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ABSTRACT

Electron density deviations from a basic variation with the solar zenith angle are investigated. A model study has been conducted in which the effects of changes in neutral and relative densities of atomic and molecular oxygen on calculated electron densities have been compared with incoherent scatter measurements in the height range 100-117 km at Arecibo, Puerto Rico. The feasibility of determining tides in the neutral atmosphere from electron density profiles was studied. It was determined that variations in phase between the density and temperature variation and the comparable magnitudes of their components makes it appear improbable that the useful information on tidal modes can be obtained in this way.
CHAPTER I

GENERAL STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

1.1 E-Region Morphology

Appleton (1953) discussed the differences in time between the maximum of ionization and the maximum of production in terms of the "sluggishness" of the E-region. Researchers (Mitra, 1958; Appleton and Lyon, 1961; and Palluconi, 1963) attempted to determine the recombination rate, $\alpha$, of the E-region by observing asymmetries about noon in foE using the charge continuity equation. The lag or sometimes lead value $\tau$ was employed. While many attempts were made to calculate recombination rates in this way it became apparent with modern laboratory measurements (Biondi, 1964) that the time constants were too small to account for the effect and that the explanation of the phase differences must be elsewhere.

Monro, Nisbet and Stick (1976) in the first part of the present study demonstrated that local noon asymmetries in the E-region electron density were caused by tides in temperature, density, and winds as measured by incoherent scatter. They demonstrated that the effect of the semidiurnal tide on the atomic and molecular oxygen densities may also be an important factor in explaining E-region asymmetries.

These studies can only be done at a very few locations none of which are in the southern hemisphere. The global tidal variations are extremely important in determining the mode structure and
wider geographical coverage is necessary before the tidal morphology can be resolved. The tidal variations in the lower thermosphere have been shown to be very variable (Wand and Perkins, 1970; Salah and Wand, 1974; and Fellous et al., 1975) and thus a long series of observations is desirable. It, therefore seemed important to reexamine the studies that had been made of E-region changes to determine to what extent the data can now be used to study the tides. A complete analysis of the electron density at fixed heights is necessary to determine morphology of the tidal system. Some indication may, however, be determined from the one parameter that has been extensively studied, \( \tau \), the difference in time between the minimum solar zenith angle and the maximum electron density. Palluconi (1963) has shown that \( \tau \) varies with latitude such that it is generally negative for equatorial stations becoming positive at 20° and reaching a peak at 40°. The value of \( \tau \) is generally symmetric about the equator during equinox with a shift in the minimum from the equator toward the winter pole during solstice. The general seasonal response for high latitude stations is a maximum value of \( \tau \) in the summer with a minimum in the winter and generally a negative value throughout the year for equatorial stations. Since the number of southern hemisphere stations is minimal it is not possible to conclude with great certainty the tidal effects simultaneously in both hemispheres from previous studies. Data is available in the World Data Center for several years that could, however, be analyzed.
1.2 Solar Fluxes

The solar wavelengths of importance in photoionizing the E-region have been reviewed by Rishbeth and Garriott (1969) and Banks and Kockarts (1973). X-rays from 8 to 140 \( \text{Å} \) are important in ionizing the three major constituents, molecular nitrogen and atomic and molecular oxygen in the lower E-region, particularly in times of enhanced solar activity. The EUV flux from 140 to 786 \( \text{Å} \) is important in ionizing molecular nitrogen and atomic oxygen in the upper E-region. Wavelengths from 786 \( \text{Å} \) to 1027 \( \text{Å} \) are important with molecular nitrogen being ionized up to 796 \( \text{Å} \), atomic oxygen up to 911 \( \text{Å} \) and molecular oxygen up to 1027 \( \text{Å} \) including Lyman \( \beta \).

Nitric oxide is a very minor constituent in the upper atmosphere however as was shown by Nicolet and Aitkin (1959) it is of importance in the D-region and lower E-region because of its ability to be photoionized up to 1340 \( \text{Å} \) which includes H Lyman \( \alpha \).

Donnelly and Pope (1973) compiled the results of different solar flux measurements and normalized them to a 10.7 cm flux of \( 150 \times 10^{-22} \text{ Wm}^{-2} \text{ Hz}^{-1} \) at 1 AU. Their solar flux model includes wavelengths of 1 to 3000 \( \text{Å} \). As shown by Hall and Hinteregger (1970) care must be used when applying a flux model for a different 10.7 cm flux value then for the measurement conditions. Table 1 shows the solar flux values of Hinteregger et al., (1965) for low solar activity, \( \Phi_{\text{HHS}} \), and of Donnelly and Pope (1973) for medium solar activity, \( \Phi_{\text{DP}} \).

Variations in EUV spectral lines over one solar rotation period of 27 days have been reported by Hall and Hinteregger (1970).
Table 1: Absorption Cross Sections, Photoionization Yields and Assumed Photon Fluxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>( \lambda ) ( \mathrm{\AA} )</th>
<th>( \sigma / 10^{-18} \text{cm}^2 )</th>
<th>Photoionization Yields</th>
<th>Photon Fluxes ( \Phi/10^9 \text{Ph-cm}^{-2}\text{-sec}^{-1} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( \text{O} ) ( \text{O}_2 ) ( \text{N}_2 ) ( \text{O} ) ( \text{O}<em>2 ) ( \text{N}<em>2 ) ( \Phi</em>{\text{HHS}} ) ( \Phi</em>{\text{DP}} )</td>
<td>( \lambda_{\text{DP}} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15-10</td>
<td>.135 \ .27 \ .15 \ 16.7 \ 16.7 \ 18.9 \ .0005 \ .0092</td>
<td>16-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.8-15</td>
<td>.35 \ 7 \ .36 \ 12.4 \ 12.4 \ 13.8 \ .003 \ .015</td>
<td>23.3-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>31-22.8</td>
<td>.045 \ .09 \ 1.0 \ 10.1 \ 10.1 \ 12.8 \ .005</td>
<td>31-23.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>41-31</td>
<td>.1 \ 2 \ .07 \ 8.4 \ 8.4 \ 9.4 \ .02</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>40-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50-41</td>
<td>.17 \ .34 \ .14 \ 6.7 \ 6.7 \ 7.6 \ .03</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>50-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>60-50</td>
<td>.27 \ .54 \ .22 \ 6.7 \ 6.7 \ 7.6 \ .068</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>60-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>70-60</td>
<td>.35 \ .7 \ .32 \ 4.8 \ 4.8 \ 5.4 \ .08</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>70-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>80-70</td>
<td>.45 \ .9 \ .42 \ 4.8 \ 4.8 \ 5.4 \ .08</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>80-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>90-80</td>
<td>.5 \ 1.0 \ .4 \ 4.2 \ 4.2 \ 4.8 \ .1</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>90-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>103-90</td>
<td>.9 \ 1.8 \ .7 \ 3.7 \ 3.7 \ 4.2 \ .13</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>100-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>139-103</td>
<td>1.1 \ 2.2 \ .9 \ 2.9 \ 2.9 \ 3.3 \ .304</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>140-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>165-138</td>
<td>2.1 \ 4.2 \ 1.4 \ 2.3 \ 2.3 \ 2.6 \ .6</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>170-140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>180-165</td>
<td>2.9 \ 5.7 \ 1.9 \ 2.0 \ 2.0 \ 2.3 \ .5</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>180-170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>190-180</td>
<td>3.9 \ 6.8 \ 2.2 \ 1.9 \ 1.9 \ 2.1 \ 2.2</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>190-180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>205-190</td>
<td>4.0 \ 8.0 \ 2.4 \ 1.8 \ 1.8 \ 2.0 \ 1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>210-190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>220-205</td>
<td>4.7 \ 9.4 \ 2.2 \ 1.6 \ 1.6 \ 1.6 \ 1.55</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>220-210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>240-220</td>
<td>5.6 \ 11.2 \ 3.1 \ 1.2 \ 1.2 \ 1.2 \ .85</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>240-220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>260-240</td>
<td>6.7 \ 13.4 \ 3.6 \ 1.2 \ 1.2 \ 1.2 \ 1.3</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>260-240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>256.3-257</td>
<td>7.2 \ 14.4 \ 3.8 \ 1.2 \ 1.2 \ 1.2 \ .40</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>256.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>280-260</td>
<td>8.0 \ 16.0 \ 4.2 \ 1.0 \ 1.0 \ 1.0 \ 1.4</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>280-260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>810-796</td>
<td>3.3 \ 40.0 \ 6.7 \ 1.0 \ 2.4 \ 0.0 \ .2</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>810-796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>840-810</td>
<td>3.2 \ 26.0 \ 3.3 \ 1.0 \ .38</td>
<td>0.0 \ .78</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>832-835</td>
<td>3.2 \ 13.5 \ 11.1 \ 1.0</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>860-840</td>
<td>3.1 \ 11.7 \ 5.0 \ 1.0</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>890-860</td>
<td>2.9 \ 8.9 \ 5.0 \ 1.0</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>911-890</td>
<td>2.7 \ 9.3 \ 4.3 \ 1.0</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>920-911</td>
<td>0.0 \ 7.4 \ 3.8 \ 0.0</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Absorption Cross Sections, Photoionization Yields and Assumed Photon Fluxes (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>λ Å</th>
<th>( \sigma \times 10^{-18} \text{ cm}^2 )</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O₂</th>
<th>N₂</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O₂</th>
<th>N₂</th>
<th>( \Phi_{\text{HHS}} ) ( \Phi \times 10^9 \text{ Ph cm}^{-2} \text{ sec}^{-1} )</th>
<th>( \lambda_{\text{DP}} )</th>
<th>( \lambda_{\text{DP}} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>950-920</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>950-920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>937.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>937.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>949.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>949.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>972.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>250.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>972.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>977.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>991.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>991.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1025.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1025.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1215.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>300.</td>
<td>310.</td>
<td>1215.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
compared with the 10.7 cm flux which ranged from $100 - 200 \times 10^{-22}$ Wm$^{-2}$ Hz$^{-1}$. The ratio of the fluxes 284 $\ensuremath{\AA}$ to 304 $\ensuremath{\AA}$ was shown to increase by 200 per cent as the 10.7 cm flux increased from 100 to $200 \times 10^{-22}$ Wm$^{-2}$ Hz$^{-1}$. The combined fluxes of 1025 A$^0$, 977 R, 584 R and 304 R increased by 70 per cent as the 10.7 cm flux increased from 60 to $160 \times 10^{-22}$ Wm$^{-2}$ Hz$^{-1}$.

A discrepancy has been shown to exist between the results of ion densities calculated using current neutral atmospheric models and photochemistry with the fluxes of Hinteregger (1970) and observations of ionosphere parameters. Swartz and Nisbet (1973) comparing profiles of energy input and loss with similar profiles of ion production and loss concluded that the EUV fluxes needed to be multiplied by a factor of two. Mitra et al., (1974) found the fluxes of soft x-rays to be incompatible with the observations of electron density and the ratio of \([\text{NO}] / [\text{O}^+]\) in the altitude range of 90 to 130 km. It was shown that an increase by a factor of three for the soft x-rays is needed to reconcile calculations and observations. Hercoux et al., (1974) modeled the region of 110 to 300 km and found an electron density that was generally low by 30 per cent compared with an electron density profile derived from an ionogram. They concluded that the error was probably in the density measurements. Nisbet (1975) showed that a general doubling of the flux would increase the electron densities to match the experimental values. Heroux et al., (1975) replied that while a doubling of the flux would help at the lower altitudes the increase at the upper altitudes would be too great. Donahue et al., (1973) and Monro, Nisbet and Stick (1976) have
shown that the atomic oxygen is very variable and can differ greatly from models such as CIRA 1972. It is difficult to obtain absolute values for solar fluxes corresponding to given solar conditions. The discrepancies appear to be greater under high solar conditions than for low activity (Miller and Nisbet, 1974). All of these factors contribute to making such comparisons difficult.

Ionization cross sections were reviewed by Ohshio et al., (1966). The absorption cross section along with the photoionization yield for the major E-region neutrals, N\textsubscript{2}, O\textsubscript{2} and O corresponding to different regions of the EUV and x-ray spectrum are listed in Table 1. Swider (1969) described the production of secondaries by x-rays as a function of the total production, the density of the constituents and the wavelength intervals. The total ion-electron pair production rate $q$ was shown to be distributed among the different ions according to the ratio 0.62 : 0.17 : 0.14 : 0.07 : 1.00 for $q(N_2^+) : q(O_2^+) : q(N^+) : q(O^+) : q_{total}$.

1.3 E-Region Tides

Absorption of solar energy by ozone in the strato-mesosphere causes waves to propagate into the thermosphere. Chapman and Lindzen (1970) modeled the atmosphere and derived variations in temperature, wind and density in terms of altitude, latitude and local time. Richmond (1971) included dissipative effects which resulted in a dampening of the diurnal (1, 1) mode above 105 km while the semidiurnal modes were free to propagate through the region. Bernard and Spizzichino (1971) using incoherent scatter techniques were able to show that the semidiurnal tide dominated
both wind and temperature oscillations above 100 km. At altitudes below 100 km the diurnal tide, the semidiurnal tide and gravity waves have comparable amounts of energy. Salah (1974) observed a dominant semidiurnal tide in the lower thermosphere in both temperature and meridional winds corresponding to the (2, 4) model. Lindzen and Hong (1974) developed a program which showed a great amount of mode coupling between the main semidiurnal mode (2, 2) and higher modes which results in higher modes of the semidiurnal tide dominating above 100 km and a reduction in the amplitude of the (2, 2) mode.

Salah et al., (1975) discussed results from three incoherent scatter stations for the lower E-region. A good agreement in both magnitude and phase of the average semidiurnal tides was found for Millstone Hill and St. Santin. The tide was identified as a (2, 4) mode. The oscillations at Arecibo were dominated by the semidiurnal tide however great variability in phase was observed. The implications of simultaneous experiments at the three stations are that the E-region is controlled by local effects.

Seasonal variations of the tides were observed by Salah and Wand (1974) for Millstone Hill and St. Santin revealing a smaller amplitude in the semidiurnal tide during the winter than during the summer or equinox due to a larger phase variability in the winter.

Salah (1974) using incoherent scatter data showed the neutral density variations to be semidiurnal and in phase with the temperature at the lower E-region altitudes. The variations for the neutral density were of the order of a factor of two while temperature varied by 11 per cent.
Mayr and Volland (1972) used a neutral atmospheric model to predict that the atomic oxygen density would vary diurnally with a maximum shifted toward early morning by the zonal wind and toward later afternoon by vertical diffusion in the daytime. The net result is a maximum at 1030 local solar time. Alcayde et al., (1972) using measurements of satellite drag and incoherent scatter show atomic oxygen variations at 120 km, extrapolated down from higher altitudes, to have a dominant diurnal mode with a superimposed semidiurnal mode. There are maximums at 900 and 1500 hours with a minimum at 1200. The ratio of maximum to minimum is approximately 1.5. Danilov (1972) using rocket mass spectrometer data derived a model of atomic oxygen starting at 130 km for low, moderate and high solar activity. For all three solar conditions the model shows a diurnal variation in atomic oxygen with a maximum at 1300 hours. During moderate activity a ratio of two is reported for maximum to minimum density at 130 km. Offerman (1974) using rocket measurements finds a maximum in molecular nitrogen to occur at 1400 hours at 150 km. Molecular oxygen was found to have a diurnal variation with a maximum at 900 to 1000 hours with a 20 per cent variation.

1.4 Ion Chemistry

The major neutral constituents photoionized in the E-region are $N_2$, $O_2$ and $O$. Nitric oxide ionized by H Lyman $\alpha$ is also of importance. The photochemistry of the E-region has been reviewed by Biondi (1969), Bortner et al., (1972) and Ferguson (1974). The rates used in this work have been determined from a review of current
literature. They are presented in Table 2.

1.5 Sporadic E and Tides

Whitehead (1961) explained sporadic-E formation as being due to vertical wind shears in the horizontal neutral winds. Whitehead (1967) elaborated on his original explanation by demonstrating that the existence of a second ion with a smaller recombination rate, such as a metallic ion, could explain the general shape of the sporadic-E layer. The theory showed that the vertical wind shear of the zonal wind was more important than that of the meridional in the lower E-region for forming a sporadic-E layer.

Wright et al., (1967) observed neutral winds from visible trails of gun launched vehicles in conjunction with radio soundings of the sporadic-E layer. Their results show that sporadic-E occurs where the vertical ion movements converge. The wind profile was observed to descend at the rate of two vertical wavelengths in 24 hours.

MacDougall (1974) used the theory of wind shear to determine characteristics of the neutral zonal winds in the lower E-region from ionogram measurements of the sporadic-E layer altitude and its descent with time. He assumed that the sporadic-E layer formed where the neutral wind above had a westward direction and the wind below an eastward direction for layers existing below 115 km. Above about 120 km the vertical shear in the north-south neutral wind determined the convergence of ionization. The ionogram data on the sporadic-E layer height evolution revealed three general patterns;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Rate Constant</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$N_2^+ + NO \rightarrow NO^+ + N_2$</td>
<td>$3.3 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
<td>Fehsenfeld et al., (1970)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_2^+ + e \rightarrow N + N(2D)$</td>
<td>$1.8 \times 10^{-7} \left( \frac{300}{T} \right)^{3.9}$</td>
<td>Mehr and Biondi (1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N^+ + O_2 \rightarrow NO^+ + O$</td>
<td>$3 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
<td>Lindinger et al., (1974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N^+ + O_2 \rightarrow O_2^+ + N(2D)$</td>
<td>$3 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
<td>Lindinger et al., (1974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N^+ + O \rightarrow O^+ + N$</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^{-12}$</td>
<td>Bortner et al., (1972)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N^+ + NO \rightarrow NO^+ + N$</td>
<td>$8 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
<td>Goldan et al., (1966)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N^+ + e \rightarrow N + h\nu$</td>
<td>$2.4 \times 10^{-10} T^{-0.7}$</td>
<td>Biondi (1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Rate Equation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) ( \text{O}^+ + \text{N}_2 \rightarrow \text{NO}^+ + \text{N} )</td>
<td>( 6 \times 10^{-13} \frac{600}{T} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) ( \text{O}^+ + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{O}_2^+ + \text{O} )</td>
<td>( 2 \times 10^{-11} \left( \frac{300}{T} \right)^{1/2} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) ( \text{O}^+ + \text{NO} \rightarrow \text{NO}^+ + \text{O} )</td>
<td>(&lt; 1.3 \times 10^{-13} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) ( \text{O}^+ + \text{e} \rightarrow \text{O} + \text{h} \nu )</td>
<td>( 2.4 \times 10^{-10} \left( T_e \right)^{-0.7} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) ( \text{O}_2^+ + \text{NO} \rightarrow \text{NO}^+ + \text{O}_2 )</td>
<td>( 4.4 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) ( \text{O}_2^+ + \text{N}_2 \rightarrow \text{NO}^+ + \text{NO} )</td>
<td>(&lt; 1 \times 10^{-15} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) ( \text{O}_2^+ + \text{e} \rightarrow \text{O} + \text{O}(^1\text{D}) )</td>
<td>( 1.95 \times 10^{-7} \left( \frac{300}{T_e} \right)^{0.7} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) ( \text{NO}^+ + \text{e} \rightarrow \text{N} + \text{O} )</td>
<td>( 4.6 \times 10^{-7} \left( \frac{300}{T} \right)^{0.2} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) ( \text{N}_2^+ + \text{O} \rightarrow \text{NO}^+ + \text{N}(^2\text{D}) )</td>
<td>( 1.4 \times 10^{-10} \left( \frac{300}{T} \right)^{0.44} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) ( \text{N}_2^+ + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{O}_2^+ + \text{N}_2 )</td>
<td>( 5 \times 10^{-11} \left( \frac{300}{T} \right)^{0.8} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) ( \text{N}_2^+ + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{NO}^+ + \text{NO} )</td>
<td>(&lt; 3.0 \times 10^{-14} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Chemical Reaction Rates**

- Lindinger et al., (1974)
- Lindinger et al., (1974)
- McFarland et al., (1974b)
- Biondi (1969)
- Lindinger et al., (1975)
- Ferguson (1974)
- Mehr and Biondi (1969)
- Biondi (1969)
- McFarland et al., (1974a)
- McFarland et al., (1973)
- Warneck (1967)
a semidiurnal, a diurnal, and a steady wind component. The semi-
diurnal wind component predominated in the middle latitudes while
being sparse in the equatorial zone and at high latitudes. The results
indicated a mixture of several semidiurnal modes. The semidiurnal
components were found to be in good agreement with that of Bernard
and Spizzichino (1971). The diurnal component was found mainly for
equatorial stations and weak in the middle latitudes. The steady
wind component was observed to be generally eastward in a band of
± 10° of the equator and generally westward in the region of 10° - 30°
from the equator.

Harper et al., (1975) found the sporadic-E layer to move in
accord with the convergence node in the vertical ion motion. Above
124 km the derived wind in the north-south direction had a node
near the sporadic-E layer with a poleward wind above and an equatorial
wind below.

Nighttime E-region ionization sources have been reported
by Young et al., (1971), Fujitaka et al., (1971), Johnson (1972) and
Strobel (1974) to be primarily H Lyman & interplanetary emission
of He I 504 ˚ and He II 304 ˚, starlight from 1026 to 910 ˚ and a
minor contribution from H Lyman a. Fujitaka et al., (1971) observed
peak electron density layers in conjunction with rocket measurements
of vertical ion velocity. The layers of peak density were found to
occur where the ions converged. The points of convergence were
found to descend throughout the night. Geller et al., (1975) using
nighttime rocket measurements of electron density in the continuity
equation were able to reconstruct the vertical ion drifts. The drift
velocity was a function of the shape of the enhanced ionization layer. The ion drift so determined indicated a tidal wind of the (2, 4) mode.

1.6 Specific Statements of the Problem

1. To investigate the effects of variations in neutral density, vertical ion velocity and temperature on the E-region electron density profiles and to determine the importance of each in making midlatitude electron density models.

2. To study effects of tides in the E-region on the electron densities and to examine the feasibility of determining tidal information from electron density profiles.

3. To compare measured solar fluxes and electron ion densities with that of a model and to examine causes of any discrepancies found.
CHAPTER II

E-REGION MODEL

2.1 Neutral Model Atmosphere

The E-region is considered to be that part of the ionosphere immediately above the turbopause and therefore its major neutral constituents may be assumed to follow a molecular diffusion profile. As such the altitude profiles of the major constituents O, O₂ and N₂ are determined by the individual scale heights

\[ H_i = \frac{kT}{m_i g} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.1)

where

\( k \) is Boltzmann's constant
\( T \) is the neutral temperature
\( g \) is the acceleration due to gravity
\( m_i \) is the molecular weight of the \( i^{th} \) constituent

having the height relation for element \( n_i \)

\[ n_i(z) = n_{i_0} \frac{T_0}{T(z)} \exp \left[ - \int_{z_0}^{z} \frac{dz}{H_i(z)} \right] \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.2)

where \( n_{i_0} \) and \( T_0 \) are the number density and temperature respectively of constituent \( i \) at altitude \( z_0 \) and \( T(z) \) is the temperature at altitude \( z \).

For the initial model it was assumed that the relative densities of O, O₂ and N₂ at each height was as given in CIRA (1972). The density
of the minor constituent nitric oxide was taken to be the model values reported by Meira (1971). These were in some cases modified as will be described later. The total amount of any one constituent above the considered altitude can be approximated by

\[ \int_{0}^{\infty} n_i \, dz = n_i \, H_i \quad (2.3) \]

Values of ion collision frequency and ion temperature were obtained by analyzing the incoherent scatter data from Arecibo, Puerto Rico for the six altitudes 100, 104, 107, 110, 114 and 117 km. The total neutral density was derived from the ion collision frequency by the relationship of Banks (1966). Because the accuracy of the temperature measurements is greater than the accuracy of the collision frequency measurements at the upper and lower ends of the altitude range of interest, an averaging procedure based on diffusion equilibrium was used. Diffusion equilibrium can be assumed since the vertical accelerations induced by the vertical motions, including the tides, are much smaller than that due to gravity. It is thus much better to use all the collision frequencies measured to derive a best estimate of the collision frequency of each measurement and the corresponding temperature. This average collision frequency can then be used to derive the neutral densities at the six altitudes using scale heights calculated from the temperature measurements. In this work the collision frequencies were normalized to 110 km according to the formula
\[ v_{j110} = v_j \frac{T_j}{T_{110}} \exp \left[ -\frac{mg}{2k} \sum_{j}^{110} (z_n - z_m) \left( \frac{1}{T_m} + \frac{1}{T_n} \right) \right] \]

where \( v_{j110} \) is the collision frequency at 110 km based on the \( j \)th altitude and \( v_j \) is the measured collision frequency at the \( j \)th altitude. The average \( \bar{v}_{110} \) can then be calculated as

\[ \bar{v}_{110} = \frac{\sum_j v_{j110} \left( \frac{v_j}{\sigma_j} \right)^2}{\sum_j \left( \frac{v_j}{\sigma_j} \right)^2} \]  

(2.5)

where \( \sigma_j \) is the error in collision frequency at the \( j \)th height.

The measured ion temperatures were assumed to be equal to the neutral temperatures as shown by Nisbet (1967) for E-region altitudes. As the accuracy of the temperature measurements was considerably better than that of the ion collision frequencies, the reduced temperature measurements were adopted for each height.

2.2 Solar Effects and Photoionization

The equation for calculating the production of ionization by solar photons can be derived using the well known equation (2.6), see for example Rishbeth and Garriott (1969),

\[ Q(\chi, z) = \sum_i \Phi_i \omega \exp \left[ -\sec \chi \sum_j \sigma_{ij} H_j(z) \right] \sum_j v_{ij} \sigma_{ij} n_j(z) \]  

(2.6)
where the subscripts $i$ and $j$ refer to the wavelength group and the individual constituents respectively and

$$\Phi_{i\infty}$$ is the photon flux outside the earth's atmosphere at one astronomical unit.

$\chi$ is the solar zenith angle.

$\sigma_{ij}$ is the total absorption cross section for constituent $j$ and wavelength $i$.

$H_j(z)$ is the scale height of the $j^{th}$ constituent.

$\gamma_{ij}$ is the photoionization yield for constituent $j$ and wavelength group $i$.

$n_j(z)$ is the density of the $j^{th}$ constituent.

Values for $\sigma_{ij}$ and $\gamma_{ij}$ were taken from Ohshio (1966) and are listed in Table 1. The individual neutral densities and scale heights were computed as explained in section 2.1. The photon flux for each wavelength group was taken to be the Hinteregger et al., (1965) value repeated on Table 1. The angle $\chi$ was calculated as a function of time of day, latitude and solar declination.

$$\chi = \arccos \left[ \sin (g) \sin (\delta) + \cos (g) \sin (\delta) \cos \left( \frac{2\pi (HL - 12)}{24} \right) \right]$$

(2.7)

where

$g$ is the geographical latitude.

$HL$ is the local solar time in decimal hours.

$\delta$ is the solar declination angle.
In this study it has been assumed that

\[ \delta = -0.40915 \cos \left( \frac{2\pi}{365.25} (D + 8) \right) \text{ radians} \quad (2.8) \]

where \( D \) is the day number.

The effect of secondaries being formed by x-rays was modeled according to the method described by Swider (1969). First the total production was determined as stated above accounting for increased production through the ionization yield. By energetic photoelectrons the ion production becomes

\[ q(O^+) = \frac{1.15 \left[ 0.29 n(O_2) + 0.5 n(O) \right]/n(N_2)}{1 + 1.5 \left[ n(O_2) + 0.5 n(O) \right]/n(N_2)} \cdot q_{\text{TOTAL}} \quad (2.9) \]

\[ q(O_2^+) = \frac{1.5 \left[ 0.71 n(O_2) \right]/n(N_2)}{1 + 1.5 \left[ n(O_2) + 0.5 n(O) \right]/n(N_2)} \cdot q_{\text{TOTAL}} \quad (2.10) \]

\[ q(N_2^+) = 0.81 \left[ q_{\text{TOTAL}} - (q(O^+) + q(O_2^+)) \right] \quad (2.11) \]

\[ q(N^+) = 0.19 \left[ q_{\text{TOTAL}} - (q(O^+) + q(O_2^+)) \right] \quad (2.12) \]

Equations (2.9) through (2.12) have the effect of distributing the total ion-electron pair production rate \( q \) among the various ions as
0.62 : 0.17 : 0.14 : 0.07 : 1.00 for \( q(N_2^+) : q(O_2^+) : q(N^+) : q(O^+) : q \)
as reported by Swider (1969) for the E-region.

2.3 Chemistry

The ion neutral reactions of importance in the E-region used in this work were reviewed by Biondi (1969), Bortner et al., (1972) and Ferguson (1974). Data was available for the ion temperature which was included into the electron density model. Those rates which varied as a function of temperature did so according to an inverse law \( (T)^{-a} \) where \( a \) is a measured quantity.

A reaction scheme including the more important reactions (Ferguson, 1974) is shown in Figure 1. The steady state of the ion densities is solved using the continuity equation

\[
\frac{d[n_j]}{dt} = Q(n_j) - l(n_j) + p(n_j) - \text{div} (n_j v_j) \tag{2.13}
\]

where

- \( Q(n_j) \) is the photoionization of species \( n_j \).
- \( l(n_j) \) is the loss due to ion-neutral charge transfer.
- \( p(n_j) \) is the gain due to ion-neutral charge transfer.
- \( \text{div} (n_j v_j) \) is the divergence of the flux \( n_j v_j \).

The equation is solved for the five ions \( O^+, O_2^+, N_2^+ \) and \( NO^+ \). While \( N_2^+ \) is a major ion produced because of its large concentration, it is not an abundant ion in this region because of its fast reactions with \( O_2 \) and \( O \). Because of their low ionization potentials most ionization takes the form of \( NO^+ \) or \( O_2^+ \).
Figure 1 Chemical Reaction Diagram
2.4 Ion Transport

Several authors (Monro, 1970; Strobel, 1974; Ogawa and Shimazaki, 1975) have concluded that the effects of ion drift in the E-region are negligible. In this study interest was centered around exploring rather small departures from simple solar zenith angle dependencies and therefore in every minor contributing effect.

The ion drift velocities were measured at the Arecibo incoherent scatter facility in the vertical direction for the E-region along with the electron densities. The effect of ion drift velocities on the electron density was investigated by its inclusion in the continuity equation through the divergence term \( \text{div}(n_i v) \). An idea of the effect of the divergence term can be obtained by assuming that the departures from photoequilibrium are small and that the dominant recombination process is dissociative and can be represented by a coefficient \( \alpha \). With this approximation at 117 km when the electron density vertical gradient is small the perturbation from a photoequilibrium density is

\[
\Delta n_e \approx - \frac{1}{2\alpha} \frac{dv}{dz} \quad (2.14)
\]

where \( v \) is the vertical velocity and at 100 km when the vertical gradients in velocity are small

\[
\Delta n_e \approx - \frac{v}{2\alpha} \frac{1}{n_e} \frac{dn_e}{dz} \quad (2.15)
\]
CHAPTER III

DISCUSSION OF THE ANALYSIS

3.1 Causes of Electron Density Variations

Electron densities measured by incoherent scatter sounding were compared with calculations derived from the model described in section 2.1. The incoherent scatter measurements provided the following information:

1. electron density,
2. collision frequency in the region of 100 to 117 km. This can be used to extract the total density,
3. temperature,
4. vertical amplitude of the ion drift.

An examination of model and experimental electron density profiles in the E-region shows very clearly two regions, a higher region where the electron density gradient with altitude is very small and a lower region of large vertical electron density gradient.

Varying the total solar flux has the effect of multiplying the electron density profile by a constant factor at all altitudes. Varying the total density has the effect of varying the height of the profile without changing its shape. A multiplication factor for both the density and solar flux was chosen for each set of data corresponding to measurements of one day.

This study investigated the effect of variations in density, pressure, temperature, vertical ion drift velocity and atomic and molecular oxygen density on the electron density calculated from
Some idea of the vertical velocities in this height range can be obtained from Harper et al., (1975) who found at Arecibo divergences of vertical velocities at 117 km of the order of $6 \times 10^{-3}$ sec$^{-1}$ and vertical velocities of less than 5 m sec$^{-1}$ at 100 km.

Using these formulae with the values estimated above from Harper et al., (1975) wind measurements give values of $\Delta n_e/n_e$ of the order of 0.1 at 117 km and less than 0.01 at 100 km. The effect at 100 km is not large but at 117 km is not negligible compared to the morning to afternoon differences.
the model described in Chapter II. The investigation was separated between the two regions as described previously with the division occurring at about 110 km.

The sensitivity of the electron density to changes in the neutral density, pressure, temperature, ion drift, and relative atomic and molecular oxygen were investigated in the lower region. Sensitivity factors for density, pressure and temperature were determined by allowing the model to be varied by one of the three parameters and the resulting electron density compared with model results when no parameters varied. The calculations were done for three days, August 12, 1974, September 17, 1974 and September 18, 1974 and the results are shown in Tables 3, 4, and 5. From the relative changes in the electron density due to the three parameters it is evident that no one parameter consistently dominates in the lower E-region. As discussed in section 2.4 the relative change in electron density at 100 km due to vertical ion drifts is on the order of .01. In Figure 2 the contours of electron density as a function of atomic and molecular oxygen are shown for 100 km. The electron density is seen to be almost independent of atomic oxygen. The maximum sensitivity of electron density to molecular oxygen variations is .05.

The same analysis was performed on the upper region. Again not one of the three parameters, density, pressure and temperature, consistently dominated over the other two. As shown in section 2.4 the vertical wind velocity accounts for a relative change in electron density of .10 which is of the same order of magnitude as that due to
Table 3: Relative Electron Density Variations for August 12, 1974

\[
\frac{\Delta n_e}{n_e} = A \sin \left( \frac{2\pi}{12} (t - t_c) \right)
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Altitude</th>
<th>Pressure</th>
<th>Temperature</th>
<th>Density</th>
<th>Pressure</th>
<th>Temperature</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Relative Electron Density Variations for September 17, 1974

\[
\frac{\Delta n_e}{n_e} = A \sin \left( \frac{2\pi}{12} (t - t_c) \right)
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Altitude</th>
<th>Pressure</th>
<th>Temperature</th>
<th>Density</th>
<th>Pressure</th>
<th>Temperature</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Relative Electron Density Variations for September 18, 1974

\[
\frac{\Delta n_e}{n_e} = A \sin \left( \frac{2 \pi}{12} (t - t_c) \right)
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Altitude</th>
<th>Pressure</th>
<th>Temperature</th>
<th>Density</th>
<th>Pressure</th>
<th>Temperature</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
density, pressure and temperature variations. The contours of electron density as a function of atomic and molecular oxygen are shown in Figures 2 and 3 revealing a dependence of electron density on both constituents. The maximum gradient or sensitivity is .05 for atomic oxygen and .02 for molecular oxygen.

3.2 Feasibility of Determining Neutral Parameters from Electron Density Variations

The three days, August 12, 1974, September 17, 1974 and September 18, 1974 were used to investigate the feasibility of determining variations in the neutral atmosphere from deviations in electron density from a basic secant X variation in electron density. If one of the parameters totally dominated the others in causing electron density variations it would be possible to work back from the electron density to obtain that parameter’s variation. From Tables 3, 4, and 5 it is seen that the relative changes in the electron density corresponding to changes in the temperature, density and pressure are comparable implying that the electron density variations do not reflect a variation in just one parameter.

If there existed a relationship among the atmospheric parameters it would be possible to determine their variations. For the three days examined there existed a prevalent semi-diurnal tide. At 100 km the phase difference between the temperature and the density were 2, 7 and 0 hours for August 12, 1974, September 17, 1974 and September 18, 1974 respectively. There existed no constant phase relationship at any one height.
Figure 2 Electron Density as a Function of Atomic and Molecular Oxygen Densities at Noon for an Altitude of 100 km
Figure 3 Electron Density as a Function of Atomic and Molecular Oxygen Densities at Noon for an Altitude of 117 km
It would be very valuable if the amplitude and phase of the tidal motions could be determined from electron density measurements alone since they are available simultaneously at a large number of stations over a long period of time and for a large variety of conditions. It is the conclusion of this study that it is not possible to do this.

3.3 Comparison of the Modeled and Measured Electron Densities

The basic shape of the measured electron densities in the E-region varies as the secant of $\chi$, the solar zenith angle, however there are deviations which can not be explained by a changing solar zenith angle alone. An objective of this study was to investigate the effect of neutral atmospheric variations on the electron density. As stated in section 1.2 care must be taken in using a solar flux model for times other than when measured. The solar flux for one day for all wavelength groups was multiplied by a constant in order to obtain the level of ion density measured in the upper section of the E-region where the gradient in electron density is about zero. The density at all altitudes was multiplied by a constant in order to have the proper altitude of the division between the upper and lower regions.

The effects of measured temperature, density and vertical ion motion were included in the model of electron density. The inclusion of these variations did not consistently eliminate the
discrepancies between the modeled and measured electron densities. An attempt was made at reconciling the differences by varying the relative amounts of atomic and molecular oxygen. To obtain a good agreement a 45 per cent variation in molecular oxygen was required for atomic oxygen. Variations of these magnitudes are unexceptably large when compared with theoretical variations (Mayr and Volland, 1972) or measured variations (Alacayde et al., 1972; Danilov, 1972 and Offerman, 1974). The difficulty in using atomic and molecular oxygen to reconcile discrepancies between measured and modeled electron densities was discussed by Monro, Nisbet and Stick (1974).

The basic problem in an analysis of this type is the number of independent variables. In the present problem the major uncertainties were in the relative densities of atomic and molecular oxygen to the molecular nitrogen density and the spectrum of the EUV solar flux. It would seem that further studies of this kind to be profitable should be done in conjunction with a series of observations such as those described by Torr et al., (1976) in which satellite observations of these important parameters are made simultaneously with the incoherent scatter measurements.

3.4 Specific Conclusions

E-region density dependence on neutral atmospheric parameters was determined for the upper and lower altitude ranges. The results show that variations in temperature, density and pressure cause variations in the electron density of comparable amounts.
While the electron density in the lower region is sensitive to variations in the relative molecular oxygen density it is sensitive to variations in both atomic and molecular oxygen density in the upper region. The effect of ion drift while small in the lower region is not negligible in the upper region.

The effects of tides in atmospheric parameters or the electron densities were studied with the objective of determining the feasibility of relating measured electron density variations back to one or more neutral atmospheric parameter variations. Since the major contributing parameters have comparable effects and there exists no fixed relationships between them, it can be concluded that tidal variations in the atmospheric parameters can not be determined from electron density variations alone.

The modeled electron densities including the effect of temperature, density and vertical ion drift measurements were compared with measured values of electron density. While some variations were reproduced there existed differences between them. The basic problem in determining the cause of discrepancies is the number of independent variables. It is concluded that simultaneous measurements of important parameters are necessary to sort out the causes of these discrepancies.
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