

The role of point discharge during Thunderstorm Ground Enhancements (TGEs)

Maribeth Stolzenburg and Thomas C. Marshall

Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Mississippi, University, MS USA

Corresponding author: Maribeth Stolzenburg, mstolzen@phy.olemiss.edu

Abstract. A new explanation for the increased fluxes of high energy particles detected in Thunderstorm Ground Enhancements (TGEs) is suggested. Point discharge, which occurs ordinarily at the surface beneath electrified clouds when the field reaches a threshold magnitude, is proposed to generate the conditions of very large electric fields for X-rays and gamma rays to be emitted via bremsstrahlung near the tips of grounded, conducting points. These X-rays and gamma rays are then detected with instrumentation located very nearby. The well-documented occurrences of TGEs accompanied by unusually large magnitudes of electric field at the ground beneath the storm nominally support this hypothesis, although additional calibrated electric field data should be acquired. It is recommended that point discharge processes be studied further to establish or eliminate their relevance to the problem of TGE occurrence and variability.

1. Introduction

Thunderstorm Ground Enhancements (TGEs), as named by Chilingarian et al. (2010) and recently reviewed by Chilingarian et al. (2020), are increases in the flux of high energy particles (electrons, gamma rays, and neutrons) at the ground that last for several minutes to hours and occur during thunderstorms. The high-energy particles detected in short duration (several minutes long) TGEs have been attributed to runaway breakdown (Gurevich et al., 1992), also known as a relativistic runaway electron avalanche (RREA), in the very large electric field (E) suggested to exist between lower positive charge and mid-level negative charge regions (e.g., Chilingarian & Mkrytchyan, 2012) of a thundercloud. E measurements made at the ground during short duration TGEs show that they are often terminated by a nearby lightning flash (e.g., Khaerdinov et al., 2005; Chilingarian et al., 2017; Chum et al., 2020); airborne observations near and within thunderstorms have also found sharply increased X-ray intensities which cease at the time of a nearby lightning flash (e.g. McCarthy & Parks, 1985; Eack et al., 1996). Observed E values at the ground are usually (but not always) positive upward during the TGEs (e.g., Khaerdinov et al., 2005; Chum et al., 2020), thereby causing a downward force on electrons. Longer duration TGEs (1-2 hours) of increased high-energy particle fluxes have long been observed during thunderstorms (e.g. Shaw, 1967) and have been most clearly attributed to radon and daughter products (particularly ^{222}Rn) by Bogomolov et al. (2018); this explanation was also suggested by Tsuchiya et al. (2009) and many other earlier researchers. The high-energy particle bursts of short duration TGEs usually occur during these longer duration TGE events.

The particle detectors used by Chilingarian et al. (2010, 2020) to measure TGEs are located on Mt. Aragats at an altitude of 3.20 km msl. Bursts of strong TGEs have also been found using detectors on other mountain tops including in the Tien-Shan mountains at 3.30 km (Chubenko et al., 2000), on Mt. Fuji at 3.80 km (Torii et al., 2009), at 2.77 km on a mountain in Gifu prefecture (Tsuchiya et al., 2009), and at 2.60 km on Lomnický štít (Chum et al., 2020). See Lidvansky (2003) for a review of earlier studies of high-energy particle bursts at the ground associated with thunderstorms.

The explanation given by Chilingarian and colleagues for short duration TGEs is dependent on the thunderstorm charge structure aloft. Results from many balloon-borne instruments through storms above Langmuir Laboratory (3.2 km msl) have found that both a lower positive charge and a main negative charge region are common in the thunderstorm convective region

charge structure there (e.g. Stolzenburg et al., 1998). The predominant charge carriers of the lower positive charge region in convection are precipitation-sized particles (Bateman et al. 1999; Marshall & Winn 1982; Marshall & Marsh 1993; Marsh & Marshall 1993; Stolzenburg & Marshall 1998). Positive E values of 26-186 kV/m have been observed at altitudes of 4-6 km msl, between the lower positive and main negative charge regions (e.g., Stolzenburg et al., 1998; Marshall et al., 2005; Stolzenburg & Marshall, 2009). Although no in situ observations of the cloud charge structure or in-cloud E during TGEs have been made, there are reasons to expect that a substantial positive charge region and large positive E would exist in the thunderclouds above the mountain peaks where TGEs have been observed.

In this article, we offer a different explanation for the increased fluxes of high energy particles detected as TGEs. Our hypothesis relies on point discharge occurring at the surface beneath electrified clouds and generating the conditions for X-rays and gamma-rays to be emitted near grounded, conducting points at the ground; these X-rays and gamma-rays are then detected with instrumentation very nearby. We suggest that point discharge deserves further study by those with the suitable detailed observations in order to establish or eliminate its relevance to understanding TGE occurrence and variability.

2. Point Discharge

Herein we use the ‘physics’ definition of the vector E, which is oriented in the direction of the force it exerts on a positive charge. We only need to consider the vertical component of E, and we define positive E as upward. In addition, for the purposes herein we use the terms *point discharge* and *corona* (or corona discharge) interchangeably; there are technical differences between these in some literature, where the latter (also referred to as ‘brush discharge’) is more audible, more luminous, and occurs at greater field strengths.

Measuring E at the ground beneath a thunderstorm is a very useful way of studying storm electrification and evolution. However, surface E data from a single site do not provide unambiguous information about the location or magnitude of the charge(s) in the storm above, only the dominant charge polarity overhead at a given time. Furthermore, it has long been known that the interpretation of E measurements made at the ground is complicated by point discharge or corona (discharge) occurring from nearby structures and vegetation. In his studies of possible sources of electric charge in clouds, Wilson (1921) noted the importance of ions due to point

discharges “from earth-connected conductors, such as the leaves of trees or even the tips of blades of grass, under the action of the intense electric field” beneath a thundercloud. According to the Glossary of Meteorology (AMS, 2021) “Point discharge is a major process of charge transfer between electrified clouds and the earth, and [it] is a leading item in the charge balance of the global electrical circuit.”

Standler and Winn (1979) made extensive measurements of how point discharge both impacts and is affected by E at the ground. Standler and Winn [1979] stated that the “strength of the electric field at the extremities of sharp, grounded, elevated objects can be many hundred times that of the ambient field.” Standler and Winn [1979] determined that the threshold ambient E needed to start point discharge was approximately 3 kV/m under Florida thunderstorms (near sea level, flat terrain) and was 5 kV/m at Langmuir Laboratory in New Mexico (3.2 km, on a mountain ridge); they suggested that the corona threshold in Florida was smaller because there are more corona points due to “dense bushes and tall, lush grass” versus the “relatively barren mountain ridge” in New Mexico. Thus, if we assume conventional electrical breakdown is occurring at the tip of each corona point, and we know $E \geq 3000$ kV/m (at 1 atm pressure) is needed to attain conventional breakdown, then the E enhancement at the corona points in Florida may be about a factor of 1000. Similarly, at Langmuir Lab, with point discharge threshold of 5 kV/m and breakdown E of 2050 kV/m (at 0.7 atm), the E enhancement at the corona points would be about a factor of 400. These values are only estimates, but this enhancement underlies our hypothesis.

The effects of point discharge are regularly observed near the surface below thunderclouds. For example, Standler and Winn (1979) showed that corona ions emitted by point discharge were present up to at least 300 m above ground. Soula and Chauzy (1991) followed the evolution of the corona layer above the ground at sea level in Florida using five electric field meters at different altitudes on a tethered balloon. (See also Chauzy et al., 1991.) Soula and Chauzy (1991) found that “corona ions produced at the surface were detected up to the upper layer between 436 m and 603 m” and that their observations indicated “that a large proportion of corona ions were carried up to several hundreds of meters above ground.” Figure 1 shows an example of a shallow positive corona charge layer above ground at Langmuir Laboratory, as inferred from an E sounding made with a rocket-borne sensor (Marshall et al., 1995). Just after launch, the lowest altitude of measured E was 10.3 kV/m, and it increased to 29.6 kV/m in the




Figure 1 Electric field (E) soundings from two instruments (‘Balloon’ electric field meter and ‘Rocket’ electric field sounder) through the lowest 4.8 km of a thunderstorm above Langmuir Lab on 17 July 1992. Times when each instrument reached identified features in the electrical structure are marked. Rocket launch occurred when Balloon was at 10.5 km msl; Balloon launch was 22 min earlier. Visual cloud base altitude, when the balloon was observed to enter cloud, was 5.0 km msl. Right panel shows charge density of regions determined from E_z vs altitude from the Rocket sounding. Lowest two charge regions are labelled. Note shallow, intense positive charge region just above the surface that “probably is a point discharge (corona) layer.” (Adapted from *Marshall et al. 1995*.)

first 60 m above ground (Figure 1). Similar examples of distinct corona layers have been observed in many E soundings. Standler and Winn (1979) also observed that above the corona layer, E could be 2 – 6 times greater than at the ground. In Florida, Soula and Chauzy (1991) observed E values as large as 65 kV/m at 603 m, while the surface E “did not exceed 5 kV/m” during an active thunderstorm overhead. This condition is evident in Figure 2, where simultaneous observations of E at three altitudes are shown: two instrumented balloons were ascending inside an active thunderstorm while E at the surface was being measured below (from Coleman et al. 2008). For example, near the start of the time period shown (just before ‘CGa’) E at the surface (3.2 km) was < 2 kV/m, E near 4 km altitude (below cloud base) was about 20 kV/m, and E near 5 km (within the lower positive charge) was about 55 kV/m. A few minutes





Figure 2

(a) Altitude (color-coded by polarity) and vertical electric field (E_z) from two balloons ('Flight 3' and 'Flight 4') and at surface ('annex') for 7.3 min (1957:00-2004:20 UT) of a storm above Langmuir Lab on 25 July 1999. Note different scale of surface E , with 'saturation' value (of ~ 6 kV/m) reached due to point discharge/corona. Initiation altitudes (first VHF source location) and E changes due to two cloud-to-ground (CG) and one intracloud (IC) lightning flash are also marked. (Adapted from Coleman *et al.* 2008.)

(b) *Left*: balloon sounding 'Flight 3' data for E , temperature (T), and relative humidity (RH_{ice} , with respect to ice for $T < 0^\circ\text{C}$), and derived electric potential (V) (from E_z , relative to ground) shown as functions of altitude. Field changes of same three flashes as in (a) are marked. *Right*: E_z and charge region altitudes and charge densities determined using E_z data from the balloon sounding. Lowest two in-cloud charge regions are labelled. Note positive charge just above surface, at least partly due to point discharge/corona. (Adapted from Coleman *et al.* 2003.)

later, when both balloons aloft detected $E_z > 50$ kV/m, the E magnitude at the surface was < 6 kV/m. The complete sounding in Figure 2b (from Coleman et al., 2003) shows sub-cloud E_z values were 10-20 kV/m throughout the depth between the top of the corona layer and cloud base.

Thus, once E beneath a cloud reaches the ambient threshold for point discharge, the charges produced by point discharge partially shield the surface E measurement from the dominant cloud charge above. In these conditions, the surface E measurement normally saturates at a magnitude close to the threshold for producing corona. For example, E magnitudes at the surface beneath thunderstorms near the Atlantic coast in central Florida rarely exceed 8 kV/m (e.g., Jacobson & Krider, 1976; Livingston & Krider, 1978), while at Langmuir Laboratory the E magnitude at the surface is typically less than 12 kV/m (e.g., Standler and Winn, 1979; Moore et al. 1986). As Figure 2 shows and many other works support (e.g., Marshall & Winn, 1982; Marshall et al., 2009; Stolzenburg et al., 2015), coincidentally measured E magnitudes inside clouds can be larger, by a factor of 10 or more, than the maximum measured at the surface.

3. Point Discharge Hypothesis for TGEs

The *Point Discharge Hypothesis* for TGEs can be posed as follows: during a thunderstorm the large electric field that exists near the tips of grounded, conducting points undergoing point discharge beneath the storm will produce many of the X-ray and gamma ray photons (0.1 – 8 MeV) photons that are detected in TGEs. We describe the mechanism next.

There are many instruments and high-energy particle detectors located at 3.20 km altitude on Mt. Aragats (e.g., Chilingarian et al., 2020) and at other mountain-top observatories where TGEs have been observed. As discussed above, Langmuir Laboratory is located at 3.20 km altitude on a mountain, where the E threshold for starting point discharge is about 5 kV/m, and the point discharge enhancement factor is about 400. There are many grounded, pointed conductors at Langmuir Laboratory, including trees, bushes, and grass. There are also multiple research buildings (two made entirely of metal) and other man-made structures, all of which also produce point discharge ions (e.g., at roofing edges, metal handrails, metal steps, metal screws, metal bolts, lightning protection rods, and at the various types of electrical antennas). Essentially all of these natural and man-made conductors emit point discharge ions when the surface $E \geq 5$ kV/m.

Let us assume that the above description of available pointy objects is also approximately true at Mt. Aragats. Suppose there are pointed, grounded, conducting objects in the area that will go into corona when the surface E reaches the local point discharge threshold of ~ 5 kV/m. These

points might even be edges or corners of a metal box holding a particle detector. Now suppose that the electric field at the ground increases to the local point discharge threshold of +5 kV/m. Very near the tips of the grounded, pointy conductors, E is approximately +2 MV/m (i.e., they are emitting point discharge/corona in conventional breakdown field at 0.7 atm), and E is directed upward from the tips (because the tips have positive charge induced on them by the surface E). If there is a free electron in any of the regions where E is +2 MV/m, it will start an electron avalanche that will produce many point discharge ions, which in turn will reduce the local E around that tip.

What if there is not a free electron in the region with $E = 2$ MV/m around the grounded object's tip? Nothing will happen immediately, since the electron avalanche of breakdown requires an initial electron. However, if a cosmic ray electron comes downward, toward the grounded, conducting object's tip, the electron will experience an intense downward force, which will increase its energy. Thus, in this manner many of the available cosmic ray electrons could gain substantial energy because of the very large E associated with the point discharge process at the ground beneath the thunderstorm. If the suitable cosmic ray electron passes especially close to any of the (thousands of) grounded conducting points that are in corona, the electron could gain an energy up to a few MeV. Because E due to the tip will be directed radially away from the tip, the path of a cosmic ray electron passing close to the tip will be bent, and a bremsstrahlung X-ray or a gamma ray will be emitted.

Thus, we hypothesize that point discharge occurring near the particle detectors could produce both X-rays and gamma rays, which are the main particles detected in TGEs (e.g., Chum et al., 2020). Note that this process of producing the energetic photons and electrons close to the detectors (for example, from sharp metal edges of their housing) should also increase the likelihood that these particles are detected.

A rough estimate of how many cosmic ray electrons come close to the tip of a corona point each second is as follows. This estimate has two parts. First, we consider the cross-sectional area with E due to the tip ≥ 2050 kV/m (the breakdown threshold at 3.20 km, ground altitude at Mt. Aragats and Langmuir Laboratory). Since free electrons are needed to start the breakdown electron avalanche (i.e., to make point discharge ions), the volume with $E \geq 2050$ kV/m must be big enough for free electrons to occur quickly. Let us assume that $E \geq 2050$ kV/m extends out to 2 cm from the tip. Second, for the point discharge hypothesis, cosmic ray electrons need to pass

through the breakdown field volume to produce X-rays and gamma rays via bremsstrahlung. To estimate the background cosmic ray flux at Mt Aragats, we used EXPACS (EXcel-based Program for calculating Atmospheric Cosmic-ray Spectrum; Sato, 2015; 2016) for a July day in 2017, and found 0.224 electrons/cm²/s in the energy range of 0.01 – 9 MeV (with 0.014 electrons/cm²/s in the energy range 1 – 9 MeV). The cross-sectional area of the region with $E \geq 2050$ kV/m is 12.6 cm², so there should be, on average, 2.8 cosmic ray electrons per second (169 per minute) passing through the breakdown region around each corona tip. If each corona point on the ground produces ~ 2.8 X-rays or gamma rays per second, the point discharge contribution to each TGE will be significant. (It seems possible that a cosmic ray electron that produces an X-ray or gamma ray for a TGE could also initiate an electron avalanche for making point discharge ions. In that case the point would not be able to produce another X-ray or gamma ray until the point discharge ions had moved away from the tip.)

We can also consider the situation when E at the ground is negative, with a magnitude of 5 kV/m. The charge at the tip of a grounded, conducting point will thus be negative and will produce an E of -2 MV/m above the point. A cosmic ray electron moving downward toward the point will experience an intense upward force, so it will lose energy. However, if the cosmic ray electron began with a sufficiently large energy, bremsstrahlung may occur and produce an X-ray or gamma ray, which the particle detectors could count.

Thus, we propose that the many grounded points producing point discharge ions over a wide area beneath an active thunderstorm could account for some of the energetic particles detected as a TGE. Point discharge can alter the particle counts regardless of the polarity of the surface E , as seen in some TGE data (e.g., Chilingarian et al., 2021). In a large positive E , the many grounded, conducting points can enhance the energy spectrum of cosmic ray electrons and can provide X-ray and gamma ray photons. A large negative E near the ground would tend to reduce the energy spectrum of cosmic ray electrons while still providing X-ray and gamma ray photons. As long as the surface E beneath a thunderstorm is at least as large as the local threshold E for point discharge, there should be increased fluxes of high energy photons and electrons observed at nearby detectors. At Langmuir Laboratory, the surface E is at or above the 5 kV/m threshold for point discharge for most of a thunderstorm duration, typically 30 minutes to 2 hours, so $|E|$ near each available corona point will also be greater than 2 MV/m for most of that duration. Thus, it seems that the many points having this very large E value, even over short distance, could be a

main source of extra high energy particles detected in longer duration TGEs, along with the contribution from ^{222}Rn (e.g., Bogomolov et al., 2019).

In addition, we suggest that the point discharge hypothesis offers a possible scenario for producing at least some of the short, intense TGEs, with durations of a few minutes and larger fluxes of the higher energy particles. At least some of these intense TGEs occur directly over the particle detectors and are associated with a lightning flash directly above the detectors; for examples, see Figures 5, 8, and 10 in Chum et al. (2020), which show three lightning flashes that occurred at the mountaintop laboratory and terminated intense TGEs. Although the details are not yet known, E in a thundercloud must grow large over some region to initiate lightning. The development of such a large in-cloud E will cause with a brief ramp-up period of relatively large E at the ground, which might peak at two to three times the threshold E for point discharge. (This ramp-up to E *greater than* the corona threshold is not fully understood, but may occur simply because point discharge and corona emission cannot keep up with the growing in-cloud E.) For example, at Langmuir Lab the surface E before nearby lightning flashes is often 10 – 12 kV/m (e.g., Moore et al., 1986). Hence, this temporarily doubled ambient surface E is likely to make the E magnitude near the grounded, conducting points > 2 MV/m, perhaps as large as 4 MV/m. If the E caused by the pointy object (producing point discharge ions) is enhanced prior to a nearby flash, then the energies acquired by cosmic ray electrons passing close to the point will also be greater. This scenario could result in short duration TGEs with larger fluxes of higher energy electrons and gamma rays.

Obviously, the above scenarios for long duration TGEs and short, more energetic TGEs are quite simplistic and require careful calculations. The point discharge hypothesis should be fully tested by those with expertise in high-energy particle physics. It is our assertion, however, that point discharge is probably occurring beneath most active thunderstorms, including those observed at mountain-top laboratories. The conditions of point discharge may provide some or all of the high-energy particles detected in TGEs. In particular, if the detector housings are emitting corona ions, then cosmic ray electrons may pass close to a sharp point or edge, where $E \geq E_{\text{breakdown}}$, which then may cause bremsstrahlung X-rays and gamma rays to enter the detector.

4. Additional support for the point discharge hypothesis

Chilingarian and Mkrtchyan (2012) and Chilingarian et al. (2019, 2020, and earlier works referenced therein) associate their TGEs with very large magnitudes of E (or its negative, the

potential gradient) measured near the surface. According to Chilingarian et al. (2019) “All TGEs are related to the large disturbances reaching -20kV/m .” In each exemplary TGE case shown in the above articles, the measured peak E magnitudes range from approximately 18 kV/m to 36 kV/m . (Tables 1 and 2 in Chilingarian et al. (2019) list values ranging from -0.5 to -42 kV/m during 105 TGEs, with 64 cases $>17\text{ kV/m}$.) These E values are very large, and they indicate to us that point discharge is likely occurring throughout the surrounding area. In fact, the E and count rate records in the three above-mentioned articles indicate that flux rates nearly always increase when the measured E exceeds ~ 5 to 8 kV/m in magnitude and nearly always subside when E magnitudes drop below 5 kV/m . This relationship provides nominal support for the point discharge hypothesis we present herein, particularly if the corona emission threshold in the region of Mount Aragats is similar to that at Langmuir Lab, approximately 5 kV/m (Standler & Winn, 1979).

Since the E magnitudes given by Chilingarian and colleagues are substantially larger than those typically measured beneath thunderstorms, it should be ascertained if those measurements suffer from site error effects (such as rainfall, splashing, corona, or wind in nearby vegetation that is emitting point discharge). Another possible problem with measuring surface E is that charge can be induced on the instrument itself by the thunderstorm field; unless it is accounted for by determining the ‘form factor’ (via site calibration) of the mill installation, this induced charge would be included in the measured surface E. Calibration with a known reference sensor that is flush-mounted in flat ground and away from nearby sources of space charge emission (pointy objects), as described in Rust and MacGorman (1988) and Antunes de Sá et al. (2020), would be highly worthwhile during thunderstorm conditions to ensure the accuracy of the E measurements during TGEs. Note that even without a form factor correction, the E mill data from Mt. Aragats nicely show the thunderstorm evolution and the rapid growth of E during short, intense TGEs.

5. Summary

Thunderstorm Ground Enhancements (TGEs) of high-energy particles have been detected on several mountaintops around the globe, as described above. Some of these studies have concluded that intense TGE enhancements (typically lasting only a few minutes) were caused by relativistic runaway electron avalanches (RREAs) associated with the large electric fields suggested to exist between the lower positive charge and main negative charge region in the

thunderclouds (e.g., Chilingarian et al. 2020, 2021). As argued by Chilingarian and colleagues, their conclusions require that the large E values exist in cloud near 3.5 km altitude for detection of the TGEs within a few hundred meters below. However, no measurements of intense TGEs include E data from within the parent thundercloud.

In situ measurements of electric field through many active thunderstorms are well described in the published literature. Some of these measurements have revealed E values sufficient for RREA (e.g., Marshall et al., 2005; Stolzenburg et al., 2007; Stolzenburg and Marshall, 2009). However, such large E magnitudes have not been detected at low altitude, below about 5 km, and not less than 2 km above ground. Such altitudes are apparently too distant to cause TGEs that are detected at the ground, even at mountaintop high-energy particle detectors. For this reason other possible explanations for TGEs seem warranted. The possible explanation offered in this article we term the Point Discharge Hypothesis.

It is well known that sufficiently electrified thunderclouds cause point discharge to occur from pointy objects, such as grass, trees, metal points, metal edges, etc., on the ground beneath the cloud. These pointed, conducting objects acquire induced charge caused by the ambient thunderstorm E at the ground, which in turn is caused by the dominant charge overhead. Very near the tip of pointy objects undergoing point discharge, $E \geq 3$ MV/m (at 1 atm), as necessary for point discharge via conventional breakdown. We suggest that this very large E can accelerate background cosmic ray electrons to larger energies. In addition, all of the cosmic ray electrons that come close enough to the tip of a pointy object will emit photons, via bremsstrahlung. Some higher energy cosmic rays will produce X-rays and gamma rays also via bremsstrahlung. X-rays and gamma-rays are the main components of TGEs. In the Point Discharge Hypothesis, X-rays and gamma rays would be produced very near ground, at the tips of the many pointy objects that are within a few meters to a few hundred meters of the particle detectors. Thus, these emissions might be a source of TGEs. We hope that this hypothesis will be examined via modeling and further observations.

Acknowledgements. We are grateful to Earle Williams for returning our attention to the matter of TGEs and to Alexander Kostinskiy for earlier discussions alerting us to the EXPACS program capabilities. EXPACS is available at <http://phits.jaea.go.jp/expacs/> (as of 8 Aug 2021). Work on this article has been supported in part by U.S. National Science Foundation grant AGS-1745931.

References.

- AMS (2021). Glossary of Meteorology, accessed 1 Aug 2021. <https://glossary.ametsoc.org/wiki/>
- Antunes de Sá, A., Marshall, R., Sousa, A., Viets, A., & Deierling, W. (2020). An array of low-cost, high-speed, autonomous electric field mills for thunderstorm research. *Earth and Space Science (Hoboken, N.J.)*, 7(11), e2020EA001309-n/a. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020EA001309>
- Bateman, M. G., Marshall, T. C., Stolzenburg, M., & Rust, W. D. (1999). Precipitation charge and size measurements inside a new mexico mountain thunderstorm. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 104(D8), 9643-9653. <https://doi.org/10.1029/1998JD200118>
- Bogomolov, V. V., Iyudin, A. F., Maximov, I. A., Panasyuk, M. I., & Svertilov, S. I. (2019). Comment on “Long lasting low energy thunderstorm ground enhancements and possible m-222 daughter isotopes contamination”. *Physical Review. D*, 99(10). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.99.108101>
- Chauzy, S., Médale, J., Prieur, S., & Soula, S. (1991). Multilevel measurement of the electric field underneath a thundercloud: 1. A new system and the associated data processing. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 96(D12), 22319-22326. <https://doi.org/10.1029/91JD02031>
- Chilingarian, A., & Mkrtchyan, H. (2012). Role of the lower positive charge region (LPCR) in initiation of the thunderstorm ground enhancements (TGEs). *Physical Review. D, Particles, Fields, Gravitation, and Cosmology*, 86(7). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.86.072003>
- Chilingarian, A., Avetisyan, A., Hovsepyan, G., Karapetyan, T., Kozliner, L., Sargsyan, B., & Zazyan, M. (2019). Origin of the low-energy gamma ray flux of the long-lasting thunderstorm ground enhancements. *Physical Review. D*, 99(10). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.99.102002>
- Chilingarian, A., Daryan, A., Arakelyan, K., Hovhannisyanyan, A., Mailyan, B., Melkumyan, L., et al. (2010). Ground-based observations of thunderstorm-correlated fluxes of high-energy electrons, gamma rays, and neutrons. *Physical Review. D, Particles, Fields, Gravitation, and Cosmology*, 82(4). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.82.043009>
- Chilingarian, A., Hovsepyan, G., Karapetyan, T., Karapetyan, G., Kozliner, L., Mkrtchyan, H., et al. (2020). Structure of thunderstorm ground enhancements. *Physical Review. D*, 101(12). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.101.122004>

Chilingarian, A., Hovsepyan, G., Soghomonyan, S., Zazyan, M., & Zelenyy, M. (2018). Structures of the intracloud electric field supporting origin of long-lasting thunderstorm ground enhancements. *Physical Review. D*, 98(8). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.98.082001>

Chilingarian, A., Hovsepyan, G., Svechnikova, E., & Zazyan, M. (2021). Electrical structure of the thundercloud and operation of the electron accelerator inside it. *Astroparticle Physics*, 132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.astropartphys.2021.102615>

Chilingarian, A., Khanikyants, Y., Mareev, E., Pokhsraryana, D., Rakov, V. A., & Soghomonyan, S. (2017). Types of lightning discharges that abruptly terminate enhanced fluxes of energetic radiation and particles observed at ground level. *Journal of Geophysical Research. Atmospheres*, 122(14), 7582-7599. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JD026744>

Chubenko, A. P., Antonova, V. P., Kryukov, S. Y., Piskal, V. V., Ptitsyn, M. O., Shepetov, A. L., Vildanova, L. I., Zybin, K. P., & Gurevich, A. V. (2000). Intensive X-ray emission bursts during thunderstorms. *Physics Letters. A*, 275(1), 90-100. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0375-9601\(00\)00502-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0375-9601(00)00502-8)

Chum, J., Langer, R., Baše, J., Kollárik, M., Strhárský, I., Diendorfer, G., & Ruzs, J. (2020). Significant enhancements of secondary cosmic rays and electric field at the high mountain peak of lomnický štít in high tatra during thunderstorms. *Earth, Planets, and Space*, 72(1), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40623-020-01155-9>

Coleman, L. M., Marshall, T. C., Stolzenburg, M., Hamlin, T., Krehbiel, P. R., Rison, W., & Thomas, R. J. (2003). Effects of charge and electrostatic potential on lightning propagation. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 108(D9), 4298-n/a. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2002JD002718>

Coleman, L. M., Stolzenburg, M., Marshall, T. C., & Stanley, M. (2008). Horizontal lightning propagation, preliminary breakdown, and electric potential in new mexico thunderstorms. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 113(D9), D09208-n/a. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007JD009459>

Eack, K. B., Beasley, W. H., Rust, W. D., Marshall, T. C., & Stolzenburg, M. (1996). Initial results from simultaneous observation of X-rays and electric fields in a thunderstorm. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 101(D23), 29637-29640. <https://doi.org/10.1029/96JD01705>

Gurevich, A. V., Milikh, G. M. & Roussel-Dupre, R. (1992). Runaway electron mechanism of air breakdown and preconditioning during a thunderstorm. *Physics Letters A*, 165, 463-468. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0375-9601\(92\)90348-P](https://doi.org/10.1016/0375-9601(92)90348-P)

- Khaerdinov, N. S., Lidvansky, A. S., & Petkov, V. B. (2005). Cosmic rays and the electric field of thunderclouds: Evidence for acceleration of particles (runaway electrons). *Atmospheric Research*, 76(1), 346-354. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2004.11.012>
- Jacobson, E. A., & Krider, E. P. (1976). Electrostatic field changes produced by florida lightning. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 33(1), 103-117. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(1976\)033<0103:EFCPBF>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1976)033<0103:EFCPBF>2.0.CO;2)
- Lidvansky, A. S. (2003). The effect of the electric field of the atmosphere on cosmic rays. *Journal of Physics. G, Nuclear and Particle Physics*, 29(5), 925-937. <https://doi.org/10.1088/0954-3899/29/5/313>
- Livingston, J. M., & Krider, E. P. (1978). Electric fields produced by florida thunderstorms. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 83(C1), 385-401. <https://doi.org/10.1029/JC083iC01p00385>
- Marsh, S. J., & Marshall, T. C. (1993). Charged precipitation measurements before the first lightning flash in a thunderstorm. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 98(D9), 16605-16611. <https://doi.org/10.1029/93JD00419>
- Marshall, T. C., & Marsh, S. J. (1993). Negatively charged precipitation in a new mexico thunderstorm. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 98(D8), 14909-14916. <https://doi.org/10.1029/93JD00420>
- Marshall, T. C., & Winn, W. P. (1982). Measurements of charged precipitation in a new mexico thunderstorm: Lower positive charge centers. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 87(C9), 7141-7157. <https://doi.org/10.1029/JC087iC09p07141>
- Marshall, T. C., Rison, W., Rust, W. D., Stolzenburg, M., Willett, J. C., & Winn, W. P. (1995). Rocket and balloon observations of electric field in two thunderstorms. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 100(D10), 20815-20828. <https://doi.org/10.1029/95JD01877>
- Marshall, T. C., Stolzenburg, M., Krehbiel, P. R., Lund, N. R., & Maggio, C. R. (2009). Electrical evolution during the decay stage of new mexico thunderstorms. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 114(D2), D02209-n/a. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JD010637>
- Marshall, T. C., Stolzenburg, M., Maggio, C. R., Coleman, L. M., Krehbiel, P. R., Hamlin, T., et al. (2005). Observed electric fields associated with lightning initiation. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 32(3), L03813-n/a. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2004GL021802>

McCarthy, M., & Parks, G. K. (1985). Further observations of X-rays inside thunderstorms. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *12*(6), 393-396. <https://doi.org/10.1029/GL012i006p00393>

Moore, C. B., Vonnegut, B., Rolan, T. D., Cobb, J. W., Holden, D. N., Hignight, R. T., et al. (1986). Abnormal polarity of thunderclouds grown from negatively charged air. *Science (American Association for the Advancement of Science)*, *233*(4771), 1413-1416. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.233.4771.1413>

Rust, W. D., & MacGorman, D. R. (1988). Techniques for measuring the electrical parameters of thunderstorms. In E. Kessler (Ed.), *Instruments and Techniques for Thunderstorm Observation and Analysis*. Norman, OK: U. Oklahoma Press.

Sato, T. (2015). Analytical model for estimating terrestrial cosmic ray fluxes nearly anytime and anywhere in the world: Extension of PARMA/EXPACS. *PLOS ONE*, *10*(12): e0144679.

Sato, T. (2016). Analytical model for estimating the zenith angle dependence of terrestrial cosmic ray fluxes. *PLOS ONE*, *11*(8): e0160390.

Shaw, G. E. (1967). Background cosmic count increase associated with thunderstorms. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, *72*(18), 4623-4626. <https://doi.org/10.1029/JZ072i018p04623>

Soula, S., & Chauzy, S. (1991). Multilevel measurement of the electric field underneath a thundercloud: 2. dynamical evolution of a ground space charge layer. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *96*(D12), 22327-22336. <https://doi.org/10.1029/91JD02032>

Standler, R. B., & Winn, W. P. (1979). Effects of coroneae on electric fields beneath thunderstorms. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, *105*(443), 285-302. <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.49710544319>

Stolzenburg, M., & Marshall, T. C. (1998). Charged precipitation and electric field in two thunderstorms. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *103*(D16), 19777-19790. <https://doi.org/10.1029/98JD01675>

Stolzenburg, M., & Marshall, T. C. (2009). Electric field and charge structure in lightning-producing clouds. In H.-D. Betz, U. Schumann, P. Laroche (Eds.), *Lightning: Principles, instruments and applications: Review of modern lightning research*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9079-0_3

- Stolzenburg, M., Marshall, T. C., & Krehbiel, P. R. (2015). Initial electrification to the first lightning flash in new mexico thunderstorms. *Journal of Geophysical Research. Atmospheres*, *120*(21), 11,253-11,276. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JD023988>
- Stolzenburg, M., Marshall, T. C., Rust, W. D., Bruning, E., MacGorman, D. R., & Hamlin, T. (2007). Electric field values observed near lightning flash initiations. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *34*, L04804. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006GL028777>
- Stolzenburg, M., Rust, W. D., & Marshall, T. C. (1998). Electrical structure in thunderstorm convective regions: 2. isolated storms. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *103*(D12), 14079-14096. <https://doi.org/10.1029/97JD03547>
- Torii, T., Sugita, T., Tanabe, S., Kimura, Y., Kamogawa, M., Yajima, K., & Yasuda, H. (2009). Gradual increase of energetic radiation associated with thunderstorm activity at the top of mt. fuji. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *36*(13), L13804-n/a. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008GL037105>
- Tsuchiya, H., Enoto, T., Torii, T., Nakazawa, K., Yuasa, T., Torii, S., et al. (2009). Observation of an energetic radiation burst from mountain-top thunderclouds. *Physical Review Letters*, *102*(25), 255003-255003. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.102.255003>
- Wilson, C. T. R. (1921). Investigations on lightning discharges and on the electric field of thunderstorms. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Containing Papers of a Mathematical Or Physical Character*, *221*(582-593), 73-115. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.1921.0003>