



1 **Satellite drag effects due to uplifted oxygen neutrals during** 2 **super magnetic storms**

3 Gurbax S. Lakhina¹ and Bruce T. Tsurutani²

4 ¹Indian Institute of Geomagnetism, New Panvel (W), Navi Mumbai, India.

5 ²Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, USA.

6 *Correspondence to:* Gurbax S. Lakhina (gslakhina@gmail.com)

7 **Abstract:** During intense magnetic storms, prompt penetration electric fields (PPEFs) through
8 $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}$ forces near the magnetic equator uplift the dayside ionosphere. This effect has been called
9 the “dayside superfountain effect”. Ion-neutral drag forces between the upward moving
10 O^+ (oxygen ions) and oxygen neutrals will elevate the oxygen atoms to higher altitudes. This
11 paper gives a linear calculation indicating how serious the effect may be during an 1859-type
12 (Carrington) superstorm. It is concluded that the oxygen neutral densities produced at low-
13 Earth-orbiting (LEO) satellite altitudes may be sufficiently high to present severe satellite drag. It
14 is estimated that with a prompt penetrating electric field of ~ 20 mV/m turned on for 20 min, the
15 O atoms and O^+ ions are uplifted to 850 km where they produce about 40 times more satellite
16 drag per unit mass than normal. Stronger electric fields will presumably lead to greater uplifted
17 mass.

18

19 **1. Introduction**

20 Prompt penetration of interplanetary electric fields (IEFs) to the dayside equatorial ionosphere
21 has been known for a long time (Obayashi 1967; Nishida 1968; Kelley et al. 1979). It has been
22 shown that during super magnetic storms, defined as storms with $\text{Dst} < -250$ nT (Tsurutani et al.
23 1992; Echer et al. 2008), the prompt penetrating electric fields (PPEFs) associated with large IEF
24 intervals can last for more than several hours in the ionosphere (Maruyama et al. 2004; Mannucci
25 et al. 2005; Sahai et al. 2005; Huang et al. 2005). Intense dawn-to-dusk (eastward viewing from
26 the northern hemisphere) PPEFs uplift the dayside plasma to higher altitudes and magnetic
27 latitudes due to $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}$ drifts (Tsurutani et al. 2004; Mannucci et al. 2005; Verkhoglyadova et al.
28 2007). The ionospheric electron-ion recombination rate is much slower at higher altitudes



29 (Tsurutani et al. 2005), thus the “old” uplifted ionosphere is more or less stable. Solar
30 photoionization replaces the displaced plasma at lower altitudes, increasing the total electron
31 content (TEC) of the ionosphere. After the PPEF subsides, the plasma flows down along the
32 magnetic field lines to even greater magnetic latitudes. This overall process is named as the
33 “dayside superfountain effect”.

34

35 During superstorms, the vertical TEC values are found to increase to several times quiet time
36 values across the dayside ionosphere at low and middle latitudes. This has been empirically
37 observed by satellite and from ground-based GPS receivers. Apart from the dayside
38 superfountain effect, which occurs during the first few hours of a superstorm, there is another
39 mechanism called the “disturbance dynamo” (Blanc & Richmond 1980; Fuller-Rowell et al.
40 1997). The latter is caused by particle precipitation and atmosphere heating in the auroral zone
41 during the superstorms and consequential equatorward-directed neutral winds due to this heating
42 process. However, all superstorms are not alike as they have different peak intensities and
43 associated convection electric fields (Gonzalez et al. 1994). Therefore, the PPEFs produce
44 different effects in terms of TEC enhancements, poleward-shifting of equatorial ionization
45 anomaly (EIA) peaks (Namba & Maeda 1939; Appleton 1946) from the typical quiet time
46 positions at $\sim \pm 10^\circ$, compositional changes, etc. Studies of the Bastille day (15 July 2000)
47 superstorm (Basu et al. 2001, 2007; Kil et al. 2003, Yin et al. 2004; Rishbeth et al. 2010), the
48 Halloween (30 October 2003) superstorm (Tsurutani et al. 2004, 2007, 2008; Mannucci et al.
49 2005; Verkhoglyadova et al. 2007), and some other superstorms events (Foster et al. 2004; Lin et
50 al. 2005; Immel et al. 2005; Mannucci et al. 2008, 2009) clearly illustrate the above point.

51

52

53 Using a modified version of the low- to mid-latitude ionosphere code SAMI2 (Sami2 is Another
54 Model of the Ionosphere) of the Naval Research Laboratory (NRL) (Huba et al. 2000, 2002),
55 Tsurutani et al. (2007) have studied the O^+ ion uplift in the dayside ionosphere due to first ~ 2
56 hours of PPEFs during the 30 October 2003 (Halloween) superstorm. Their simulations clearly
57 show the dayside O^+ ions uplifted to higher altitudes (~ 600 km) and higher magnetic latitudes
58 (**MLAT**) ($\sim \pm 25^\circ$ to 30°), forming highly displaced EIA peaks. The rapid upward drift of the O^+
59 ions causes neutral oxygen (O) uplift due to ion-neutral drag forces. They also find that above \sim



60 400 km altitude, the neutral oxygen atom densities within the displaced EIAs increase
61 substantially over their quiet time values.

62

63 Recently, Tsurutani et al. (2012) have modeled the 1-2 September 1859 Carrington storm using
64 the modified SAMI2 code (Verkhoglyadova, 2007, 2008). This superstorm's intensity was the
65 highest in recorded history, Dst ~ -1760 nT (Tsurutani et al. 2003; Lakhina et al. 2012). The
66 storm-time electric field has been estimated to have been ~ 20 mV/m. Similar features to the 30
67 October 2003 storm were found, but all effects were more severe. The EIAs were found to be
68 located at ~ 500 to 900 km altitude with broad peaks located at $\sim \pm 25^\circ$ to 40° MLAT. In this
69 paper, we study the uplift of neutral oxygen O atoms due to the ion-neutral drag force during an
70 1859-type superstorm. The possible satellite drag effects on Low Earth Orbiting (LEO) satellites
71 will be discussed.

72

73 **2. Change in neutral O atom densities due to ion-neutral drag**

74 When O^+ ions drift rapidly upwards through the neutral atmosphere (under the influence of an
75 $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}$ force associated with the PPEFs during an 1859-type superstorm), they exert an ion-neutral
76 drag force on the neutral atoms and will uplift them (Tsurutani et al., 2007). A simplified ion-
77 neutral momentum exchange is given by (Baron & Wand 1983; Kosch et al. 2001):

$$78 \quad \frac{\partial U}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{\tau_{in}} (V_d - U) \quad (1)$$

79 where U is the vertical speed of the neutral oxygen atom due to ion-neutral drag force, $V_d =$
80 $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B} / B^2$ is the O^+ vertical drift due to the $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}$ force, and τ_{in} is the ion-neutral coupling time
81 constant (Killeen et al. 1984) given by:

$$82 \quad \tau_{in} = \frac{n_o}{n_i \nu_{in}} \quad (2)$$

83 In Eq. (2), n_o is the neutral oxygen O atom density, n_i is the O^+ ion density, and ν_{in} is the ion-
84 neutral collision frequency.



85

86 Following Tsurutani et al. (2007), we calculate the ion-neutral coupling time, τ_{in} , for a
87 representative altitude of ~ 340 km. We obtain v_{in} from the expression given by Bailey & Balan
88 (1996), i.e., $v_{in} = 4.45 \times 10^{-11} \cdot n_o \cdot T^{1/2} \cdot (1.04 - 0.067 \log_{10} T)^2$, where T is average of the O and O⁺
89 temperatures. Using O and O⁺ temperatures of $\sim 10^3$ K and noon-time densities of $n_o = 1.1 \times 10^9$
90 cm^{-3} and $n_i = 3.5 \times 10^6 \text{cm}^{-3}$, we get $\tau_{in} \sim 5$ min.

91 Considering the initial (boundary) conditions at the reference altitude ($z \sim 340$ km) as $U = 0$ at t
92 $= 0$, the solution to Eq.(1) can be written as

$$93 \quad U = V_d [1 - \exp(-t/\tau_{in})] \quad (3)$$

94 The uplift of the neutrals will cause changes in their density with altitude, z . To first order, the
95 continuity equation for O can be written as:

96

$$97 \quad \frac{\partial n}{\partial t} + U \frac{\partial n_o}{\partial z} = 0 \quad (4)$$

98

99 On substituting U from Eq.(3) and integrating Eq.(4) with the boundary condition that $n = n_o$ at t
100 $= 0$, we get the change in neutral density as:

$$101 \quad \delta n = \frac{V_d}{H} [t - \tau_{in} (1 - \exp(-t/\tau_{in}))] \quad (5)$$

102

103 where $\delta n = (n - n_o)/n_o$, and $H = (\frac{1}{n_o} \frac{\partial n_o}{\partial z})^{-1}$ is the oxygen neutral scale height. Equation (5) implies
104 that neutral density time dependence at progressively higher altitude layers will be affected by
105 the arrival of neutrals uplifted from below due to the ion-neutral drag. We must emphasize that
106 Eq.(5) gives only the first-order estimates. Implicitly it is assumed that the pressure gradient and
107 gravity effects balance each other during the uplift. For more accurate estimates, one has to
108 consider the nonlinear coupling terms along with the inclusion of gravity, pressure gradients,



109 viscosity and the effects of heating and expansion during the uplift process. The decrease of the
110 ambient oxygen densities are also not taken into account in the above estimate. All of these will
111 have to be considered in a fully self consistent nonlinear code.

112

113 3. Satellite drag due to O⁺ and O enhanced fluxes during superstorms

114 Drag force per unit mass on a satellite moving through the Earth's atmosphere is given by
115 (Chopra 1961; Gaposchkin & Coster 1988; Moe & Moe 2005; Pardini et al. 2010; Li 2011):

$$116 \quad F = \frac{1}{2}C_D\left(\frac{A}{M}\right)(mn)V_s^2 + \frac{1}{2}C_{Di}\left(\frac{A}{M}\right)(m_i n_i)V_s^2 \quad (6)$$

117 where C_D represents the neutral drag coefficient due to impingement of O atoms on the satellite
118 surface and C_{Di} is the ion (Coulomb) drag coefficient due to scattering of O⁺ ions by the satellite
119 potential (a satellite moving in an ionized atmosphere acquires an electric charge mainly through
120 collisions with charged particles), m is the mass of neutral atom (O), and m_i is the mass of O⁺
121 ions, A is the satellite cross-section area perpendicular to the velocity vector, M the mass of the
122 satellite, and V_s is the satellite velocity with respect to the atmosphere. The drag coefficients C_D
123 and C_{Di} have been discussed theoretically and calculated from empirical observations of satellite
124 deceleration and other data by many workers (Chopra 1961; Cook 1965, 1966; Fournier 1970;
125 Gaposchkin & Coster 1988; Moe & Moe 2005; Moe et al. 1998; Pardini et al. 2010; Li 2011).
126 The information on the gas-surface interaction on the surface of the satellite and contamination
127 of the satellite surface due to the adsorbed atomic oxygen, are essential to accurately determine
128 the drag coefficients (Chopra 1961; Cook 1965, 1966; Pardini et al. 2010). Various studies
129 (Chopra 1961; Cook 1965, 1966; Pardini et al. 2010) show that for spherically- or cylindrically-
130 shaped satellites, the neutral drag coefficient C_D varies from ~ 2.0 to 2.8 between altitudes of $z =$
131 ~ 200 to 800 km with a most commonly used value of $C_D = 2$. In contrast the Coulomb drag
132 coefficient C_{Di} varies widely with altitude, e.g., $C_{Di} = 7 \times 10^{-5}$, 0.32 and 6.1 at $z = 250$, 500 and
133 800 km, respectively (Chopra, 1961; Li, 2011). The area to mass ratio of the satellite, A/M , can
134 have values of ~ 0.038 - 0.285 cm²/g, which obviously varies from satellite to satellite. A typical
135 value of a satellite payload is $A/M = 0.1$ cm²/g (Gaposchkin & Coster 1988; Pardini et al. 2010),
136 which we will use in our following calculations. A typical value for the LEO satellite speed with



137 respect to the atmosphere is $V_s \sim 7.5 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. Thus our calculations of n_o (O densities) during
138 superstorms can be used to calculate the drag force on LEO satellites by using Eq. (5).

139

140 In Table 1, for the super magnetic storm of 1-2 September 1859, we have given the estimates of
141 altitude, z , reached by uplifted O atoms from the integration of Eq. (3) (column 2), change in O
142 density from Eq. (5), δn (column 3), the Coulomb drag coefficient, C_{Di} extrapolated from the
143 values given by Chopra (1961) and Li (2011) (column 4), and the drag force per unit mass, F
144 calculated from Eq. (6) (column 5) for various values of time, t , after the application of 20 mV/m
145 PPEF in the equatorial ionosphere (with a constant $B_0 = 0.35 \times 10^{-4} \text{ T}$) (column 1). A constant
146 neutral drag coefficient $C_D = 2.0$, $V_s = 7.5 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, and $A/M = 0.1 \text{ cm}^2/\text{g}$ and for a scale height of
147 $H \sim 50 \text{ km}$ are assumed. The reference altitude is taken at $z = 340 \text{ km}$ with the oxygen atom (O)
148 mass density $mn_o = 2.94361 \times 10^{-14} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$. The background neutral O density is assumed to
149 decrease exponentially with altitude with a scale height of $H = 50 \text{ km}$. It is interesting to note
150 that in just 20 minutes ($t = 1200 \text{ s}$), the uplifted O atoms reach an altitude of $z = 856 \text{ km}$ from the
151 reference altitude of 340 km at $t = 0$. The drag force per unit mass on the satellite is $F = 0.0017$
152 cm s^{-2} at $z = 340 \text{ km}$ ($t = 0$) and it increases to $F = 0.0692 \text{ cm s}^{-2}$ at an altitude of $z = 856 \text{ km}$ ($t =$
153 1200 s), an increase of more than 40 times! As one can see from Column 4, the Coulomb drag
154 coefficient increases with altitude, therefore its contribution to F increases as O^+ ions and O
155 neutral atoms are uplifted by the action of PPEFs via the $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}$ force. We find that Coulomb drag
156 dominates over the neutral drag at altitudes above $\sim 750 \text{ km}$.

157 4. Conclusions

158 We have done preliminary estimates of the drag force per unit mass on typical low Earth orbiting
159 satellites moving through the ionosphere during super magnetic storms, like the Carrington 1-2
160 September 1859 event. A simple first-order model is employed to calculate the changes in
161 density of the neutral O atoms at different altitudes due to ion-neutral drag between the uplifted
162 O^+ ions and O neutral atoms. The uplifted O^+ ion speeds result from the $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}$ force from the
163 PPEFs. It should be noted that there is no expansion of the column of gas from 340 km to 850
164 km, rather the entire column of atmosphere is uplifted by the $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}$ force. There may be a slight
165 increase in the temperature of the O atoms due to the friction with O^+ ions. Consequently, as the



166 pressure remains the same or is slightly increased, it will more or less balance the gravity during
167 the first 20 minutes or so. Eventually, the nonlinear coupling, gravity, pressure gradients and
168 viscosity effects will dominate and will stop the uplift of the neutrals. Therefore, this simple
169 model may be reasonable for the first ~ 20 minutes after the onset of the PPEF in the ionosphere.

170 In this paper, we have not considered the effect of Joule heating in increasing the neutral
171 densities and temperatures during super magnetic storms. The Joule heating occurs in the
172 auroral regions, but it may come down to lower latitudes during superstorms. Therefore, the
173 effects due to Joule heating are important primarily at high latitudes initially, and such increases
174 are expected to manifest at equatorial latitudes after 2-3 hours or more. However our mechanism
175 will occur near the equator and at middle latitudes. At middle latitudes the two mechanisms
176 would most likely merge. Furthermore, it can be estimated that an increase in neutrals
177 temperature of 200 K, say from 800 to 1000 K, will cause a factor of 10 increase in the O
178 density at 850 km just by the scale height effect. A 400 degree increase in temperature would
179 increase the O density by a factor of 100 at 850 km. This is the same increase that is obtained
180 from our proposed mechanism. It should be remembered that the process of uplift of neutral O
181 atoms due to penetration electric fields during super magnetic storms occurs during the span of
182 20 minutes. In reality, an increase in the temperature of neutrals by 200 K to 400 K in 20 minutes
183 at equatorial latitudes by the Joule heating or any other process during magnetic storms has not
184 been observed.

185

186 It is shown that in just ~ 20 minutes after the action of a 20 mV/m PPEF in the equatorial
187 ionosphere, the neutral O atoms (and also O⁺ ions) are uplifted to an altitude of $z = 856$ km from
188 a reference level of $z = 340$ km. A typical spherically- or cylindrically- shaped satellite moving
189 through the ionosphere at altitudes of ~ 850 km would experience a 40 times more drag per unit
190 mass than normal. If larger IEFs associated with either superflares (see Maehara et al. 2012,
191 Tsurutani and Lakhina, 2014) or during extreme magnetic storms stronger than the Carrington
192 storm (Vasyliunas 2011, Lakhina and Tsurutani, 2016), are imposed on the magnetosphere then
193 larger scale PPEFs will be imposed on the dayside ionosphere with even greater O atom uplift.
194 We do not know when such cases can occur at the Earth, but we cannot exclude the possibility
195 at this time.



196

197 Acknowledgements: Portion of this work was done at NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory,
198 California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, USA. GSL thanks the Indian National Science
199 Academy for support under the Senior Scientist Scheme.

200

201 **References**

202 Appleton, E. V., Two anomalies in the ionosphere, *Nature*, 157, 691, 1946.

203 Bailey, G. J. and N. Balan, A low-latitude ionosphere-plasmasphere model, in *STEP: Handbook*
204 *of Ionospheric Models*, edited by Schunk, R. W., p. 173, Utah State Univ., Logan, Utah, 1996.

205

206 Baron, M. J. and R. H. Wand, F region ion temperature enhancements resulting from Joule
207 heating, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 88, 4114–4118, 1983.

208

209 Basu, S., Su. Basu, K. M. Groves, H.-C. Yeh, S.-Y. Su, F. J. Rich, P. J. Sultan., and M. J.
210 Keskinen, Response of the equatorial ionosphere in the south Atlantic region to the great
211 magnetic Storm of July 15, 2000, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 28(18), 3577–3580, 2001.

212

213 Basu, S., Su. Basu, F. J. Rich, K. M. Groves, E. MacKenzie, C. Coker, Y. Sahai, P. R. Fagundes,
214 and F. Becker-Guedes, Response of the equatorial ionosphere at dusk to penetration electric
215 fields during intense magnetic storms, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112, A08308,
216 doi:10.1029/2006JA012192, 2007.

217

218 Blanc, M. and A.D. Richmond, The ionospheric disturbance dynamo, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 86, 1669,
219 1980.

220 Chopra, K. P., Interactions of rapidly moving bodies in terrestrial atmosphere, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*
221 33,153–198, 1961.

222 Cook, G.E., Satellite drag coefficients, *Planet. Space Sci.* 13, 929–946, 1965.

223



- 224 Cook, G.E., Drag coefficients of spherical satellites, *Ann. Geophys.* 22, 53–64, 1966.
225
- 226 Echer, E., W. D. Gonzalez and B. T. Tsurutani, Interplanetary conditions leading to superintense
227 geomagnetic storms ($Dst < -250$ nT) during solar cycle 23, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 35, L06S03,
228 doi:10.1029/2007GL031755, 2008.
- 229 Foster, J. C., A. J. Coster, P. J. Erickson, F. J. Rich, and B. R. Sandel, Stormtime observations of
230 the flux of plasmaspheric ions to the dayside cusp/magnetopause, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 31,
231 L08809, doi:10.1029/2004GL020082, 2004.
232
- 233 Fournier, G., Electric drag, *Planet. Space Sci.*, Vol. 18, 1035 - 1041, 1970.
234
- 235 Fuller-Rowell, T. M., M. V. Codrescu, R. G. Roble and A. D. Richmond, How does the
236 thermosphere and ionosphere react to a geomagnetic storm?, in *Magnetic Storms*, AGU
237 Geophys. Mon. Ser., 98, edited by B.T. Tsurutani et al., 203, AGU, Wash. D.C., 1997.
- 238 Gonzalez, W. D., J. A. Joselyn, Y. Kamide, H. W. Kroehl, G. Rostoker, B. T. Tsurutani and V.
239 M. Vasylunas, What is a geomagnetic storm?, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 99, 5771, 1994.
- 240 Gaposchkin, E. M. and A. J. Coster, Analysis of Satellite Drag, *The Lincoln Laboratory*
241 *Journal*, vol.1, number 2, 203-224, 1988.
- 242 Heelis, R. A., J. J. Sojka, M. David and R.W. Schunk, Storm time density enhancements in the
243 middle-latitude dayside ionosphere, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 114, A03315, doi:10.1029/2008JA013690,
244 2009.
- 245 Huang, C.-S., J. C. Foster, L. P. Goncharenko, P. J. Erickson, W. Rideout, and A. J. Coster, A
246 strong positive phase of ionospheric storms observed by the Millstone Hill incoherent scatter
247 radar and global GPS network, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 110, A6, doi:10.1029/2004JA010865, 2005.
248
- 249 Huba, J. D., G. Joyce and J. A. Fedder, Sami2 is another model of the ionosphere (SAMI2): a
250 new low-latitude ionosphere model, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 105(A10), 23,035, 2000.
251



- 252 Huba, J. D., K. F. Dymond, G. Joyce, S. A. Budzien, S. E. Thonnard, J. A. Fedder and R. P.
253 McCoy, Comparison of O^+ density from ARGOS LORAAS data analysis and SAMI2 model
254 results, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 29, 7, 6-1, doi:10.1029/2001GL013089, 2002.
255
- 256 Immel, T. J., J. C. Foster, A. J. Coster, S. B. Mende, and H. U. Frey, Global storm time plasma
257 redistribution imaged from the ground and space, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 32, L03107,
258 doi:10.1029/2004GL021120, 2005.
259
- 260 Kelley, M. C., B. G. Fejer, and C. A. Gonzales, An explanation for anomalous equatorial
261 ionospheric electric field associated with a northward turning of the interplanetary magnetic
262 field, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 6(4), 301–304, 1979.
263
- 264 Kil, H., L. J. Paxton, X. Pi, M. R. Hairston, and Y. Zhang, Case study of the 15 July 2000
265 magnetic storm effects on the ionosphere-driver of the positive ionospheric storm in the winter
266 hemisphere, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 108(A11), 1391, doi:10.1029/2002JA009782, 2003.
267
- 268 Killeen, T. L., P. B. Hays, G. R. Carignan, R. A. Heelis, W. B. Hanson, N. W. Spencer, and L.
269 H. Brace, Ion-neutral coupling in the high-latitude F region: Evaluation of ion heating terms
270 from Dynamics Explorer 2, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 89, 7495–7508, 1984.
271
- 272 Kosch, M. J., K. Cierpka, M. T. Rietveld, T. Hagfors, and K. Schlegel, High-latitude ground-
273 based observations of the thermospheric ion-drag constant, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 28(7), 1395 –
274 1398, 2001.
275
- 276 Lakhina, G. S., S. Alex, B. T. Tsurutani and W. D. Gonzalez, Super magnetic storms: Hazard
277 to the Society, in AGU monograph on *Extreme Events and Natural Hazards: The Complexity*
278 *Perspective*, eds. A. S. Sharma, A. Bunde, V. P. Dimri, and D. N. Baker, AGU, Washington,
279 D.C., in press, 2012.
280
- 281 Lakhina, G. S. and B. T. Tsurutani, Geomagnetic storms: historical perspective to
282 modern view, *Geosci. Lett.*, 3:5. DOI 10.1186/s40562-016-0037-4, 2016.



283

284 Li, L.-S., Perturbation effect of the Coulomb drag on the orbital elements of the earth satellite
285 moving in the ionosphere, *Acta Astronautica*, 68, 717–721, 2011.

286

287 Lin, C. H., A. D. Richmond, R. A. Heelis, G. J. Bailey, G. Lu, J. Y. Liu, H. C. Yeh, and S.-Y.
288 Su, Theoretical study of the low- and midlatitude ionospheric electron density enhancement
289 during the October 2003 superstorm: Relative importance of the neutral wind and the electric
290 field, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 110, A12312, doi:10.1029/2005JA011304, 2005.

291

292 Maehara, H., T. Shibayama, S. Notsu, Y. Notsu, T. Nagao, S. Kusaba, S. Honda, D. Nogami, and
293 K. Shibata, Superflares on solar-type stars, *Nature*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature11063>, 2012.

294

295 Mannucci, A. J., B. T. Tsurutani, B. A. Iijima, A. Komjathy, A. Saito, W. D. Gonzalez, F. L.
296 Guarnieri, J. U. Kozyra and R. Skoug, Dayside global ionospheric response to the major
297 interplanetary events of October 29-30, 2003 “Halloween storms”, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 32,
298 L12S02, doi:10.1029/2004GL021467, 2005.

299 Mannucci, A. J., B.T. Tsurutani, M. A. Abdu, W. D. Gonzalez, A. Komjathy, E. Echer, B. A.
300 Iijima, G. Crowley and D. Anderson, Superposed epoch analysis of the dayside ionospheric
301 response to four intense geomagnetic storms, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, A00A02,
302 doi:10.1029/2007JA012732, 2008.

303 Mannucci, A. J., B. T. Tsurutani, M. C. Kelley, B. A. Iijima and A. Komjathy, Local time
304 dependence of the prompt ionospheric response to the 7, 9, and 10 November 2004 superstorms,
305 *J. Geophys. Res.*, 114, A10308, doi:10.1029/2009HA014043, 2009.

306 Maruyama, T., G. Ma, and M. Nakamura, Signature of TEC storm on 6 November 2001 derived
307 from dense GPS receiver network and ionosonde chain over Japan, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 109, A10,
308 doi:10.1029/2004JA010451, 2004.

309

310 Moe, K. and M. M. Moe, Gas–surface interactions and satellite drag coefficients, *Planet. Space*
311 *Sci.* 53, 793–801, 2005.

312



- 313 Moe, K., M. M. Moe, S. D. Wallace, Improved satellite drag coefficient calculations from
314 orbital measurements of energy accommodation. *J. Spacecraft Rockets* 35, 266–272, 1998.
315
- 316 Namba, S. and K. -I. Maeda, *Radio Wave Propagation*, 86 pp., Corona, Tokyo, 1939.
- 317 Nishida, A., Coherence of geomagnetic DP2 fluctuations with interplanetary magnetic variations,
318 *J. Geophys. Res.*, 73, 5549–5559, 1968.
319
- 320 Obayashi, T., The interaction of solar plasma with geomagnetic field, disturbed condition, in:
321 *Solar Terrestrial Physics*, 107, edited by J. W. King and W. S. Newman, Acad. Press., London,
322 1967.
- 323 Pardini, C., L. Anselmo, K. Moe, and M. M. Moe, Drag and energy accommodation
324 coefficients during sunspot maximum, *Adv. Space Res.*, 45, 638–650, 2010.
- 325 Rishbeth, H., R. A. Heelis, J. J. Makela and S. Basu, Storming the Bastille: the effect of electric
326 fields on the ionospheric F-layer, *Ann. Geophys.*, 28, 977, 2010.
- 327 Sahai, Y., P. R. Fagundes, F. Becker-Guedes, M. J. A. Bolzan, J. R. Abalde, V. G. Pillat, R. de
328 Jesus, W. L. C. Lima, G. Crowley, K. Shiokawa, J. W. MacDougall, H. T. Lan, K. Igarashi,
329 and J. A. Bittencourt, Effects of the major geomagnetic storms of October 2003 on the
330 equatorial and low-latitude F region in two longitudinal sectors, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 110, A12,
331 doi:10.1029/2004JA010999, 2005.
- 332 Tsurutani, B. T., W. D. Gonzalez, F. Tang, and Y. T. Lee, Great magnetic storms, *Geophys. Res.*
333 *Lett.*, 19, 73, 1992.
334
- 335 Tsurutani, B. T., W. D. Gonzalez, G. S. Lakhina and S. Alex, The extreme magnetic storm of 1-2
336 September 1859, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 108, A7, doi:10.1029/2002JA009504, 2003.
- 337 Tsurutani, B.T., A. J. Mannucci, B. Iijima, M. A. Abdu, J. H. A. Sobral, W. D. Gonzalez, F.
338 Guarnieri, T. Tsuda, A. Saito, K. Yumoto, B. Fejer, T. J. Fuller-Rowell, J. Kozyra, J. C. Foster,
339 A. Coster and V. M. Vasyliunas, Global dayside ionospheric uplift and enhancement associated



- 340 with interplanetary electric fields, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *109*, A08302, doi:10.1029/2003JA010342,
341 2004.
- 342 Tsurutani, B.T., D. L. Judge, F. L. Guarnieri, P. Gangopadhyay, A. R. Jones, J. Nuttall, G. A.
343 Zambon, L. Kidkovsky, A. J. Mannucci, B. Iijima, R. R. Meier, T. J. Immel, T. N. Woods, S.
344 Prasad, L. Floyd, J. Huba, S. C. Solomon, P. Straus and R. Viereck, The October 28, 2003
345 extreme EUV solar flare and resultant extreme ionospheric effects: Comparison to other
346 Halloween events and the Bastille Day event, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *32*, L03S09,
347 doi:10.1029/2004GL021475, 2005.
- 348 Tsurutani, B. T., O. P. Verkhoglyadova, A. J. Mannucci, T. Araki, A. Saito, T. Tsuda, and K.
349 Yumoto, Oxygen ion uplift and satellite drag effects during the 30 October 2003 daytime
350 superfountain event, *Ann. Geophys.*, *25*, 569, 2007.
- 351
- 352 Tsurutani, B. T., O. P. Verkhoglyadova, A. J. Mannucci, A. Saito, T. Araki, K. Yumoto, T.
353 Tsuda, M. A. Abdu, J. H. A. Sobral, W. D. Gonzalez, H. McCreadie, G. S. Lakhina, and V. M.
354 Vasyliunas, Prompt penetration electric fields (PPEFs) and their ionospheric effects during the
355 great magnetic storm of 30-31 October 2003, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *113*, A05311,
356 doi:10.1029/2007JA012879, 2008.
- 357 Tsurutani, B. T., O. P. Verkhoglyadova, A. J. Mannucci, G. S. Lakhina and J. D. Huba, Extreme
358 changes in the dayside ionosphere during a Carrington-type magnetic storm, *J. Space Weather*
359 *Space Clim.*, *2*, A05, DOI: 10.1051/swsc/2012004, 2012.
- 360
- 361 Tsurutani, B. T., and G. S. Lakhina, An extreme coronal mass ejection and consequences for
362 the magnetosphere and Earth, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *41*, doi:10.1002/2013GL058825, 2014.
- 363 Vasyliunas V M, The largest imaginable magnetic storm. *J Atm Sol Terr Phys* 73:1444.
364 doi:10.1016/j.jastp.2010.05.012, 2011.
- 365
- 366 Verkhoglyadova, O. P., B. T. Tsurutani and A. J. Mannucci, Modeling of time development of
367 TEC variations during a superstorm event, edited by A. Bhardwaj and M. Duldig, *Adv. Geosci.*,
368 112, 2007.



369

370 Verkhoglyadova, O. P., B. T. Tsurutani, A. J. Mannucci, A. Saito, T. Araki, D. Anderson, M.
 371 Abdu and J. H. A. Sobral, Simulation of PPEF effects in dayside low-latitude ionosphere for the
 372 October 30, 2003 superstorm, in *Midlatitude Ionospheric Dynamics and Disturbances*, Geophys.
 373 Mon. Ser. 181, edited by P. Kintner et al., AGU, Wash. D.C., 169, 2008.

374 Yin, P., C. N. Mitchell, P. S. J. Spencer, and J. C. Foster, Ionospheric electron concentration
 375 imaging using GPS over the USA during the storm of July 2000, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 31,
 376 L12806, doi:10.1029/2004GL019899, 2004.

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385 Table 1: Estimates of the altitude, z , attained by uplifted O atoms, relative change in O density,
 386 δn , Coulomb drag coefficient (extrapolated from Chopra (1961) and Li (2011)), C_{Di} , drag force
 387 per unit mass on satellite, F , at different times, t , after the onset of a PPEF of 20 mV/m in a
 388 Carrington (1-2 September 1859) super magnetic storm. The reference altitude is taken at $z =$
 389 340 km with the Earth's magnetic field, $B_0 = 0.35 \times 10^{-4}$ T, and the oxygen atom (O) mass density
 390 $m_{n_o} = 2.94361 \times 10^{-14}$ g cm⁻³. The background neutral O density is assumed to decrease
 391 exponentially with altitude with a scale height of $H = 50$ km. The other parameters are: neutral
 392 drag coefficient $C_D = 2.0$, $V_s = 7.5$ km s⁻¹, and area to mass ratio of satellite, $A/M = 0.1$ cm²/g,
 393 and the scale height, $H = 50$ km.

t = time after onset of PPEFs, in s	z = altitude attained, in km	δn = change in O density	C_{Di} = Coulomb drag coefficient	F = drag force per unit mass, in cm s ⁻²
0	340	0	0.01	0.0017
300	402	1.26	0.15	0.0028
600	534	3.88	0.32	0.0075
900	690	7.01	1.43	0.0199
1200	856	10.32	6.1	0.0692

394