Hot Prograde Flows in the Active-Region Corona

Hugh S. Hudson

Hudson et al. 2011SoPh...273....69HEVE can do DopplerChamberlin 2016SoPh...291.1665CMEGS-A astigmatism

Hudson et al. 2022MNRAS.515L...84HHot prograde flowsFitzpatrick-Hudson 2023SoPh...298....2FMEGS-A confirmation

EVE Doppler capability



One day

One week

As reported in Hudson et al. (2011)

- A diurnal effect due to spacecraft orbit, plus
- Thermal perturbation at 16:00 UT calibrations
- A few-day "swoop", unidentified...
- Persistent wiggles at longer periods than the p-modes (5 min), still unidentified...

Doppler 30.4 nm hourly



The EVE MEGS-A spectrometer is mildly astigmatic (Chamberlin, 2016): wavelengths depend slightly on image structure

EVE's spectroscopic advantages

- High throughput; excellent SNR
- Excellent stability (geosynchronous orbit)
- Stable wavelength scale
- High time resolution (10 s sampling)
- MEGS-B accurately stigmatic
- Sun-as-a-star, no imaging

Fast prograde coronal flows



Redshifts from W limb region and blueshifts from E: this means *prograde flow;* It is strongly localized. This is a MEGS-B result, not compromised by the MEGS-A astigmatism or line blends

Doppler/image correlations

Simple image correlations confirm the prograde flows and show that they depend sensitively on the temperature of formation

View from S pole

One active region, one full rotation: the "impulse response" function

Time-series data from early 2018

The correlation between line flux and Doppler signal shows the expected 90° phase shift

Morphological history of the active-region corona

- The coronal green line (Fe XIV): "coronal condensations", high temperatures
- X-ray imaging (rockets, Skylab): magnetic ``loops''
- X-ray time domain (*Yohkoh/SXT*): some microflares but also stable hot loops at T ~ 2 MK
- Doppler radiometry (EVE): Fast prograde flows in hot loops, this (New!) result

Conclusions

- The EVE Sun-as-a-Star stable EUV spectroscopy has made an unexpected discovery: hot lines show prograde flows comparable to the sound speed.
- Theory had not predicted this; no modeling had anticipated it. Nor has there been imaging confirmation!
- We currently have no explanation. The observed flow speeds are lower limits because of projection, dilution, and confusion. The prograde sense matches that expected from leader/follower sunspot asymmetry.

Extra slides, including MEGS-A (Fitzpatrick-Hudson 2023)

Modeling astigmatism and Doppler flows simultaneously

$$f(X_{ij}, Y_{ij}) = \underbrace{C_0 Y_{ij} + C_1 X_{ij}^2}_{\text{Astigmatism}} + \underbrace{C_2 F(X_{ij})}_{\text{Flow}} + C_3 t$$

- Astigmatism (C₀, C₁) follows the known form of this effect (Chamberlin) but with adjustable parameters
- Doppler flows follow our super-simple model (C₂)
- Instrument degradation (C₃) is prescribed (using Chamberlin's fits over the EVE history)

Results for Fe XIV 211 \boldsymbol{A}

Generally, the MEGS-A results also show the flows and clarify the temperature dependence (Fitzpatrick & Hudson 2023).

Temperature dependence

Doppler amplitude vs. $log(T_{max})$: Pearson r = 0.71