A self-consistent nonlinear force-free solution for a solar active region magnetic field

> M. S. Wheatland School of Physics University of Sydney

S. Régnier University of St Andrews

> Oxford University 1 July 2009





Overview

Background

Solar flares Vector magnetograms Nonlinear force-free model The problem – two solutions

Method

Using both solutions Bayesian decision making Iteration

Application to Hinode/SOT data AR 10953

Summary

Background: Solar flares

- Magnetic explosions in the Sun's corona
 - large flares influence local "space weather"
- Need to accurately model the coronal field



Data: Hinode/SOT

Background: Vector magnetograms

- Polarisation state of photospheric lines measured
- Vector magnetic field inferred ("inversion")
 - ▶ map of **B** at photosphere ("vector magnetogram")
- Problems:
 - instrumental uncertainties
 - validity/reliability of the inversion
 - 180 degree ambiguity in transverse field
- New generation of high resolution instruments
 - SOLIS/VSM: ground based, full disk
 - Hinode/SOT: satellite launched in 2006
 - SDO/HMI: to be launched in 2009
- In principle, boundary conditions for coronal field modelling



Data: Hinode/SOT (Schrijver et al. 2008)

Background: Nonlinear force-free magnetic fields

Force-free field B satisfies

$$(\nabla \times \mathbf{B}) \times \mathbf{B} = 0 \nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0$$
 (1)

- suitable model for the coronal magnetic field
- current density $\mathbf{J} = \mu_0^{-1} \nabla \times \mathbf{B}$ is parallel to \mathbf{B}
- coupled nonlinear PDEs

Alternative form:

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{B} = \alpha \mathbf{B}$$
$$\mathbf{B} \cdot \nabla \alpha = \mathbf{0}$$
(2)

 \blacktriangleright force-free parameter α is constant along field lines

Boundary conditions (Grad & Rubin 1958):

- B_n in boundary
- α in boundary over region where $B_n > 0$ or where $B_n < 0$
 - over "one polarity"
 - we label the polarities P and N respectively



• Note that $\mathbf{J} = \alpha \mathbf{B} / \mu_0$

▶ alternatively, BCs for $J_z = \alpha B_z / \mu_0$ over P or over N

- Nonlinear force-free BVPs are hard to solve
- Variety of iterative numerical methods (Wiegelmann 2008)
 - demonstrated to work on test cases (Schrijver et al. 2006)
 - not all methods use correct BCs
- Current-field iteration (Grad & Rubin 1958)
 - "Picard" iteration: at iteration k + 1, solve

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{B}^{k+1} = \alpha^{k} \mathbf{B}^{k}$$
$$\mathbf{B}^{k+1} \cdot \nabla \alpha^{k+1} = 0$$
(3)

- Fast current-field iteration (Wheatland 2007)
 - order N^4 (grid with N^3 points)
 - parallel code (OpenMP)

- Bipole test case
 - **B**-lines blue, **J**-lines yellow



Background: The problem – two solutions

- Force-free modelling from solar data
 - assume locally planar photosphere (z = 0 plane)
 - $B_z(x, y, 0)$ from vector magnetogram
 - $\alpha(x, y, 0)$ from magnetogram values via

$$\alpha(x, y, 0) = \left. \frac{1}{B_z} \left(\frac{\partial B_y}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial B_x}{\partial y} \right) \right|_{z=0}$$
(4)

for points with $B_z(x, y, 0) > 0$ (P) or $B_z(x, y, 0) < 0$ (N)

Workshops on application to Hinode/SOT data

- different force-free methods produce different solutions (Schrijver et al. 2008; DeRosa et al. 2009)
- energy estimates do not agree
- current-field iteration solutions not self-consistent
 - ▶ *P* and *N* choices for BCs produce different solutions

- AR 10953 on 30 April 2007 (DeRosa et al. 2009)
 - ▶ *P* solution (blue) and *N* solution (red)



- Boundary conditions inconsistent with force-free model
 - errors in field determination
 - field at photospheric level is forced (Metcalf et al. 1995)
- ► Necessary conditions for a force-free field (Molodenskii 1969)
 - integrals representing net force, torque
 - non-zero for solar data
 - "preprocessing" applied to enforce these conditions... (Wiegelmann et al. 2006)
 - ...but they are necessary, not sufficient
 - preprocessed BCs still inconsistent with the force-free model (DeRosa et al. 2009)
- Alternative approach:
 - find the "closest" force-free solution to the observed data

Method: Using both solutions

- Vector magnetogram provides boundary values $\alpha_0 \pm \sigma_0$
- Apply current-field iteration using α_0 over P
 - solution field lines map α_0 values in P to points in N
 - defines new boundary values $(\alpha_1 \pm \sigma_1)$ at points in N
- Apply current-field iteration using α_0 over N
 - ▶ solution field lines map α_0 values in *N* to points in *P*
 - defines new boundary values $(\alpha_1 \pm \sigma_1)$ at points in P
- The two solutions define a complete set of $\alpha_1 \pm \sigma_1$ values
 - new α boundary values at points in P and N
- We have two possible sets of boundary values
 - need to decide on a most probable value at each point



Method: Bayesian decision making

Bayes's theorem:

$$\mathcal{P}(M|D,I) \propto \mathcal{P}(D|M,I)\mathcal{P}(M,I)$$
(5)

• \mathcal{P} is probability, M a model, D data, I other information

- here *M* is the value of α , $D = (\alpha_1, \sigma_1)$ and $I = (\alpha_0, \sigma_0)$
- Assuming Gaussian errors

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}(D|M,I) &\propto e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\alpha-\alpha_1)^2/\sigma_1^2} \\ \mathcal{P}(M,I) &\propto e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\alpha-\alpha_0)^2/\sigma_0^2} \end{aligned}$$
 (6)

Hence

$$\mathcal{P}(M|D,I) = \exp\left[-\frac{(\alpha - \alpha_0)^2}{2\sigma_0^2} - \frac{(\alpha - \alpha_1)^2}{2\sigma_1^2}\right]$$
(7)

• $d\mathcal{P}/d\alpha = 0$ implies most probable value

$$\alpha = \alpha_2 = \frac{\alpha_0/\sigma_0^2 + \alpha_1/\sigma_1^2}{1/\sigma_0^2 + 1/\sigma_1^2}$$
(8)

▶ for constant uncertainties α₂ = ¹/₂(α₀ + α₁)
 ▶ Corresponding uncertainty

$$\sigma_2 = \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_0^2} + \frac{1}{\sigma_1^2}\right)^{-1/2}$$
(9)

• assuming Gaussian behaviour of \mathcal{P} around $\alpha = \alpha_2$

- > Values α_2 still inconsistent with the force-free model
 - but closer to consistency

Method: Iteration

- Repeat the procedure, starting with $\alpha_2 \pm \sigma_2$
 - "self-consistency cycles"
 - label cycles by solutions (k = 1, 2 constructed at cycle 1)



Application to Hinode/SOT data: AR 10953

AR 10953 at 22:30 UT on 30 June 2007 (DeRosa et al. 2009)

- (B_x, B_y, B_z) on 320 × 320 grid over 185.6 (Mm)²
- Hinode data over only part: rest has SOHO/MDI B_z values
- α_0 obtained by centred differencing of B_x and B_y
- $\alpha_0 = 0$ for MDI data
- uncertainties not available, so assumed constant



- Calculation on $320 \times 320 \times 256$ grid
 - 10 self-consistency cycles
 - > 20 current-field iterations for each solution
 - run on one node (8 cores) of Science Faculty HPC







- Quantitative measures confirm convergence
- Energy E_k of solution k in units of potential energy E_0
 - E_{19} and E_{20} differ by < 0.03%
- Mean vector error (Schrijver et al. 2006)

$$\mathsf{MVE}_{k} = \frac{1}{N_{x}N_{y}N_{z}} \sum_{i} \frac{|\mathbf{B}_{i}^{(k)} - \mathbf{B}_{i}^{(k-1)}|}{|\mathbf{B}_{i}^{(k-1)}|}, \quad (10)$$

- reduced by more than a factor of 60
- Changes in field components are large
 - RMS changes: $\Delta B_x \approx 120 \,\mathrm{G}$, $\Delta B_y \approx 100 \,\mathrm{G}$
 - partly due to artificial embedding within MDI data
 - cf. preprocessing: $\Delta B_x, B_y \approx 60 \,\mathrm{G}, \,\Delta B_z \approx 80 \,\mathrm{G}$



Currents reduced in magnitude overall by averaging

but basic structures remain



- Application a "proof of concept"
 - uncertainties should be assigned
 - embedding in MDI data is undesirable

Comparison with Hinode/XRT image

Summary

- Vector magnetograms enable coronal field modelling
- Nonlinear force-free model appropriate in the corona
 - but photospheric boundary data is not force-free
 - \blacktriangleright different solutions for the P and N choices for BCs on α
- Method to calculate a self-consistent nonlinear force-free field
 - calculate P and N solutions
 - \blacktriangleright use solutions and Bayes's theorem to decide on new BCs on α
 - iterate
- Demonstrated to work on Hinode/SOT data
 - a "proof of concept"
 - should be improved by including uncertainties
 - should be improved by using only vector magnetogram data