



Multi-instrument view on solar eruptive events observed with the Siberian Radioheliograph: From detection of small jets up to development of a shock wave and CME

V.V. Grechnev, S.V. Lesovoi*, A.A. Kochanov, A.M. Uralov, A.T. Altyntsev, A.V. Gubin, D.A. Zhdanov, E.F. Ivanov, G.Ya. Smolkov, L.K. Kashapova

Institute of Solar-Terrestrial Physics, Irkutsk, Russia

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Coronal mass ejections
Instrumentation and data management
Prominences
Radio bursts
Surges
Shock waves

ABSTRACT

The first 48-antenna stage of the Siberian Radioheliograph (SRH) started single-frequency test observations early in 2016, and since August 2016 it routinely observes the Sun at several frequencies in the 4–8 GHz range with an angular resolution of 1–2 arc minutes and an imaging interval of about 12 s. With limited opportunities of the incomplete antenna configuration, a high sensitivity of about 100 Jy allows the SRH to contribute to the studies of eruptive phenomena along three lines. First, some eruptions are directly visible in SRH images. Second, some small eruptions are detectable even without a detailed imaging information from microwave depressions caused by screening the background emission by cool erupted plasma. Third, SRH observations reveal new aspects of some events to be studied with different instruments. We focus on an eruptive C2.2 flare on 16 March 2016 around 06:40, one of the first flares observed by the SRH. Proceeding from SRH observations, we analyze this event using extreme-ultraviolet, hard X-ray, white-light, and metric radio data. An eruptive prominence expanded, brightened, and twisted, which indicates a time-extended process of the flux-rope formation together with the development of a large coronal mass ejection (CME). The observations rule out a passive role of the prominence in the CME formation. The abrupt prominence eruption impulsively excited a blast-wave-like shock, which appeared during the microwave burst and was manifested in an “EUV wave” and Type II radio burst. The shock wave decayed and did not transform into a bow shock because of the low speed of the CME. Nevertheless, this event produced a clear proton enhancement near Earth. Comparison with our previous studies of several events confirms that the impulsive-piston shock-excitation scenario is typical of various events.

1. Introduction

Solar flares, coronal mass ejections (CMEs), associated shock waves, and related phenomena are known as causes of space weather disturbances. Hard electromagnetic emissions and energetic particles pose hazard to space-borne equipment, astronauts on spacecraft, and even crew members and passengers on aircraft that carry out transoceanic flights entering high latitudes. CME-associated shock waves travel over large distances in the heliosphere, being responsible for the geomagnetic storm sudden commencement (SSC). Magnetic structures of CMEs hitting the Earth's magnetosphere can cause strong geomagnetic storms.

In spite of a certain space weather impact, the origin and interrelation of solar eruptive phenomena are still not quite clear. Comprehending solar eruptions is hampered by observational difficulties. The existing concepts are mostly based on the hypotheses that

were proposed several decades ago and back-extrapolated results of in-situ measurements in near-Earth space.

According to a widely accepted view, the main driver of a solar eruption is a magnetic flux rope. It is considered as the active structure of a CME that governs its development and subsequent expansion. The flux rope is traditionally assumed to be associated with the CME cavity. Prominences (filaments) or associated structures appear to be among the most probable flux-rope progenitors (Gibson, 2015). However, genesis of flux ropes, their size range, and other properties are not clear so far. According to some concepts, the flux rope pre-exists before the eruption onset (Chen, 1989, 1996; Cheng et al., 2013). Different concepts relate the flux-rope formation to reconnection processes, which are also responsible for solar flares (Inhester et al., 1992; Longcope and Beveridge, 2007; Qiu et al., 2007).

There is no consensus about coronal shock waves. Some authors advocate flare-ignited blast waves at least in some events (Magdalenic

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: svlesovoi@gmail.com (S.V. Lesovoi).

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8139289>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/8139289>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)