

CRITICAL HEIGHT OF THE TORUS INSTABILITY IN TWO-RIBBON SOLAR FLARES

DONG WANG^{1,2}, RUI LIU¹, YUMING WANG¹, KAI LIU¹, JUN CHEN¹,
JIAJIA LIU¹, ZHENJUN ZHOU¹, & MIN ZHANG²¹CAS Key Laboratory of Geospace Environment, Department of Geophysics and Planetary Sciences, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China; rliu@ustc.edu.cn²Department of Mathematics and Physics, Anhui Jianzhu University, Hefei 230601, China

ABSTRACT

We studied the background field for 60 two-ribbon flares of M-and-above classes during 2011–2015. These flares are categorized into two groups, i.e., *eruptive* and *confined* flares, based on whether a flare is associated with a coronal mass ejection or not. The background field of source active regions is approximated by a potential field extrapolated from the B_z component of vector magnetograms provided by the Helioseismic and Magnetic Imager. We calculated the decay index n of the background field above the flaring polarity inversion line, and defined a critical height h_{crit} corresponding to the theoretical threshold ($n_{\text{crit}} = 1.5$) of the torus instability. We found that h_{crit} is approximately half of the distance between the centroids of opposite polarities in active regions, and that the distribution of h_{crit} is bimodal: it is significantly higher for confined flares than for eruptive ones. The decay index increases monotonously with increasing height for 86% (84%) of the eruptive (confined) flares but displays a saddle-like profile for the rest 14% (16%), which are found exclusively in active regions of multipolar field configuration. Moreover, n at the saddle bottom is significantly smaller in confined flares than that in eruptive ones. These results highlight the critical role of background field in regulating the eruptive behavior of two-ribbon flares.

Keywords: Sun: flares—Sun: coronal mass ejections (CMEs)—Sun: magnetic fields—instabilities

1. INTRODUCTION

Solar flares and coronal mass ejections (CMEs) are among the most energetic phenomena in the solar system. They are often associated with each other and hence believed to be governed by the same physical process (Priest & Forbes 2002; Harrison 2003; Zhang et al. 2001, 2004). In the “standard” picture (Shibata 1998), a positive feedback is established between the slow rising of a magnetic flux rope and magnetic reconnection underneath; as a result, the flux rope erupts into interplanetary space as a CME, and the reconnection is mapped to the solar surface as two flare ribbons. However, some flares may exhibit circular-shaped (e.g., Liu et al. 2015) or X-shaped ribbons (e.g., Liu et al. 2016b), and not all flares are associated with CMEs (Yashiro et al. 2005). Conventionally, flares are categorized as eruptive flares (with CME association) and confined flares (without CME association). Wang & Zhang (2007) suggested that eruptive flares differ from confined ones in both the energy release location and the ratio between magnetic flux in the low ($<1.1 R_{\odot}$) and high ($>1.1 R_{\odot}$) corona. Relevant to the ratio is the torus instability, which has been recognized as a pertinent MHD instability underlying solar eruptions from both theoretical (van Tend & Kuperus 1978; Kliem & Török 2006; Aulanier et al. 2010) and observational perspectives (e.g., Török & Kliem 2005; Liu 2008; Cheng et al. 2011; Xu et al. 2012; Zuccarello et al. 2014; Sun et al. 2015; Liu et al. 2016). The torus instability occurs when the external field above the flux rope decreases too rapidly with increasing height, which is quantified by the decay index $n = -d \ln B / d \ln h$. The threshold value of the instability n_{crit} is derived to be 1.5 for a toroidal current channel (Kliem & Török 2006), while for a very flat, nearly two-dimensional current channel, $n_{\text{crit}} \gtrsim 1$ (Démoulin & Aulanier 2010). On the other hand, some numerical studies (e.g., Fan & Gibson 2007; Kliem et al. 2013; Zuccarello et al. 2016) and laboratory experiments (Myers et al. 2015, 2016, 2017) found that n_{crit} is in the range [1.4–2.0].

Before the above discrepancy is resolved, we simply take $n_{\text{crit}} = 1.5$ as a yardstick number and define the height

corresponding to n_{crit} as *critical height* h_{crit} to quantify the onset point of the torus instability. We carried out a comprehensive investigation to evaluate in what extent the decay index affects solar eruptions, which has significant implications for space weather forecasting. We selected events from two-ribbon flares occurring during 2011–2015. The working assumption is that a magnetic flux rope is present in a classical two-ribbon flare, no matter the rope is preexistent (e.g., Liu et al. 2010) or newly formed (e.g., Wang et al. 2017). In the sections that follow we elaborate on the procedure of calculation in §2 and give the statistical results and concluding remarks in §3.

2. OBSERVATION & ANALYSIS

2.1. Instruments

This study mainly used data from the Helioseismic and Magnetic Imager (HMI; Scherrer et al. 2012) and the Atmospheric Imaging Assembly (AIA; Lemen et al. 2011) onboard the Solar Dynamics Observatory (SDO; Pesnell et al. 2012), which was launched on 2010 February 11. HMI’s `hmi.sharp_cea` data series provide disambiguated vector magnetograms that are deprojected to the heliographic coordinates with a Lambert (cylindrical equal area; CEA) projection method, at a cadence of 720 s and a pixel scale of 0.03° (or 0.36 Mm; Bobra et al. 2014). Flares are monitored by the Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite (GOES) in soft X-ray (SXR) irradiance and by AIA’s seven EUV imaging passbands (94, 131, 171, 193, 211, 304, and 335 Å) and two UV imaging passbands (1600 and 1700 Å) with a spatial resolution of $1.5''$ and a temporal cadence of 12 s (24 s) for EUV (UV) passbands (Lemen et al. 2011). To obtain the context on CMEs, we examined coronagraph images obtained by Solar and Heliospheric Observatory (SOHO) and Solar Terrestrial Relations Observatory (STEREO).

2.2. Selection and Category of Events

60 two-ribbon flares of M- and X-class are selected in this study (Table 1) according to observations of UV flare ribbons in the chromosphere and of EUV post-flare arcades in the corona. The selection criterion is that the center of the source active region is located within ~ 45 degree from the solar disk center, so that the measurements of photospheric magnetic field are relatively reliable. Flares are categorized as either ‘E’ (eruptive) or ‘C’ (confined) in Table 1. To determine whether a flare is associated with a CME, we collated coronagraph images obtained by SOHO and STEREO, and EUV images obtained by AIA. The SOHO LASCO CME catalog¹ provides a benchmark reference for this purpose. Taking into account the timing and location of flares relative to CMEs as well as the CME speed and direction, we identified 35 eruptive and 25 confined flares (Table 1).

Table 1. Flare list

| Number | Date YYYYMMDD | Time ^a hhmm | Location | | Class | Category ^c | Profile ^d | Configuration ^e | h_{crit} (Mm) |
|--------|------------------|---------------------------|----------|-----------------------|-------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| | | | AR | Position ^b | | | | | |
| 1 | 20110307 | 1430 | 11166 | N11E21 | M1.7 | E | I | D | $46.8^{+3.2}_{-3.2}$ |
| 2 | 20110802 | 0619 | 11261 | N17W22 | M1.4 | E | I | M | $22.2^{+5.1}_{-6.0}$ |
| 3 | 20111001 | 0959 | 11305 | N10W06 | M1.2 | E | I | M | $24.1^{+2.5}_{-1.9}$ |
| 4 | 20111002 | 0050 | 11305 | N09W12 | M3.9 | E | I | M | $19.4^{+2.8}_{-2.3}$ |
| 5 | 20111226 | 0227 | 11387 | S21W33 | M1.5 | E | S | M | $11.6^{+3.9}_{-1.6}$ |
| 6 | 20111226 | 2030 | 11387 | S21W44 | M2.3 | E | S | M | $9.3^{+3.6}_{-1.9}$ |
| 7 | 20120119 | 1605 | 11402 | N32E27 | M3.2 | E | I | M* | $46.9^{+6.0}_{-5.0}$ |
| 8 | 20120123 | 0359 | 11402 | N28W21 | M8.7 | E | I | M* | $46.0^{+5.9}_{-6.0}$ |
| 9 | 20120307 | 0024 | 11429 | N18E31 | X5.4 | E | I | D | $38.6^{+6.1}_{-3.4}$ |
| 10 | 20120307 | 0114 | 11429 | N15E26 | X1.3 | E | I | D | $39.1^{+7.5}_{-8.1}$ |
| 11 | 20120310 | 1744 | 11429 | N17W24 | M8.4 | E | I | D | $62.4^{+10.4}_{-19.9}$ |
| 12 | 20120314 | 1521 | 11432 | N13E05 | M2.8 | E | I | M | $31.1^{+7.8}_{-9.6}$ |
| 13 | 20120315 | 0752 | 11432 | N14W03 | M1.8 | E | I | M | $40.7^{+2.4}_{-3.0}$ |
| 14 | 20120606 | 2006 | 11494 | S19W05 | M2.1 | E | I | M* | $20.0^{+1.4}_{-1.4}$ |
| 15 | 20120614 | 1435 | 11504 | S19E06 | M1.9 | E | I | D | $45.8^{+4.4}_{-4.7}$ |
| 16 | 20120705 | 1318 | 11515 | S16W43 | M1.2 | E | I | M* | $68.9^{+5.6}_{-5.2}$ |
| 17 | 20120712 | 1649 | 11520 | S13W03 | X1.4 | E | I | M* | $36.0^{+5.0}_{-5.3}$ |

Table 1 continued on next page

¹ http://cdaw.gsfc.nasa.gov/CME_list/index.html

Table 1 (*continued*)

| Number | Date YYYYMMDD | Time ^a hhmm | Location | | Class | Category | Profile ^d | Configuration ^e | h_{crit} (Mm) |
|--------|------------------|---------------------------|----------|-----------------------|-------|----------|----------------------|----------------------------|--|
| | | | AR | Position ^b | | | | | |
| 18 | 20130516 | 2153 | 11748 | N11E40 | M1.3 | E | I | M* | 21.9 ^{+2.4} _{-2.4} |
| 19 | 20130812 | 1041 | 11817 | S21E18 | M1.5 | E | I | M* | 22.9 ^{+3.4} _{-2.7} |
| 20 | 20131013 | 0043 | 11865 | S22E17 | M1.7 | E | S | M | 15.3 ^{+7.5} _{-4.3} |
| 21 | 20131028 | 1153 | 11877 | S16W44 | M1.4 | E | I | D | 69.7 ^{+3.4} _{-3.0} |
| 22 | 20140212 | 0425 | 11974 | S12W02 | M3.7 | E | S | M | 64.8 ^{+10.6} _{-14.0} |
| 23 | 20141217 | 0110 | 12242 | S20E08 | M1.5 | E | I | M* | 26.6 ^{+4.3} _{-3.9} |
| 24 | 20141217 | 0150 | 12241 | S11E33 | M1.1 | E | I | M | 15.9 ^{+11.4} _{-3.6} |
| 25 | 20141217 | 0451 | 12242 | S18E08 | M8.7 | E | I | M* | 27.7 ^{+5.7} _{-5.1} |
| 26 | 20141220 | 0028 | 12242 | S19W29 | X1.8 | E | I | M | 40.5 ^{+4.3} _{-4.5} |
| 27 | 20141221 | 1217 | 12241 | S13W25 | M1.0 | E | I | M | 51.7 ^{+8.2} _{-21.5} |
| 28 | 20150309 | 2353 | 12297 | S18E45 | M5.8 | E | I | M | 31.9 ^{+5.8} _{-6.2} |
| 29 | 20150315 | 2322 | 12297 | S19W32 | M1.2 | E | I | M | 20.1 ^{+5.6} _{-5.3} |
| 30 | 20150316 | 1058 | 12297 | S17W38 | M1.6 | E | S | M | 16.8 ^{+1.9} _{-2.5} |
| 31 | 20150621 | 0142 | 12371 | N12E13 | M2.0 | E | I | D | 46.3 ^{+10.3} _{-12.9} |
| 32 | 20150622 | 1823 | 12371 | N13W06 | M6.5 | E | I | D | 31.6 ^{+12.3} _{-8.5} |
| 33 | 20150625 | 0816 | 12371 | N12W40 | M7.9 | E | I | D | 56.6 ^{+5.7} _{-7.4} |
| 34 | 20151104 | 1352 | 12443 | N08W02 | M3.7 | E | I | D | 68.7 ^{+3.9} _{-4.4} |
| 35 | 20151109 | 1312 | 12449 | S13E39 | M3.9 | E | I | M* | 35.3 ^{+4.4} _{-5.5} |
| 36 | 20110309 | 1107 | 11166 | N09W06 | M1.7 | C | I | D | 46.9 ^{+4.1} _{-8.5} |
| 37 | 20110803 | 0432 | 11261 | N17E12 | M1.7 | C | S | M | 16.9 ^{+2.0} _{-1.6} |
| 38 | 20111105 | 0335 | 11339 | N20E45 | M3.7 | C | I | M | 74.5 ^{+8.2} _{-7.6} |
| 39 | 20111105 | 1121 | 11339 | N19E41 | M1.1 | C | I | M | 74.9 ^{+8.9} _{-8.3} |
| 40 | 20111106 | 0103 | 11339 | N21E33 | M1.2 | C | I | M | 82.2 ^{+9.7} _{-9.3} |
| 41 | 20111231 | 1315 | 11389 | S25E46 | M2.4 | C | I | M* | 61.4 ^{+1.9} _{-2.3} |
| 42 | 20111231 | 1626 | 11389 | S26E42 | M1.5 | C | I | M* | 62.5 ^{+2.5} _{-3.4} |
| 43 | 20120306 | 1241 | 11429 | N18E36 | M2.1 | C | I | D | 37.9 ^{+5.1} _{-7.6} |
| 44 | 20120427 | 0824 | 11466 | N11W30 | M1.0 | C | I | M* | 27.2 ^{+2.1} _{-2.0} |
| 45 | 20120509 | 1408 | 11476 | N06E22 | M1.8 | C | I | M | 33.6 ^{+4.1} _{-3.8} |
| 46 | 20120710 | 0514 | 11520 | S16E35 | M1.7 | C | I | M* | 38.4 ^{+3.6} _{-4.2} |
| 47 | 20131101 | 1953 | 11884 | S12E01 | M6.3 | C | S | M* | 71.2 ^{+6.7} _{-7.2} |
| 48 | 20140204 | 0400 | 11967 | S14W07 | M5.2 | C | S | M | 28.4 ^{+7.5} _{-6.6} |
| 49 | 20140206 | 2305 | 11967 | S15W48 | M1.5 | C | S | M | 19.4 ^{+5.4} _{-3.3} |
| 50 | 20141020 | 0911 | 12192 | S16E42 | M3.9 | C | I | D | 78.7 ^{+11.8} _{-14.1} |
| 51 | 20141020 | 1637 | 12192 | S14E39 | M4.5 | C | I | D | 82.1 ^{+12.6} _{-15.2} |
| 52 | 20141022 | 1428 | 12192 | S14E13 | X1.6 | C | I | D | 70.6 ^{+8.4} _{-7.9} |
| 53 | 20141024 | 2141 | 12192 | S22W21 | X3.1 | C | I | D | 84.0 ^{+10.5} _{-9.9} |
| 54 | 20141201 | 0641 | 12222 | S22E17 | M1.8 | C | I | M* | 57.1 ^{+1.6} _{-1.4} |
| 55 | 20141217 | 1901 | 12241 | S10E23 | M1.4 | C | I | M | 48.6 ^{+6.6} _{-6.1} |
| 56 | 20141218 | 2158 | 12241 | S11E10 | M6.9 | C | I | M | 54.7 ^{+5.6} _{-4.9} |
| 57 | 20141219 | 0944 | 12242 | S19W27 | M1.3 | C | I | M* | 48.7 ^{+17.1} _{-9.5} |
| 58 | 20150103 | 0947 | 12253 | S05E16 | M1.1 | C | I | D | 58.9 ^{+1.9} _{-2.5} |
| 59 | 20150104 | 1536 | 12253 | S05E01 | M1.3 | C | I | D | 62.5 ^{+0.8} _{-0.8} |
| 60 | 20150311 | 1851 | 12297 | S15E18 | M1.0 | C | I | M | 19.6 ^{+5.2} _{-6.4} |

^aGOES 1–8 Å peak time.

^bFlare position provided by GOES.

^c‘E’ for eruptive flares, ‘C’ for confined flares.

^d‘I’ for monotonous increasing of n as a function of h , ‘S’ for a saddle-like $n(h)$ profile.

^e‘D’ for a dipolar magnetic field, ‘M’ for a multipolar field and ‘M*’ indicates that the active region of interest is too close to be separated from a neighboring active region.

2.3. Decay Index & Critical Height

According to an analytical model of torus instability, a toroidal flux ring is unstable to lateral expansion if the external poloidal field B_{ex} decreases rapidly with increasing height such that the decay index $n = -d \ln B_{\text{ex}} / d \ln h$ exceeds $3/2$ (Kliem & Török 2006). Due to the difficulty in decoupling B_{ex} from the flux-rope field in either simulation or observation, a conventional practice is to approximate B_{ex} with a current-free potential field (e.g., Török & Kliem 2007; Fan & Gibson 2007; Démoulin & Aulanier 2010; Liu 2008). In our study, the coronal potential field is extrapolated from the B_z component of the vector magnetograms for active regions, using a Fourier transformation method (Alissandrakis 1981).

Hence in our calculation $n = -d \ln B_t / d \ln h$, where B_t denotes the transverse component of the extrapolated potential field, i.e., $B_t = \sqrt{B_x^2 + B_y^2}$. Precisely speaking, it is the external field component orthogonal to the axial current of the flux rope that creates the downward $\mathbf{J} \times \mathbf{B}$ force. B_t often serves as a good approximation since potential field is almost orthogonal to PIL, along which a flux rope in equilibrium typically resides. One needs keep in mind that this approximation works better with less curved PILs. Here we take as an example the confined flare on 2014 October 22 in NOAA AR 12192 (No. 52 in Table 1; see also Sun et al. 2015; Liu et al. 2016a) to demonstrate how the critical height h_{crit} is calculated. Figure 1(a) shows a pre-flare photospheric B_z map of AR 12192 at 13:48 UT prior to the onset of the flare and Figure 1(b) the flare ribbons observed near the SXR peak at 14:28 UT in AIA 1600 Å. We sampled the segment of polarity inversion line (PIL) that is located in between the two flare ribbons (referred to as ‘flaring PIL’ hereafter) by clicking on it as uniformly as possible to get sufficient representative points (marked by crosses), and then calculate decay index n at different heights at these selected points. In Figure 1(c) we plot n as a function of h , which is averaged over the selected points, with the error bar indicating the standard deviation. We located the critical height corresponding to $n = 1.5$ by linear interpolation between the discrete $n(h)$ points, which have a step of 0.36 Mm, and similarly we located the height at $n = 1.5$ on the $n + \delta n$ and $n - \delta n$ profile, where δn is the standard deviation at each $n(h)$ point, to get an uncertainty estimation of critical height. For this case, we obtained that $h_{\text{crit}} = 70.6^{+8.4}_{-7.9}$ Mm. As a comparison, Figure 1(d–f) shows an eruptive flare taking place on 2012 March 14 (No. 12). The corresponding $h_{\text{crit}} = 31.1^{+7.8}_{-9.6}$ Mm is much smaller than the confined case.

To evaluate the complexity of magnetic field in active regions and its impact on h_{crit} , we calculated the centroids of positive and negative magnetic fluxes for each active region and their distance d . We propose that the magnetic field relevant to a flare of interest can be deemed as dipolar field (labeled ‘D’ in Table 1) if the centroids of opposite polarities are located at two sides of, and their connection passes through, the flaring PIL (e.g., Figure 1a). In contrast, the magnetic field is deemed as multipolar field (labeled ‘M’ in Table 1) if the connection of centroids fails to pass through (e.g., Figure 1d), or, is almost parallel to, the flaring PIL. The latter category includes some cases in which the active region of interest cannot be clearly separated from a neighboring active region (labeled ‘M*’ in Table 1). By visual inspection, we confirmed that this categorization gives a result consistent with the conventional view of dipolar and multipolar field.

3. RESULTS

The distribution of h_{crit} for the sample of 60 two-ribbon flares is shown in the top panel of Figure 2. The total distribution of h_{crit} peaks at the heights of 20–30 Mm, but for confined flares h_{crit} significantly spreads to higher heights than eruptive flares. The average h_{crit} is 36.3 ± 17.4 Mm for the 35 eruptive flares, and 53.6 ± 21.3 Mm for the 25 confined flares. h_{crit} is highly correlated with the centroid distance d of active regions (bottom panel of Figure 2). From the linear fittings using a least absolute deviation method (LADFIT in IDL), we obtained an empirical formula

$$h_{\text{crit}} \simeq \frac{1}{2}d, \quad (1)$$

which may serve as a rule of thumb for the scale of h_{crit} . In comparison to numerical models, Kliem et al. (2014, Eq. 15) found that within the framework of the active-region model developed by Titov & Démoulin (1999), h_{crit}/L is slightly below unity, where L is the half distance between two monopoles. This is derived for a freely expanding torus without being line-tied. In the numerical experiments with a line-tying surface (Török & Kliem 2007, their Figures 2 and 3), one can also see that for bipolar configurations h_{crit} increases when the distance between external sources increases and that Eq. 1 approximately holds for each case (T. Török, private communication). On the other hand, h_{crit} is found to be comparable to the horizontal distance between two sub-photospheric monopoles in a series of numerical simulations imposing different photospheric flows and diffusive coefficients (Aulanier et al. 2010; Zuccarello et al. 2015; Zuccarello et al. 2016). Generally speaking, h_{crit} may be affected by various factors including, but not limited to, 1)

functional form of the external field; 2) other external sources besides the dipole confining the flux rope; 3) depths of the external sources below the surface. For example, in Török & Kliem (2007), the monopoles are very close to the surface, as compared to the significant depths set in Aulanier et al. (2010).

Two distinct types of $n(h)$ profiles emerge in this investigation, similar to a much smaller sample of 9 flares studied by Cheng et al. (2011): 1) n increases monotonically as the height increases in 30 of 35 (86%) eruptive flares and in 21 of 25 (84%) confined flares; and 2) the rest $n(h)$ profiles are saddle-like, exhibiting a local minimum at a height higher than h_{crit} (e.g., top panel of Figure 3). The saddle-like profile provides a potential to confine an eruptive structure if the local minimum n_b at the bottom of the saddle is significantly below n_{crit} and the eruption has not developed a large enough disturbance when the eruptive structure reaches the height of n_b . For example, the deep saddle bottom at higher altitudes than h_{crit} may help confine the eruption on 2014 Feb 4 (top panel of Figure 3). For the 9 flares exhibiting a saddle-like $n(h)$ profile, including 5 eruptive and 4 confined flares, the distribution of n_b is given in the bottom panel Figure 3. One can see that n_b of the 5 eruptive flares (black) is generally larger than that of the 4 confined flares (red). In relation to the field configuration, an outstanding characteristic for saddle-like profiles is that all 9 events originate from multipolar magnetic field (Table 2). However, it is not clear exactly what a photospheric flux distribution would yield the saddle shape because, on the one hand, the relevant magnetic field is highly complex; on the other hand, the majority cases of monotonously growing $n(h)$ also originate from multipolar field (Table 2). This will be considered in a future investigation.

Table 2. The number of different type of flares and $n(h)$ profiles in relation to magnetic field configuration of active regions. The same notations are adopted here as in Table 1.

| | <i>I</i> | <i>S</i> | <i>E</i> | <i>C</i> |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| <i>D</i> | 18 | 0 | 10 | 8 |
| $M(M^*)$ | 33 (16) | 9 (1) | 25 (10) | 17 (7) |

To conclude, this investigation confirms that the decay index profile of the background field plays an important role in deciding whether a two-ribbon flare would lead up to a CME. Moreover, the saddle-like profile present in some active regions may provide an additional confinement effect on eruptions. These results indicate the possibility that some two-ribbon flares might be innately incapable of producing CMEs.

The authors thank the anonymous reviewer for constructive comments that help greatly improve the paper. D.W. acknowledges the support by Natural Science Foundation of Anhui province education department (KJ2016JD18, KJ2017A493). R.L. acknowledges the support by NSFC 41474151 and the Thousand Young Talents Program of China, and thanks T. Török for helpful comments. Y.W. acknowledges the support from NSFC 41131065 and 41574165. This work was also supported by NSFC 41421063, CAS Key Research Program KZZD-EW-01-4, and the fundamental research funds for the central universities.

REFERENCES

- Alissandrakis, C. E. 1981, *A&A*, 100, 197
- Aulanier, G., Török, T., Démoulin, P., & DeLuca, E. E. 2010, *ApJ*, 708, 314
- Bobra, M. G., Sun, X., Hoeksema, J. T., et al. 2014, *SoPh*, 289, 3549
- Cheng, X., Zhang, J., Ding, M., Guo, Y., & Su, J. 2011, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 732, 87
- Démoulin, P., & Aulanier, G. 2010, *ApJ*, 718, 1388
- Fan, Y., & Gibson, S. E. 2007, *ApJ*, 668, 1232
- Harrison, R. 2003, *Advances in Space Research*, 32, 2425
- Kliem, B., Lin, J., Forbes, T. G., Priest, E. R., & Török, T. 2014, *ApJ*, 789, 46
- Kliem, B., Su, Y. N., van Ballegoijen, A. A., & DeLuca, E. E. 2013, *ApJ*, 779, 129
- Kliem, B., & Török, T. 2006, *Physical Review Letters*, 96, 255002
- Lemen, J. R., Akin, D. J., Boerner, P. F., et al. 2011, in *The Solar Dynamics Observatory* (Springer), 17–40
- Liu, C., Deng, N., Liu, R., et al. 2015, *ApJL*, 812, L19
- Liu, L., Wang, Y., Wang, J., et al. 2016a, *ApJ*, 826, 119
- Liu, R., Chen, J., Wang, Y., & Liu, K. 2016b, *Scientific Reports*, 6, 34021
- Liu, R., Liu, C., Wang, S., Deng, N., & Wang, H. 2010, *ApJL*, 725, L84
- Liu, R., Kliem, B., Titov, V. S., et al. 2016, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 818, 148
- Liu, Y. 2008, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 679, L151
- Myers, C. E., Yamada, M., Ji, H., et al. 2015, *Nature*, 528, 526
- . 2016, *Physics of Plasmas*, 23, 112102
- . 2017, *Plasma Physics and Controlled Fusion*, 59, 014048

- Pesnell, W. D., Thompson, B. J., & Chamberlin, P. C. 2012, *SoPh*, 275, 3
- Priest, E., & Forbes, T. 2002, *The Astronomy and Astrophysics Review*, 10, 313
- Scherrer, P. H., Schou, J., Bush, R., et al. 2012, *Solar Physics*, 275, 207
- Shibata, K. 1998, *Astrophysics and Space Science*, 264, 129
- Sun, X., Bobra, M. G., Hoeksema, J. T., et al. 2015, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 804, L28
- Sun, X., Bobra, M. G., Hoeksema, J. T., et al. 2015, *ApJL*, 804, L28
- Titov, V., & Démoulin, P. 1999, *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 351, 707
- Török, T., & Kliem, B. 2005, *ApJ*, 630, L97
- Török, T., & Kliem, B. 2007, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, 328, 743
- van Tend, W., & Kuperus, M. 1978, *SoPh*, 59, 115
- Wang, W., Liu, R., Wang, Y., et al. 2017, *Nature Communications*, under review
- Wang, Y., & Zhang, J. 2007, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 665, 1428
- Xu, Y., Liu, C., Jing, J., & Wang, H. 2012, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 761, 52
- Yashiro, S., Gopalswamy, N., Akiyama, S., Michalek, G., & Howard, R. A. 2005, *Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics)*, 110, A12S05
- Zhang, J., Dere, K., Howard, R., Kundu, M., & White, S. 2001, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 559, 452
- Zhang, J., Dere, K., Howard, R., & Vourlidas, A. 2004, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 604, 420
- Zuccarello, F., Aulanier, G., & Gilchrist, S. 2016, *The Astrophysical journal letters*, 821, L23
- Zuccarello, F. P., Aulanier, G., & Gilchrist, S. A. 2015, *ApJ*, 814, 126
- Zuccarello, F. P., Seaton, D. B., Mierla, M., et al. 2014, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 785, 88




Figure 1. Derivation of the decay index profile for two exemplary events, a confined flare (No. 52) on the left and an eruptive flare (No. 12) on the right. (a) and (d) HMI B_z map. The red line denotes the flaring PIL and the green line connects the centroids of opposite polarities. (b) and (e) The AIA 1600 Å image overlaid by B_z contour (50 G and 10 G), with red (blue) colors indicating negative (positive) polarity. The sign ‘+’ denotes the points selected along the flaring PIL. (c) and (f) The decay index n as a function of the height h above the surface in units of Mm. Dotted lines indicate where n_{crit} and h_{crit} are taken.




Figure 2. Distribution of h_{crit} (top) and its relation to the centroid distance d of active regions (bottom). In the bottom panel, plus and diamond symbols denote dipolar (D) and multipolar (M) magnetic field, respectively. Eruptive ('E') and confined ('C') events are shown in blue and red, respectively. 'sl' indicates the slope given by linear fitting and 'cc' the correlation coefficient with the confidence interval denoted in the brackets. $h_{\text{crit}} = \frac{1}{2}d$ is marked by the dotted line.




Figure 3. Saddle-like $n(h)$ profile. Top panel shows an exemplary $n(h)$ profile from the confined flare on 2014 February 4 (No. 48 in Table 1). n_b and h_{crit} are marked. Bottom panel shows the distribution of n_b for 5 eruptive (black) and 4 confined (red) flares.