Relativistic electron microburst events: modeling the atmospheric impact

A. Seppälä¹*, E. Douma¹, C. J. Rodger¹, P. T. Verronen², M. A. Clilverd³, and J. Bortnik⁴

4	¹ Department of Physics, University of Otago, PO Box 56, Dunedin 9054, New Zealand
5	² Finnish Meteorological Institute, PO Box 503, FI-00101 Helsinki, Finland
6	³ British Antarctic Survey/NERC, High Cross, Madingley Road, CB3 0ET, Cambridge, UK
7	⁴ Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences, University of California, Los Angeles, California, USA

8 Key Points:

1

2

3

- New electron microburst flux, spectrum and occurrence information used in atmospheric simulations.
 Microbursts drive 7-20% short term ozone loss in upper mesosphere with largest impact during winter.
- Additional 10% longer term ozone loss in winter middle mesosphere.

^{*}Previously at Finnish Meteorological Institute

Corresponding author: A. Seppälä, annika.seppala@otago.ac.nz

14 Abstract

Relativistic electron microbursts are short duration, high energy precipitation events that are an 15 important loss mechanism for radiation belt particles. Previous work to estimate their atmospheric 16 impacts found no significant changes in atmospheric chemistry. Recent research on microbursts 17 revealed that both the fluxes and frequency of microbursts are much higher than previously thought. 18 We test the seasonal range of atmospheric impacts using this latest microburst information as 19 input forcing to the SIC model. A modeled 6h microburst storm increased mesospheric HO_x 20 by 15–25%/800–1200% (summer/winter) and NO_x by 1500–2250%/80–120%. Together these 21 drive 7-12%/12-20% upper mesospheric ozone losses, with a further 10-12% longer term middle 22 mesospheric loss during winter. Our results suggest that existing electron precipitation proxies, 23 which do not yet take relativistic microburst energies into account, are likely missing a significant 24 source of precipitation that contributes to atmospheric ozone balance. 25

²⁶ 1 Introduction

In recent years, we have seen an increased interest in assessing the importance of solar variability 27 in the form of energetic particle precipitation on the Earth's atmosphere [e.g. Andersson et al., 2014; 28 Seppälä et al., 2014; Arsenovic et al., 2016; Damiani et al., 2016]. These particles, mainly electrons 29 and protons, are of solar and magnetospheric origin and are guided by the Earth's magnetic field 30 to the polar regions, where they ionize the neutral atmosphere. This effect, known as energetic 31 particle precipitation, or EPP, influences the chemical balance of the atmosphere by increasing the 32 production of a number of gases (so called odd hydrogen, HO_x , and odd nitrogen, NO_x) which take 33 part in ozone loss [see the comprehensive review by Jackman and McPeters, 2004]. Changes in the 34 chemical balance can couple further to atmospheric dynamics providing a potential link to regional 35 variations in climate even up to solar cycle time scales [e.g. Seppälä et al., 2009; Baumgaertner 36 et al., 2011; Semeniuk et al., 2011; Seppälä et al., 2013; Arsenovic et al., 2016]. 37

In order to include these effects in climate simulations, Matthes et al. [2017] have provided 38 the first long term proxy for energetic electron precipitation (<1 MeV) levels building on work 39 by van de Kamp et al. [2016]. Proxies like this rely on EPP observations organized by solar and 40 geomagnetic activity levels as measured by geomagnetic activity indices, such as the Ap-index. 41 While geomagnetic indices can capture the overall activity levels reasonably well, they are not able 42 to resolve precipitation at high time resolution. In reality there are many different physical processes 43 in near-Earth space that drive geomagnetic activity, and also precipitation of energetic particles, into 44 the atmosphere. The dynamical variability of all possible driving mechanisms is yet to be taken into 45

-2-

account, and the short but high-intensity events are not adequately captured when proxies are created 46 using average geomagnetic activity indices. One example of these types of events are relativistic 47 electron microbursts. Relativistic microbursts are short duration (<1 s) bursts of precipitation of high energy (>1 MeV) electrons [Imhof et al., 1992; Blake et al., 1996]. They occur primarily on the 49 magnetic local time morningside outside the plasmasphere in the L-shell range 3-8 [Douma et al., 50 2017]. L is a magnetic field line parameter used to describe the relation of the magnetic latitude of 51 the field line at the surface and its location in near-Earth space [McIlwain, 1961]. Here we calculated 52 the L-shells using the International Geomagnetic Reference Field (IGRF). Lorentzen et al. [2001] 53 found that microbursts remained intense for ~ 6 hours during a period of high geomagnetic activity. 54 One precipitation period can be made up of many individual microbursts, with localized impact, 55 while the overall precipitation can have a large impact [Dietrich et al., 2010]. 56

The relativistic energies of the electron microbursts mean that the main impact of the precipita-57 tion will be focused at mesospheric altitudes above about 50 km. Previously, Turunen et al. [2009] 58 simulated the impact of a single monoenergetic, 2 MeV electron microburst event on the atmosphere 59 and found the impact to be negligible. Since their study, research by e.g. Blum et al. [2015] and 60 Douma et al. [2017] has shown that 1) there can be many microburst events in close succession during 61 periods of high geomagnetic activity, 2) their fluxes are often much higher than the 100 electrons 62 $cm^{-2}sr^{-1}s^{-1}$ used by *Turunen et al.* [2009] [*Borovsky*, 2017] and 3) the electron energy spectrum is 63 more accurately modeled as exponentially decreasing (with increasing energy) than monoenergetic 64 [*Crew et al.*, 2016]. 65

Here, we use the newly available information on microburst electron precipitation characteristics to estimate the seasonal range of impact on polar atmospheric HO_x , NO_x and ozone, and assess the importance of relativistic electron microbursts on energetic particle precipitation driven atmospheric ozone variability.

70 **2** Materials and Methods

In order to describe the characteristic precipitation in these events we utilize the relativistic microburst dataset derived from SAMPEX HILT, recently reported in *Douma et al.* [2017]. We employ the *O'Brien et al.* [2003] algorithm which was updated by *Blum et al.* [2015] to include the microburst intensity. Based on a long timescale global average, we find the best conjunction of high microburst occurrence and high microburst intensity is located at *L*-shell 4.43 and (56.11°N, 311.95°E), being SAMPEX observations mapped to 100 km altitude. This location is in the region

where SAMPEX HILT measures only the bounce loss cone [Dietrich et al., 2010]. During highly 77 geomagnetically disturbed times (AE* >300 nT) within 2° latitude and longitude of this location we 78 calculate an occurrence rate of 0.0513 microbursts/s (~3 microbursts/min) with a flux intensity mean 79 value of 1733.5 cm⁻²sr⁻¹s⁻¹ and median value of 963 cm⁻²sr⁻¹s⁻¹ of >1.05 MeV electrons, i.e., 80 about an order of magnitude larger than Turunen et al. [2009]. Further it is found that the average 81 duration of these microbursts is 0.1 s, in agreement with the value used by *Rodger et al.* [Fig. 7, 82 2007] and Turunen et al. [2009]. The above averages were calculated from the SAMPEX HILT 83 solid state detector array row 4 data between 1996 and 2007 during high geomagnetic activity (AE* 84 >300 nT). To estimate the duration we used the highest available instrument resolution (100 ms for 85 this row, see *Douma et al.* [2017]). Note that higher occurrence rates and intensities are observed 86 [O'Brien et al., 2004], but we use the statistical averages to consider a more "typical", not extreme 87 precipitation levels here. 88

The SAMPEX HILT intensity observations provide integral electron fluxes with energies 89 >1.05 MeV. We convert this integral intensity to a differential electron flux spectrum based on 90 the modeling of whistler mode chorus produced electron microbursts reported in Rodger et al. [Fig. Q1 7, 2007]. Here we use the modeled results for the Southern Hemisphere. We find that the Rodger et al. [Fig. 7, 2007] modeling is well fit by a spectral relationship combining (through multiplication) 93 a power-law and e-folding (i.e. exponentially decreasing) relationship for energies <1 MeV and an 94 e-folding only relationship for energies >1 MeV. A differential electron flux spectrum is produced 95 for both the mean and median fluxes, presented here in Figure 1. The figure also includes scaled 96 values of the Firebird L=5.9 microburst flux observations from Crew et al. [2016]. This shows 97 our differential electron flux spectrums are highly consistent with the energy dependence of the 98 experimentally observed <1 MeV microburst fluxes reported by Crew et al. [2016]. 99

To assess the impact of the microburst precipitation we used the 1-D Sodankylä Ion and Neutral 103 Chemistry model (SIC). The latest version (corresponding to the one used in this study) of the 104 model was recently reported by Verronen et al. [2016]. A detailed description of the SIC model 105 is available from Verronen et al. [2005] and Turunen et al. [2009]. Our modeling location was 106 set to (73°S, 349°E). This is the Southern Hemisphere (SH) conjugate location for the SAMPEX 107 observations discussed above, and corresponds to L-shell of 4.43. We performed two sets of 108 simulations, one for summer solstice conditions, and one for winter solstice conditions, to gain the full 109 range of atmospheric responses to the electron precipitation. Background conditions were set to the 110 geomagnetically active year 2003 and no other source of particle precipitation was included. For both 111 seasons three simulations were made: "REF", a background reference without microburst electron 112



Figure 1. Differential electron flux and energy spectrum for the mean event (solid line) and median event (dashed line) precipitating microburst flux. The red crosses show the scaled fluxes from FIREBIRD microburst observations [*Crew et al.*, 2016].

precipitation; "mean flux" with microburst electron forcing based on the mean event precipitating flux as described above and, "median flux" with microburst electron forcing based on the median event precipitating flux as described above. We take the previously mentioned *Lorentzen et al.* [2001] 6 hour period of microburst precipitation in our simulations, which is also consistent with the time AE* is elevated above 300 nT during very large geomagnetic storms. The microbursts take place in the first 6 hours of the mean flux and median flux simulations, after which the electron forcing is turned off and no excess ionization is applied.

The SIC model is normally run at a temporal resolution of 5 minutes. As this is much longer 120 than the duration of the individual microbursts (0.1 s), we need to account for this in the electron 121 forcing. With the occurrence rate of 3 microbursts/min and each individual microburst having a 122 duration of 0.1 s, we find that the fraction of the 5 min time step impacted by the microbursts is 123 1/200. By using the ionization calculated for an individual microburst electron flux and spectrum 124 $(I_{\mu Burst})$ multiplied with this factor, we can now apply the average ionization over the 5 min time 125 step, *i.e.* $I_{average} = 1/200 \times I_{\mu Burst}$. We note that the photochemical lifetimes of HO_x and NO_x at 126 mesospheric altitudes range from hours to days. 127

128 **3 Results**

The ionization rates for the mean and median flux microbursts ($I_{\mu Burst}$) are shown in Figure 2. Due to the energies of these precipitating electrons, the enhanced ionization from the microbursts is focused on the mesosphere and lower thermosphere, with the highest ionization rates between about 60 km and 90 km. The change in the background atmosphere from summer to winter has an effect on the ionization rate altitude profile, and the peak height of the ionization is about 5 km higher during summer than during winter. There is also a clear difference between the mean and median precipitating fluxes, with higher ionization rates for the mean fluxes.



Figure 2. Atmospheric ionization rates at midnight for summer (red) and winter (blue). Solid lines correspond
 to the mean precipitating flux and dashed lines to the median flux as in Figure 1.

Figure 3 presents the change in HO_x , NO_x and ozone for SH summer solstice. The top row 138 corresponds to the mean flux precipitation (blue lines in Figure 2) and the bottom row to the median 139 flux precipitation (red lines in Figure 2). All results here and after this are presented as %-change from 140 the REF simulation. The change in atmospheric chemistry closely follows the shape of the ionization 141 rate profiles (see Figure 3 of Turunen et al. [2009] for impact altitudes of different energies). The 142 largest impact is focused between about 75 km and 85 km, reflecting the peak of the ionization profile. 143 The short lived HO_x increases by up to 15% when median flux is applied, and up to 25% when mean 144 flux is applied. From now on, instead of giving the median and mean flux responses separately, we 145 will report them together, e.g. for HO_x above as 15-25% with the first value corresponding to the 146

median flux response and the second value corresponding to the mean flux response. After the first 147 6 hours of simulation the microburst forcing stops and HO_x rapidly recovers to background levels. 148 The NO_x enhancements are focused at the same altitude region, but are much higher in magnitude 149 (1500–2250%) and persist longer, with 500–750% increases remaining by the end of the day. Our 150 analysis of the individual chemical reactions for these simulations confirms that under the summer 151 conditions and at high mesospheric altitudes, the ozone response is largely dominated by HO_x driven 152 ozone loss. The largest ozone impacts occur around the local minimum in mesospheric ozone profile, 153 at about 80 km altitude. These range from -10 to -18% and have largely recovered within 3 hours of 154 155 the precipitation ending, consistent with the HO_x recovery.



Figure 3. Summer: change in HO_x (left), NO_x (center) and O₃ (right) for the mean flux simulation (top row) and median flux simulation (bottom row). All values are presented as %-change from the REF simulation. Time on the x-axis is local time from the start of the simulation. The microbursts take place in the first 6 hours.

The SH winter solstice responses are presented in Figure 4. Unlike summer, the changes in all constituents are spread over a wider range of altitudes and, due to polar night conditions in our SH winter solstice location, last much longer. Due to the longer lasting effects these simulations were extended to 48h (summer simulations were restricted to 24h). The HO_x responses are much

larger than during summer, as expected [Seppälä et al., 2015], and range from 800% to 1200%. 163 At the end of the 48h period HO_x remains elevated but <50%. While the microburst precipitation 164 enhances HO_x between 55 and 80 km, by the end of the 6h microburst storm period the peak increases 165 are towards the bottom end of this altitude range, at around 65 km. On the other hand, the NO_x 166 enhancements of 80-120% peak around 70 km, closer to the ionization rate maximum. The lack of 167 photodissociation loss processes in the polar winter enable the long lived NO_x enhancements, with 168 only marginal reduction after 2 days. As discussed in previous work [see Seppälä et al., 2015], we 169 note that, although the %-change values seem to have a large discrepancy between summer and winter, 170 these are driven by seasonal variations in the background atmosphere and the absolute increases are 171 comparable for both seasons (NO_x: 10^6-10^7 molecules cm⁻³, HO_x: 10^5-10^6 molecules cm⁻³). 172





Figure 4. As in Figure 3 but during winter. Note that the time period here is 48h.

The largest ozone losses (-25– -35%) take place in the first 12h and are focused at altitudes of 75–80 km. In this region the main source of ozone loss is the reaction $H + O_3 \rightarrow OH + O_2$ which forms a HO_x-driven catalytic cycle together with $OH + O \rightarrow H + O_2$. Below 75 km the brief 2 hour window of sunlight around noon at the high mesospheric altitudes activates the effective ozone loss [see *Verronen et al.*, 2005], leading to >10% ozone reduction which persists beyond the simulation period. Detailed examination reveals that there are two distinct ozone loss regions, one above and one below ~70 km. Above 70 km the loss is driven by HO_x and at ~36h we start to see recovery of the ozone as the HO_x enhancements deplete. Below 70 km the ozone loss is largely dominated by NO_x and remains depleted at ~10% level beyond the 48h simulation period. We examine this more closely in Figure 5 which shows the change in ozone in the upper mesospheric column at 75-82 km and the middle mesospheric column at 63-70 km.



Figure 5. Change in ozone in the 75-82 km column during the first 24 hours for summer (red) and winter (dark blue), and in the 63-70 km column for winter (light blue). For individual altitudes, see Figures 3-4. Solid lines correspond to the mean precipitating flux and dashed lines to the median flux as in Figures 1 and 2. The microbursts take place in the first 6 hours as indicated by the grey horizontal bar. The solar illumination conditions at 75 km altitude (star = night, circle = day) are marked for the summer/winter cases with corresponding colors (red/blue) at the bottom of the figure.

The upper mesospheric column in Figure 5 corresponds to the region dominated by the short 191 term HO_x -driven ozone loss, and the middle mesospheric column to the region dominated by the 192 long term NO_x -driven ozone loss during winter. During summer the total ozone amount is a balance 193 of the loss driven by the microburst forcing and production from photolysis (sunlight). As a balance 194 of these two the ozone loss maximizes near the end of the microburst forcing period, reaching values 195 of -7--12%. As the forcing ends, ozone rapidly recovers and returns to background levels within 4 196 hours. During winter we observe an ozone enhancement in the upper mesosphere in the first 2 hours 197 of the simulation. This is a result of enhanced production of atomic oxygen which rapidly reacts 198

to form ozone. Within 2 hours this additional production is overtaken by the HO_x -driven loss that 199 results in 12–20% reduction in the column ozone. The brief sunlit hours at the upper mesospheric 200 altitudes [Verronen et al., 2005] start the ozone recovery by boosting production. By the end of the 201 24 hour period the ozone column has recovered to within -5 - -10% of the unperturbed levels and is 202 showing a clear trend towards background levels. In the middle mesosphere, below 70 km, where 203 ozone responses were limited to wintertime, the impact is -2-5% initially, but this increases to -10-204 -12% following activation of the catalytic loss cycles by sunlight. While ozone above 70 km starts 205 to recover by the following day, in the middle mesosphere region ozone remains reduced at the 10%206 level at the end of the 48h simulation period and shows no clear recovery trend. 207

4 Conclusions

Based on the available information, *Turunen et al.* [2009] found microbursts to have a negligible impact on atmospheric chemical balance. Since this study new results presented by *Blum et al.* [2015] have shown that the microburst fluxes of *Turunen et al.* [2009] were underestimated by at least an order of magnitude. We now also know that high geomagnetic activity levels will likely lead to many repeated microbursts, while previously only an isolated precipitation burst was considered [*Turunen et al.*, 2009].

Using this new information, we carried out a set of simulations to investigate the effects of 215 relativistic electron microbursts on atmospheric chemistry. To assess the seasonal variation of the 216 atmospheric effects, which are known to strongly depend on solar illumination, we examined the 217 impacts for both summer and winter solstice conditions. A storm of microbursts occurring over 218 a 6h time period, consistent with a large geomagnetic storm, will reduce the upper mesospheric 219 ozone column by 7–12% during summer conditions. This ozone loss is short lived and the HO_x and 220 NO_x produced by the microburst precipitation both rapidly recover to background levels. However, 221 during winter when photochemical loss is limited by lack of sunlight, the upper mesospheric ozone 222 column is initially reduced by 12–20%. As the upper mesospheric column starts to recover, a delayed 223 10-12% ozone loss, lasting beyond the 48h simulation period, dominates the middle mesosphere 224 (63-70 km). Our results show that the atmospheric impact is a balance of the ionizing electron 225 precipitation and the prevailing sunlight conditions [see also Verronen et al., 2005]. We applied a 226 constant occurrence rate of 3 microburst/min in our simulations. In reality this rate is not constant. 227 However, variations in this rate would not impact the longer term change in ozone, which appears 228 well after the microburst forcing has ended and is largely controlled by the enhanced long lived NO_x 229 and sunlight conditions. 230

Relativistic microbursts typically include energies higher than the <1 MeV electrons included 231 in the EPP proxy of van de Kamp et al. [2016] and Matthes et al. [2017]. In terms of atmosphere 232 response, this energy difference means that the higher energy microburst electrons impact lower 233 atmospheric altitudes. As a result, the peak impact from microbursts (Figure 2) takes place about 234 10 km lower in the atmosphere than the van de Kamp et al. [2016, Figure 9] EPP proxy. Microbursts 235 are an important loss mechanism for particles from the radiation belts and they occur as part of 236 geomagnetic activity. The results presented here suggest that the existing EPP proxies, which do not 237 yet take relativistic microburst energies into account, are likely missing a significant source of EPP 238 contributing to atmospheric ozone balance. 239

240 Acknowledgments

- The work of AS and PTV was supported in part by the Academy of Finland through the projects
- ²⁴² #276926 (SECTIC: Sun-Earth Connection Through Ion Chemistry), #258165, and #265005 (CLASP:
- ²⁴³ Climate and Solar Particle Forcing). MAC was supported by the Natural Environment Research
 ²⁴⁴ Council.
- 245 SAMPEX data is available from the SAMPEX Data Center at Caltech: http://www.srl.caltech.edu/sampex/DataCenter.
- The SIC model results presented here are available from the corresponding author.

247 References

- Andersson, M. E., P. T. Verronen, C. J. Rodger, M. A. Clilverd, and A. Seppälä (2014), Missing
 driver in the Sun–Earth connection from energetic electron precipitation impacts mesospheric
 ozone, *Nature Com.*, 5(5197), doi:10.1038/ncomms6197.
- Arsenovic, P., E. V. Rozanov, A. Stenke, B. Funke, J. M. Wissing, K. Mursula, F. Tummon, and
 T. Peter (2016), The influence of Middle Range Energy Electrons on atmospheric chemistry and
 regional climate, *J. Atmos. Sol. Terr. Phys.*, *149*, 180–190, doi:10.1016/j.jastp.2016.04.008.
- Baumgaertner, A. J. G., A. Seppälä, P. Joeckel, and M. A. Clilverd (2011), Geomagnetic activity
 related NOx enhancements and polar surface air temperature variability in a chemistry climate
 model: modulation of the NAM index, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, *11*(9), 4521–4531, doi:10.5194/acp11-4521-2011.
- Blake, J. B., M. D. Looper, D. N. Baker, R. Nakamura, B. Klecker, and D. Hovestadt (1996), New
- ²⁵⁹ high temporal and spatial resolution measurements by SAMPEX of the precipitation of relativistic
- electrons, *Adv. Space Res.*, *18*, 171–186, doi:10.1016/0273-1177(95)00969-8.

- Blum, L., X. Li, and M. Denton (2015), Rapid MeV electron precipitation as observed by SAM PEX/HILT during high-speed stream-driven storms, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *120*, 3783–3794, doi: 10.1002/2014JA020633.
- Borovsky, J. E. (2017), Electrical conductivity channels in the atmosphere produced by relativistic electron microbursts from the magnetosphere, *J. Atmos. Sol. Terr. Phys.*, *155*, 22–26, doi:
 10.1016/j.jastp.2017.01.004.
- ²⁶⁷ Clilverd, M. A., C. J. Rodger, and T. Ulich (2006), The importance of atmospheric precipita tion in storm-time relativistic electron flux dropouts, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *33*, L01102, doi:
 ²⁶⁹ 10.1029/2005GL024661.
- Crew, A. B., et al. (2016), First multipoint in situ observations of electron microbursts: Ini tial results from the NSF FIREBIRD II mission, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *121*, pp. 5272-5283, doi:
 10.1002/2016JA022485.
- Damiani, A., B. Funke, M. López-Puertas, M. L. Santee, R. R. Cordero, and S. Watanabe (2016),
 Energetic particle precipitation: A major driver of the ozone budget in the Antarctic upper
 stratosphere, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 43(7), 3554–3562, doi:10.1002/2016GL068279.
- Dietrich, S., C. J. Rodger, M. A. Clilverd, J. Bortnik, and T. Raita (2010), Relativistic microburst
 storm characteristics: Combined satellite and ground-based observations, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *115*,
 A12240, doi:10.1029/2010JA015777.
- Douma, E., C. J. Rodger, L. W. Blum, and M. A. Clilverd (2017), Occurrence characteristics of
 relativistic electron microbursts from SAMPEX observations, *J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics*,
 122, 8096–8107, doi:10.1002/2017JA024067.
- Imhof, W. L., H. D.Voss, J. Mobilia, D. W. Datlowe, E. E. Gaines, J. P. McGlennon, and
 U. S. Inan (1992), Relativistic electron microbursts, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 97, 13829–13837, doi:
 10.1029/92JA01138.
- Jackman, C. H., and R. D. McPeters (2004), The Effect of Solar Proton Events on Ozone and Other Constituents, in *Solar Variability and its Effects on Climate, Geophysical Monograph 141*, 305–319, American Geophysical Union, doi:10.1029/141GM21.
- Lorentzen, K. R., M. D. Looper, and J. B. Blake (2001), Relativistic electron microbursts during the GEM storms, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 28, 2573–2576, doi:10.1029/2001GL012926.
- Matthes, K., B. Funke, M. E. Andersson, L. Barnard, J. Beer, P. Charbonneau, M. A. Clilverd,
- T. Dudok de Wit, M. Haberreiter, A. Hendry, C. H. Jackman, M. Kretschmar, T. Kruschke,
- ²⁹² M. Kunze, U. Langematz, D. R. Marsh, A. Maycock, S. Misios, C. J. Rodger, A. A. Scaife,
- A. Seppälä, M. Shangguan, M. Sinnhuber, K. Tourpali, I. Usoskin, M. v. d. Kamp, P. T. Verronen,

- and S. Versick (2017), Solar Forcing for CMIP6 (v3.2), *Geosci. Model Dev.*, *10*, 2247–2302, doi:10.5194/gmd-10-2247-2017.
- McIlwain, C. E. (1961), Coordinates for mapping the distribution of magnetically trapped particles,
 J. Geophys. Res., 66(11), 3681–3691, doi:10.1029/JZ066i011p03681.
- O'Brien, T. P., K. R. Lorentzen, I. R. Mann, N. P. Meredith, J. B. Blake, J. F. Fennell, M. D. Looper,
 D. K. Milling, and R. R. Anderson (2003), Energization of relativistic electrons in the presence
- of ULF wave power and MeV microbursts: Evidence for dual ULF and VLF acceleration, J.
- ³⁰¹ *Geophys. Res.*, 108, 1329, doi:10.1029/2002JA009784.
- O'Brien, T. P., M. D. Looper, and J. B. Blake (2004), Quantification of relativistic electron microburst
 losses during the GEM storms, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *31*, L04802, doi:10.1029/2003GL018621.
- Rodger, C. J., M. A. Clilverd, D. Nunn, P. T. Verronen, J. Bortnik, and E. Turunen (2007), Storm
- time, short-lived bursts of relativistic electron precipitation detected by subionospheric radio wave
 propagation, J. Geophys. Res., 112, A07301, doi:10.1029/2007JA012347.
- Semeniuk, K., V. I. Fomichev, J. C. McConnell, C. Fu, S. M. L. Melo, and I. G. Usoskin (2011),
 Middle atmosphere response to the solar cycle in irradiance and ionizing particle precipitation,
 Atmos. Chem. Phys., *11*(10), 5045–5077, doi:10.5194/acp-11-5045-2011.
- Seppälä, A., C. E. Randall, M. A. Clilverd, E. V. Rozanov, and C. J. Rodger (2009), Geomagnetic activity and polar surface air temperature variability, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *114*, A10312, doi: 10.1029/2008JA014029.
- Seppälä, A., H. Lu, M. A. Clilverd, and C. J. Rodger (2013), Geomagnetic activity signatures in
 wintertime stratosphere wind, temperature, and wave response, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *118*, 2169–2183,
 doi:10.1002/jgrd.50236.
- Seppälä, A., K. Matthes, C. E. Randall, and I. A. Mironova (2014), What is the solar influence
 on climate? Overview of activities during CAWSES-II, *Prog. Earth Planet. Sci.*, *1*(1), 24, doi:
 10.1186/s40645-014-0024-3.
- Seppälä, A., M. A. Clilverd, M. J. Beharrell, C. J. Rodger, P. T. Verronen, M. E. Andersson, and D. A.
 Newnham (2015), Substorm-induced energetic electron precipitation: Impact on atmospheric chemistry, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *42*, 8172–8176, doi:10.1002/2015GL065523.
- Thorne, R. M., T. P. O'Brien, Y. Y. Shprits, D. Summers, and R. B. Horne (2005), Timescale for MeV electron microburst loss during geomagnetic storms, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *110*, A09202, doi:10.1029/2004JA010882.
- Turunen, E., P. T. Verronen, A. Seppälä, C. J. Rodger, M. A. Clilverd, J. Tamminen, C. F. Enell, and T. Ulich (2009), Impact of different energies of precipitating particles on NOx generation

- in the middle and upper atmosphere during geomagnetic storms, J. Atmos. Sol. Terr. Phys., 71,
- ³²⁸ 1176–1189, doi:10.1016/j.jastp.2008.07.005.
- van de Kamp, M., A. Seppälä, M. A. Clilverd, C. J. Rodger, P. T. Verronen, and I. C. Whittaker (2016),
- A model providing long-term datasets of energetic electron precipitation during geomagnetic storms, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *121*(20), 12,520–12,540, doi:10.1002/2015JD024212.
- Verronen, P. T., A. Seppälä, M. A. Clilverd, C. J. Rodger, E. Kyrölä, C. F. Enell, T. Ulich, and
- E. Turunen (2005), Diurnal variation of ozone depletion during the October–November 2003 solar
- proton events, J. Geophys. Res., 110, A09S32, doi:10.1029/2004JA010932.
- Verronen, P. T., M. E. Andersson, D. R. Marsh, T. Kovacs, and J. M. C. Plane (2016), WACCM-D
- Whole Atmosphere Community Climate Model with D-region ion chemistry, J. Adv. Mod. Earth
- ³³⁷ Sys., 8(2), 954–975, doi:10.1002/2015MS000592.

Figure 1.



Figure 2.



Figure 3.



Figure 4.



Figure 5.

Change in O₃ partial column 10 75-82km Summer mean 75-82km Summer median 75-82km Winter mean 5 75-82km Winter median 63-70km Winter mean ${\sf O}_3$ change $\mu{\sf Burst}$ - REF [%] 63-70km Winter median 0 -5 -10 -15 -20 2 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22 24 4 0 Time [h]