Comparison of Dst forecast models for intense geomagnetic storms
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[1] We have compared six Dst forecast models using 63 intense geomagnetic storms (Dst ≤ −100 nT) that occurred from 1998 to 2006. For comparison, we estimated linear correlation coefficients and RMS errors between the observed Dst data and the predicted Dst during the geomagnetic storm period as well as the difference of the value of minimum Dst (\(\Delta Dst_{min}\)) and the difference in the absolute value of Dst minimum time (\(\Delta t_{Dst}\)) between the observed and the predicted. As a result, we found that the model by Temerin and Li (2002, 2006) gives the best prediction for all parameters when all 63 events are considered. The model gives the average values: the linear correlation coefficient of 0.94, the RMS error of 14.8 nT, the \(\Delta Dst_{min}\) of 7.7 nT, and the absolute value of \(\Delta t_{Dst}\) of 1.5 hour. For further comparison, we classified the storm events into two groups according to the magnitude of Dst. We found that the model of Temerin and Lee (2002, 2006) is better than the other models for the events having \(-100 \leq Dst < -200\) nT, and three recent models (the model of Wang et al. (2003), the model of Temerin and Li (2002, 2006), and the model of Boynton et al. (2011b)) are better than the other three models for the events having \(Dst \leq -200\) nT.


1. Introduction

[2] Geomagnetic storms are large disturbances in the Earth’s magnetosphere and are produced by enhanced solar wind-magnetosphere energy coupling through the magnetic reconnection mechanism [Dungey, 1961; Sugiura, 1964; Gonzalez et al., 1994]. In general, a geomagnetic storm is characterized by a depression in the horizontal (H) component of the geomagnetic field. This depression is mainly caused by the ring current encircling the Earth in a westward direction and can be monitored by the Dst index [Kamide et al., 1998; Daglis et al., 1999; Wang et al., 2003]. The Dst index is based on measurements from four magnetometers near the equator [Sugiura and Kamei, 1991]. It can be calculated by measuring the horizontal geomagnetic field component at four low-latitude ground observatories which represent the effects of several current systems in the low-latitude geomagnetic field [Akasofu and Chapman, 1972; Campbell, 1996; Rostoker et al., 1997; Wang et al., 2003].

[3] Since the Dst is a representative index for indicating a geomagnetic storm, there have been several attempts to forecast it using real-time solar wind data. Burton et al. [1975] found that the Dst can be well modeled using the solar wind data obtained from spacecraft as input. Their model predicts the ground-based Dst index solely from the velocity and density of the solar wind and the Bz component of the interplanetary magnetic field (IMF). Following Burton et al. [1975], numerous attempts have been made to improve the Dst forecast model [Murayama, 1986; Gonzalez et al., 1994, 2004; Thomsen et al., 1998; Klimas et al., 1998; Fenrich and Luhmann, 1998; O’Brien and McPherron, 2000; Wang et al., 2003; Temerin and Li, 2002, 2006; Xie et al., 2008]. Also, the Dst index was predicted by neural network methods [Wu and Lundstedt, 1996, 1997; Barkhatov et al., 2000; Lundstedt et al., 2002; Watanabe et al., 2003; Paloccia et al., 2006; Amata et al., 2008] and the NARMAX algorithm [Boaghe et al., 2001; Boynton et al., 2011b]. Some of the above Dst forecast models are contributing to the prediction of geomagnetic storms via web pages as a part of the space weather forecast (e.g., http://spgr.ssl.berkeley.edu/dst_index/ and http://lasp.colorado.edu/space_weather/dsttemerin/dsttemerin.html).

[4] The purpose of this study is to compare representative Dst forecast models during intense geomagnetic storms (Dst ≤ −100 nT). For this we consider the following six models as follows: Burton et al. [1975], Fenrich and Luhmann [1998], O’Brien and McPherron [2000], Wang et al. [2003], Temerin and Li [2002, 2006], and Boynton et al. [2011b]. For the input data for the models, we used the solar wind data observed by ACE spacecraft from 1998 to 2006. For a statistical comparison of the Dst forecast models, we estimated linear correlation coefficients and RMS (Root Mean Square) errors between the predicted Dst data and the observed Dst data during geomagnetic storm period. We also obtained the differences between the
observed and predicted values of the following quantities: the Dst minimum ($\Delta D_{\text{Dst}_{\text{min}}}$) and the time of the Dst minimum ($\tau_{\text{D}}$). Also, we classified the intense geomagnetic storm events into four groups depending on the interplanetary structures causing the storms and compared the six Dst models for each group. By comparing the statistical models, we identify the best Dst forecast model for the prediction of intense geomagnetic storms. The paper is organized as follows. We briefly explain the data and the six Dst models in section 2. We present the results of our study in section 3. A brief summary and discussions are given in section 4.

2. Data and Method

2.1. Data

In this study, the observed Dst data were obtained from the World Data Center for Geomagnetism, Kyoto (http://wdc.kugi.kyoto-u.ac.jp). The “Kyoto Dst” is calculated every hour and is available in real time from this website. This real time Dst values are replaced by provisional values and final values at later dates, which are also available at the Web site. Since the time resolution of observed Dst data is an hour, we used the ACE magnetic field and the solar wind data with the same resolution. The ACE spacecraft located in a halo orbit about L1 libration point ~1.5 million km upstream of the Earth. In this study, we considered one hour Dst resolution and did not use propagation. The ACE spacecraft data were obtained from the Coordinated Data Analysis Web (CDAWeb) available at NASA’s Goddard Space Flight Center (http://cdaweb.gsfc.nasa.gov/cdaweb/). The magnetic field and solar wind velocity vectors are given in the Geocentric Solar Magnetospheric (GSM) coordinate system.

2.2. Dst Forecast Models

[6] Burton et al. [1975] model (hereinafter referred to as the B model) predicts the Dst index based on solar wind data obtained from a spacecraft using the following formula:

$$\frac{dD_{\text{Dst}}^*}{dt} = Q(t) - \frac{D_{\text{Dst}}^*}{\tau},$$  
(1)

where

$$D_{\text{Dst}}^* = D_{\text{Dst}} - b \sqrt{P_{\text{dyn}}} + c.$$  
(2)

In the above equations $D_{\text{Dst}}^*$ is simply the pressure-corrected Dst, from which the contribution of the magnetopause current to Dst has been eliminated by the equation (2). When the solar wind dynamic pressure is enhanced, the magnetopause moves closer to the Earth, and the currents associated with it contaminate Dst. The constant $b$ is a measure of the pressure correction and $c$ is a measure of the quite-time ring current, magnetopause current, and magnetotail current. They determined the constants $b$ and $c$ from the linear regression of $\Delta D_{\text{Dst}}$ and $\Delta \sqrt{P}$ ($b = 16$ nT/(nPa)\(^{1/2}\) and $c = 20$ nT). $Q(t)$ is the rate of ring current injection as a function of the solar wind electric field, $E_y = V_x B_z$, where $V_x$ is an x component of solar wind velocity and $B_z$ is a z component of IMF. $\tau$ is a measure of the ring current decay, the value of which corresponds to an e-folding time of 7.7 hours. Several studies have been performed to improve the Dst prediction by either modifying $Q$ or $\tau$. Fenrich and Luhmann [1998] modified the Burton formula as follows. $Q(t)$ was modified to be dependent of the solar wind dynamic pressure as well as $E_y$. The value of $\tau$ corresponds to an e-folding time of 3 or 5 hours during the main phase of
the storms when \( E_v \) is greater than 4 mV/m and e-folding time 7.7 hours for the remainder of the events. As a result, they found that their model (hereinafter referred to as the FL model) was much better than the B model. Therefore their study implies that during storms the ring current decay is indeed bi-exponential and also that the ring current injection rate increases during periods of enhanced solar wind dynamic pressure. O’Brien and McPherron [2000] modified slightly the Burton formula. The constants \( b \) and \( c \) were determined by a linear fit of the residual phase space offset against \( \Delta \sqrt{P} \). A linear fit of the residual phase offset after the removal of \( Q \) to the change of the \( \sqrt{P} \) yields a pressure correction term \( b \) of 7.26 nT/(nPa)\(^{1/2} \). And they obtained a value for \( c \) of 11 nT. They assumed that the position of ring current is controlled by the \( E_v \) during the ring current injection period for southward IMF. Therefore they calculated the \( Q \) in terms of \( E_v \) (we refer to this model as the OM model). They considered that \( \tau \) also depend on \( E_v \). The model of Wang et al. [2003] (hereinafter referred to as the W model) includes the influences of the solar wind dynamic pressure on \( Q \) and \( \tau \). His model finds that the strength of \( Q \) is proportional to the solar wind dynamic pressure with a power of 0.2 during southward IMF and also that \( \tau \) is controlled by the size of the magnetosphere for northward IMF. 

\( \tau \) decreases as the solar wind dynamic pressure increases, interpreted to be the same as the decrease of the magneto-  
pheric size during the periods of northward IMF. Wang et al. [2003] compared their model with the FL model, OM model, and McPherron and O’Brien [2001]. They found that the RMS errors for the predicted negative \( Dst \) obtained using their model are always smaller than those from the other three models. Also, the correlation coefficients between the observed and predicted \( Dst \) of their model are the highest among the four models. Furthermore they found that the OM model can be substantially improved, especially for intense geomagnetic storms by including the influences of the solar wind dynamic pressure. The model of Temerin and Li [2002, 2006] (hereinafter referred to as the TL model) predicts \( Dst \) by defining differently \( Q \) and \( \tau \) from the other four models. The TL model divides the \( Q \) term into three parts (\( dstl \), \( dst2 \), and \( dst3 \)), where each \( Q \) term is a function of the current values of the solar wind magnetic field, density, and velocity and of the past values of solar wind magnetic field and of past values of \( dstl \) and \( dst2 \). \( Q \) terms also have a strong dependence on the angle between the solar wind velocity and Earth’s magnetic dipole axis. 

\( \tau \) terms in the three parts have different time constants ranging from 5 days to 1 hour. Temerin and Li compared their model with the B model using data for five years (1995–1999). As a result, they obtained a RMS error of 10.6 nT and a prediction efficiency of 67.6%. Using the original Burton parameters, they obtained a RMS error of 11.8 nT and a prediction efficiency of 59.7%. The model of Boynton et al. [2011b] predicts \( Dst \) differently from the other models. Their model is based on the NORMAX OLS-ERR algorithm that is nonlinear autoregressive moving averages model with exogenous inputs (NORMAX) [Billings et al., 1989; Boahe et al., 2001; Baliukhin et al., 2001] and an orthogonal least squares (OLS) algorithm (hereinafter referred to as the NM model). The NORMAX OLS-ERR algorithm was employed to identify a single input single
output model (SISO) for predicting the $D_{st}$ using a solar wind-magnetosphere coupling function deduced by Boynton et al. [2011a]. They found the best coupling function for the predicting $D_{st}$ model, $C = p^{1/2}V^{4/3}B_T \sin^{6}(\theta/2)$, where $p$ is the dynamic pressure, $V$ is the solar wind velocity, and $\theta$ is the IMF clock angle ($\theta = \tan^{-1}(B_y/B_z)$).

For the input data for the models, we use solar wind data from the ACE spacecraft with 1-hour resolution and obtain the predicted $D_{st}$ with the same resolution. For comparison, the resolution of the predicted value of the TL model was reduced from 5 min to 1 hour by taking the average values. We predicted $D_{st}$ index for 9 years (whole period from 1998 to 2006) with first initial $D_{st}$ value of zero. When run the $D_{st}$ model program for calculating the prediction value of $D_{st}$, we do not use the observed $D_{st}$ data. We use the only previously predicted $D_{st}$ data.

2.3. Method of Comparison

[8] For comparison we apply the six models to solar wind data during 63 intense geomagnetic storms ($D_{st} \leq -100$ nT) from 1998 to 2006 that were identified by Zhang et al. [2007] and Echer et al. [2008]. For the quantitative comparison, we estimated the linear correlation coefficient, the RMS error, the $D_{st_{min}}$ and the $D_{t_{Dst}}$ of each event for a given model.

First, we determined the start times and the end times of the 63 storm events using the observed $D_{st}$ data. Figure 1 shows the example of period of the storm for the six models. The start times are defined as the times when there were noticeable decrease of $D_{st}$ values after the corresponding interplanetary shocks (Storm Sudden Commencements, SSC) by checking the variation of the solar wind data (velocity, density, and magnetic field). The end times are defined as the times when the $D_{st}$ just recovers to above $-50$ nT after the minimum $D_{st}$ since we are more interested in lower values of $D_{st}$. The second and the third columns of Table 1 show the start times and the end times of the 63 storm events.

3. Results

3.1. Statistical Comparison for All Events

[11] We compared statistically the six models by using 63 intense geomagnetic storm events. Figure 2 shows $CC$ (correlation coefficient), RMS, $D_{st_{min}}$, and $D_{t_{Dst}}$ averaged over the 63 storms for the six models. We find that for the all parameters, the TL model is better than the other models. We can also see that the $D_{st_{min}}$ values for the W, TL, and NM models are much smaller than those of the other three models in Figure 2c. Figure 3 shows the event number distribution of $D_{st_{min}}$ for the six models. We see that $D_{st_{min}}$ values are positive for most of the storms in the case of the B and FL model that mostly overestimate the $D_{st}$ minimum values. On the other hand, the event number distributions of the W, TL, and NM models are quite symmetric and $D_{st_{min}}$ most of the events are distributed within $\pm 50$ nT. Therefore, the average values for the W, TL, and NM models are small. The RMS errors in $D_{st_{min}}$ (shown in parentheses in Figure 2c) are also smaller for the W, TL, and NM models compared to the other three models.
3.2. Dependence on Dst Magnitude

[12] For comparison, we classify the storm events into following two groups according to the magnitude of Dst: (1) Group 1, 53 storm events having $-100 \leq Dst < -200$ nT, and (2) Group 2, 10 super storm events having $Dst \leq -200$ nT. The forth column of the Table 1 shows the Dst minimum value of events.

[13] Figure 4 shows $CC$, $RMS$, $\Delta Dst_{min}$, and $|\Delta Dst|$ of the two groups for the six models. We see that $CC$ for the TL model is the highest among the six models for the group 1 events, while the $CC$ for the W, TL, and NM models are higher compared to the other three models for the group 2 events (see Figure 4a). $RMS$ values for the TL model are smaller than those of the other models for both groups (see Figure 4b). The $\Delta Dst_{min}$ for the TL model is the smallest among the six models for the group 1 events, while it is the smallest for the W model for the group 2 events (see Figure 4c). And, the $\Delta Dst_{min}$ value for the NM model is smaller than the other models. Finally, the $|\Delta Dst|$ value for the TL model is the smallest for the group 1 events, while the W model has the smallest value for the group 2 events (see Figure 4d). From these results, we see that the TL model is better than the other models for the storms with $-100 \leq Dst < -200$ nT, while the W, TL, and NM models are better than the others for the super storms ($Dst \leq -200$ nT).

3.3. Dependence on Interplanetary Structures

[14] In this section, we classified storm events into four groups according to their interplanetary structures causing the storms: 27 sMC events (IP shock and MC), 18 SH events...
(Sheath Field), 8 CIR events, and 10 nonMC events (non-MC type ICME). The interplanetary structures of these 63 intense geomagnetic storm events were identified by Echer et al. [2008]. The fifth column of the Table 1 shows the interplanetary structures of events.

Table 2 shows the $CC$ for the four groups. We find that the $CC$ values for the TL model are the highest for all groups. Table 3 shows that the $RMS$ values for the TL model are the smallest among the six models for all groups. Table 4 shows that the $\Delta Dst_{\text{min}}$ values for the TL model are the smallest among the six models except for the SH and the nonMC group. The $\Delta Dst_{\text{min}}$ for the NM and the OM models are smallest for the SH group and the nonMC group, respectively. The $\Delta Dst_{\text{min}}$ for the TL model are all positive for the non-MC group events; their average value (about 16 nT) of the nonMC group events is higher than those (less than 10 nT) for the other groups. This fact implies that the TL model overestimates $Dst$ for this group. Table 5 shows the $|\Delta t_{Dst}|$ of the four groups. We find that $|\Delta t_{Dst}|$ for the TL model are the smallest among the six models except for the nonMC group. The $|\Delta t_{Dst}|$ for the FL model is the smallest for the nonMC group.

### 4. Summary and Discussions

In this paper, we compared six $Dst$ forecast models using 63 intense geomagnetic storms ($Dst \leq -100$ nT) that occurred from 1998 to 2006. In particular, we examined the linear correlation coefficient, the RMS error, $\Delta Dst_{\text{min}}$, and $|\Delta t_{Dst}|$. The main results from this study can be summarized as follows.

First, the TL model is better than the other five models when all 63 storms are considered for various parameters. Second, the TL model is better than the other models for storms with $-100 \leq Dst < -200$ nT, and the three recent models (the W, TL, and NM models) are better for the super storms ($Dst \leq -200$ nT). Third, the TL model is also superior to the other models for all types of interplanetary structures that cause geomagnetic storms. The detailed comparison of these models is summarized in Tables 2–5.

Comparing statistically the six $Dst$ forecast models, we conclude that the TL model is best suited for predicting $Dst$. This model has the highest $CC$, the smallest $RMS$, and the smallest $\Delta Dst_{\text{min}}$ and $|\Delta t_{Dst}|$ for the nonMC group. It is clear that the TL model is the most effective in predicting intense geomagnetic storms.
Table 4. The $\Delta D_{st minimum}$ (nT) of the Four Groups for the Six Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>sMC</th>
<th>SH</th>
<th>CIR</th>
<th>nonMC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B model</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL model</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM model</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W model</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL model</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM model</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The RMS direction of IMF such that magnetic activity depends approximately on the sixth power of the sine of half the IMF clock angle. Balikhin et al. [2010] also showed that the coupling functions between solar wind and magnetosphere should be proportional to the sixth power of the sine of half the IMF clock angle and the NM model predicted $Dst$ by using such the coupling function.

We have examined the error in percentage to find out how well the TL model predicted the $Dst$ minimum value. Figure 5 shows the relationship between $\Delta D_{st minimum}/|D_{st minimum}|$ and $|D_{st minimum}|$ for the 63 storm events for the TL model. We find that ~93% (59/63) of the events are located within ±20%. The RMS error in $\Delta D_{st minimum}/|D_{st minimum}|$ is 0.108. This value means that the error in percentage of the predicted the $Dst$ minimum value is ~11%, which is quite good from the viewpoint of space weather forecast.

In Figure 5, we examined one noticeable outlier event which is the storm that occurred on 20 November 2003 with an error percentage of 30% (printed by arrow in Figure 5). This event belongs to the group 2 (see section 3.2). All events in the group 2 are located within ±20% except for this storm event. As shown in Figure 4, the average value of $\Delta D_{st minimum}$ for group 2 is 15.3 nT. If we exclude this outlier, the average value becomes 3.2 nT. Temerin and Li [2006] explained that because they compared the predicted $Dst$ (~300 nT) with the provisional version of the “Kyoto $Dst$” index (~472 nT), this event showed a large difference between them. Although we compared the predicted $Dst$ with the final version of the “Kyoto $Dst$” index (~422 nT), this event still shows the largest difference among all events. On the other hand, the W model very well predicts the $Dst$ (~420 nT) of this event; its error is only 2 nT. This event is the largest storm of solar cycle 23 and had other peculiarities discussed by Gopalaswamy et al. [2005].

Temin and Li found the parameters in the model using by minimizing the RMS error between the predicted $Dst$ and observed $Dst$ data for eight years (1995–2002). They selected optimized parameters for the model by minimizing the RMS error. Our some events overlap the events of Temerin and Li which are used to decide the parameters in the model. To avoid some arguments on this overlapping, we make another comparison of the six models using 139 storm events ($D_{st} \leq -50$ nT) from 2003 to 2010. If we consider only intensive storms, the number of data is too small for statistics. We estimated the linear correlation coefficient, the RMS error, $\Delta D_{st minimum}$ and $|\Delta D_{st}|$.

Table 5. The $|\Delta D_{st}|$ (hour) of the Four Groups for the Six Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>sMC</th>
<th>SH</th>
<th>CIR</th>
<th>nonMC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B model</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL model</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM model</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W model</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL model</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM model</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The RMS value of $\Delta D_{st minimum}$.
Relatively, the W, TL, and NM models well predict the super storm events. Among these models, the NM model approach possesses advantages over the W and TL approaches in that NM provides physically interpretable results as demonstrated by Balikhin et al. [2010]. Another important point is that the results of the NM model with a modified form of the coupling function allow us to revisit the analytical derivation of this function and pinpoint the miscalculation made by Kan and Lee [1979].

Our main purpose is to compare the representative Dst forecast models for predicting the intense geomagnetic storms and explore suitable models for real-time space weather forecast. We conclude that the TL model is the best Dst forecast model for most cases, and the W, TL, and NM models are the best three models for some super storms events. In the near future, we will apply these models to past solar wind data in order to check if these models well predict the occurrence of geomagnetic storms using contingency tables and related statistical parameters [Ji et al., 2010]. Finally, all these results will be used for real-time Dst forecast.
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