

# Which factors of an Active Region determine whether a flare will be CME-associated or not?

#### Christian Baumgartner, Julia K. Thalmann, <u>Astrid M. Veronig</u>

Institute of Physics & Kanzelhöhe Observatory, University of Graz, Austria

#### Motivation

Intro



More energetic flares are more likely to be eruptive

X-Class Flares ( $10 \uparrow -4 \text{ Wm} \uparrow -2$  Peak SXR Flux) >90% CME association rate

Yashiro et al. (2006)

#### Motivation

#### Exceptions:

NOAA 12192 (17-30 October 2014) Largest AR since 1990

6 X-class and 30 M-class flares
only 1 M-class flare was eruptive!
(e.g. Thalmann et al. 2015, Sun et al. 2015)



Intro

### Goal



• Better understanding of the role of the ARs magnetic structure in the production of large confined vs. eruptive flares

#### Approach: Investigate the

- 1) Flare location within the host active region
- 2) Magnetic field strength in the corona above the flaring region
- 3) Magnetic field orientation in the corona above the flaring region

#### **Event Selection**

#### Study Setup

#### • Criteria:

- GOES class ≥ M5.0 ("large" flares)
- Flare location  $\leq$  50° from the solar disk's center
- January 2011 December 2015
- 44 large flares
  - 12 confined (7 M- and 5 X-flares)
  - 32 eruptive (18 M- and 14 X-flares)

### Data and Methods



3D potential field models for each event:

- based on the Fourier transformation method (Alissandrakis, 1981)
- extrapolated from photospheric magnetic field observations using SDO/HMI data (Schou et al. 2012)
- at least 12 mins prior to the onset of the flare
- identification of flare-relevant regions using SDO/AIA data (Lemen et al. 2012)

#### Extent of Host Active Region

Method

*d*J*PC*... distance between opposite magnetic polarity centers (flux weighted centers)

NOAA 12192 on October 25, 2014 (16:47 UT)



### Extent of Host Active Region

Method

*dlPC*... distance between opposite magnetic polarity centers

 $\rightarrow_{T} \frac{1}{2} d \downarrow PC$  approximates AR's dipole radius!

NOAA 12192 on October 25, 2014 (16:47 UT)



#### Flare Location



#### Flare Distance from Active-Region Center

*d*↓*FC* ... distance between flare site and flux weighted AR center

NOAA 12192 on October 25, 2014 (16:47)



### Flare Distance from Active-Region Center

*d*↓*FC* ... distance between flare site and flux weighted AR center

NOAA 12192 on October 25, 2014 (16:47)



Results

Flare distance from AR center normalized by the extent of the host's AR dipole  $d\downarrow FC \mid d\downarrow PC$ 



Results

Flare distance from AR center normalized by the extent of the host's AR dipole  $d\downarrow FC \mid d\downarrow PC$ against  $d\downarrow PC$ 



In periphery of the host AR's dipole field

Results

Flare distance from AR center normalized by the extent of the host's AR dipole  $d\downarrow FC \mid d\downarrow PC$ against  $d\downarrow PC$ 



In periphery of the host AR's dipole field

Results

Flare distance from AR center normalized by the extent of the host's AR dipole  $d\downarrow FC \mid d\downarrow PC$ against  $d\downarrow PC$ 



In periphery of the host AR's dipole field

60

80

d PC [Mm]

100

120

140

Results

1.0 0.8 Flare distance from AR center BC normalized by the extent of σ 0.6 С the host's AR dipole *d*JFC | *d*JPC 'ס against *d*↓*PC* 0.4  $| \times |$ **\*** 0.2 compact AR *d\PC* < 60 Mm

0.0 20

1.2

In periphery of the host AR's dipole field

confined eruptive

![](_page_16_Figure_2.jpeg)

Method

Decay Index *n* (Kliem & Török 2006)

 $n = -d \ln B \downarrow hor /d \ln h$ 

 $B \downarrow hor$ ...horizontal field strengthh...height in the corona

Critical height for torus instability of cylindrical fluxrope:  $h\downarrow crit = h(\langle n \rangle \approx 1.5)$ 

(Török & Kliem 2007, Fan & Gibson 2007, Démoulin & Aulanier 2010, Zuccarello et al. 2015)

Decay 2.5 index n 1.9 1.2 model height 0.6 above photosphere I (Inthis) 140 0.0 10 Defining a vertical plane 190 200 × [Mm]<sup>210</sup> above flare-relevant PIL 220 230

2.5 Decay 1000 index n 2.0 1.9 800 2.12.02.02.0 <B<sub>hor</sub>> [G] 600 1.2 400 0.6 200 0.0 [(um)] 140 0.0 10 100 Height [Mm] 130 ·5n .0n *hicrit* ... critical height 190 200 × [Mm] 210 for torus instability 220 230

#### Vertical Decay of Magnetic Field above Flare Site

![](_page_20_Figure_1.jpeg)

critical height for torus instability

#### Results

Method

**PIL ... Polarity Inversion Line** 

PIL-Extraction on each layer of the potential field model

![](_page_22_Figure_1.jpeg)

Results

![](_page_23_Figure_2.jpeg)

height normalized by the extent of the individual AR dipole  $(h/d\downarrow PC)$ 

![](_page_24_Figure_1.jpeg)

height normalized by the extent of the individual AR dipole  $(h/d\downarrow PC)$ 

#### Results

#### $\Delta \varphi = |\varphi(h/d\downarrow PC = 0.5) - \varphi(h=0)|$

Change of orientation of flarerelevant PIL between photosphere and AR dipole apex

eruptive number of events confined 40 60 80 20 0 Δφ [°]

Results

 $\Delta \varphi = |\varphi(h/d \downarrow PC = 0.5) - \varphi(h=0)|$ 

Change of orientation of flare-relevant PIL between photosphere and AR dipole apex

Results

![](_page_26_Figure_2.jpeg)

Change of orientation of flare-relevant PIL versus critical height for torus instability

## Summary and Conclusions

#### Determining factors for large eruptive vs. confined flares are:

- Vertical decay of the host AR magnetic field above flare PIL: in confined flares, magnetic field decays more slowly (*hlcrit* is higher)
- Orientation of flare-relevant PIL as function of height: confined events → quicker adjustment with respect to global AR field
- Flare location within AR:

Large flares occurring in AR periphery  $\rightarrow$  tend to be eruptive Large confined flares: predominatly located close to AR center, below the "dipole field" of large ARs (consistent with Wang & Zhang 2007)

Study published in: Baumgartner, Thalmann, Veronig, ApJ 853, 105 (2018)

# Thank you for your attention!

(c)

Δφ [°]

100

80

60

40

20

0.0

0.5

1.0

h/d PC

![](_page_29_Figure_1.jpeg)

0.5

1.0

h/d PC

1.5

2.0

vertical height normalized by the extent of the individual AR dipole  $(h/d\downarrow PC)$ 

2.0

1.5

0.0

#### Results

# Bibliography

- C. E. Alissandrakis. On the computation of constant alpha force-free magnetic field. *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 100:197-200, July 1981.
- C. Baumgartner, J. K. Thalmann, and A. M. Veronig. On the factors determining the eruptive character of solar flares. *Astrophysical Journal*, 853:105, Feb. 2018. doi:10.3847/1538-4357/aaa243
- P. Démoulin and G. Aulanier. Criteria for Flux Rope Eruption: Non-equilibrium Versus Torus Instability. Astrophysical Journal, 718:1388-1399, Aug. 2010. doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/718/2/1388.
- Y. Fan and S. E. Gibson. Onset of Coronal Mass Ejections Due to Loss of Confinement of Coronal Flux Ropes. *Astrophysical Journal*, 668:1232-1245, Oct. 2007. doi: 10.1086/521335.
- B. Kliem and T. Török. Torus Instability. *Physical Review Letters*, 96(25):255002, June 2006. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett. 96.255002.
- J. R. Lemen et al. The Atmospheric Imaging Assembly (AIA) on the Solar Dynamics Observatory (SDO). Solar Physics, 275:17-40, Jan. 2012. doi: 10.1007/s11207-011-9776-8.
- J. Schou et al. Design and Ground Calibration of the Helioseismic and Magnetic Imager (HMI) Instrument on the Solar Dynamics Observatory (SDO). *Solar Physics*, 275:229-259, Jan. 2012. doi:10.1007/s11207-011-9842-2.
- T. Török and B. Kliem. Numerical simulations of fast and slow coronal mass ejections. *Astronomische Nachrichten*, 328:743, Oct. 2007. doi: 10.1002/asna.200710795.
- Y. Wang and J. Zhang. A Comparative Study between Eruptive X-Class Flares Associated with Coronal Mass Ejections and Confined X-Class Flares. *Astrophysical Journal*, 665:1428-1438, Aug. 2007. doi: 10.1086/519765.
- F. P. Zuccarello, G. Aulanier, and S. A. Gilchrist. Critical Decay Index at the Onset of Solar Eruptions. *Astrophysical Journal*, 814:126, Dec. 2015. doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/814/2/126.