

A theoretical estimate of the pole-equator temperature difference and a possible origin of the near-surface shear layer

Arnab Rai Choudhuri
Department of Physics
Indian Institute of Science
Bangalore - 560012, India

Abstract

Convective motions in the deep layers of the solar convection zone are affected by rotation, making the convective heat transport latitude-dependent, but this is not the case in the top layers near the surface. We use the thermal wind balance condition in the deeper layers to estimate the pole-equator temperature difference. Surface observations of this temperature difference can be used for estimating the depth of the near-surface layer within which convection is not affected by rotation. If we require that the thermal wind balance holds in this layer also, then we have to conclude that this must be a layer of strong differential rotation and its characteristics which we derive are in broad agreement with the observational data of the near-surface shear layer.

1 Introduction

Whether the surface temperature of the Sun has any variations with latitude is an interesting question both from theoretical and observational considerations. We point out that a simple order-of-magnitude estimate of the pole-equator temperature variation can be made from the thermal wind balance equation, which is the key equation in the theory of the meridional circulation. Although this equation is well known in the literature (see, for example, Kitchatinov, 2013; Karak et al., 2015, §5.2; Choudhuri, 2020) and this order-of-magnitude estimate follows easily from this equation, we have not come across a discussion of this anywhere in the literature of the subject. Presumably, it is not generally realized that such a simple order-of-magnitude estimate of the pole-equator temperature difference can be made and that it has important implications. This order-of-magnitude analysis gives us a clue to understanding an enigmatic finding of helioseismology. Although the isorotation contours of solar differential rotation are nearly radial within the body of the convection zone, they bend towards the equator near the surface, giving rise to a near-surface shear layer (Howe, 2009). The origin of this layer is still not fully understood, although there have been efforts to explain this on the basis of numerical simulation (Guerrero et al., 2013; Hotta, Rempel, and Yokoyama, 2015). We propose a simple alternative explanation of this layer.

Heat is transported by convection in the outer layers of the Sun from about $0.7R_{\odot}$ to the solar surface. Convective motions are expected to be affected by the solar rotation if the convective turnover time τ_c is more than or comparable to the solar rotation period, i.e. if

$$\tau_c \geq 25 \text{ days.} \quad (1)$$

Immediately below the solar surface, convection takes place in the form of granules with turnover times of the order of a few minutes. Since granular convection does not satisfy the condition (1), we believe that convection below the surface till a depth, say D , will be completely unaffected by rotation. However, below this depth D , convection is likely to take place in the form of giant cells with much longer turnover times. Numerical simulations indeed show the existence of banana-shaped giant cells roughly aligned parallel to the rotation axis—see Figure 1 in Brown et al. (2010) or Figure 3 in Gastine et al. (2014). Heat transport in such convection cells is clearly affected by rotation. Since the Coriolis force (which is crucial in producing the banana cells by acting on moving fluid parcels) is more effective in lower latitudes, we expect the effect of rotation to be more at the lower latitudes. Heat transport should be more efficient at higher latitudes, giving rise to a higher temperature at the poles. A hotter pole will tend to drive a meridional circulation equatorward at the solar surface (opposite to what is observed). This type of circulation driven by temperature differences on isochoric surfaces (i.e. surfaces of constant density) is often referred to as a thermal wind. It was realized nearly half a century ago that the effect of rotation on convection may make the heat transport in the Sun latitude-dependent and may produce a thermal wind (Durney and Roxburgh 1971; Belvedere and Paterno 1976).

The thermal wind is opposed by the centrifugal force term arising out of the differential rotation. With differential rotation mapped by helioseismology, one can now calculate this centrifugal force term fairly accurately. Within the main body of the convection zone, the centrifugal force term is expected to roughly balance the thermal wind term. In fact, the centrifugal force term must slightly overpower the thermal wind term to drive the meridional circulation in the correct direction. This balance is, however, thought to be upset in the layers just below the solar surface. It has been argued that the dissipative term, which is negligible inside the body of the convection zone compared to the centrifugal force term, becomes important in the layer near the surface and balances the centrifugal term, the thermal wind term being negligible there (Hotta, Rempel, and Yokoyama, 2014; Karak et al. 2015). We present a different point of view. We argue that the thermal wind term becomes even more important in the layer just below the surface and plays a crucial role in creating the near-surface shear layer.

On the basis of a mean field model of the differential rotation and the meridional circulation, Kitchatinov and Rüdiger (1994) concluded that the pole of the Sun has to be about 4 K hotter than the equator. An input from observations will be very crucial in deciding between the various alternative viewpoints. Rüdiger (1989, p. 79) has provided a summary of the early efforts in determining the pole-equator temperature difference. Nearly all the authors reported an upper limit rather than an actual measurement. Such efforts have continued (Kuhn, Libbrecht, and Dicke, 1988; Rast, Ortiz, and Meisner, 2008). In one

of the last investigations we are aware of, Rast, Ortiz, and Meisner (2008) reported an excess temperature of 2.5 K in the polar region at the photospheric level. If this is true, then it provides a strong support to our theoretical conjecture, as we shall point out. We hope that this important issue will be settled observationally in the near future.

An estimate of the pole-equator temperature difference from the thermal wind balance condition is presented in the next Section. Then §3 is devoted to determining the various characteristics of the near-surface shear layer by assuming that this balance condition holds in this layer also. Our conclusions are summarized in §4.

2 An order of magnitude estimate of the pole-equator temperature difference

The well-known equation driving the meridional circulation (which is the equation of the azimuthal component of vorticity) can be derived from basic principles of fluid mechanics. See, for example, Choudhuri (2020) for a derivation of this equation. The two important source terms in this equation are the centrifugal term and the thermal wind term. The dissipation term within the convection zone turns out to be negligible compared to the centrifugal term estimated from helioseismology. This means that the centrifugal term cannot be balanced by the dissipation term in the interior of the convection zone and must be balanced by the thermal wind term in order to maintain a steady meridional circulation. This leads to the equation

$$r \sin \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \Omega^2 = \frac{1}{r} \frac{g}{\gamma C_V} \frac{\partial S}{\partial \theta}, \quad (2)$$

where S is the specific entropy (i.e. the entropy per unit mass), z is measured parallel to the rotation axis starting from the equatorial plane and all the other symbols have their usual meanings. We may mention that Balbus et al. (2009) constructed a theoretical model of differential rotation by solving this equation to find $\Omega(r, \theta)$. We are somewhat skeptical about this approach due to the non-uniqueness of this equation. Suppose we find a solution Ω^2 of this equation. If we add any arbitrary function $f(r \sin \theta)$ to this solution, it is easy to check that this will still be a solution of (2). However, we can use (2) to make an order of magnitude estimate of the pole-equator temperature difference which we need for balancing the centrifugal term that would arise from the differential rotation measured by helioseismology.

We now try to estimate the magnitude of the centrifugal term, as given by the left hand side of (2), below the shallow layer near the solar surface. We look at Figure 1 of Howe (2009) giving a map of the solar differential rotation and consider a vertical straight line starting from the bottom of the convection zone in the equatorial plane and going upwards. We note that Ω has the value $\Omega_{\text{eq}}/2\pi = 460$ nHz at the beginning of this line at the bottom of the convection zone and the value $\Omega_{\text{mid}}/2\pi = 420$ nHz where it reaches the bottom of the near-surface shear layer. It is easy to argue that the left hand side of (2) in the interior of the convection would approximately be equal to

$$r \sin \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \Omega^2 \approx -[\Omega_{\text{eq}}^2 - \Omega_{\text{mid}}^2]. \quad (3)$$

Substituting the values of Ω_{eq} and Ω_{mid} , we get

$$r \sin \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \Omega^2 \approx -[(460)^2 - (420)^2] \times (2\pi 10^{-9})^2 \text{ s}^{-2} \approx 1.4 \times 10^{-12} \text{ s}^{-2}. \quad (4)$$

Next, we make an estimate of the right hand side of (2). We note that the specific entropy of an ideal gas is given by

$$S = C_V \ln T - (\gamma - 1) C_V \ln \rho + K,$$

where K is a constant. The entropy difference between the equator and the pole on any isochoric surface (i.e. a surface of constant ρ) is

$$\Delta S = C_V \ln \left(\frac{T_{\text{eq}}}{T_{\text{pole}}} \right).$$

Taking ΔT to be the temperature excess of the pole with respect to equator, we have

$$\Delta S \approx -C_V \frac{\Delta T}{T_S}, \quad (5)$$

where T_S is the temperature of our isochoric surface and we have made use of the approximation $\ln(1+x) \approx x$ for $|x| \ll 1$. Since this entropy difference takes place over an angular separation $\pi/2$, we have

$$\frac{\partial S}{\partial \theta} \approx -2C_V \frac{\Delta T}{\pi T_S}, \quad (6)$$

Substituting this in the right hand side of (2), we get

$$\frac{1}{r} \frac{g}{\gamma C_V} \frac{\partial S}{\partial \theta} \approx -\frac{2}{\pi \gamma} \frac{GM_{\odot}}{(0.85R_{\odot})^3} \frac{\Delta T}{T_S}, \quad (7)$$

where we have taken r to be given by $0.85R_{\odot}$ corresponding to the middle of the convection zone and have also used this to calculate g . If we now use the standard values of solar mass and radius, then we get (taking $\gamma = 1.4$)

$$\frac{1}{r} \frac{g}{\gamma C_V} \frac{\partial S}{\partial \theta} \approx 2.8 \times 10^{-7} \frac{\Delta T}{T_S} \text{ s}^{-2}. \quad (8)$$

We note that (4) gives the value of the left hand side of (2) only inside the convection zone underneath the near-surface layer, whereas (8) gives the value of the right hand side of (2) for any isochoric surface, provided $\Delta T/T$ is much smaller than 1. By equating (4) and (8), we arrive at

$$\frac{\Delta T}{T_S} \approx 5.0 \times 10^{-6}. \quad (9)$$

If we take T_S equal to the temperature 5800 K at the photospheric surface, then we get a rather low value $\Delta T \approx 2.9 \times 10^{-2}$ K. But, should we use the photospheric temperature for T_S in (9)? As we point out, (4) gives the magnitude of the centrifugal term underneath the near-surface shear layer. For the sake of consistency, we may expect (8) would be equal to (4) only if use $\Delta T/T$ for an isochoric surface below the near-surface shear layer. At what depth this isochoric surface should be is discussed in the next Section. We stress the rather non-intuitive fact that a centrifugal force resulting from a significant variation in Ω needs a very small pole-equator temperature difference to give rise to a thermal wind term to balance it.

3 Physics of the near-surface layer

As we move from a region inside the convection zone towards the solar surface, the convection cells would be of smaller size due to decrease in the pressure scale height and rotation would have less effect on the convection cells. While this is a gradual transition, we can make the following simplification. Below a certain depth D , we assume that (1) is satisfied and convection is significantly affected by rotation. On the other hand, (1) is not satisfied above D and convection is unaffected by rotation. We now make an estimate of this depth D .

Within the convection zone, the temperature gradient dT/dr is very nearly equal to the adiabatic gradient, the small difference between the two depending on the mixing length l (Kippenhahn and Weigert, 1990, §7). Since the mixing length l would be latitude-dependent below D due to the effect of rotation, the gradient dT/dr would vary with latitude beneath D . On the other hand, the mixing length l would be independent of latitude above D , leading us to conclude the dT/dr would be the same at all latitudes in this layer near the surface. This means that the temperature would fall radially at the same rate at all latitudes in this layer. Suppose ΔT is the pole-equator temperature difference at the depth D . As we move from this depth D towards the surface, the overall temperature would keep falling, but ΔT would still be the pole-equator temperature difference at the photospheric surface due to the temperature falling at the same rate at all latitudes. In other words, a pole-equator temperature difference at depth D gets directly mapped to the photospheric surface, even though the overall temperature keeps falling. If ΔT is really 2.5 at the photospheric surface as claimed by Rast, Ortiz, and Meisner (2008), then we have to conclude that ΔT at the depth D also should be 2.5 K.

Presumably, the depth D would be in a region where the centrifugal term is given by (4) and consequently (9) holds. Taking $\Delta T \approx 2.5$ K, we conclude that the temperature of the isochoric surface at this depth would be of order

$$T_S \approx 5.0 \times 10^5 \text{ K}. \quad (10)$$

From the standard model of the convection zone (Spruit, 1974; Bahcall and Ulrich, 1988), we note that the temperature would have such a value at a radial distance of about $0.91R_\odot$ from the solar centre, which gives a depth of

$$D \approx 63,000 \text{ km} \quad (11)$$

below the photospheric surface. Our contention is that, if the pole-equator temperature difference at the solar surface is really 2.5 K, then the pole-equator temperature would continue to remain approximately 2.5 K till this depth 63,000 km, in spite of the overall temperature changing by 2 orders of magnitude between the solar surface and this layer at depth 63,000 km. If ΔT remains the same but T keeps falling as we move radially outward in this layer, certainly $\Delta T/T$ would keep increasing, making the thermal wind term given by (8) stronger and stronger. To have an estimate of this term, we may take the temperature of an intermediate layer to calculate the thermal wind term. Taking $T_S \approx 5 \times 10^4$ K, the thermal wind term given by (8) turns out to be

$$\frac{1}{r} \frac{g}{\gamma C_V} \frac{\partial S}{\partial \theta} \approx 1.4 \times 10^{-11} \text{ s}^{-2}. \quad (12)$$

The value of the thermal wind term in this top layer given by (12) is clearly larger than the centrifugal term in the interior of the convection zone as given by (4). If we want the centrifugal term and the thermal wind term to balance each other even in this thin layer, then clearly $d\Omega^2/dz$ has to be larger in this layer, showing the necessity of a near-surface shear layer. We have already pointed out that the value of $\Omega/2\pi$ is 420 nHz at the point where a vertical straight line starting from the bottom of the convection zone in the equatorial plane intersects the bottom of the near-surface layer we are considering. If $\Omega_{\text{top}}/2\pi$ is the value of the angular frequency at the point where this vertical straight line extended further would meet the solar surface, then the centrifugal term in this near-surface layer is given by

$$r \sin \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \Omega^2 \approx -\frac{R_{\odot}}{D} \left[(420)^2 - \left(\frac{\Omega_{\text{top}}}{2\pi} \right)^2 \right] \times (2\pi 10^{-9})^2 \text{ s}^{-2}. \quad (13)$$

If we require that the centrifugal term and thermal wind term should be comparable even within this near-surface layer, then we have to equate (12) and (13). On using the value of D given by (11), this gives

$$\frac{\Omega_{\text{top}}}{2\pi} \approx 380 \text{ nHz}. \quad (14)$$

Looking at Figure 1 of Howe (2009), we note that the observational value is about 400 nHz. In other words, the jump in the value of $\Omega/2\pi$ according to our theoretical estimates is ≈ 40 nHz, whereas the observational jump is ≈ 20 nHz.

We thus find that our simple considerations give various important characteristics of the near-surface layer—such as its depth D and the jump in $\Omega/2\pi$ within this layer—within a factor about 2 of the observational values.

4 Conclusion

It is generally believed that the centrifugal force term and thermal wind term approximately balance each other within the interior of the convection zone. From this balance condition, we estimate the pole-equator temperature difference. We argue that this temperature difference is appropriate for a layer at some depth below the surface and that this temperature difference remains the same as we move through the near-surface layer towards the surface, although the overall temperature keeps falling. Whether the thermal wind balance should hold within the near-surface layer as well is not a settled question. Hotta, Rempel, and Yokoyama (2015) argued that the centrifugal force term in this layer should be balanced by the turbulent dissipation term. We point out that the thermal wind term will become larger in this layer and propose the alternative viewpoint that this term will have to be balanced by the centrifugal force term. This suggests that the near-surface layer has to be a layer of strong differential rotation. The various characteristics of this layer which we infer agree with the properties of the near-surface shear layer measured by helioseismology.

We point out that we have not considered magnetic forces in our discussion. Although the magnetic forces are believed to drive the torsional oscillations (Chakraborty, Chatterjee, and Choudhuri, 2009) and the variations of the meridional circulation with the solar cycle (Hazra and Choudhuri 2017), they

presumably are not important in determining the mean characteristics of the large-scale flows.

The value of the pole-equator temperature difference at the surface is crucial in estimating the characteristics of the near-surface shear layer. On using the value 2.5 K, as reported by Rast, Ortiz, and Meisner (2008), we find that the characteristics of this layer which we obtain are in reasonable agreement with measurements from helioseismology. In case there is no pole-equator temperature difference at the surface, then our idea will clearly not work. Due to the difficulties in treating the near-surface layer realistically in numerical simulations, it is not possible to draw any firm conclusion about this temperature difference from simulations (Bidya Karak, private communication). We hope that the temperature difference at the solar surface will be firmly established by independent measurements of different groups in the near future.

Finally, we point out that in this paper we do not address the important question of the possible angular momentum transport mechanisms which must be needed for sustaining the near-surface shear layer. Inclusion of such dynamical considerations will be essential for developing a fully self-consistent model of the near-surface shear layer. In the present paper, our aim is to show that the mere existence of a pole-equator temperature difference would suggest the existence of a near-surface layer within which a strong shear would be needed for balancing the thermal wind term.

Acknowledgements. I thank Leonid Kitchatinov and Bidya Karak for valuable discussions. My research was supported in part by a J.C. Bose Fellowship awarded by the Department of Science and Technology, Government of India.

References

- Bahcall, J. N., and Ulrich, R. K.: 1988, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 60, 297.
Balbus, S. A., Bonart, J., Latter, H.N., Weiss, N. O.: 2009, *MNRAS* 400, 176.
Belvedere, G., and Paterno, L.: 1976, *Solar Phys.* 47, 525.
Brown, B. P., Browning, M. K., Brun, A. S., Miesch, M. S., Toomre, J.: 2010, *Astrophys. J.* 711, 424.
Chakraborty, S., Choudhuri, A. R., Chatterjee, P.: 2009, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 102, 041102.
Choudhuri, A.R.: 2020, in preparation.
Durney, B. R., and Roxburgh, I. W.: 1971, *Solar Phys.* 16, 3.
Gastine, T., Yadav, R. K., Morin, J., Reiners, A., Wicht, J.: 2014, *MNRAS* 438, L76.
Guerrero, G., Smolarkiewicz, P. K., Kosovichev, A. G., Mansour, N. N.: 2013, *Astrophys. J.* 779, 176.
Hazra, G. and Choudhuri, A. R.: 2017, *MNRAS* 472, 2728.
Hotta, H., Rempel, M., Yokoyama, T.: 2015, *Astrophys. J.* 798, 51.
Howe, R.: 2009, *Living Rev. Solar Phys.*, 6, 1.
Karak, B. B., Jiang, J. Miesch, M. S., Charbonneau, P., Choudhuri, A. R.: 2014, *Space Sci. Rev.* 186, 561.
Kippenhahn, R., and Weigert, A.: 1990, *Stellar Structure and Evolution*, Springer-Verlag.

- Kitchatinov, L. L.: 2013, in A. G. Kosovichev, E. de Gouveia Dal Pino and Y. Yan (eds.), *Solar and Astrophysical Dynamos and Magnetic Activity: IAU Symposium 294*, 399.
- Kitchatinov, L. L., and Rüdiger, G.: 1995, *Astron. Astrophys.* 299, 446.
- Kuhn, J. R., Libbrecht, K. G., Dicke, R. H.: 1988, *Science* 242, 908.
- Rast, M.P., Ortiz, A., Meisner, R. W.: 2008, *Astrophys. J.* 673, 1209.
- Rüdiger, G.: 1989, *Differential Rotation and Stellar Convection*, Gordon & Breach.
- Spruit, H.C.: 1974, *Solar Phys.* 34, 277.