sim 30 R_E$ 63].

TUMS owe their existence to the collisionless bow-shock that stands in front of our planet. The bow-shock dissipates some of the SW kinetic energy by deflecting and energizing a small portion of the incident particles (electrons, ions). At its Q par section, where the angle between the upstream IMF and the local shock normal is less than 45° , reflected particles may escape back upstream to large distances where they coexist with the incoming SW. Such non-Maxwellian particle distributions lead to different instabilities, forming a highly perturbed foreshock region [16].

The formation mechanisms for TUMS fall into three categories: (1) the interaction of IMF directional discontinuities in the SW [6] with the bow-shock or (2) with the reflected foreshock ions and (3) due to internal foreshock processes.

The main reason why TUMS have such an impact on the near-Earth environment is the variation in magnetic field orientation and strength and the SW P_{dyn} inside them which lead to modifications of the total (dynamic, thermal and magnetic) pressure impinging upon the magnetopause [e.g., 4]. As has been shown in the past, upstream negative and positive pressure pulses excite toroidal and poloidal mode waves in the Pc5 frequency range [69, 72]. Even modest positive pressure pulses may also lead to an increase in temperature anisotropy of energetic protons which in turn results in ion-cyclotron instability and consequently in Pc1 magnetospheric waves [42, 1].

P_{dyn} variations have also been found to generate field aligned currents [FACs, 3, 39] and intensify whistler mode waves [33, 55]. FACs can lead to electron precipitation and discrete auroras, while the intensified whistler mode waves can scatter electrons into loss cones and induce diffuse auroras.

Finally, it should be mentioned that various types of TUMS have been observed at other planets, [e.g., 43, 36, 47, 64, 11, 9, 8, 10, 65, 53, 40, 37], although their

impact on the corresponding downstream regions has not been studied due to the lack of multi-spacecraft observations.

It is the purpose of this mini review to summarize the impact of the largest-scale TUMS on the near-Earth environment. In the following sections we describe such effects caused by hot flow anomalies (HFA, section 2), foreshock bubbles (FB, 3), foreshock compressional boundaries (FCB, 4), and travelling foreshocks (TF, 5). The HFAs and TFs fall into the first category in terms of their formation mechanisms, FBs fall into the second category, while the FCBs occur due to internal foreshock processes. In section 6 we summarize these effects while in section 7 we list some of the future tasks needed to be done in order to deepen our knowledge about the subject.

2 Hot flow anomalies

HFAs [51, 59], form when an IMF directional discontinuity intersects the bow shock and the convection electric field ($-\mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{B}$) points towards the discontinuity's current sheet on at least one side. Their typical sizes range between 1 and $3 R_E$ in the direction perpendicular to their current sheet, but they have been observed by [12] to extend up to $7 R_E$ upstream of the bow shock. HFAs are characterized by (see also Figure 1a) central cores that contain hot plasma with flow velocities much lower than the ambient SW. The plasma flow inside HFAs is by definition highly deflected from the Sun-Earth line. The plasma density and magnetic field values in the core are lower than in the SW. The core is surrounded by a rim in which magnetic field strength and plasma density are enhanced compared to ambient SW values. An example of an HFA is shown in Figure 1a.

The first geoeffective HFA was reported by [50, 49, 7, 48]. An order of magnitude decrease of the P_{dyn} inside the event caused the magnetopause to move outward and then inward in excess of $5 R_E$ past Interball-1 twice within 7 minutes. Minor disturbances in geomagnetic field magnitude were observed at geosynchronous orbit by GOES-8, while Polar Ultraviolet Imager (UVI) observed a sudden brightening of the afternoon aurora, followed by a more intense transient brightening of the morning aurora.

[25] reported observations of extreme motion of the dawn flank magnetopause caused by an HFA. The magnetopause moved outward by at least $4.8 R_E$ in 59 s, implying flow speeds of up to 800 km s^{-1} in the direction normal to the nominal magnetopause. The transient deformation of the magnetopause generated field-aligned currents (FACs) and created travelling convection vortices [e.g., 21] which were detected by ground magnetometers.

Magnetopause deformation due to HFAs was also observed by [54]. The authors reported a highly asymmetric deformation of the magnetosphere and suggested that it occurred either due to one elongated HFA or a pair of HFAs that simultaneously appeared at both flanks. On the dusk side, the deformation was very weak. On the dawn side, the magnetopause was first displaced outward from its nominal position by $\sim 5 R_E$ and then inward by $\sim 4 R_E$.

[23] and [58] observed HFAs that excited global Pc5 perturbations [periods 150–600 s, e.g., 24] at the geosynchronous orbit. [23] also reported observations of magnetopause surface modes caused by an HFA. [58] demonstrated that HFAs can also generate localized magnetospheric oscillations in the Pc5 range with clear dawn-dusk asymmetry.

Several works also related passing HFAs to geomagnetic pulsations in the Pc3 range (22–100 mHz). [17] reported observations of an HFA associated with a type of Pc3 fluctuations whose frequency did not depend on the IMF strength, contrary to the case of Pc3 waves typically observed inside the magnetosphere [e.g. 61]. Similarly, [73] reported observations of an HFA causing nearly monochromatic Pc3 ULF waves that were observed in orbit and on the ground and that exhibited characteristics of standing Alfvén waves. They occurred in all sectors (dawn, noon, dusk and nightside) indicating that the HFA cause a global response of the magnetosphere.

HFAs have also been shown to impact the nightside magnetosphere. This was first reported by [19] who observed an HFA remnant in the far magnetotail at $X \sim -310 R_E$. Similarly, impacts of unidentified TUMS, possibly HFAs, in the midtail magnetosheath have also been reported by [66] and [34, 35], implying that HFAs may exhibit lifetimes of several tens of minutes.

Figure 1e) summarizes the reported downstream effects of HFAs.

3 Foreshock bubbles

Foreshock bubbles (FBs) form due to the interaction of IMF directional discontinuities with the backstreaming foreshock ions. When they cross a discontinuity and project their velocity in the new perpendicular direction more than in the new parallel direction, the foreshock ions become more concentrated and thermalized on the upstream side of the discontinuity. Foreshock ions can easily cross rotational discontinuities (RD), since there exists a normal magnetic field component, so the ions can simply propagate along the field lines through them. At tangential discontinuities (TD), the normal magnetic field component is zero, so only ions with gyroradii larger than the TD thickness are able to cross the TDs. [41, 31, 32, 67, 68]. Thus, stronger energy fluxes of foreshock ions are expected across RDs which may cause faster expansion of RD-driven FBs compared to TD-driven FBs.

Once ions cross the discontinuities, they undergo additional heating and start to expand against the SW, forming the bubble. FBs exhibit signatures in spacecraft data that are similar to those of HFAs (see Figure 1b), namely a hot, tenuous core with low IMF strength and a rim with enhanced density and B-magnitude (see Figure 1b). However, whereas HFAs commonly exhibit rims on their upstream and downstream edges, the FBs only exhibit them on their upstream side. FBs may affect the magnetopause on larger scales than HFAs since their sizes transverse to the Earth-Sun line are larger [5–10 R_E 5, 60].

The first to report that FBs can be geoeffective were [23]. The authors showed that a FB caused magnetopause undulations. Inside the magnetosphere but close to the magnetopause, the event caused variations of the North-South component of the magnetic field and similar effects were observed at geosynchronous orbit. Pc5 pulsations with similar properties as those commonly associated by the HFAs, were also observed.

[5] showed that FBs have a global impact on Earth’s magnetosphere. Once an FB interacts with the bow shock, magnetosheath particles are accelerated towards the intersection of the FB’s current sheet with the bow shock resulting in fast, sunward flows as well as outward motion of the magnetopause. Ground-based magnetometers can detect signatures of this motion simultaneously across 7 h of magnetic local time.

Figure 1f) summarizes the reported downstream effects of FBs.

4 Foreshock compressional boundaries

The FCBs [e.g., 44, see also Figure 1c] are boundary regions that separate the highly disturbed ultra-low frequency [ULF, 20] wave foreshock from either the pristine SW or the foreshock region populated by field-aligned ion beams [46] but not the ULF waves. FCBs are characterized by a strong compression of magnetic field magnitude and density that is followed by strong decreases of these two quantities on the foreshock side (Figure 1c). These events differ somewhat from the rest of the TUMS in the sense that they are not truly transient phenomena. Models indicate that they exist even during steady solar wind conditions and it is their motion, due to changing solar wind conditions, that has a transient impact on the magnetosphere.

[23] described two FCBs that were observed to have an impact on the magnetopause and inside the magnetosphere. Both caused the Themis-D probe, originally located near the magnetopause on the magnetospheric side, to briefly enter the magnetosheath. Transient magnetic field and plasma density perturbations were detected throughout the dayside sector by several spacecraft located at distances corresponding to geosynchronous orbit and beyond. The timing of the perturbations observed by different spacecraft was found to be consistent with the motion of the FCB across the bow shock, in a dusk to dawn sense. Figure 1g) summarizes the reported downstream effects of FCBs.

5 Travelling foreshocks

TFs or foreshock cavities [e.g., 57, 27, See also Figure 1d] appear upstream of the bow shock, either in pristine SW or in the region of the ion foreshock that is not perturbed by the ULF waves. This happens when a bundle of magnetic field lines from a relatively thin magnetic flux tube, with orientation different from the background IMF, connects to the nominally quasi-perpendicular bow shock in such a way that the geometry of the section of the bow shock intersected by the flux tube is changed from quasi-perpendicular to quasi-parallel. As the flux tube is convected by the SW, its intersection with the bow shock propagates along the bow shock surface. Upstream of it, a foreshock is formed that follows this intersection. There are several ways that TFs may cause disturbances in the magnetosphere and the atmosphere (see also Figure 1g).

For example, it has been reported by [52] that two TFs drove magnetospheric ULF waves in the Pc1 frequency band. Specifically, TFs caused ground Pc1 pearl pulsations, which are amplitude-modulated Pc1 waves with a repetition period of several tens of seconds [e.g. 26]. These pearl pulsations were observed for a long interval (~ 1 hr) in the morning sector (4–8 local time, LT) and were detected at eight ground stations located at $L = 3.5\text{--}7.4$ (L is the distance expressed in R_E at which the B-field lines cross the Earth's magnetic equator).

The same authors reported GOES-12 and THEMIS E measurements showing the Pc1 pulsations detected by the ground stations accompanied by EMIC waves in the frequency range 0.2–0.35 Hz in the prenoon sector (7.5–12 LT) at geocentric distances between $5.8 R_E$ and $9 R_E$. The events also caused precipitation of ions with energies 30–80 keV. Additionally, GOES-10 and 12 and THEMIS-B, -E and -D observed a transient compression of the dayside magnetosphere during which the magnetic field strength changed by up to 10 nT and whose observed durations were of up to 5 minutes.

Finally, [56] and [30] showed that TFs are directly transmitted into the magnetosheath where they can cause the formation of enhanced P_{dyn} structures, known as magnetosheath jets [45], in the quasi-perpendicular magnetosheath. This is the region of the magnetosheath in which the jets are rarely observed and their origins are different from those detected in the quasi-parallel magnetosheath.

6 Summary and discussion

In this mini-review we discussed the reported downstream effects of the four largest-scale TUMS on the near-Earth environment. These structures may strongly affect the bow shock–magnetosheath–ionosphere system and create a wide range of space weather phenomena. It is almost certain that in the future the list of impacts of each type of TUMS will keep increasing. Table 1 summarizes explicitly reported space weather effects.

	HFA	FB	FCB	TF
Magnetopause displacement	×	×	×	
Transient geomagnetic disturbances	×	×	×	
Transient magnetospheric plasma compression			×	
Transient deceleration of magnetospheric plasma			×	
Pc1 pulsations				×
Pc3 pulsations	×			
Pc5 pulsations	×	×		
Magnetospheric EMIC waves				×
Ion precipitation				×
Field-aligned currents	×			
Travelling convection vortices	×			
Ground magnetic field perturbations	×	×		×
Auroral brightenings	×			
Magnetosheath jets				×

Table 1: Transient upstream mesoscale structures and observed downstream effects.

We still do not understand all the mechanisms by which different TUMS affect the regions downstream of the bow shock.

For example, we do not know how the monochromatic Pc3 fluctuations are caused by HFAs. One possibility is that shocks that sometimes form at the HFAs and FBs steepened edges, drive their own foreshocks with ULF fluctuations which eventually perturb the magnetosphere, similar to the ULF waves in the terrestrial foreshock [e.g., 18, 62]. Turbulence and waves in the cores of these structures [70, 29] could also be the cause.

Another possible effect that has not yet been well studied is that TUMS associated enhancements of P_{dyn} could lead to impulsive penetration of mass into the magnetosphere [13]. Modification of the IMF upstream and in the magnetosheath could also result in magnetopause reconnection [22].

These effects could be caused by TUMS associated magnetosheath jets [45]. It has been shown by [56] and [30] that the TFs transmitted into the magnetosheath can be a source of these jets downstream of the quasi-perpendicular bow-shock.

[38, 14] have demonstrated that magnetosheath jets can be geoeffective and can act as a vector for coupling TUMS and foreshock processes to the magnetopause and ionosphere.

To make matter worse, certain types of TUMS can contain another type of upstream mesoscale structures. The latter is most evident in the case of TFs that often contain FCBs at their edges [27]. Moreover, TFs exhibit other phenomena that are also observed inside the “regular” foreshock, such as ULF waves, shocklets, foreshock cavitons, etc.

7 Future work

It is clear that our knowledge of how exactly TUMS interact with the bow shock and the regions downstream of it is still limited. Future investigations should include more multi-point observations of individual events with spacecraft in different regions (upstream of the bow shock, magnetosheath, magnetosphere, ground observations). These should be accompanied by local and global numerical simulations. There are numerous tasks in the “to do” list:

- Study of the microphysics in the cores and the boundary regions of the TUMS, i.e. possible generation of ULF waves and turbulence, magnetic reconnection, particle heating and acceleration.
- Study of the impact of foreshock cavitons and spontaneous hot flow anomalies on the regions downstream of the terrestrial bow-shock.
- Comparison study of properties and impact if FCBs formed by rotational versus tangential discontinuities.
- Detailed investigations of the impact of the TUMS on the bow shock. Do TUMS cause shock erosion, its additional rippling and what are the downstream consequences of these processes?
- Studies of the TUMS’s substructure and the physical processes leading to it.
- Direct observational confirmation between the TFs and the magnetosheath jets and Pc3–4 waves in the magnetosphere.
- Statistical study that would reveal the relative importance of travelling versus the “regular” foreshocks for the production of magnetosheath jets and Pc3–4 waves.
- Determine the impact of each type of TUMS on the nightside magnetosphere. For example, can they trigger substorms?
- Test whether energetic particles accelerated in the foreshock and TUMS can enter into the magnetosphere (across the magnetopause or through the cusp) and become geoeffective.
- Quantify the energy input from TUMS into the magnetosphere in comparison with typical solar wind drivers.
- Determine the role of TUMS during storm time (e.g., enhance magnetospheric ULF waves and thus modulate radiation belt particles).

- Determine how HFAs excite the Pc3 waves and whether they can also be caused by FBs.
- Determine the impact of TUMS on the near-planetary environment at other planets. One such opportunity will emerge with the dual orbiter BepiColombo mission at Mercury.

Such tasks require multi-point spacecraft observations as well as 3D physically scaled global numeric models that go beyond the fluid description of plasma. Currently, numerous in-situ and ground based observations are available as well as the required kinetic simulation assets that will make addressing these tasks possible.

8 Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the International Space Science Institute (ISSI) through ISSI International Team project #555. The CIWeb (<https://clweb.irap.omp.eu/>) tool was used for visualizing the data and producing some of the figures. PK's work was supported by the DGAPA PAPIIT through the IN100424 grant. XBC acknowledges DGAPA PAPIIT grant IN106724. The work of LT was supported by the Research Council of Finland (grant number 322544). SR acknowledges funding from NASA DRIVE Science Center for Geospace Storms (CGS) — 80NSSC22M0163. DGS's work was supported by NASA's LWS TR&T program. MOA was supported by UKRI (STFC/EPSC) Stephen Hawking Fellowship EP/T01735X/1 and UKRI Future Leaders Fellowship MR/X034704/1. YP acknowledges Academy of Finland grant no. 339756. ATL was supported by Royal Society awards URF\R1\180671 and RGF\EA\181090. HZ acknowledges National Natural Science Foundation of China grant 42330202.




Figure 1: (a) Examples of observed (a) HFA, (b) FB, (c) FCB and (d) TF. Sketches of (e) HFA, (f) FB and (g) TF and FCB and the corresponding downstream effects. The panels a) to d) exhibit (from top to bottom) magnetic field magnitude, plasma density, parallel (blue) and perpendicular (red) ion temperatures, SW speed, SW velocity components, SW P_{dyn} and ions spectra. In the case of the HFA and FB, the red shaded intervals mark rims of enhanced B and plasma density, while yellow shaded intervals mark hot cores. In the case of the FCB, the intervals shaded in red and yellow mark the B and density dip and peak, respectively. In the case of the traveling foreshock, the yellow color marks its core, while the red color marks the surrounding FCBs.

References

- [1] B. J. Anderson and D. C. Hamilton. Electromagnetic ion cyclotron waves stimulated by modest magnetospheric compressions. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 98(A7):11369–11382, July 1993.
- [2] Syun-Ichi Akasofu. A review of studies of geomagnetic storms and auro-ral/magnetospheric substorms based on the electric current approach. *Frontiers in Astronomy and Space Sciences*, 7:100, 2021.
- [3] Tohru Araki. *A Physical Model of the Geomagnetic Sudden Commencement*, pages 183–200. American Geophysical Union (AGU), 1994.
- [4] M. O. Archer, D. L. Turner, J. P. Eastwood, T. S. Horbury, and S. J. Schwartz. The role of pressure gradients in driving sunward magnetosheath flows and magnetopause motion. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 119:8117–8125, October 2014.
- [5] M. O. Archer, D. L. Turner, J. P. Eastwood, S. J. Schwartz, and T. S. Horbury. Global impacts of a Foreshock Bubble: Magnetosheath, magnetopause and ground-based observations. *Planet. Space Sci.*, 106:56–66, February 2015.
- [6] J. E. Borovsky. Flux tube texture of the solar wind: Strands of the magnetic carpet at 1 AU? *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113:A08110, August 2008.
- [7] N. L. Borodkova, D. G. Sibeck, G. N. Zastenker, S. A. Romanov, and J. A. Sauvaud. Fast Deformation of Dayside Magnetopause. *Cosmic Research*, 36(3):245, May 1998.
- [8] Glyn Collinson, Jasper Halekas, Joseph Grebowsky, Jack Connerney, David Mitchell, Jared Espley, Gina DiBraccio, Christian Mazelle, Jean-André Sauvaud, Andrei Fedorov, and Bruce Jakosky. A hot flow anomaly at mars. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 42(21):9121–9127, 2015.
- [9] G. A. Collinson, D. G. Sibeck, A. Masters, N. Shane, T. L. Zhang, A. Fedorov, S. Barabash, A. J. Coates, T. E. Moore, J. A. Slavin, V. M. Uritsky, S. Boardsen, and M. Sarantos. A survey of hot flow anomalies at venus. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 119(2):978–991, 2014.
- [10] Glyn Collinson, David Sibeck, Nick Omid, Rudy Frahm, Tielong Zhang, David Mitchell, Jasper Halekas, Jared Espley, Yoshifumi Futaana, and Bruce Jakosky. Foreshock cavities at venus and mars. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 125(8):e2020JA028023, 2020. e2020JA028023 2020JA028023.
- [11] G. A. Collinson, L. B. Wilson, III, D. G. Sibeck, N. Shane, T. L. Zhang, T. E. Moore, A. J. Coates, and S. Barabash. Short large-amplitude magnetic structures (SLAMS) at Venus. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117(A16):A10221, October 2012.
- [12] Christina Chu, Hui Zhang, David Sibeck, Antonius Otto, QiuGang Zong, Nick Omid, James P. McFadden, Dennis Fruehauff, and Vassilis Angelopoulos. THEMIS satellite observations of hot flow anomalies at Earth’s bow shock. *Annales Geophysicae*, 35(3):443–451, March 2017.
- [13] A. V. Dmitriev and A. V. Suvorova. Large-scale jets in the magnetosheath and plasma penetration across the magnetopause: THEMIS observations. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 120:4423–4437, June 2015.

- [14] Alexei V. Dmitriev and Alla V. Suvorova. Atmospheric effects of magnetosheath jets. *Atmosphere*, 14(1), 2023.
- [15] J. P. Eastwood, E. Biffis, M. A. Hapgood, L. Green, M. M. Bisi, R. D. Bentley, R. Wicks, L. A. McKinnell, M. Gibbs, and C. Burnett. The Economic Impact of Space Weather: Where Do We Stand? *Risk Analysis*, 37(2):206–218, February 2017.
- [16] J. P. Eastwood, A. Balogh, E. A. Lucek, C. Mazelle, and I. Dandouras. Quasi-monochromatic ulf foreshock waves as observed by the four-spacecraft cluster mission: 1. statistical properties. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 110(A11):n/a–n/a, 2005. A11219.
- [17] J. P. Eastwood, S. J. Schwartz, T. S. Horbury, C. M. Carr, K.-H. Glassmeier, I. Richter, C. Koenders, F. Plaschke, and J. A. Wild. Transient pc3 wave activity generated by a hot flow anomaly: Cluster, rosetta, and ground-based observations. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 116(A8), 2011.
- [18] M. J. Engebretson, L. J. Zanetti, T. A. Potemra, W. Baumjohann, H. Luehr, and M. H. Acuna. Simultaneous observation of Pc 3-4 pulsations in the solar wind and in the Earth’s magnetosphere. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 92(A9):10053–10062, September 1987.
- [19] G. Facskó, A. Opitz, B. Lavraud, J.G. Luhmann, C.T. Russell, J-A. Sauvaud, A. Fedorov, A. Kis, and V. Wertzergom. Hot flow anomaly remnant in the far geotail? *Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics*, 124:39–43, 2015.
- [20] E. W. Greenstadt, G. Le, and R. J. Strangeway. ULF waves in the foreshock. *Adv. Space Res.*, 15:71–84, 1995.
- [21] K. H. Glassmeier, U. Motschmann, M. Dunlop, A. Balogh, M. H. Acuña, C. Carr, G. Musmann, K. H. Fornaçon, K. Schweda, J. Vogt, E. Georgescu, and S. Buchert. Cluster as a wave telescope - first results from the fluxgate magnetometer. *Annales Geophysicae*, 19(10):1439–1447, October 2001.
- [22] H. Hietala, T. D. Phan, V. Angelopoulos, M. Oieroset, M. O. Archer, T. Karlsson, and F. Plaschke. In Situ Observations of a Magnetosheath High-Speed Jet Triggering Magnetopause Reconnection. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 45(4):1732–1740, Feb 2018.
- [23] M. D. Hartinger, D. L. Turner, F. Plaschke, V. Angelopoulos, and H. Singer. The role of transient ion foreshock phenomena in driving Pc5 ULF wave activity. *Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics)*, 118:299–312, January 2013.
- [24] J. A. Jacobs, Y. Kato, S. Matsushita, and V. A. Troitskaya. Classification of Geomagnetic Micropulsations. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 69(1):180–181, January 1964.
- [25] K. S. Jacobsen, T. D. Phan, J. P. Eastwood, D. G. Sibeck, J. I. Moen, V. Angelopoulos, J. P. McFadden, M. J. Engebretson, G. Provan, D. Larson, and K.-H. Fornaçon. THEMIS observations of extreme magnetopause motion caused by a hot flow anomaly. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 114:A08210, August 2009.

- [26] Chae-Woo Jun, Kazuo Shiokawa, Martin Connors, Ian Schofield, Igor Poddelsky, and Boris Shevtsov. Study of Pc1 pearl structures observed at multi-point ground stations in Russia, Japan, and Canada. *Earth, Planets and Space*, 66:140, December 2014.
- [27] P. Kajdič, X. Blanco-Cano, N. Omidi, D. Rojas-Castillo, D. G. Sibeck, and L. Billingham. Traveling foreshocks and transient foreshock phenomena. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 122(9):9148–9168, 2017. 2017JA023901.
- [28] E. K. J. Kilpua, A. Balogh, R. von Steiger, and Y. D. Liu. Geoeffective Properties of Solar Transients and Stream Interaction Regions. *Space Science Reviews*, 212(3-4):1271–1314, November 2017.
- [29] P. Kovács, G. Facskó, and I. Dandouras. Turbulent dynamics inside the cavity of hot flow anomaly. *Planetary and Space Science*, 92:24–33, 2014.
- [30] Primož Kajdič, Savvas Raptis, Xóchitl Blanco-Cano, and Tomas Karlsson. Causes of jets in the quasi-perpendicular magnetosheath. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 48(13):e2021GL093173, 2021. e2021GL093173 2021GL093173.
- [31] Z. Liu, D. L. Turner, V. Angelopoulos, and N. Omidi. THEMIS observations of tangential discontinuity-driven foreshock bubbles. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 42:7860–7866, October 2015.
- [32] Terry Z. Liu, Drew L. Turner, Vassilis Angelopoulos, and Nick Omidi. Multipoint observations of the structure and evolution of foreshock bubbles and their relation to hot flow anomalies. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 121(6):5489–5509, 2016. 2016JA022461.
- [33] W. Li, R. M. Thorne, J. Bortnik, Y. Nishimura, and V. Angelopoulos. Modulation of whistler mode chorus waves: 1. role of compressional pc4–5 pulsations. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 116(A6), 2011.
- [34] Terry Z. Liu, Chih-Ping Wang, Boyi Wang, Xueyi Wang, Hui Zhang, Yu Lin, and Vassilis Angelopoulos. ARTEMIS Observations of Foreshock Transients in the Midtail Foreshock. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47(21):e90393, November 2020.
- [35] Terry Z. Liu, Hui Zhang, Chih-Ping Wang, Vassilis Angelopoulos, Andrew Vu, Xueyi Wang, and Yu Lin. Statistical Study of Foreshock Transients in the Midtail Foreshock. *Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics)*, 126(5):e29156, May 2021.
- [36] A. Masters, C. S. Arridge, M. K. Dougherty, C. Bertucci, L. Billingham, S. J. Schwartz, C. M. Jackman, Z. Bebesi, A. J. Coates, and M. F. Thomsen. Cassini encounters with hot flow anomaly-like phenomena at saturn’s bow shock. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 35(2), 2008.
- [37] H. Madanian, N. Omidi, D. G. Sibeck, L. Andersson, R. Ramstad, S. Xu, J. R. Gruesbeck, S. J. Schwartz, R. A. Frahm, D. A. Brain, P. Kajdic, F. G. Eparvier, D. L. Mitchell, and S. M. Curry. Transient foreshock structures upstream of mars: Implications of the small martian bow shock. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 50(8):e2022GL101734, 2023. e2022GL101734 2022GL101734.

- [38] K. Nykyri, M. Bengtson, V. Angelopoulos, Y. Nishimura, and S. Wing. Can Enhanced Flux Loading by High-Speed Jets Lead to a Substorm? Multipoint Detection of the Christmas Day Substorm Onset at 08:17 UT, 2015. *Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics)*, 124(6):4314–4340, June 2019.
- [39] Yukitoshi Nishimura, Takashi Kikuchi, Yusuke Ebihara, Akimasa Yoshikawa, Shun Imajo, Wen Li, and Hisashi Utada. Evolution of the current system during solar wind pressure pulses based on aurora and magnetometer observations. *Earth, Planets and Space*, 68(1):144, August 2016.
- [40] N. Omid, G. Collinson, and D. Sibeck. Foreshock bubbles at venus: Hybrid simulations and vex observations. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 125(2):e2019JA027056, 2020. e2019JA027056 2019JA027056.
- [41] N. Omid, J. P. Eastwood, and D. G. Sibeck. Foreshock bubbles and their global magnetospheric impacts. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 115:A06204, June 2010.
- [42] J. V. Olson and L. C. Lee. Pc1 wave generation by sudden impulses. *Planetary and Space Sciences*, 31(3):295–302, March 1983.
- [43] Marit Øieroset, David L. Mitchell, Tai D. Phan, Robert P. Lin, and Mario H. Acuña. Hot diamagnetic cavities upstream of the Martian bow shock. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 28(5):887–890, March 2001.
- [44] N. Omid, D. G. Sibeck, and X. Blanco-Cano. Foreshock compressional boundary. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 114:A08205, August 2009.
- [45] Ferdinand Plaschke, Heli Hietala, Martin Archer, Xóchitl Blanco-Cano, Primož Kajdič, Tomas Karlsson, Sun Hee Lee, Nojan Omid, Minna Palmroth, Vadim Roytershteyn, Daniel Schmid, Victor Sergeev, and David Sibeck. Jets Downstream of Collisionless Shocks. *Space Science Reviews*, 214(5):81, Aug 2018.
- [46] G. Paschmann, N. Sckopke, J.R. Asbridge, S.J. Bame, and J.T. Gosling. Energization of solar wind ions by reflection from the earth's bow shock. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 85(A9):4689–4693, 1980.
- [47] James A. Slavin, Mario H. Acuña, Brian J. Anderson, Stas Barabash, Mehdi Benna, Scott A. Boardsen, Markus Fraenz, George Gloeckler, Robert E. Gold, George C. Ho, Haje Korth, Stamatios M. Krimigis, Ralph L. McNutt, Jim M. Raines, Menelaos Sarantos, Sean C. Solomon, Tielong Zhang, and Thomas H. Zurbuchen. MESSENGER and Venus Express observations of the solar wind interaction with Venus. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 36(9):L09106, May 2009.
- [48] R. J. Sitar, J. B. Baker, C. R. Clauer, A. J. Ridley, J. A. Cumnock, V. O. Papitashvili, J. Spann, M. J. Brittner, and G. K. Parks. Multi-instrument analysis of the ionospheric signatures of a hot flow anomaly occurring on July 24, 1996. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 103(A10):23357–23372, 1998.
- [49] D. G. Sibeck, N. L. Borodkova, S. J. Schwartz, C. J. Owen, R. Kessel, S. Kokubun, R. P. Lepping, R. Lin, K. Liou, H. Lühr, R. W. McEntire, C.-I. Meng, T. Mukai, Z. Nemecek, G. Parks, T. D. Phan, S. A. Romanov, J. Safrankova, J.-A. Sauvaud, H. J. Singer, S. I. Solov'yev, A. Szabo, K. Takahashi, D. J. Williams, K. Yumoto, and G. N. Zastenker. Comprehensive study of the magnetospheric response to a hot flow anomaly. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 104:4577–4594, March 1999.

- [50] D. G. Sibeck, N. L. Borodkova, G. N. Zastenker, S. A. Romanov, and J.-A. Sauvaud. Gross deformation of the dayside magnetopause. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 25:453–456, 1998.
- [51] Steven J. Schwartz, Chris P. Chaloner, Peter J. Christiansen, Andrew J. Coates, David S. Hall, Alan D. Johnstone, M. Paul Gough, Andrew J. Norris, Richard P. Rijnbeek, David J. Southwood, and Les J. C. Woolliscroft. An active current sheet in the solar wind. *Nature*, 318(6043):269–271, 1985.
- [52] A. V. Suvorova, A. V. Dmitriev, V. A. Parkhomov, and B. Tsegmed. Quiet Time Structured Pc1 Waves Generated During Transient Foreshock. *Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics)*, 124(11):9075–9093, November 2019.
- [53] S.D. Shuvalov, V.N. Ermakov, V.O. Zorina, and K.I. Kim. Propagation properties of hot flow anomalies at mars: Maven observations. *Planetary and Space Science*, 179:104717, 2019.
- [54] J. Šafránková, O. Goncharov, Z. Němeček, L. Přech, and D. G. Sibeck. Asymmetric magnetosphere deformation driven by hot flow anomaly(ies). *Geophysical Research Letters*, 39(15):L15107, August 2012.
- [55] Run Shi, Ze-Jun Hu, Binbin Ni, Desheng Han, Xiang-Cai Chen, Chen Zhou, and Xudong Gu. Modulation of the dayside diffuse auroral intensity by the solar wind dynamic pressure. *Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics)*, 119(12):10,092–10,099, December 2014.
- [56] D. G. Sibeck, S. H. Lee, N. Omid, and V. Angelopoulos. Foreshock Cavities: Direct Transmission Through the Bow Shock. *Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics)*, 126(5):e29201, May 2021.
- [57] D. G. Sibeck, T.-D. Phan, R. Lin, R. P. Lepping, and A. Szabo. Wind observations of foreshock cavities: A case study. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 107:1271, October 2002.
- [58] Xiao-Chen Shen, Quanqi Shi, Boyi Wang, Hui Zhang, Mary K. Hudson, Yukitoshi Nishimura, Michael D. Hartinger, Anmin Tian, Qiu-Gang Zong, I. J. Rae, and Alexander W. Degeling. Dayside magnetospheric and ionospheric responses to a foreshock transient on 25 June 2008: 1. flr observed by satellite and ground-based magnetometers. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 123(8):6335–6346, 2018.
- [59] M. F. Thomsen, J. T. Gosling, S. A. Fuselier, S. J. Bame, and C. T. Russell. Hot, diamagnetic cavities upstream from the earth’s bow shock. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 91(A3):2961–2973, 1986.
- [60] D. L. Turner, T. Z. Liu, L. B. Wilson, I. J. Cohen, D. G. Gershman, J. F. Fennell, J. B. Blake, B. H. Mauk, N. Omid, and J. L. Burch. Microscopic, Multipoint Characterization of Foreshock Bubbles With Magnetospheric Multiscale (MMS). *Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics)*, 125(7):e27707, July 2020.
- [61] K. Takahashi, R. L. McPherron, and T. Terasawa. Dependence of the spectrum of Pc 3-4 pulsations on the interplanetary magnetic field. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 89(A5):2770–2780, May 1984.

- [62] L. Turc, O. W. Roberts, D. Verscharen, A. P. Dimmock, P. Kajdič, M. Palmroth, Y. Pfau-Kempf, A. Johlander, M. Dubart, E. K. J. Kilpua, J. Soucek, K. Takahashi, N. Takahashi, M. Battarbee, and U. Ganse. Transmission of foreshock waves through Earth's bow shock. *Nature Physics*, 19(1):78–86, January 2023.
- [63] N. A. Tsyganenko. Data-based modeling of the geomagnetosphere with an IMF-dependent magnetopause. *Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics)*, 119(1):335–354, January 2014.
- [64] V. M. Uritsky, J. A. Slavin, S. A. Boardsen, T. Sundberg, J. M. Raines, D. J. Gershman, G. Collinson, D. Sibeck, G. V. Khazanov, B. J. Anderson, and H. Korth. Active current sheets and candidate hot flow anomalies upstream of mercury's bow shock. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 119(2):853–876, 2014.
- [65] P. W. Valek, M. F. Thomsen, F. Allegrini, F. Bagenal, S. Bolton, J. Connerney, R. W. Ebert, R. Gladstone, W. S. Kurth, S. Levin, P. Louarn, B. Mauk, D. J. McComas, C. Pollock, M. Reno, J. R. Szalay, S. Weidner, and R. J. Wilson. Hot flow anomaly observed at jupiter's bow shock. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 44(16):8107–8112, 2017.
- [66] Chih-Ping Wang, Terry Z. Liu, Xiaoyan Xing, and Arnaud Masson. Multispacecraft observations of tailward propagation of transient foreshock perturbations to midtail magnetosheath. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 123(11):9381–9394, 2018.
- [67] Chih-Ping Wang, Xueyi Wang, Terry Z. Liu, and Yu Lin. Evolution of a foreshock bubble in the midtail foreshock and impact on the magnetopause: 3-d global hybrid simulation. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47(22):e2020GL089844, 2020. e2020GL089844 2020GL089844.
- [68] Chih-Ping Wang, Xueyi Wang, Terry Z. Liu, and Yu Lin. A foreshock bubble driven by an imf tangential discontinuity: 3d global hybrid simulation. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 48(9):e2021GL093068, 2021. e2021GL093068 2021GL093068.
- [69] Qiugang Zong. Energetic electrons response to ULF waves induced by interplanetary shocks in the outer radiation belt. In *38th COSPAR Scientific Assembly*, volume 38, page 2, January 2010.
- [70] H. Zhang, D. G. Sibeck, Q. G. Zong, S. P. Gary, J. P. McFadden, D. Larson, K. H. Glassmeier, and V. Angelopoulos. Time History of Events and Macroscale Interactions during Substorms observations of a series of hot flow anomaly events. *Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics)*, 115(A12):A12235, December 2010.
- [71] Hui Zhang and Qiugang Zong. *Transient Phenomena at the Magnetopause and Bow Shock and Their Ground Signatures*, chapter 2, pages 11–37. American Geophysical Union (AGU), 2020.
- [72] X. Y. Zhang, Q.-G. Zong, Y. F. Wang, H. Zhang, L. Xie, S. Y. Fu, C. J. Yuan, C. Yue, B. Yang, and Z. Y. Pu. Ulf waves excited by negative/positive solar wind dynamic pressure impulses at geosynchronous orbit. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 115(A10), 2010.

[73] L. L. Zhao, H. Zhang, and Q. G. Zong. Global ULF waves generated by a hot flow anomaly. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 44(11):5283–5291, June 2017.