A Small Peak in the Swarm-LP Plasma Density Data at the Dayside Dip Equator
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Abstract

In this paper, we statistically investigate an artifact in Langmuir Probe (LP) observations of Swarm satellites. A small peak of electron density ($N_e$) is frequently found in the Swarm data around the dayside dip equator. On the contrary, they appear in neither the Total Electron Content data of the Swarm/Global Positioning System Receivers nor COSMIC-2 in-situ measurements at similar altitudes but with low orbit inclination. Arguably, this peak does not represent natural ionospheric irregularities but is likely to result from artifacts. The phenomena are found regardless of the season, solar activity, and the velocity direction of the satellite (ascending and descending). They predominantly occur when the magnetic declination is close to zero, that is, when the Swarm ram direction and the Earth’s magnetic field are aligned under sunlight. Hence, we attribute the phenomenon to intensified secondary electrons escape when the geomagnetic field lines are normal to conducting surfaces that emit secondary electrons. Since the magnitude of the artifact is only a few percent of the large-scale background, it does not have a serious impact on the value of the Swarm/LP data in scientific research. Nevertheless, future efforts to determine the exact cause of the artifacts will contribute to improving the reliability and quality of plasma density and temperature measured by Swarm/LP.

Plain Language Summary

In this paper, we statistically investigate artifacts found in Langmuir Probe (LP) observations of Swarm satellites and search for their possible causes. LP is an instrument that measures the density and temperature of charged particles (so-called “plasma”) around the satellite. Unexpectedly, small peaks of plasma density often occur around the dayside dip equator in the Swarm/LP data, while they are not at all observed in other similar equipment, such as Swarm Global Positioning System Receivers or COSMIC-2 satellites’ ion probes at similar altitudes. For this reason, we deem this peak an artifact. This phenomenon occurs in all seasons, solar activity, and satellite movement directions. But, it predominantly appears when the ram direction of Swarm is nearly aligned with the Earth’s magnetic field under sunlight. Hence, we consider that it originates from enhanced secondary electrons escape under a particular magnetic field configuration. The artifacts do not have a deleterious impact on scientific research because they are only a few percent of the background. However, efforts to determine the exact cause of artifacts are warranted for improving the reliability and quality of LP data.

1. Introduction

Plasma technologies play an essential role in our contemporary life, such as in food pasteurization, the disinfec- tion of medical tools, and the manufacture of semiconductors. Accordingly, plasma diagnoses using various methods (e.g., Abdu et al., 1991; Lee et al., 2013; Takahashi et al., 1981) are becoming more and more important. Langmuir Probe (LP) was first designed by Langmuir in 1924 to diagnose gas discharge in laboratory chambers (Langmuir & Mott-Smith, 1924) and has been intensively used for observing ionosphere and magnetosphere in space (Marks, 2011). It applies a variable voltage (V) to a conducting probe surface, after which the electric current (I) collected by the probe is measured (Hoang et al., 2019; Marholm & Marchand, 2020; Oyama, 2015; Smirnov et al., 2021). The current-voltage (I–V) characteristics curve, which represents the relationship between the applied voltage, also called “bias,” and the measured current (Amatucci et al., 2001), is a key output from the probe. It should be noted that the spacecraft is subject to the sheath effect, which alters the properties of the plasma within the Debye length. Therefore, the mounting posts of LPs should provide enough spatial separation...
between the probe and the spacecraft (Smirnov et al., 2021). In general, two approximations are used to express the electric current exchanged between the probe and the plasma: orbital motion limited and sheath area limited (Abe & Oyama, 2013; Langmuir & Mott-Smith, 1924). From the I–V curve, one can derive the temperature and density of thermal electrons. The temperature and density of ionospheric thermal plasma are important parameters for characterizing the overall ionosphere (Abe & Oyama, 2013), whose state can affect communication/navigation and the operation of satellites (Marks, 2011).

LPs come in a variety of shapes, and their data are processed by analytical or empirical expressions for plasma diagnoses. The probes are used in different operational modes, depending on what they are to measure (Marholm & Marchand., 2020). The LPs have been frequently installed on Low Earth Orbit (LEO) satellites for determining the basic characteristics of the space plasma (Abe & Oyama, 2013). The first in-situ measurement of electron temperature in the ionosphere was made by Langmuir in 1947 (Abe & Oyama, 2013; Oyama, 2015; Reifman & Dow, 1949). Even in recent decades, to name a few relevant missions, the Swedish micro-satellite Astrid-2 was launched on 10 December 1998, piggyback on a Cosmos-3M rocket, into a circular orbit at 1,000 km altitude with Langmuir INterferometer and Density instrument for Astrid-2 as a payload (Holback et al., 2001; Marklund et al., 2001). On 15 July 2000, the Challenging Minisatellite Payload (CHAMP) was launched to observe the Earth's gravity, magnetic field, neutral atmosphere, and ionosphere, the last of which were monitored with the Planar Langmuir Probe (PLP) (Cooke et al., 2003; Gorbunov & Kornbleuh., 2003; Heise et al., 2002; Lee et al., 2011). On 29 June 2004, Detection of Electro-Magnetic Emissions Transmitted from Earthquake Regions (DEMETER) was launched and placed in a polar, circular, and quasi sun-synchronous orbit (10.30 and 22.30 in local time; LT) at an altitude of 710 km (Sarkar et al., 2007). DEMETER had a LP instrument, called “Instrument Sonde de Langmuir” (ISL) to map the bulk plasma parameters (primarily electron density and temperature) and to study their variations associated with earthquakes and other sources of perturbations (Kakinami et al., 2013; Lebreton et al., 2006). On 16 April 2008, Communications/Navigation Outage Forecasting System (C/NOFS) satellite developed by the Air Force Research Laboratory was launched into a low-inclination (13°) orbit with a perigee near 400 and an apogee near 850 km (Bilitza et al., 2012; Costa et al., 2014). Using its PLP, C/NOFS is capable of measuring in situ ion density within the low-latitude F-region (Dao et al., 2011). On 2 November 2009, the PROBA-2 spacecraft was launched from Plesetsk as a secondary passenger onboard a rocket launcher (Côté et al., 2011). PROBA-2 had the Dual Segmented LP (DSLP) instrument to measure the density of space plasma and its variations, the electron temperature, and the satellite potential (Rochus et al., 2004). The DSLP is of ISL heritage flown on the DEMETER mission (Gantois et al., 2006). On 22 November 2013, Swarm satellites were launched from the Plesetsk Cosmodrome, and a pair of LPs are carried by each spacecraft to measure electron density and temperature (Buchert et al., 2015; Knudsen et al., 2017).

Depending on the sign of the bias, the probe current depends on the flux of positively charged ions, at negative bias, or on the density of negative electrons, at positive bias, respectively. The analysis of the probe current can provide estimates of both the ion density $N_i$ for known ion mass and the electron density $N_e$ in the different bias regimes, respectively (Ryu et al., 2017). Ion and electron densities can be different when electrons attach to molecular ions and/or dust particles (Morooka et al., 2018). In the Earth's F region ionosphere charging of dust and molecules is expected to be insignificant, and ion and electron densities are equal. The Swarm LP processing chain estimates the ion density in the negative bias regime. The estimate is then used as a reliable proxy for the electron density, and labeled “$N_e$” in the data product and this paper.

Despite the long heritage in space plasma research, the quality of the LP data still has some inherent issues. For example, LP operations are likely to be compromised when a satellite passes through solar terminators (Ivarsen et al., 2019; Yan et al., 2022). Also, the data can sometimes exhibit an anomaly that makes the electron density and temperature unstable (Jin et al., 2020). The electrode surfaces of LPs can also be oxidized, causing measurement glitches by distorting current-voltage (I–V) characteristics (Pyy et al., 1995; Samaniego et al., 2018). Furthermore, errors can appear due to contamination of probe surfaces (Fang et al., 2018; Oyama, 1976). The contamination leads to hysteresis in the I-V curve: that is, the curve takes different shapes depending on whether the applied voltage is swept upward or downward (Hirao & Oyama., 1971; Hirt et al., 2001; Jiang et al., 2020; Winkler et al., 2000). To overcome the interference of the contaminated layer in the LP measurement, Szuszczewicz and Holmes (1975) used a discrete pulse scan instead of a continuous triangular wave scan: this type of LP is called a “pulsed LP.” Oyama et al. (2012) studied the time interval of LP pulses and proposed the pulse on/off time ratio of 1/99 gives the same result as the uncontaminated probe characteristic curve. There can be another constraint
for LPs, in the case of a small satellite: a conducting area of the satellite body should be much larger than the conducting area of the probe. Since the electric potential applied to an LP has the reference point (i.e., electric ground) at the satellite body, the latter should be stably maintained to the space plasma potential. However, if the conducting area of the satellite is not hundreds of times larger than the conducting area of the probe, the LP operation can be significantly degraded (Lee et al., 2013).

To validate and recalibrate the LP measurements that can be subject to the inherent limitations as mentioned above, scientists usually compare the post-launch LP data with ground-based observations. McNamara et al. (2007) compared the PLP data of CHAMP with the ionosonde density profiles over Jicamarca, Peru. The electron temperature data of CHAMP was also validated by incoherent scatter radar data of Arecibo and Tromsø (EISCAT), and the mean relative deviation was reduced to less than 3% through calibration (Rother et al., 2010). Larson et al. (2021) compared the electron density measured by Swarm/LP with the Resolute Bay Incoherent Scatter Radar data. Such comparison and/or calibration studies contributed to scientific research by providing reliability and increasing the accuracy of satellite data (Lomidze et al., 2018).

In this paper, we statistically investigate a small peak of plasma density in Swarm/LP observations over daytime dip equatorial regions. Section 2 gives a brief description of the instruments and data sets. We also present a representative example and demonstrate how to estimate the intensity of those peaks for every Swarm pass. In Section 3, the dependence of their occurrence on solar zenith/azimuth angle, magnetic declination angle, seasonal, and the direction of satellite velocity (i.e., ascending and descending nodes) are analyzed. We additionally address whether the peak can be observed by other instruments and/or spacecraft. Finally, we discuss possible causes of the phenomenon in Section 4 and draw conclusions in Section 5.

2. Swarm Satellites

The Swarm mission operated by European Space Agency (ESA) consists of three satellites at an altitude of 520 (Swarm-B) and 470 km (Swarm-A, C), each having a near-polar orbit (Schreiter et al., 2021). The inclination angles are about 88°, which means that the orbits are approximately aligned with the geographic meridian (Park et al., 2015). The prime purpose of the mission is to study the internal and external magnetic fields of the Earth and to observe the electric and plasma states of the ionosphere (Knudsen et al., 2017). The payloads on board are Vector Field Magnetometer, Absolute Scalar Magnetometer, Electric Field Instrument (EFI), GPS Receivers (GPSR), and Laser Retro-Reflectors (Gvishiani et al., 2016; Marchetti & Akhoondzadeh, 2018). In particular, the EFI consists of two Thermal Ion Imagers (TIIs) on a faceplate and two LPs below TIIs (Rehman et al., 2012; Singh et al., 2021). The LPs of Swarm measure electron density ($n_e$), electron temperature ($T_e$), and floating potential with a nominal time resolution of 2 Hz (Knudsen et al., 2017; Singh et al., 2021).

The GPSR onboard Swarm is a multi-channel receiver that receives up to eight GPS signals simultaneously at 1 Hz (Zakharenkova et al., 2019). The phase of GPS L1-L2 carriers is related to Total Electron Content (TEC), which is the integrated number of electrons along the path between each Swarm satellite and the GPS satellites (Dahle et al., 2017; Hong et al., 2017; Hussien et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2007; Schreiter et al., 2021). TEC can be used as a proxy of the in-situ plasma density (e.g., Noja et al., 2013, Figure 8). In this study, we use the LP and TEC data compiled into the Ionospheric Plasma Irregularities (; product identifier IPD) product that has 1 Hz data rate (Jin et al., 2022).

The faceplate controls the entrance of ions into the TII instrument mechanically and also via a negative bias (Knudsen et al., 2017). The LP sets the faceplate bias and monitors its current. Thus another independent estimate of the ion density is obtained at 16 Hz resolution, similar to a PLP, but without the ability to sweep the bias and to measure $T_e$. The faceplate density estimate is available only when the TII is inactive (Aol et al., 2020).

In addition, FormoSat-7/COSMIC-2 satellite data is compared with Swarm satellite data. The COSMIC-2 satellites, which the National Space Organization/National Applied Research Laboratories (NSPO/NARL) in Taiwan and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) in the United States collaborated on, were launched on 25 June 2019. The final destination altitude is about 550 km (Schreiner et al., 2020), which is similar to that of Swarm-Bravo (~520 km). These six COSMIC-2 satellites have Ion Velocity Meters (IVMs) that measure ion temperature, velocity, and density (Yue et al., 2014). An important difference between Swarm and COSMIC-2 is the orbit inclination: the former orbit is nearly aligned with the geographic meridian (orbit
inclination~88°) while that of the latter is much smaller (orbit inclination~24°). That is to say, the Swarm ram direction can sometimes be aligned with geomagnetic field lines at low latitudes. On the contrary, such alignment between spacecraft orbit and the magnetic field is inherently impossible for COSMIC-2. In this study, we use COSMIC-2 data obtained at altitudes at and below 550 km for comparison with Swarm observations.

The target phenomenon we are going to investigate in this paper is a small peak of electron density near the dayside dip equator, which is different from two giant off-equatorial peaks known as Equatorial Ionization Anomaly. Figure 1 is a representative example of this peak, which was observed by Swarm/LP on 27 October 2015. Figure 1a presents a wide view of a satellite pass, and Figure 1b is an zoom-up of the equatorial region. The upper row is the electron density and the lower row is the TEC profile. The x-axis represents Universal Time Coordinated (bottom axis), Geographic LATitude (middle axis), and Magnetic LATitude (top axis) along the Swarm orbit. Using Python's Apexpy library, we find the dip equator and mark it with a black dashed line in Figure 1b. Regarding the black dashed line, the blue shadow (Eq) corresponds to ±8 s on both sides, which represents the dip equatorial region hosting the small density peak. After a buffering interval of 7 s, two red shadows (Eq-off) for 15 s after having a buffer of 7 s. The $N_e$ ratio is the ratio of the mean $N_e$ values over the blue and red shadows. The $N_e$ ratio is a proxy for the intensity of the equatorial peaks and will be used throughout the rest of this paper. If the $N_e$ ratio is larger than unity, it means that the average value of $N_e$ in the blue shadow is larger than in the red shadows, so we consider that an equatorial peak occurs.

![Figure 1](https://example.com/figure1.png)

**Figure 1.** Electron density ($N_e$) and Total Electron Content (TEC) plots of Swarm-A. The top row has electron density as the y-axis, and the bottom graphs present TEC. Figure 1a shows electron density and TEC during an equator crossing, and Figure 1b is an enlarged graph around the magnetic equator. Panels in each column share the same Magnetic LATitude (MLAT), Geographic LATitude (GLAT), and Universal Time Coordinated (UTC) on the x-axis. Concerning the magnetic equator, we pick up three different regions for statistical analyses: a blue shadow (Eq) for ±8 s, and two red shadows (Eq-off) for 15 s after having a buffer of 7 s. The $N_e$ ratio is the ratio of the mean $N_e$ values over the blue and red shadows. The $N_e$ ratio is a proxy for the intensity of the equatorial peaks and will be used throughout the rest of this paper. If the $N_e$ ratio is larger than unity, it means that the average value of $N_e$ in the blue shadow is larger than in the red shadows, so we consider that an equatorial peak occurs.

3. Result

Figure 2 shows the $N_e$ ratio derived from Swarm observations from July 2014 to October 2021. The x-axis is the solar zenith angle (SZA) in degrees. When SZA is 0°, the Sun is on the zenith of Swarm, and when SZA is 180°, it is on the nadir. The SZA between 0° and 90° approximately corresponds to the dayside. The y-axis is the
magnetic declination (i.e., the angle between geomagnetic and geographic north directions) at the dip equator in degrees, and the color bar is the $N_e$ ratio as described above. Whenever an equatorial peak as shown in Figure 1 occurs, the $N_e$ ratio should be higher than unity and appear reddish in Figure 2. The black dashed line in each panel marks zero declination at the dip equator, meaning that the true North and the magnetic North coincide. As Swarm orbits are nearly aligned with the true North (orbit inclination angle $\sim$88°), the black dashed line of “zero-declination at the dip equator” signifies that Swarm ram direction is nearly parallel to geomagnetic field lines. The upper graph (a) is LP data for the Swarm-A satellite (altitude $\sim$470 km), the middle graph (b) is those of Swarm-B/LP data, and Panel (c) is about Swarm-A/Faceplate. A black dashed line is drawn to represent a magnetic declination of zero. Note that the color bar displays the $N_e$ ratio in the range of 0.95–1.05.

Figure 2. Color plots of electron density ($N_e$) ratio between equatorial and off-equatorial regions for Swarm Langmuir Probe (LP) and faceplate measurements. The horizontal axis is solar zenith angle, and the vertical axis is magnetic declination. Panel (a) presents the $N_e$ ratio of Swarm-A/LP data, Panel (b) shows that of Swarm-B/LP data, and Panel (c) is about Swarm-A/Faceplate. A black dashed line is drawn to represent a magnetic declination of zero. Note that the color bar displays the $N_e$ ratio in the range of 0.95–1.05.

Figure 3 displays the geographic distribution of strong equatorial peaks, for which the $N_e$ ratio of Swarm-A/LP data is higher than 1.03. The x-axis of all panels shares the same longitude. The red symbols in the upper panel
show the place where the strong peaks ($N_e$ ratio >1.03) occurred on the world map: the x-axis is geographic longitude, and the y-axis is latitude. Also, the blue line represents the dip equator. The middle panel is the absolute value of magnetic declination at the dip equator for each longitude. The bottom panel shows the frequency of the intense peaks as a histogram. Green vertical dashed lines indicate the longitudes at which the absolute value of the magnetic declination becomes zero in the middle panel. We can see that the equatorial peaks are absent in the longitudinal region of the large magnetic declination angle. The reason, which will be extensively discussed later in Section 4, is secondary electrons by the photoelectric effect, and the effect on the satellite varies depending on the magnetic declination.

**Figure 3.** Distributions of strong equatorial peaks ($N_e$ ratio >1.03) in Swarm-A/LP data. The x-axis of all panels is geographic longitude. The top panel presents the location of the peaks with red symbols on the world map, and the blue line represents the dip equator. The middle panel is the absolute value of magnetic declination at the dip equator, calculated using the chaosmagpy (https://pypi.org/project/chaosmagpy/) subroutine. The bottom panel represents the number of events satisfying the criterion ($N_e$ ratio >1.03). In the middle panel, the longitudes at which the absolute value of the magnetic declination becomes zero are indicated by green vertical dashed lines. Since the peaks of the histogram on the bottom panel are concentrated at the longitude points of the four green dashed lines, it is revealed that the strong equatorial peaks mainly occur in areas where the magnetic declination becomes zero. In summary, Figure 3 confirms Figure 2 in that the equatorial peaks predominantly occur where magnetic declination is zero around the dip equator: that is, where the geographic and magnetic North directions (as well as the Swarm ram directions) are nearly parallel.

We note that no previous studies ever reported on such small density peaks around the daytime dip equator that we are addressing. Considering the long history of LEO plasma measurements, it is highly possible that the peaks in Figures 1–3 are not truly natural phenomena, but artifacts. To support this conjecture, we applied the same analysis method to other independent data sets, whose results are shown in Figure 4: (a) Swarm-A GPS TEC and (b) plasma density measured by COSMIC-2. Figure 4a presents TEC data of Swarm-A, which are processed in the same way as for the LP data: the result is called “TEC ratio” hereafter. Note that TEC is expected to have a reasonable correlation with LP measurements (e.g., Noja et al., 2013, Figure 8). Figure 4b is the $N_e$ ratio of COSMIC-2, which has similar altitudes as that of Swarm-B, but a much smaller orbit inclination (~24°) than Swarm (~88°). As COSMIC-2 satellites have different orbit inclination from those of Swarm, the $N_e$ ratio is calculated with slightly different window lengths: 8, 7, and 15 s windows in Figure 1 become 19.669, 17.210, and 36.879 s by considering a factor of sin(24°) for COSMIC-2. In this way, the latitude range used for deriving the $N_e$ ratio would be comparable between Swarm and COSMIC-2. In Figure 4, neither panel shows conspicuous red
pixels near the black dashed line. Therefore, the peaks observed by Swarm/LP near the daytime dip equator (e.g., Figures 1 and 2) are considered “artifacts,” because they occur only in electron density data measured by Swarm/LP and Faceplate, and do not appear in Swarm/TEC data or COSMIC-2/ion density data.

Now we elucidate what background conditions are favorable for the occurrence of the daytime equatorial $N_e$ peaks. Figure 5 is similar to Figure 2a, but sub-categorized by seasons (Equinoxes: Mar., Apr., Sep., Oct.; June solstice: May-August; December solstice: November–February) and solar activity levels. The three panels on the left are for the solar maximum before 1 January 2018, and the three on the right are for the solar minimum after 1 January 2018. Also, the graphs at the top are the northern spring and autumn (equinox), the middle graphs are the northern summer (June solstice), and the bottom graphs are the northern winter (December solstice) season.

The black horizontal dashed line indicates zero declination, and the reddish area corresponding to the $N_e$ ratio

---

**Figure 4.** Similar to Figure 2, but for (a) TEC ratio from Swarm-A and (b) $N_e$ ratio from COSMIC-2.

**Figure 5.** Color plots of $N_e$ ratio for different seasons and solar cycle phases. The left column panels are solar maximum before 2018/1/1, and the right column panels are solar minimum after 2018/1/1. The top row corresponds to Equinoxes, the middle row to June Solstice, and the bottom row to December Solstice. The x-axis is solar zenith angle (SZA), the y-axis is magnetic declination, and the color palette is the $N_e$ ratio.
greater than 1 is concentrated around the dashed line when the SZA is less than 90°. Figure 5 demonstrates that the daytime equatorial peaks occur in the LP data of Swarm-A in all solar cycle phases and seasons. Similarly, we analyze the association of the $N_e$ ratio with the solar azimuth as shown in Figure 6. To focus on strong equatorial peaks, only the data points for which the absolute value of magnetic declination is less than 3° are used (e.g., see Figure 3). The x-axis of Figure 6 is SZA, the y-axis is the solar azimuth angle at the dip equator. The data used are from Swarm-A/LP for all periods, but only the data points for which the absolute value of magnetic declination is less than 3° are taken into account.

Figure 6. Color plots of $N_e$ ratio as a function of solar zenith angle (SZA) and solar azimuth angle. The top panel is the ascending direction in which the satellite moves northward, and the bottom panel is the descending direction in which it moves southward. The x-axis is SZA, and the y-axis is the solar azimuth angle at the dip equator. The data used are from Swarm-A/LP for all periods, but only the data points for which the absolute value of magnetic declination is less than 3° are taken into account.

4. Discussion

4.1. Possible Generation Mechanisms

In the previous Section, we have shown that small density peaks are frequently found in the Swarm/LP and faceplate $N_e$ data. As no previous study reported similar geophysical phenomena, and as the peaks are absent in Swarm/TEC data and COSMIC-2 in-situ observations at similar altitudes, we deem the dayside equatorial peak as an artifact. In this Section, we discuss possible mechanisms that may have led to the peaks. Since this phenomenon is related to sunlight and zero magnetic declination (see Figures 2 and 3), we suggest that it originates from secondary electrons escape facilitated under certain magnetic field configurations by the photoelectric effect. As depicted in Figure 7, under the influence of the geomagnetic field, secondary electrons
generated by sunlight are likely to return to the surface which they came from (Figure 7a) due to the gyromotion. In this case, the secondary electrons can generate no net current (Wang et al., 2014). For example, if secondary electrons originate from the LP surface and immediately return to it, they would hardly induce sensible current to LP electronics. However, the escape of secondary electrons depends on the direction of the magnetic field concerning the emitting surface (Costin, 2021). The escape is facilitated when the magnetic field is perpendicular to the surface of the satellite (Figure 7b; also Laulainen et al., 2016). When the magnetic field is normal to the surface, the amount of secondary electrons escaping from the surface (e.g., LP surface) is more than doubled (Anashin et al., 2001). On the contrary, electrons are returned when the satellite’s surface is parallel to the magnetic field (i.e., grazing magnetic fields), such as in Figure 7a.

We remind the readers that dayside equatorial peaks in Figure 1 frequently occur under the condition of zero declination at the dip equator. The condition (at the dip equator and where the declination is near zero) means that the Swarm’s ram direction is nearly parallel to the geomagnetic field lines (or the ram surface is normal to the magnetic field, which corresponds to Figure 7b). For negative bias as is used for Swarm/LP, escaping secondary electrons would produce a stronger ion current with a correspondingly higher ion density estimate (labeled “\(N_e\)”). This effect is absent if the secondary electrons return to the probe due to the magnetic gyro motion at non-zero declination (see Figure 7a). The thermal electron gyroradius is about 2–3 cm for typical conditions at equator crossings by Swarm. For secondary electrons, the gyroradius becomes larger. Assuming typical values for the geomagnetic field strength (40,000 nT) and secondary electron energy (2 eV), the gyroradius of secondary electrons is ~10 cm. This would allow secondary electrons to return to the faceplate, with a dimension of about 20 cm. The LP diameter is 0.8 cm, smaller than the gyroradius, which might prevent secondary electrons from returning to the probe. However, a small density enhancement is observed for estimates with both instruments, that is, the faceplate and the LP. Possibly, lower-energy secondary electrons (e.g., 0.1 eV), if any, may fit better in situations described in Figure 7 because they would have gyroradii of a few centimeters. The explanation of the escaping and the non-escaping secondary electrons should in the future be investigated in more detail.

The dependence of the daytime \(N_e\) ratio on solar azimuth (Figure 6) can also be put into the same context. When Swarm is in a prenoon sector (SZA < 90° and solar azimuth <180°), the ambient electron density is smaller than in the afternoon (Lomidze et al., 2018, Figure 5). As the ambient ionosphere gets more tenuous, relative effects of secondary electrons (in comparison to those of the ambient thermal plasma) on Swarm/LP would become stronger. That may explain why the daytime \(N_e\) ratio in Figure 6 is slightly stronger before noon (solar azimuth <180°) than in the afternoon (solar azimuth >180°).

For COSMIC-2, whose orbit inclination is only 24°, its ram direction can in no way be aligned with the geomagnetic field. This difference can explain the absence of such peaks in the COSMIC-2/IVM data. As the Swarm GPS antenna looks upward on top of the Swarm spacecraft, the TEC data can be free from the effect of this secondary electron because Swarm/LP is placed at the bottom of the satellite; that is, the GPS antenna and LP are separated well by the large spacecraft body. Therefore, we suggest that the daytime equatorial peaks observed by Swarm/LP, which are very likely to be artifacts, are related to enhanced secondary electrons escape from the LP surface when the Swarm ram direction is aligned with the geomagnetic field.
4.2. Effects on Electron Temperature Measurements

For completeness, we apply the same method as demonstrated in Figure 1 to electron temperature measured by Swarm/LP: hereafter “$T_e$ ratio.” Figure 8 is similar to Figure 2, but presents the $T_e$ ratio of Swarm-A/LP. Note that previous studies found a few quality issues in electron temperature measured by Swarm/LP. Caution was urged for Swarm/LP electron temperature data (a) when SZA is about 50° (Jin et al., 2020; Figures S2-S3) and (b) at nightside regions hosting plasma irregularities (Rodríguez-Zuluaga et al., 2019). These two well-known artifacts are also visible in Figure 8: (a) a noisy vertical band around SZA ∼ 50° and (b) overall complex behavior of $T_e$ ratio at night (SZA > 90°). Besides these noisy regions, when the declination is 0° and SZA < 90°, a blue area having a ratio lower than 1 appears. That is, the equatorial density peak in Figure 2 is accompanied by the (apparent) local decrease of electron temperature. As the former ($N_e$ ratio enhancement) is likely to be artifacts as mentioned before, so is the latter (concomitant electron temperature decrease). We should not misinterpret this temperature decrease as a natural phenomenon, for example, as a geophysical anti-correlation between ionospheric density and temperature reported in past studies (Kakinami et al., 2011; Su et al., 2015; Yang et al., 2020). Anyhow, both the density and temperature perturbations we address in this study have small magnitudes of a few percent (see the color bars in Figures 2 and 8), the existence of these artifacts would not seriously compromise the usefulness of Swarm/LP data for scientific research. Just, one needs to be careful when trying to find natural plasma irregularities in the dayside low-latitude ionosphere (e.g., Abdu et al., 1988; Huang et al., 2013; Kil et al., 2019) using Swarm data.

4.3. Further Supports From Observations During Solar Cycle 23

Despite the evidence given above, one may still suspect that the equatorial peaks represent a natural phenomenon similar to what was reported at low latitudes by Oya et al. (1991) and Shinbori et al. (2007). To give further support to our arguments that the peaks be artifacts, we add two more satellites to our analyses. Figure 9 is similar
to Figure 4, but for (a) (CHAMP, high-inclination satellite) and (b) Republic of China Satellite 1 (ROCSAT-1, low-inclination satellite). Both spacecraft measured in situ ion density during Solar Cycle 23. CHAMP had 87.18° of inclination (i.e., like Swarm), and the mission period was from 2000 to 2010 (Xiong et al., 2013). The PLP onboard CHAMP is similar to Swarm/LP in that both derive plasma density from the ion currents in the ion saturation regime (e.g., Knudsen et al., 2017; McNamara et al., 2007), where negatively biased probes collect the ions while repelling ionospheric and/or secondary electrons. On the contrary, traditional LPs mostly extracted plasma density in the “electron” saturation regime (e.g., Lee et al., 2013; Oyama, 2015), in which electrons are collected toward the probe surface. ROCSAT-1 (also known as Formosat-1) had 35° of inclination (i.e., like COSMIC-2), and the mission period was from 1999 to 2004. The Ionospheric Plasma and Electrodynamics Instrument (IPEI) onboard ROCSAT-1 belongs to the same family of ion probes as that of COSMIC-2/IVM. To sum up, CHAMP/PLP, Swarm/LP, ROCSAT-1/IPEI, and COSMIC-2/IVM all derive plasma density from collected ion currents, with the former two on near-polar (inclination angle ~90°) orbits and the latter two on low-inclination orbits.

As was the case for Swarm, the high inclination of the CHAMP orbit enables alignment between the ram direction and the geomagnetic field wherever the declination angle approaches zero at the dip equator. In Figure 9a, CHAMP observations clearly reveal the equatorial peak. On the other hand, ROCSAT-1 with a low inclination angle cannot be aligned with the geomagnetic field at all, and the equatorial peak does not appear in Figure 9b. Overall, the CHAMP and ROCSAT-1 results in Solar Cycle 23 respectively reproduce those of Swarm and COSMIC-2 in Solar Cycle 24–25. Observations by all the four satellites spanning two solar cycles can be summarized in the following one sentence: plasma density estimated from ion current exhibits the equatorial peak when the spacecraft flies nearly along the geomagnetic field. As mentioned in a previous section, the equatorial peaks’ absence in COSMIC-2/IVM and presence in Swarm/LP, while both measured ion currents at similar altitudes, evidence that the equatorial peaks are artifacts. In this subsection, we have demonstrated that the equatorial peaks are similarly absent in ROCSAT-1/IPEI data while present in CHAMP observations, despite their overlapping observation periods. It corroborates the argument that the equatorial peaks are not geophysical.

In addition to the contrast in the orbit inclination angles, we note another small difference that distinguishes COSMIC-2/IVM and ROCSAT-1/IPEI from Swarm/LP and CHAMP/PLP. The latter group (Swarm/LP and CHAMP/PLP) has current collectors directly exposed to the space plasma environment, so that secondary electrons can freely escape under favorable magnetic field geometry. However, for the former group (COSMIC-2/IVM and ROCSAT-1/IPEI), the current collectors are protected by electrostatic grids with significant negative bias (called “suppressor grid”); see Chao & Su, (2020). The grid can additionally hinder secondary electron escape and can contribute to the absence of the equatorial peaks in COSMIC-2/IVM and ROCSAT-1/IPEI data. Quantifying the relative importance of the geomagnetic field effect and grid effect may be an interesting topic for future studies.

5. Conclusions

We analyze small $N_e$ peaks that are frequently found in Swarm/LP and faceplate data near the dayside dip equator. This phenomenon appears regardless of the season, solar activity, and velocity direction (ascending/descending) of the satellite. The absence of similar structures in Swarm/TEC and COSMIC-2/IVM data, as well as the absence of relevant reports in previous studies, implies that it is arguably an artifact. This explanation is further corroborated by CHAMP and ROCSAT-1 observations during the preceding solar cycle (Solar Cycle 23), which exhibited similar inter-spacecraft discrepancy to that between Swarm and COSMIC-2. The equatorial $N_e$ peaks in Swarm (and CHAMP) data predominantly occur when the magnetic declination is zero at the dip equator, that is, when the Swarm’s (and CHAMP’s) ram direction and the Earth’s magnetic field are approximately aligned under sunlight. We suggest that the peak reflects enhanced secondary electrons escape when the geomagnetic field becomes normal to the Swarm’s (and CHAMP’s) ram surface. The secondary electrons currents can impact LP observation results: the secondary electrons entering and exiting the conductor can be misinterpreted by LPs as natural currents of the thermal plasma. Though the artifacts are small in magnitude (a few percent of the ambient), our study can contribute to further improving the reliability and quality of LP data in the future.
Data Availability Statement

The $N_e$, $T_e$, and TEC data of Swarm can be accessed from the official Swarm website of ESA (https://swarm-diss.eo.esa.int/swarm%2FLevel2daily%2FLatest_baselines%2FPDP%2FIRR), and directory is Home-Level2daily-Latest_baselines-IPD-IRR data. Swarm Faceplate 16 Hz data is from the same Swarm website, and the directory is Home-Advanced-Plasma_Data-16_Hz_Faceplate plasma_density. Ion density data of COSMIC-2 can be obtained through the COSMIC-2 data website (https://data.cosmic.ucar.edu/gnss-ro/cosmic2/postProc/level2/).
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