



The implications of temporal variability in wave-particle interactions in Earth's Radiation Belts

C. E. J. Watt^{1,2}, H. J. Allison³, R. L. Thompson⁴, S. N. Bentley^{1,2}, N. P. Meredith⁵, S. A. Glauert⁵, R. B. Horne⁵, I. J. Rae^{6,2}

¹Department of Meteorology, University of Reading, Reading, UK

²Department of Mathematics, Physics and Electrical Engineering, Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

³GFZ, German Centre for Geosciences, Potsdam, Germany

⁴Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Reading, Reading, UK

⁵British Antarctic Survey, Cambridge, UK

⁶Mullard Space Science Laboratory, University College London, London, UK

Key Points:

- Plasmaspheric hiss wave-particle interactions are observed to exhibit large variability over timescales ranging from 2 minutes to 9 hours
- Numerical diffusion experiments are sensitive to variability timescales, even when experiments experience the same time-integrated diffusion
- Experiments reveal more diffusion from average of all diffusion coefficients than when coefficient is constructed from averaged inputs

Corresponding author: C. E. J. Watt, clare.watt@northumbria.ac.uk

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as doi: [10.1029/2020GL089962](https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL089962).

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

Abstract

Changes in electron flux in Earth’s outer radiation belt can be modeled using a diffusion-based framework. Diffusion coefficients D for such models are often constructed from statistical averages of observed inputs. Here we use stochastic parameterization to investigate the consequences of temporal variability in D . Variability timescales are constrained using Van Allen Probe observations. Results from stochastic parameterization experiments are compared with experiments using D constructed from averaged inputs, and an average of observation-specific D . We find that the evolution and final state of the numerical experiment depends upon the variability timescale of D ; experiments with longer variability timescales differ from those with shorter timescales, even when the time-integrated diffusion is the same. Short variability timescale experiments converge with solutions obtained using an averaged observation-specific D , and both exhibit greater diffusion than experiments using the averaged-input D . These experiments reveal the importance of temporal variability in radiation belt diffusion.

Plain Language Summary

Electron behavior in the Earth’s radiation belts can only be modeled successfully if we average important processes over a long time. The direction of the high-energy electron motion, or its energy, can be changed through interaction with an electromagnetic wave, but these interactions are energy-dependent. The efficacy of the interaction depends upon the strength of the electromagnetic waves, but also on the local density of the plasma and the magnetic field strength. In many models, years of spacecraft measurements are averaged to provide input into the models. We have shown in previous work that the variability of the wave-particle interactions is much larger than that suggested by averaged models. Here, we show the implications of this variability when applied within a radiation belt model. We use a technique that is popular in numerical weather prediction and climate modelling to capture the natural variability of the wave-particle interaction. We demonstrate that the results from the model depend sensitively on the presence, and timescale, of the variability. Some of the variability may be captured by constructing our averages in a different way, but our efforts first require better descriptions of how wave-particle interactions vary, and on what timescales.

1 Introduction

Physics-based radiation belt models of electron behaviour often focus on the wave-particle interactions that accelerate and scatter particles or contribute to radial diffusion. These models make considerable use of quasilinear theory to describe the wave-particle interactions (e.g. Lyons et al. (1972); Ripoll et al. (2020)) and can be used to study the flux of high-energy electrons on a range of timescales, from single storms (e.g. Ripoll et al., 2016; Allison et al., 2019; Li et al., 2016; Drozdov et al., 2015) to multiple solar cycles (Glauert et al., 2018). The strength of quasilinear theory is that it can be used to describe wave-particle interactions, whose characteristic timescales are much less than a second, in models whose timescales are considerably longer.

The quasilinear theory of wave-particle interactions describes the slow (relative to the wave period) evolution of the particle distribution function, f , due to resonant interactions. Diffusion coefficients describe the efficacy of this process, combining information regarding the intensity of the waves as a function of frequency and wave-normal angle, and the resonant condition between the electrons and the waves. In a Fokker-Planck model, the diffusion coefficients contain all the important sub-grid physics, hence our choice of methods to model the diffusion coefficients becomes a key part of the model.

Models of diffusion coefficients largely employ two different strategies: parameterized “average” models and event-specific types. Parameterized models offer comprehen-

sive spatial coverage, and are often parameterized by a geomagnetic activity index. For example, the energy and pitch-angle diffusion due to whistler mode hiss or chorus has been parameterized by Kp (e.g. Spasojevic et al. (2015); Wang et al. (2019)) or AE (e.g. Horne et al. (2013); Meredith et al. (2018, 2020))

The availability of new datasets (e.g. from the NASA Van Allen Probes and the JAXA Arase mission) have encouraged the construction of “event-specific” models of diffusion coefficients. For example, event-specific models of whistler-mode waves can include not only the variation of wave characteristics, but the variation of the magnetic field and number density that controls the resonant condition between waves and electrons (e.g. Tu et al., 2014; Ripoll et al., 2016, 2017, 2019; Zhao et al., 2018) or indeed the wave amplitudes themselves (e.g. Malaspina et al., 2016, 2018). Event-specific models capture more of the variability in wave-particle interactions (see e.g. Ripoll et al. (2017)), and perhaps importantly, more of the extremes in this process than averaged parameterized models. In what follows, we investigate the effects of including temporal variability in a more general diffusion model, where we build a stochastic parameterization (Berner et al., 2017) from a statistical database of observations. We focus on pitch-angle diffusion due to plasmapheric hiss (e.g. Meredith et al. (2018); Hartley et al. (2018); Malaspina et al. (2017); Li et al. (2015)).

2 Methods

2.1 Constructing $D_{\alpha\alpha}(t)$

In Figure 1, we show the probability distribution function of observation-specific bounce-averaged pitch-angle diffusion coefficients $D_{\alpha\alpha}(X_i, Y_i)$ constructed using 4 years of observations from Van Allen Probe A. Individual pairs of observations X_i, Y_i of ratio of plasma frequency to electron gyrofrequency ($X_i = \omega_{pe}/\Omega_e$) and wave intensity at $f = 252$ Hz ($Y_i = \delta B^2$) are used as input to the calculation of each $D_{\alpha\alpha}(\alpha)$. Diffusion coefficients are shown for $E = 0.5$ MeV. Full details of other inputs and method of calculation are described in (Watt et al., 2019).

Figure 1(a) demonstrates a large amount of variability in $D_{\alpha\alpha}(\alpha)$. Where the diffusion coefficient is weakest ($60^\circ \lesssim \alpha \lesssim 75^\circ$), the variability is highest. There is a region at $\alpha \sim 75^\circ$ where the resonant condition is not satisfied, and so there is no diffusion across this pitch-angle range. The diffusion coefficient is rarely greater than 10^{-5} s^{-1} (similar to a diffusion timescale of 1 day) across all pitch-angles.

It is possible to construct an estimate of the average diffusion in two ways Shprits et al. (2009); Horne et al. (2013); Wang et al. (2019); Zhu et al. (2019) : (i) using the average values of input conditions $D_{\alpha\alpha}(\langle X_i \rangle, \langle Y_i \rangle)$ where $\langle \dots \rangle$ indicates an arithmetic mean (c.f. methods of Shprits et al. (2009); Horne et al. (2013); Wang et al. (2019); Zhu et al. (2019)) or (ii) constructing an average of each observation specific diffusion coefficient $\langle D_{\alpha\alpha}(X_i, Y_i) \rangle$. In Figure 1(a), the white solid line indicates the value of $\langle D_{\alpha\alpha}(X_i, Y_i) \rangle$, and the dashed line indicates $D_{\alpha\alpha}(\langle X_i \rangle, \langle Y_i \rangle)$. At all pitch-angles $\langle D_{\alpha\alpha}(X_i, Y_i) \rangle > D_{\alpha\alpha}(\langle X_i \rangle, \langle Y_i \rangle)$ and for $\alpha < 60^\circ$, $\langle D_{\alpha\alpha}(X_i, Y_i) \rangle \sim 2D_{\alpha\alpha}(\langle X_i \rangle, \langle Y_i \rangle)$. $\langle D_{\alpha\alpha}(X_i, Y_i) \rangle$ is positive over a slightly larger range of α than $D_{\alpha\alpha}(\langle X_i \rangle, \langle Y_i \rangle)$.

Two example probability density functions for $\alpha = 30^\circ$ and $\alpha = 60^\circ$ are shown in Figure 1(b) on a logarithmic scale, indicating the non-Gaussian nature of the distributions. Figure 1(c) shows the quantile-quantile plot for the probability distribution function of $D_{\alpha\alpha}(\alpha = 45^\circ)$, representative of all the probability distribution functions shown in Figure 1(a). The deviations from standard normal quantiles (red line) towards the right-hand side of the plot indicate the presence of a statistically heavy tail.

We construct a variable $D_{\alpha\alpha}(t)$ that preserves the underlying distribution and range of $D_{\alpha\alpha}$ as displayed in Figure 1. We choose a simple method where the function $D_{\alpha\alpha}(\alpha)$




Figure 1. (a) Distribution of 2377 diffusion coefficients calculated using Pitch Angle Diffusion for Ions and Electrons (PADIE - Glauert and Horne (2005)) algorithm for co-located simultaneous observations of wave intensity, number density and magnetic field strength over a four-year interval. Observations are limited to a small range of magnetic local time ($09 - 10$ MLT), magnetic latitude ($-5^\circ \leq \lambda \leq +5^\circ$ and L^* ($2.95 \leq L^* \leq 3.05$)). Each column of the shaded region is a normalised probability distribution function estimated with a kernel density method. The solid white line indicates the average of the distribution of diffusion coefficients, and the dashed white line indicates a diffusion coefficient calculated from the averaged input values of wave intensity, number density and magnetic field strength over the same four-year interval. (b) Estimated probability distribution function when $\alpha = 30^\circ$ (dark blue) and $\alpha = 60^\circ$ (orange). (c) Quantile-quantile plot for the probability distribution function for $\alpha = 45^\circ$. Blue '+' indicate the quantiles of the distribution of $D_{\alpha\alpha}(\alpha = 45^\circ)$, and the red line indicates the expected behaviour of the quantiles if the probability distribution function were normal.

117 is randomly selected from the 2377 calculated values and kept constant for a period $t =$
 118 Δt (note the importance of retaining the functional dependence of $D_{\alpha\alpha}$ on the pitch-angle).
 119 At the end of this period, another $D_{\alpha\alpha}(\alpha)$ is chosen and kept constant for the same time
 120 period. The modelled time-series is denoted $D_{rand}(\Delta t)$, and our choices of Δt are moti-
 121 vated in the following section.

122 2.2 Timescales

123 To construct $D_{rand}(\Delta t)$, an estimate of the temporal scales of variability of $D_{\alpha\alpha}$
 124 is required. Since orbiting spacecraft that sample the outer radiation belt (e.g. NASA
 125 Van Allen probes, JAXA Arase, CRRES) traverse this region relatively quickly, distin-
 126 guishing spatial and temporal variations is difficult. We obtain estimates for the tem-
 127 poral scale of variability by studying the temporal evolution of inputs to the diffusion
 128 coefficients (magnetic field strength B_0 , number density n_e and wave intensity δB^2 at
 129 $f = 252$ Hz), and the diffusion coefficients themselves, calculated in our previous work
 130 (Watt et al., 2019).

131 Figure 2 shows a month of variations from 3 Nov 2012 to 3 Dec 2012 observed in
 132 the $L^* = 3.0$ bin. In each panel, circles indicate mean values and errorbars indicate stan-
 133 dard deviations of both observations and our calculated $D_{\alpha\alpha}(E = 0.5 \text{ MeV}, \alpha = 30^\circ)$
 134 during each pass of Van Allen Probe A through the bin. It takes around 2 minutes for
 135 the spacecraft to traverse the bin, and around 9 hours to return to a similar spot. Note
 136 that since location bins are very small in L^* , MLT and magnetic latitude λ , the space-
 137 craft is not guaranteed to traverse the same bin each orbit; it can be more than 9 hours
 138 from one data point shown in Figure 2 to the next.

139 Panel (a) shows the variability of the ambient magnetic field B_0 . The standard de-
 140 viation of the magnetic field is due to the spatial variation of B_0 as the spacecraft tra-
 141 verses the radial distance $2.95 < L^* < 3.05$. The variation between passes is very small
 142 compared to the variation during a pass, with the exception of the pass on the 18 Novem-
 143 ber 2012. For n_e (panel (b)), the variation from one pass to the next is much greater
 144 than the variation seen within each pass. There is a moderate geomagnetic storm with
 145 minimum Dst reaching ~ 110 nT that commences near midnight on 13 November 2012
 146 (see gray trace in Figure 2(b)). Prior to this time, n_e mainly lies between $1.5\text{-}2 \times 10^9 \text{ m}^{-3}$,
 147 but after the storm starts, n_e is depressed to between $0.5\text{-}1.5 \times 10^9 \text{ m}^{-3}$, and remains so
 148 at least until the end of the month. The variations in wave intensity δB^2 are demonstrated
 149 in panel 2(c). The wave intensity is significantly more variable than B_0 or n_e , varying
 150 over at least three orders of magnitude over the interval presented (cf. Figure 5 in Ripoll
 151 et al. (2017)). Interestingly, the variation of hiss power during the storm appears oppo-
 152 site to that reported by Malaspina et al. (2018) (i.e. that plasmaspheric hiss power de-
 153 creases with decreasing density) although storms may prove to display different wave power
 154 dependencies than in quiet times. The variation in δB^2 between spacecraft traverses through
 155 the bin is usually much bigger than the variation seen during each pass.

156 Figure 2(d) shows the variability in the calculated $D_{\alpha\alpha}(E = 0.5 \text{ MeV}, \alpha = 30^\circ)$
 157 during November 2012 (calculations of mean and standard deviation are for $\log_{10}(D_{\alpha\alpha})$).
 158 The variability of $D_{\alpha\alpha}$ during each pass should be interpreted as an estimate of the un-
 159 certainty in its calculation. The variation in diffusion coefficient largely tracks the vari-
 160 ation in the wave intensity, although the increase in diffusion is much more pronounced
 161 in the middle of the month than the increase in wave intensity. This is due to the sys-
 162 tematic decrease in electron number density in this bin as a result of the storm as pitch-
 163 angle diffusion increases when the density decreases when all other parameters are kept
 164 constant (e.g. Glauert and Horne (2005)).

165 We conclude from Figure 2(d) that temporal scales of variability of $D_{\alpha\alpha}$ in this ob-
 166 servation bin lie between 2 minutes and 9 hours. We therefore choose two temporal scales
 167 $\Delta t = 2$ minutes and $\Delta t = 6$ hours for our study to span this range. We stress that



Figure 2. Figure demonstrating temporal variability of inputs to diffusion coefficient, and coefficient itself, during the month of November 2012 as Van Allen Probe A passed through the $L^* = 3.0$ bin (see text for details of bin dimensions). (a) Shows magnetic field variations, (b) number density variations, (c) wave intensity variations and (d) the resulting variability in the calculated diffusion coefficient for $E = 0.5$ MeV and $\alpha = 30^\circ$. Circles indicate the mean of the observations made during a single pass through the bin, and errorbars indicate the standard deviation. In panels (c) and (d), mean and standard deviations were calculated for the logarithm of the displayed quantity. In panel (b), the Dst value over the same period is indicated in gray.

these choices serve an illustrative purpose in the following numerical experiments and reflect the constraints provided by spacecraft coverage (c.f. Ripoll et al. (2017)). We wish to investigate *whether* pitch-angle diffusion depends on Δt ; a full characterisation of the dependence of diffusive processes on the full range of possible Δt is a larger task left for future work.

2.3 Numerical diffusion experiments

For the illustration presented here, we assume that pitch-angle diffusion dominates, and ignore energy diffusion due to plasmaspheric hiss. One-dimensional diffusion experiments at a single energy are performed with different choices of bounce-averaged diffusion coefficients $D_{\alpha\alpha}(t)$. The energy $E = 0.5$ MeV is chosen because the original calculations of the distribution of $D_{\alpha\alpha}$ were performed at this energy. Results may also vary with energy, which will be a focus of future work.

The time evolution of the phase space density at each pitch angle, f , can be found by solving the 1-D Fokker Planck equation for pitch angle diffusion, given by

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{T \sin 2\alpha} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} \left(D_{\alpha\alpha}(t) T \sin 2\alpha \frac{\partial f}{\partial \alpha} \right) \right) - \frac{f}{\tau_L} \quad (1)$$

where $T(\alpha)$ is given by

$$T(\alpha) = 1.3802 - 0.3198(\sin \alpha + \sin^{1/2} \alpha). \quad (2)$$

The second term on the right hand side of equation (1) accounts for losses due to atmospheric collisions and the loss timescale τ_L is taken to be a quarter of the bounce period inside the loss cone and infinite outside (Shprits et al., 2008).

In the following analysis, equation (1) is solved using an explicit time stepping scheme in steps of 0.1 s. The pitch angle grid has a resolution of 1° and boundary conditions at $\alpha = 0^\circ$ and $\alpha = 90^\circ$ are required to define the calculation domain. We assume that far into the loss cone, collisions are sufficient for the phase space density distribution to be isotropic, and use $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \alpha} = 0$ at 0° and 90° (see e.g. Glauert et al. (2014)). All of the following experiments initialise the simulation with an isotropic pitch angle distribution, assuming an electron flux of $5 \times 10^3 \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ sr}^{-1} \text{ keV}^{-1}$ for all pitch angles; this distribution is then allowed to evolve over a 30 day period.

We run a series of numerical experiments using the diffusion coefficients displayed in Figure 1. Specifically, each numerical experiment employs the same initial and boundary conditions, and they differ through the choice of $D_{\alpha\alpha}(t)$:

1. Ensemble experiments with $D_{\alpha\alpha}(t) = D_{rand}(\Delta t)$ with $\Delta t = 2$ minutes and 6 hours. The ensembles each contain 60 individual scenarios where a different random selection of $D_{\alpha\alpha}(\alpha)$ is drawn from the observed distribution (see Figure 1). [Ensemble convergence is demonstrated in the Supporting Information].
2. Constant diffusion experiment where $D_{\alpha\alpha}(t) = D_{\alpha\alpha}(\langle X_i \rangle, \langle Y_i \rangle) = \text{constant}$ (represented by dashed line in Figure 1(a)).
3. Constant diffusion experiment where $D_{\alpha\alpha}(t) = \langle D_{\alpha\alpha}(X_i, Y_i) \rangle = \text{constant}$ (represented by solid line in Figure 1(a)).

The number of unique diffusion coefficients in the distribution is 2377, defined in each case for $0 < \alpha < 90^\circ$, and so given uniform sampling of the distribution, the $\Delta t = 2$ minutes ensemble is likely to have sampled all coefficients after ~ 3.3 days. and the $\Delta t = 6$ hours ensemble after ~ 400 days. Experiments are run to 30 days, with the caveat that the $\Delta t = 2$ minutes ensemble may show signs of oversampling of the discrete distribution. The experiments presented here do not distinguish between the amount



Figure 3. Examples of the distribution function solution from 1D diffusion experiments with (a) $D_{\alpha\alpha}(t) = D_{rand}(\Delta t = 6h)$, (b) average diffusion coefficient $D_{\alpha\alpha} = \langle D_{\alpha\alpha}(X_i, Y_i) \rangle$ and (c) average diffusion coefficient $D_{\alpha\alpha} = D_{\alpha\alpha}(\langle X_i \rangle, \langle Y_i \rangle)$. An artificial floor has been applied to the data at $f = 10^0 \text{ cm}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}\text{sr}^{-1}\text{keV}^{-1}$ since values of f are very small inside the loss cone.

or nature of temporal variability on different timescales, even though in reality variations on ~ 2 minute timescales are likely to have different causes than those on ~ 6 hour timescales. Our aim is to investigate the consequences of variability, and how the solutions to the diffusion equation depend on timescale with all other factors treated equally.

3 Results

In general, each member of the ensemble experiments evolves less smoothly compared to the case where a constant diffusion coefficient is used. An example is shown in Figure 3, where panel (a) displays the evolution of f during a single ensemble member from the numerical experiment where the diffusion coefficient is randomly varied $D_{\alpha\alpha}(t) = D_{rand}(\Delta t = 6h)$, and panels (b) and (c) show the evolution of f during the averaged experiments with $D_{\alpha\alpha}(t) = \langle D_{\alpha\alpha}(X_i, Y_i) \rangle = \text{constant}$ and $D_{\alpha\alpha}(t) = D_{\alpha\alpha}(\langle X_i \rangle, \langle Y_i \rangle) =$

constant, respectively. Five days of evolution are shown. Given the initial and boundary conditions of the numerical experiments, and important features of the diffusion coefficients, it is expected that $f(\alpha)$ will rapidly approach zero as α tends to zero, and the values of $f(\alpha \lesssim 75^\circ)$ will decrease as the diffusion progresses.

In the constant diffusion coefficient case, the variations in $f(\alpha)$ as a function of time are very smooth. There is more diffusion in panel (b) than in panel (c), reflecting that $\langle D_{\alpha\alpha}(X_i, Y_i) \rangle > D_{\alpha\alpha}(\langle X_i \rangle, \langle Y_i \rangle)$. The scenario where the diffusion coefficient is randomly varied often seems quite flat, with sporadic sudden changes in the evolution of f across all α , notably at $t \sim 1.7, 2.5, 3.5$ and 4.8 days. The sudden changes indicate times when a large $D_{\alpha\alpha}$ has been chosen from the distribution, and the solution after 30 days in each member of the ensemble is dependent upon the number of large jumps experienced. The times where the solution is practically constant (e.g. from $t \sim 3.6$ days to $t \sim 4.8$ days) indicate extended periods where mainly very small values of $D_{\alpha\alpha}(\alpha)$ have been chosen. There are also times where the value of f at a constant pitch-angle appears to experience brief increases with time (see e.g. $\alpha = 20^\circ$ for $2.6 < t < 3.6$ days and for $20 < \alpha < 75$ at $t = 4.8$ days). These occur during times when $D_{\alpha\alpha}(\alpha)$ significantly changes shape from one Δt period to the next, and are most obvious in numerical experiments where $\Delta t = 6$ hours (i.e. the variation time is slow). During experiments with fast variations of $D_{\alpha\alpha}(\alpha)$, small increases in f are seen only for a very short time.

All solutions tend towards a picture similar to the top of Figure 3(a) where $f(\alpha > 75^\circ)$ remains at the initial condition, and is elsewhere reduced to small values due to pitch-angle scattering and removal of phase space density in the loss cone. Snapshots of the process after 2, 10 and 30 days can be seen in Figure S1 of the supplementary information.

The temporal evolution and probability density functions of the ensemble experiments are shown in Figure 4 for a single value of α . In panel (a), the median of $f(\alpha = 30^\circ)$ from the two ensemble experiments are indicated in orange ($\Delta t = 2$ minutes) and red ($\Delta t = 6$ hours). Results from the two constant $D_{\alpha\alpha}(\alpha)$ experiments are indicated in solid black ($D_{\alpha\alpha}(t) = \langle D_{\alpha\alpha}(X_i, Y_i) \rangle$) and dashed black ($D_{\alpha\alpha}(t) = D_{\alpha\alpha}(\langle X_i \rangle, \langle Y_i \rangle)$) lines, respectively. Panel (b) indicates the mean of the time-integrated diffusion coefficients from each set of ensemble experiments, demonstrating that by this measure, the two experiments experience very similar “total” diffusion. Panels (c) and (d) show column-normalised probability density estimates of each ensemble experiment for $\Delta t = 2$ minutes and 6 hours. From Figure 1, we can see that $\langle D_{\alpha\alpha}(X_i, Y_i) \rangle > D_{\alpha\alpha}(\langle X_i \rangle, \langle Y_i \rangle)$, so it is always expected that the black solid line will lie below the black dashed line in Figure 4(a). That is, the diffusion due to the average of all the diffusion coefficients is more than the diffusion due to the diffusion coefficient constructed from averaged inputs. The ratio of $f(\alpha = 30^\circ)$ solutions of the two constant numerical experiments after 30 days is around 3.3.

The $\Delta t = 2$ minutes ensemble exhibits a time history very similar to the constant $D_{\alpha\alpha}(t) = \langle D_{\alpha\alpha}(X_i, Y_i) \rangle$ experiment, with very little spread in solutions. The median of the $\Delta t = 2$ minutes experiment tracks the $\langle D_{\alpha\alpha}(X_i, Y_i) \rangle$ experiment very well, until $t \sim 20$ days. At this point, the median of the ensemble indicates additional diffusion from the constant diffusion experiment and we can see from Figure 4(c) that the variability of the solutions increases. For a constant diffusion coefficient, the solution is likely to asymptotically approach a limit that takes into account the boundary conditions and is defined by the diffusion lifetime. However, when the shape and strength of the diffusion coefficient varies in time, there is no such limit and no associated lifetime, and diffusion is enhanced.

The time history of the $\Delta t = 6$ hours ensemble shows slightly slower diffusion initially in the median of the ensemble in Figure 4(a), and there is a large spread in the so-



Figure 4. Evolution of $f(\alpha = 30^\circ)$ and time-averaged diffusion coefficients from ensemble experiments. (a) The solid black line indicates the evolution of the numerical experiment with constant $D_{\alpha\alpha}(t) = \langle D_{\alpha\alpha}(X_i, Y_i) \rangle$ and the dashed black line indicates the evolution of the numerical experiment with constant $D_{\alpha\alpha}(t) = D_{\alpha\alpha}(\langle X_i \rangle, \langle Y_i \rangle)$. Orange and red solid lines indicate the median of the ensemble numerical experiments for $\Delta t = 2$ minutes and $\Delta t = 6$ hours, respectively. (b) Mean time-integrated $D_{\alpha\alpha}$ for each ensemble experiment. (c) and (d) Column-normalised probability density functions of the ensemble numerical experiment for $\Delta t = 2$ minutes and $\Delta t = 6$ hours, respectively.

275 lutions (see Figure 4(d)). For $\Delta t = 6$ hours, the median $f(\alpha = 30^\circ)$ decreases at a
 276 roughly constant rate until around 25 days and the final values of $f(\alpha = 30^\circ)$ are on
 277 average much lower than in the other experiments.

278 4 Discussion

279 We have demonstrated that the evolution of the phase space density in an idealised
 280 diffusion experiment depends not only on *whether* the diffusion coefficient varies with
 281 time, but also on the *timescale* of that variation. There are three notable differences in
 282 the ensemble results for $\Delta t = 2$ minutes and $\Delta t = 6$ hours: differences in the evolu-
 283 tion of median f , i.e. the trend in the behaviour of the ensemble, differences in the vari-
 284 ance of the ensembles, and differences in the final values of f between the two ensem-
 285 bles. It is important to note that both the ensemble experiments, with $\Delta t = 2$ min-
 286 utes and $\Delta t = 6$ hours, experience almost exactly the same time-integrated diffusion
 287 (see Figure 4(b)). Yet both the evolution of each ensemble, and the final state after 30
 288 days, is markedly different and depends upon the timescale Δt . Most importantly, for
 289 $\Delta t = 6$ hours, most members of the ensemble experiment experience much more dif-
 290 fusion and reach lower values of $f(\alpha = 30^\circ)$ than the two similar solutions (i.e. the en-
 291 semble result with $\Delta t = 2$ minutes, and the averaged result with $D_{\alpha\alpha}(t) = \langle D_{\alpha\alpha}(X_i, Y_i) \rangle$).
 292 We have begun investigations into why there are such differences in the two ensembles.
 293 We note that a key feature of our ensemble experiments is that the shape of the diffu-
 294 sion coefficient $D_{\alpha\alpha}(\alpha)$ changes with time, in addition to the strength of the diffusion
 295 coefficient and remind the reader that with a temporally-varying $D_{\alpha\alpha}(\alpha)$, there is no longer
 296 a well-defined lifetime.

297 It is important to note that the averaged $\langle D_{\alpha\alpha}(X_i, Y_i) \rangle$ result is a good approx-
 298 imation of the ensemble median when timescales of variation are short. The diffusion co-
 299 efficient constructed from averaged inputs, which we have denoted $D_{\alpha\alpha}(\langle X_i \rangle, \langle Y_i \rangle)$, is
 300 much slower than the average diffusion rate estimated by averaging all of the individ-
 301 ual diffusion coefficients together, which we denoted $\langle D_{\alpha\alpha}(X_i, Y_i) \rangle$. In our experiments,
 302 we noted that the difference in $f(\alpha = 30^\circ)$ after 30 days using these two different “av-
 303 erages” could be more than a factor of 10 at large pitch-angles (see Figure S1 in Sup-
 304 plemental Information), and around a factor of 3 at lower pitch-angles. These differences
 305 might depend sensitively on the location of diffusion “gaps” in pitch-angle, or on the size
 306 of the variance in the $D_{\alpha\alpha}(\alpha)$ distribution, or a combination of both. Our results strongly
 307 suggest that databases of many individual diffusion coefficients should be constructed
 308 from co-located and simultaneous measurements. Diffusion coefficient models could then
 309 be constructed using appropriate averages of these individual diffusion coefficients, or
 310 stochastic methods such as suggested here. Preliminary studies of these new methods
 311 of averaging suggest that they are more effective than previous methods (Ross et al., 2020).

312 Other evidence suggests it is important to understand the underlying distribution
 313 of diffusion coefficients. Idealized numerical experiments using a radial diffusion equa-
 314 tion (Thompson et al., 2020) noted that the amount of diffusion depends upon the na-
 315 ture of the underlying distribution of diffusion coefficients. Those distributions with sta-
 316 tistically heavier tails experienced greater diffusion, even when the distributions of dif-
 317 fusion coefficients had the same statistical average value.

318 The ensemble experiments are examples of probabilistic models that can yield rich
 319 information about the potential behaviour and uncertainty in the physical system. This
 320 uncertainty may exist due to a lack of knowledge, indicating that further parameteri-
 321 zation of the diffusion coefficients is merited, perhaps using geomagnetic indices or other
 322 magnetospheric conditions. Or it may be true that there is inherent natural variability
 323 in the system that cannot be parameterized away.

5 Conclusions

We have presented the results from a series of idealized numerical experiments that highlight the response of the pitch-angle diffusion equation to temporally-varying diffusion coefficients that reproduce the full range of observation-specific wave-particle interactions observed over a four year period by NASA Van Allen probes. We present evidence to show that both the wave intensity, and number density observed in the same region of L^* , MLT and magnetic latitude over a period of around 30 days varies significantly, causing changes in $D_{\alpha\alpha}$ of orders of magnitude on timescales of less than 9 hours. We perform idealised numerical experiments of the resulting pitch-angle diffusion that could result from different methods of averaging the diffusion coefficient, as well as two ensemble experiments that deploy stochastic parameterization techniques. If the timescale of variability is very short ($\Delta t = 2$ minutes), then the ensemble result is very similar to the result using the average of many observation-specific coefficients. Where inputs to the diffusion coefficient are averaged prior to its calculation, then the amount of diffusion experienced is much less than in any other numerical experiment. Most interestingly, in the ensemble experiments where diffusion is varied on different timescales, the phase space density solution of the experiment with longer variability timescales ($\Delta t = 6$ hours) reaches lower values than in the experiment with faster timescales, even though the total time-integrated diffusion in each experiment is the same.

Both this paper and Thompson et al. (2020) highlight that the distribution and variability timescales of diffusion coefficients are important for the evolution of electron phase space density due to diffusion. In other words, key details of the microphysical wave-particle interaction are important for accurate modeling of the macroscale radiation belt system, and the evolution of phase-space density is not solely reliant on the average properties of the diffusion coefficients. Our preliminary results isolate pitch-angle scattering due to plasmaspheric hiss, but the concepts illustrated in this paper are likely to be important for all wave-particle interactions in the inner magnetosphere.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the Natural Environment Research Council (NERC) High-light Topic Grant "Rad-Sat" NE/P017274/1 (CEJW), NE/P01738X/1 (NPM, SAG and RBM) and NE/P017185/1 (IJR). CEJW and SNB are further supported by STFC grant ST/R000921/1. HJA acknowledges Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft (HGF). RLT is supported by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) grant EP/L016613/1.

Diffusion coefficient data that are shown in Figure 1 can be found at <http://dx.doi.org/10.17864/1947.212>. Ensemble and averaged numerical experiment results can be found at <http://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4290006>.

References

- Allison, H. J., Horne, R. B., Glauert, S. A., & Del Zanna, G. (2019). On the importance of gradients in the low-energy electron phase space density for relativistic electron acceleration. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, *124*(4), 2628-2642. Retrieved from <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2019JA026516> doi: 10.1029/2019JA026516
- Berner, J., Achatz, U., Batt, L., Bengtsson, L., Cmara, A. d. l., Christensen, H. M., ... Yano, J.-I. (2017). Stochastic parameterization: Toward a new view of weather and climate models. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, *98*(3), 565-588. doi: 10.1175/BAMS-D-15-00268.1
- Drozdv, A. Y., Shprits, Y. Y., Orlova, K. G., Kellerman, A. C., Subbotin, D. A., Baker, D. N., ... Reeves, G. D. (2015). Energetic, relativistic, and ultrarelativistic electrons: Comparison of long-term verb code simulations with van allen probes measurements. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*,

- 373 120(5), 3574-3587. doi: 10.1002/2014JA020637
- 374 Glauert, S. A., & Horne, R. B. (2005). Calculation of pitch angle and energy dif-
375 fusion coefficients with the padie code. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space*
376 *Physics*, 110(A4). doi: 10.1029/2004JA010851
- 377 Glauert, S. A., Horne, R. B., & Meredith, N. P. (2014). Three-dimensional elec-
378 tron radiation belt simulations using the BAS Radiation Belt Model with
379 new diffusion models for chorus, plasmaspheric hiss, and lightning-generated
380 whistlers. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 119(1), 268-289.
381 doi: 10.1002/2013JA019281
- 382 Glauert, S. A., Horne, R. B., & Meredith, N. P. (2018). A 30-year simula-
383 tion of the outer electron radiation belt. *Space Weather*, 0(0). doi:
384 10.1029/2018SW001981
- 385 Hartley, D. P., Kletzing, C. A., Santolk, O., Chen, L., & Horne, R. B. (2018). Statis-
386 tical properties of plasmaspheric hiss from van allen probes observations. *Jour-*
387 *nal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 123(4), 2605-2619. doi: 10.1002/
388 2017JA024593
- 389 Horne, R. B., Kersten, T., Glauert, S. A., Meredith, N. P., Boscher, D., Sicard-Piet,
390 A., ... Li, W. (2013). A new diffusion matrix for whistler mode chorus waves.
391 *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 118(10), 6302-6318. doi:
392 10.1002/jgra.50594
- 393 Li, W., Ma, Q., Thorne, R. M., Bortnik, J., Kletzing, C. A., Kurth, W. S., ...
394 Nishimura, Y. (2015). Statistical properties of plasmaspheric hiss derived
395 from Van Allen Probes data and their effects on radiation belt electron dynam-
396 ics. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 120(5), 3393-3405. doi:
397 10.1002/2015JA021048
- 398 Li, W., Ma, Q., Thorne, R. M., Bortnik, J., Zhang, X.-J., Li, J., ... Goldstein,
399 J. (2016). Radiation belt electron acceleration during the 17 march 2015
400 geomagnetic storm: Observations and simulations. *Journal of Geophysi-*
401 *cal Research: Space Physics*, 121(6), 5520-5536. Retrieved from [https://](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2016JA022400)
402 agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2016JA022400 doi:
403 10.1002/2016JA022400
- 404 Lyons, L. R., Thorne, R. M., & Kennel, C. F. (1972). Pitch-angle diffusion of radi-
405 ation belt electrons within the plasmasphere. *Journal of Geophysical Research*,
406 77(19), 3455-3474. doi: 10.1029/JA077i019p03455
- 407 Malaspina, D. M., Jaynes, A. N., Boul, C., Bortnik, J., Thaller, S. A., Ergun, R. E.,
408 ... Wygant, J. R. (2016). The distribution of plasmaspheric hiss wave power
409 with respect to plasmopause location. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 43(15),
410 7878-7886. doi: 10.1002/2016GL069982
- 411 Malaspina, D. M., Jaynes, A. N., Hospodarsky, G., Bortnik, J., Ergun, R. E., &
412 Wygant, J. (2017). Statistical properties of low-frequency plasmaspheric
413 hiss. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 122(8), 8340-8352. doi:
414 10.1002/2017JA024328
- 415 Malaspina, D. M., Ripoll, J.-F., Chu, X., Hospodarsky, G., & Wygant, J. (2018).
416 Variation in plasmaspheric hiss wave power with plasma density. *Geophysical*
417 *Research Letters*, 45(18), 9417-9426. doi: 10.1029/2018GL078564
- 418 Meredith, N. P., Horne, R. B., Kersten, T., Li, W., Bortnik, J., Sicard, A., &
419 Yearby, K. H. (2018). Global model of plasmaspheric hiss from multiple
420 satellite observations. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 123(6),
421 4526-4541. doi: 10.1029/2018JA025226
- 422 Meredith, N. P., Horne, R. B., Shen, X.-C., Li, W., & Bortnik, J. (2020). Global
423 model of whistler mode chorus in the near-equatorial region (—m—i 18).
424 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47(11), e2020GL087311. doi: 10.1029/
425 2020GL087311
- 426 Ripoll, J.-F., Claudepierre, S. G., Ukhorskiy, A. Y., Colpitts, C., Li, X., Fennell,
427 J. F., & Crabtree, C. (2020). Particle dynamics in the earth's radiation belts:

- 428 Review of current research and open questions. *Journal of Geophysical Re-*
429 *search: Space Physics*, 125(5), e2019JA026735. doi: 10.1029/2019JA026735
- 430 Ripoll, J.-F., Loridan, V., Denton, M. H., Cunningham, G., Reeves, G., Santolk, O.,
431 ... Ukhorskiy, A. Y. (2019). Observations and fokker-planck simulations of
432 the l-shell, energy, and pitch angle structure of earth's electron radiation belts
433 during quiet times. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 124(2),
434 1125-1142. doi: 10.1029/2018JA026111
- 435 Ripoll, J.-F., Reeves, G. D., Cunningham, G. S., Loridan, V., Denton, M., Santolk,
436 O., ... Ukhorskiy, A. Y. (2016). Reproducing the observed energy-dependent
437 structure of Earth's electron radiation belts during storm recovery with an
438 event-specific diffusion model. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 43(11), 5616-
439 5625. doi: 10.1002/2016GL068869
- 440 Ripoll, J.-F., Santolk, O., Reeves, G. D., Kurth, W. S., Denton, M. H., Loridan,
441 V., ... Turner, D. L. (2017). Effects of whistler mode hiss waves in March
442 2013. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 122(7), 7433-7462. doi:
443 10.1002/2017JA024139
- 444 Ross, J. P. J., Glauert, S. A., Horne, R. B., Watt, C. E. J., Meredith, N. P., &
445 Woodfield, E. E. (2020). A new approach to constructing models of electron
446 diffusion by emic waves in the radiation belts. *Geophysical Research Letters*,
447 *n/a(n/a)*, e2020GL088976. doi: 10.1029/2020GL088976
- 448 Shprits, Y. Y., Subbotin, D., & Ni, B. (2009). Evolution of electron fluxes in the
449 outer radiation belt computed with the VERB code. *Journal of Geophysical*
450 *Research: Space Physics*, 114(A11). doi: 10.1029/2008JA013784
- 451 Shprits, Y. Y., Subbotin, D. A., Meredith, N. P., & Elkington, S. R. (2008). Re-
452 view of modeling of losses and sources of relativistic electrons in the outer
453 radiation belt ii: Local acceleration and loss. *Journal of Atmospheric and*
454 *Solar-Terrestrial Physics*, 70(14), 1694 - 1713. (Dynamic Variability of Earth's
455 Radiation Belts) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jastp.2008.06.014>
- 456 Spasojevic, M., Shprits, Y. Y., & Orlova, K. (2015). Global empirical models of
457 plasmaspheric hiss using Van Allen Probes. *Journal of Geophysical Research:*
458 *Space Physics*, 120(12), 10,370-10,383. doi: 10.1002/2015JA021803
- 459 Thompson, R. L., Watt, C. E. J., & Williams, P. D. (2020). Accounting for vari-
460 ability in ULF wave radial diffusion models. *Journal of Geophysical Research:*
461 *Space Physics*, 125(8), e2019JA027254. doi: 10.1029/2019JA027254
- 462 Tu, W., Cunningham, G. S., Chen, Y., Morley, S. K., Reeves, G. D., Blake, J. B.,
463 ... Spence, H. (2014). Event-specific chorus wave and electron seed popula-
464 tion models in DREAM3D using the van allen probes. *Geophysical Research*
465 *Letters*, 41(5), 1359-1366. doi: 10.1002/2013GL058819
- 466 Wang, D., Shprits, Y. Y., Zhelavskaya, I. S., Agapitov, O. V., Drozdov, A. Y., &
467 Aseev, N. A. (2019). Analytical chorus wave model derived from van allen
468 probe observations. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 124(2),
469 1063-1084. doi: 10.1029/2018JA026183
- 470 Watt, C. E. J., Allison, H. J., Meredith, N. P., Thompson, R. L., Bentley, S. N.,
471 Rae, I. J., ... Horne, R. B. (2019). Variability of Quasilinear Diffusion Coeffi-
472 cients for Plasmaspheric Hiss. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*,
473 124(10), 9545-9551. doi: 10.1002/2018JA026401
- 474 Zhao, H., Friedel, R. H. W., Chen, Y., Reeves, G. D., Baker, D. N., Li, X., ...
475 Spence, H. E. (2018). An empirical model of radiation belt electron pitch angle
476 distributions based on van allen probes measurements. *Journal of Geophysical*
477 *Research: Space Physics*, 123(5), 3493-3511. doi: 10.1029/2018JA025277
- 478 Zhu, H., Shprits, Y. Y., Spasojevic, M., & Drozdov, A. Y. (2019). New hiss and
479 chorus waves diffusion coefficient parameterizations from the van allen probes
480 and their effect on long-term relativistic electron radiation-belt verb simula-
481 tions. *Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics*, 193, 105090.
482 Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/>

Accepted Article

