

## Electrons re-acceleration at the footpoints of Solar Flares

Rim Turkmani

*Department of Physics, Imperial College, London SW7 2AZ*

John Brown

*Department of Physics & Astronomy, University of Glasgow, G12 8QQ,  
UK*

**Abstract.** Hinode's observations revealed a very dynamic and complex chromosphere. This requires revisiting the assumption that the chromospheric footpoints of solar flares are areas where accelerated particles only lose energy due to collisions. Traditionally electrons are thought to be accelerated in the coronal part of the loop, then travel to the footpoints where they lose their energy and radiate the observed Hard X-ray. Increasing observational evidence challenges this assumption. We review the evidence against this assumption and present the new Local Re-acceleration Thick Target Model (LRTTM) where at the footpoints electrons receive a boost of re-acceleration in addition to the usual collisional losses. Such a model may offer an alternative to the standard collisional thick target injection model (TTM) (Brown 1971) of solar HXR burst sources, requiring far fewer electrons and solving some recent problems with the TTM interpretation. We look at the different scenarios which could lead to such re-acceleration and present numerical results from one of them.

### 1. Introduction

Our image of the chromosphere has evolved in the last few decades from a simple stationary structured layer to a highly dynamic one which hosts a very complex magnetic field structure. Hinode's high resolution observations surprised us with an image of the chromosphere that is even more complex than predicted (e.g. Liu *et al.* 2009) and revived the debate about the relationship between chromospheric activities and the corona. This is particularly important in the context of the relationship between the chromospheric footpoints of a flaring loop and its coronal part, particularly during the height of flares which are accompanied by strong HXR radiation at the footpoints. The standard model of solar flares views the footpoints as a thick region where particles accelerated at the corona lose their energy due to collisions and radiate HXR. The relationship between the population of accelerated particles and the HXR at the footpoints is given by the Thick Target Model (Brown 71, Hudson 72). As with other 'Standard Models', steady improvements in relevant data are necessary. Here we recap the TTM in its basic form with injection from the corona, indicate some of the issues facing this, and discuss an alternative type of scenario in which the acceleration and radiation ('target') regions are not distinct.

## 2. Assumptions and Problems of the TTM

One of the main assumptions of Thick Target Model which we question here is the strict separation between the acceleration and the radiation regions. Breaking this assumption and allowing particles to gain energy in the radiation region solves many of the challenges which TTM faces as discussed below. In the TTM fast electrons are assumed to be accelerated (so the net energy change rate  $\dot{E} > 0$ ) by a usually unspecified process in a tenuous coronal region  $\mathcal{A}$  and injected continuously into a cool dense target chromosphere radiation region  $\mathcal{R}$  where their energies are assumed to be controlled mainly by collisional losses (so that  $\dot{E} < 0$ ) accompanied by HXR bremsstrahlung radiation. Radiation in  $\mathcal{A}$  is assumed to be small at high energies  $\geq 20$  keV (except for unusually dense loops - Veronig and Brown 2004). In reality, non-collisional  $\dot{E}$  due to return current Ohmic dissipation is important for the more intense events (Brown and Bingham 1984) while some redistribution of  $E$  by wave-particle interactions is inevitable since dispersive propagation (Melnik *et al.* 1999, Kontar 2001) and even collisions alone create electron distributions with  $f'(v) > 0$  (Haydock *et al.* 2001). Even in the purely collisional case of TTM injection, observed HXR fluxes place strong requirements on electron beam density and power supply. First, in *any* cool HXR source, long range Coulomb energy losses from fast electrons greatly exceed ( $\simeq 10^5 \times$ ) the HXR power radiated in close collisions, so the electron power supply needed is  $\simeq 10^5 \times$  the HXR luminosity. Second, since the electrons in  $\mathcal{R}$  are decelerated monotonically hence 'lost', they have to be continuously replenished by injection from  $\mathcal{A}$  at a high rate  $\mathcal{F}_1 \text{s}^{-1}$  above  $E = E_1$ . In a large HXR event  $\mathcal{F}_1 \gg 10^{36} \text{s}^{-1}$  for  $E_1 = 20$  keV (Hoyng *et al.* 1976) which, for event duration  $\tau_o \simeq 10^3 \text{s}$ , means a total  $\mathcal{N} \gg 10^{39}$  electrons processed. This exceeds the total electrons in a large dense coronal loop ( $10^{27} \text{cm}^3 \times 10^{11} \text{cm}^{-3}$ ), a fact often termed the *Electron Number Problem* though the solution to this was established long ago (Hoyng *et al.* 1976, Knight and Sturrock 1977, Colgate 1978). Beam electrodynamic theory shows that the E-field created by beam injection drives a return current in the plasma which delivers electrons back to the corona at rate  $\mathcal{F}_1$ , though there are issues over how the currents close at  $\mathcal{A}$  (Benka and Holman 1994). However, there *is* a real problem with the *instantaneous local beam density* if it has as small a cross sectional area  $A$  as the recent estimates of the impulsive WLF, optical and UK kernel sizes,  $< 3''$  (Hudson, Metcalf and Wolfson 2006) or  $A < 10^{16} \text{cm}^2$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}_1 \simeq A n_1 v_1 \approx 10^{36} A_{16} n_{10} \text{s}^{-1}$  where  $A_{16} = 10^{-16} A$ ,  $n_{10} = 10^{-10} n$  and  $v_1 \simeq 10^{10} \text{cm s}^{-1}$ , large event values of  $\mathcal{F}_1 \gg 10^{36}$  imply a local instantaneous (*not* time integrated) *beam* density above  $E_1 = 20$  keV of at least  $n_1 > 10^{10} \text{cm}^{-3}$ . If the beam is accelerated and propagates in the corona, this is highly implausible as it equals (or exceeds) the total *plasma* density in all but the densest loops ever seen (Veronig and Brown 2004). If the 'beam' footpoints are not monolithic but comprise a moving filament of even smaller instantaneous area (Fletcher *et al.* 2004) then the density problem would be even worse, even though such morphology seems more consistent with the values and evolution of soft X-ray emission measure and temperature (Stoiser, Brown and Veronig 2008). Note, however, that this density problem of the TTM only arises in the case of injection from the tenuous corona into the

chromosphere. It is not an issue for thick target HXR production by a beam accelerated and propagating wholly in dense layers

A second challenge to the TTM from recent data concerns the beam anisotropy. Electrons descending a loop produce HXR bremsstrahlung which is quite strongly beamed downwards (e.g. Brown 1972) unless they are near to isotropic when injected. Kontar and Brown (2006) recently emphasized (cf. Langer and Petrosian 1987) that, because of the large HXR albedo of the photosphere, such beaming should result in a HXR spectral 'bump' signature of the albedo around the 30-60 keV range. Such a feature is observed but only at the level expected for a near isotropic primary HXR source. Quantitative inference of beam anisotropy from HXR spectra, both on a few individual events (Kontar and Brown 2006) using the photosphere as a 'mirror', and statistically (Kasparova, Kontar and Brown 2007) points to near isotropy of the electrons in the HXR source. It should be noted, however, that their methods measure anisotropy with very low angular resolution - essentially in one upward and one downward direction - and could be consistent with many distributions having nearly equal up and down fluxes, though this is far from the usual TTM assumption. Another result which, if confirmed, would indicate small anisotropy of fast electrons is the reported absence of detectable polarization in impulsive H $\alpha$  kernels (Bianda *et al.* 2005) though this has been refuted by Henoux (personal communication). A nearly isotropic electron distribution does not of itself preclude the general TTM type of scenario but fast precipitation of such electrons in any realistic field requires some non-collisional transport process - e.g. electron cyclotron masering (Melrose and Dulk 1982) to defeat the effects of magnetic trapping and so allow fast electron precipitation. The difference between interplanetary and HXR source electron spectral indices has also been shown to be inconsistent with the CTM scenario (Krucker *et al.* 2007, 2009).

### 3. Local Re-acceleration Thick Target Model and Re-acceleration mechanisms

In the light of these problems with the TTM, we have considered alternatives (Brown *et al.* 2009) to the injection scenario where electrons are injected as in the TTM but constantly reaccelerated locally inside a dense HXR source. In these *Local re-acceleration thick target models - LRTTM* the fractional density, and possibly the anisotropy, of the fast electrons are reduced compared to TTM models involving purely collisional transport after injection from the corona. The reason is basically that the photon yield  $\zeta$  from one electron during its lifetime is roughly  $n_p v Q \tau$  where  $Q$  is the relevant bremsstrahlung cross section for the energy range considered and  $\tau$  is the electron lifetime. More precisely it is  $\int_t n_p v Q dt$  which, for each time segment  $\Delta t$  of monotonic  $E(t)$ , can be written  $\int_E n_p v Q dE / |\dot{E}|$ . Re-acceleration can reduce  $\dot{E}$  below the collisional energy loss rate  $\dot{E}_{coll}$  and/or increase  $E$  and hence  $\tau$  hence  $\zeta$  to  $\gg \zeta_{CTM}$ . This reduces the  $\mathcal{F}_1$  required to yield a specified HXR event flux. Many of the acceleration mechanisms which work in the corona could be a candidate for particle acceleration in the chromosphere. Most of these mechanisms rely on a generated electric field to transfer energy to the particle. With the chromosphere being so dynamic, the presence of such electric field is almost inevitable (Judge 2006), the question is

whether it is strong enough to be able to accelerate particles. The electric field needed to accelerate a particle from its thermal energy is the Driecer field, but if the particle already possesses energy above thermal then the field needed to accelerate the particle drops as  $1/v^2$ . This means that much a smaller electric field is needed to give energy to particles arriving from the corona with an initial kick in energy. This is why the case of re-acceleration in the chromosphere is stronger than the acceleration (which is not ruled out here). Examples of mechanisms which generate electric field that could re-accelerate electrons are the currents resulting from the interaction between the emerging flux and the preexisting magnetic field (Tortosa-Andreu & Moreno-Insertis 2009), electric currents generated by Alfvén waves (Guglielmino et al. 2008), and currents from reconnection events (Tortosa-Andreu & Moreno-Insertis 2009). Also, density gradient has been shown to be responsible of generating electric field both in the corona and the chromosphere (Vranjes & Poedts 2006) and (Vranjes & Poedts 2009). In (Brown et al. 2009) current sheet cascade at the chromosphere was suggested as one possible LRTTM, it is shown by 3D numerical simulations that these currents are able to reaccelerate significant percentage of electrons and subsequently increase their life time in the chromosphere and their photon yield.

## References

- Benka S. G. and Holman G.D. 1994, *Astrophysical Journal*, 435, 469.
- Bianda, M., Benz, A. O., Stenflo, J. O., Kuveller, G. and Ramelli, R. 2005, *Astron. Astrophys.* 434, 1183
- Brown, J.C. 1971, *Solar Phys.* 18, 489
- Brown, J.C. 1972, *Solar Phys.* 26,141
- Brown, J.C. and Bingham, R.L. 1984, *Astron. Astrophys.*131,11.
- Brown, J.C., Turkmani, R., Kontar, E. P., MacKinnon, A. L. and Vlahos, L. 2009 *A&A.* 508, 993B
- Colgate, S.A. 1978, *Astrophys. J.* 221, 1068
- Fletcher L. and Hudson H.S., Krucker S. and Pollock J. 2004, *AAS Bstract* 204.5403F
- Haydock E., Brown J.C., Emslie A.G. and Conway A.J., 2001, *Solar Phys.* 203, 355.
- Hoyng P, Brown, J.C. and van Beek H.F.: 1976, *Solar Phys.* 48, 197.
- Hudson, H.S. 1972, *Solar Phys.* 24, 414
- Hudson, H. S.; Wolfson and C. J.; Metcalf, T. R., *SoPh*, 234, 79
- S. L. Guglielmino, F. Zuccarello, P. Romano, and L. Bellot Rubio, 2008, *ApJ*, 688, 111
- Kasparova J., Kontar E.P. and Brown J.C. 2007, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 466, 705.
- Kontar, E.P. 2001, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 375, 629.
- Kontar E.P. and Brown, J.C. 2006, *Advances in Space Research*, 38, 945.
- Knight, J.W. and Sturrock P.A. 1977, *Astrophys. J.* 218, 306.
- Krucker S., Kontar E. P., Christe S. and Lin R. P. 2007, *ApJL*, 663, L109.
- Judge, P., 2006, *ASPC*, 354, 259
- Liu, W., Berger, T., Title, A., and Tarbell, T., 2009, *ApJ*, 707, 37
- Melnik, V. N. and Lapshin, V. and Kontar, E. 1999, *Solar Physics*, 184, 353.
- elrose D.B., & Dulk, G.A. 1982 *ApJ* 259 L41, 2009, *ApJ*, 702, 1
- Petrosian V. and Liu S. 2004 *Astrophys. J.* 610, 550
- Stoiser S., Brown, J.C. and Veronig A.M. 2008 *SoPh.* 250, 315
- Tortosa-Andreu, A. and Moreno-Insertis, *A&A* 507, 949
- Veronig, A. M. and Brown, J.C. 2004, *Astrophys J.* 603, L117.
- Vranjes, J. and Poedts, S., *MNRS*, 400, 4, 2147
- Vranjes, J. and Poedts, S., 2006, *A&A*, 458, 635