

Use of PREMOS & LYRA for the reconstruction of the UV spectrum

T. Dudok de Wit, G. Cessateur, M. Kretzschmar, L. Vieira (LPC2E, Orléans) J. Lilensten (LPG, Grenoble)

+ special thanks to the instrument teams (TIMED/SEE, SORCE/SIM, PROBA2/LYRA, ground-based instruments)

Solar spectral irradiance measurements



LASP, Boulder

Solar spectral irradiance measurements



LASP, Boulder

Solar spectral irradiance measurements



LASP, Boulder



based on data from SORCE & TIMED (2003-2010)







spectral irradiance

altitude of absorption

relative variability (solar cycle)

absolute variability (solar cycle)

based on data from SORCE & TIMED (2003-2010)



spectral irradiance

altitude of absorption

relative variability (solar cycle)

absolute variability (solar cycle)

based on data from SORCE & TIMED (2003-2010)



spectral irradiance

altitude of absorption

relative variability (solar cycle)

absolute variability (solar cycle)

based on data from SORCE & TIMED (2003-2010)













Interpolation is the problem...

Forecasting (extrapolation)

difficult except for salient features (→ talk by E. Quémerais)

Temporal interpolation

■ difficult, since we still know very little about the spectral variability during flares (→ talks by J.-F. Hochedez and M. Kretzschmar)

Interpolation in wavelength

- very tricky at high resolution (< 0.1 nm) because of atomic lines
- surprisingly easy otherwise



Can we use channels from PREMOS & LYRA to reconstruct
the Total Solar Irradiance (TSI) ?
the solar spectral irradiance ?

What does this tell us about the underlying physics ?

Such reconstructions are required for space weather products (satellite drag...) and for upper atmospheric models

What PREMOS & LYRA could look like

simulated daily outputs from PREMOS & LYRA (after data from SORCE/SIM, SORCE/SOLSTICE, TIMED/EGS & TIMED/XPS)



Long term evolution

Different trends in the long term evolution (11 year scale) : visible and infrared bands are out of phase with solar cycle [Harder et al., 2009]



solar spectrum

phase versus f10.7, for 11-year cycle Can the TSI variability be reconstructed from a few bands / proxies ?



Standard model for TSI variability

TSI = facular brightening - sunspot darkening = α Mg II index - β daily sunspot area



PICARD workshop - March 2010

TSI varibility

But there are occasions where this simple model (chromospheric brightening - photospheric darkening) breaks down



Chromospheric & Photospheric emissions are sometimes in phase = active network dominates in TSI variability

TSI varibility

But there are occasions where this simple model (chromospheric brightening - photospheric darkening) breaks down



Chromospheric & Photospheric emissions are sometimes in phase = active network dominates in TSI variability

TSI varibility

But there are occasions where this simple model (chromospheric brightening - photospheric darkening) breaks down



Chromospheric & Photospheric emissions are sometimes in phase = active network dominates in TSI variability

Does the TSI vary in phase with solar activity ?

According to these simple models, the TSI should be **in phase** with indices for solar activity (for time scales >> 27 days)

Is that really so ?

We check this by computing the cross-phase φ between the TSI and other indices for solar activity

$$\phi = \angle \langle x(\omega) y^*(\omega) \rangle$$

We use continuous wavelets. Solar activity is expressed here by the DSA (Daily Sunspot Area) [Preminger & Walton, GRL, 2005].

The TSI does NOT vary in phase with solar activity

Phase lag (in days) between the TSI and the MgII index, and the DSA, based on 31 years of data



The TSI lags much more behind the DSA than faculae do (MgII index)

The TSI does not vary in phase with solar activity !

- This result suggests that the excess of irradiance coming from plages and faculae continues to enhance the TSI after these regions have faded away.
- This is compatible with a diffusive decay of the magnetic field at active regions [Crouch et al., ApJ 2008].
- Unresolved magnetic structures do matter...

Can the spectral variability be reconstructed from a few bands ?

The variability of the solar spectrum is **remarkably coherent** in spite of the complexity of the underlying processes



- Many authors claim that the solar EUV variability is made of **3 contributions** [Lean et al. 1982; Woods et al., 2000; Warren et al., 2001; Feldman et al., 2010; ...]
 - quiet Sun + coronal holes + active regions
- Amblard et al. [2008] showed, using a statistical approach, that these can be described by **3 elementary spectra** (≠ regions)
 - quiet Sun + hot corona + cool chromosphere

- Many authors claim that the solar EUV variability is made of **3 contributions** [Lean et al. 1982; Woods et al., 2000; Warren et al., 2001; Feldman et al., 2010; ...]
 - quiet Sun + coronal holes + active regions
- Amblard et al. [2008] showed, using a statistical approach, that these can be described by **3 elementary spectra** (≠ regions)
 - quiet Sun + hot corona + cool chromosphere

Can the full spectral variability (EUV-UV-visible) also be described that way ?

Our approach is empirical

It is based on the Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) + bayesian blind source separation

We find that

> 60% of the variance can be described by a linear combination of only 3 contributions (elementary spectra)

instrumental noise sets in for > 3 contributions

Our approach is empirical

It is based on the Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) + bayesian blind source separation

We find that

> 60% of the variance can be described by a linear combination of only 3 contributions (elementary spectra)

instrumental noise sets in for > 3 contributions

The full spectral variability EUV-UV-VIS can be adequately described by 3 elementary spectra !

Proximity map

The closer two wavelengths are, the more similar their short-term (< 90 days) evolution is



Interpretation

- The UV spectrum (< 300 nm) can be properly described by LYRA channels and PREMOS 215 + 266 nm channels
- Idem for visible part, with PREMOS visible channels
- The Near-UV (300 400 nm) is difficult to reconstruct. Unfortunately, this band has the highest absolute variability. Use SODISM ?
- The Near-IR (>900 nm) is also problematic.



Spectrum reconstruction

Reconstruction by using most PREMOS channels + LYRA AI + LYRA Lyman-alpha



In the following we reconstruct the spectrum using channels marked with

Examples

2 examples of reconstructed irradiance



Good reconstruction

 $\lambda = 200 \text{ [nm]}$ relative error < 15 %

Bad reconstruction

 $\lambda = 400 \text{ [nm]}$ relative error ~ 80 %

Conclusions

The EUV-UV spectrum can be properly reconstructed using PREMOS & LYRA data

- We shall soon provide online nowcasts of the EUV-UV spectrum (FP7 SOTERIA project)
- The reconstruction of the near-UV is much more challenging.

Instrumental errors from SORCE/SIM may be largely responsible for this.

The combined use of PREMOS & LYRA will be particularly interesting for investigating the spectral variability during flares.

Reconstruction error

