Observations of the Roots of Plasma Bubbles: Are they sometimes foamy?

Charles Lougheed Bennett

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (retired)

May 25, 2023
Observations of the Roots of Plasma Bubbles: Are They Sometimes Foamy?

Charles L. Bennett

1Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (retired).

Corresponding author: Charles Bennett (Charlie_Bennett@comcast.net)

Key Points:

- Dispersionless, highly attenuated, lightning generated electromagnetic waves are observed in the lower ionosphere
- The propagation of these electromagnetic waves has characteristics of acoustic wave propagation through two-phase foams
- Such foamy plasma bubbles may cover approximately 80% of the bottomside of the equatorial nightside ionosphere.
Abstract
Dramatic irregularities in the plasma density of the ionosphere, first discovered by their effects on radio wave propagation in 1938, and despite decades of investigation, still remain puzzling. Their deleterious effects on radio wave communication, satellite command and control, GPS navigation are serious enough to strongly motivate better understanding of their nature. Many aspects of such irregularities are now understood, but the mechanism(s) of their formation and their detailed nature remain a topic of great interest. In this work, detailed time resolved measurements of lightning generated waves show dispersionless, strongly attenuated propagation with substantial propagation delays. These characteristics of the electromagnetic wave propagation in the two-phase bubble/non-bubble ionosphere parallel the characteristics of acoustic wave propagation through two-phase liquid/vapor foams; and this motivates the suggestion that the bottomside layer of the ionosphere may sometimes be foamy.

Plain Language Summary
Just as ocean waves breaking at the interface between sea and land produce copious bubbles and foam, recent satellite data suggests a similar phenomenon at the interface between neutral atmosphere and the charged plasma of the ionosphere. Lightning generated electromagnetic waves passing through the lower ionosphere observed by low altitude satellites are found to have the same characteristics as acoustic waves passing through foamy water. This hypothetical foam in the lower ionosphere apparently strongly absorbs radio waves and seems to prevent most such waves from escaping the foam to pass through to the upper ionosphere.

1 Introduction
This article is a sequel to (Bennett, 2023), that describes a novel method for the observation and analysis of the roots of equatorial plasma bubbles (EPBs). Most of the details in (Bennett, 2023) will not be repeated here, but a brief summary is presented in the following section 2.

EPBs are localized density depletions (sometimes by over four orders of magnitude relative to the surrounding plasma) in the nighttime equatorial ionosphere (Heelis, 2004; Kil & Heelis, 1998; Woodman & Hoz, 1976). The literature on EPBs is vast and spans nearly a century. Nowadays there is increasing motivation to understand such bubbles and their detrimental affects on radio communications, especially satellite communications, for which “loss of lock” events can be precipitated by their presence. Another detrimental effect is the disruption of signals from the Global Navigation Satellite System so important to modern society. Numerous reviews of the development of the experimental and theoretical understanding of plasma bubbles are available (e.g. Balan et al., 2018; De Michelis et al., 2021; Huba, 2023; Kelley et al., 2011; Makela & Otsuka, 2012; Woodman, 2009).

It is generally accepted that the lower density of plasma bubbles relative to their surroundings causes them to rise in a turbulent process giving rise to plumelike features in radar observations (e.g. Abdu et al., 2012; Hysell et al., 2005; Kelley et al., 2011; Kudeki & Bhtacharyya, 1999; Narayanan et al., 2014; Patra et al., 2005; Tsunoda, 1983; Yokoyama et al., 2011). Plasma bubbles may also be detected as emission depletion bands in optical observations, (e.g., Immel et al., 2003; Kil et al., 2004; Makela & Kelley, 2003; Makela et al., 2006; Makela & Miller, 2008; Martinis et al., 2003; Mendillo & Baumgardner, 1982; Pimenta et al., 2003; Shiokawa et al., 2004). Animations of sequences of optical images, such as those in Makela and
Miller (2008) most clearly and dramatically show plasma bubbles emerging from low altitudes with subsequent rising and Eastward drifting. Such animations not only show apparent turbulent structures emerging from regions of depleted emission, but also show apparently non-turbulent depleted emission regions extending continuously below the turbulent regions towards the base of the ionosphere. In the present article the term \textit{roots} of plasma bubbles refers to density depletions that extend \textit{contiguously} to the base of the ionosphere that aren’t necessarily turbulent. It is beyond the scope of this article to explain exactly how these density depletions are formed.

Initial observations and most early investigations of plasma bubbles involved so-called “spread F” phenomena, in which radar pulses of a given frequency, rather than reflecting from distinct ionospheric layers corresponding to distinct altitudes of reflection were observed to return from a spread out region of altitudes (Woodman, 2009). As such radar reflections require the presence of ionospheric density irregularities at the scale of the radar wavelength, conventional spread F phenomena would not be seen for non turbulent roots of plasma bubbles.

Woodman (2009) states “We implicitly assume that there is a cascade mechanism as proposed by Haerendel (1973) from the larger to the smaller scale, but we do not know exactly how this takes place.” Woodman (2009) further states “The current state of the theory is that high frequency drift instabilities can explain the shortest wavelengths, up to \textasciitilde 1 m and the low frequency waves longer than 10 m, but no existing theory can explain the waves around 3 m, i.e., the strong echoes that Jicamarca sees!”

Kelley (2011) states “How structure can be transferred from 1000 km to 1 m is still a bit of a mystery. Since there is linear growth in the power law regime, it is not because of an inertial cascade” and “Much remains to be done before the electrodynamics and coupling processes in this region during solar minimum conditions are fully understood.”

To this day, the formation of the initial density depletions evidently required to “seed” larger scale turbulent fluctuations responsible for the greatest degradations of radio communications are not fully understood (Chou et al., 2022; De Michelis et al., 2022; Huba, 2023; Kil et al., 2022).

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section \textbf{2} provides a summary of the earlier (Bennett, 2023) paper involving the detailed description of the data sources and analysis methods relevant to the current work. The main new results in the current work involve the detailed wavevector analysis of both dispersed (i.e. whistlers) and unusually low dispersion waves. In addition, previously unnoticed “precursors” to the ususally low dispersion waves are identified and described. Normally dispersed waves are discussed in section \textbf{3}. In section \textbf{4} unusually low dispersion waves are discussed. Section \textbf{5} presents a physical model for “foamy” plasma. The various observations in (Bennett, 2023) and the new observations in the present paper are interpreted in terms of this model. Section \textbf{6} provides further discussion and conclusions.

\section*{2 Highlights of Earlier Work and New Observations}

In (Bennett, 2023) I suggested that the roots of plasma bubbles might sometimes be foamy. This suggestion was made based on the propagation characteristics of lightning generated (LG) waves passing through such roots and in analogy to the propagation of acoustic waves through mixed liquid/gas phase foamy media. A specific model of the propagation of
electromagnetic waves through such “plasma foam” at the bottom of the ionosphere will be discussed in Section 5.

In Figure 1, a slightly expanded region of that shown in Figure 11 of (Bennett, 2023), the electric field signals observed by the EMFISIS instruments on the Van Allen Probe (VAP) satellite at 2.5°S 154.6°W altitude 239 km from a single lightning flash located at 9.2°N 84.8°W, comprising four strokes, are shown. In Figures 1b, 1d and 1f, the temporal variations of the electric field components \( E_u, E_v \) and \( E_w \) along the three axes, U, V and W of the spinning VAP satellite are shown. The W axis is spin aligned and approximately vertical here. Figures 1a, 1c and 1e display scalograms for the three electric field components computed using a continuous wavelet transform (CWT) as described in (Bennett, 2023). Scalograms display the time dependence of the frequency components of a waveform and feature higher temporal resolution at higher frequencies following the cone of influence (COI) function. An example of the COI function centered at the time of the second pulse is shown in Figure 1e by the white curved dashed line. An impulsive disturbance at a single time sample in the electric field would produce a scalogram peak with the shape of the COI. The COI also indicates how data outside the time period used in the CWT may affect the scalograms. The COI of the boundary effects is shown as a curved black dashed line in 1a, 1c and 1d. Scalogram values at frequencies below the boundary COI are unreliable. For example, in 1a and 1c, at the start of the time period, the greenish region below the COI is a boundary artifact.

The appearance times of the four peaks seen in Figure 1f, are delayed by 20, 31, 30 and 7 ms as indicated above Figure 1e relative to the arrival times of LG pulses at the subsatellite location. The curve shown in Figure 1g is the sum of the waveforms from the Nickolaenko et al. (2004) model using parameters for the stroke intensities and arc distances from the subsatellite position to the stroke location detected by the World Wide Lightning Locator Network (WWLLN) over the time period shown. WWLLN is a global Very Low Frequency (VLF; 3-30kHz) lightning location system capable of finding the radiated energy, time and location of individual lighting strokes with \(~10\) km spatial accuracy, \(~10\) \(\mu\)s temporal accuracy and \(~90\)% efficiency for high peak current strokes (Abarca et al., 2010; Holzworth et al., 2019; Hutchins et al., 2012; Jacobson et al., 2006; Rodger et al., 2006). Red vertical lines in Figures 1b, 1d and 1f mark the three peaks in the composite model electric field function shown in Figure 1g. The (Nickolaenko et al., 2004) model propagation speed of 245 km/s accurately matches the observed travel speed 245±5 km/s for ELF pulses observed at ground level by the World ELF Radiolocation Array (WERA), as discussed by (Bennett, 2023) and shown in Figure 10 of that article. The propagation speed of LG pulses through the Earth Ionosphere waveguide (EIWG) is primarily a function of the altitude of the EIWG upper boundary (EIWGUB) as discussed in (Golkowski et al., 2018). All of the VAP data in this article were acquired near local midnight, so that most of the stronger LG pulses travelled entirely through regions with higher EIWGUB altitudes. The second of the four pulses seen in Figure 1f was detected in the Geostationary Lightning Mapper (GLM) (Bateman et al., 2020; Goodman et al., 2013; Rudlosky et al., 2019) data, but not in the WWLLN data.

A feature of the data shown in Figure 1c that was not noticed by (Bennett, 2023) is the presence of two “Precursor” streaks most clearly seen in the \( E_v \) scalograms near 10 kHz. These precursors first appear approximately 4 ms after the red vertical lines in Figure 1a-1f. A similar precursor is only marginally apparent preceding the fourth peak and no significant precursor appears before the second pulse in Figure 1f. Examination of other VAP data bursts reveals that
such precursors often do appear, albeit only in a minority of the cases for which clear, well
identified LG peaks are seen in the scalograms. In numerous other cases, such precursors are
found very well correlated with the subsatellite arrival time of EMPs predicted using the
Nickolaenko et al. (2004) model and WWLLN measured times and locations. In the first nine
figures in the Supplemental materials S1, 22 distinct examples of precursors may be seen.

Another significant example involving multiple strokes from a single lightning flash is
shown in Figure 2. In this case, a single flash at 12.7°N 152.8°E comprising three WWLLN
strokes occurring in rapid succession produces three precursors and three bipolar pulses in the
electric field components. The bipolar pulses are narrowest in the $E_v$ component and broadest in
the $E_u$ component. The precursors in this case appear strongest in the $E_u$ component, are
significant in the $E_v$ component but lost in the noise in the $E_w$ component. The relatively broad
temporal extent of the precursors suggests that they may be a novel form of spread F, but seen at
frequencies far below radar frequency and in terms of direct propagation delay rather than as
reflected pulses. Validation of the assumed 245 km/s group velocity for propagation through the
EIWG in this case is validated by the WERA data for these LG pulses shown in the last three
figures in the Supplemental materials.

Despite the substantial propagation delays for the LG events seen in Figures 1f and 2d,
no significant increase in the widths of the pulses (relative to the model pulses in Figures 1g and
2g) from the propagation through the EIWG from the location of the lightning flash to the
subsatellite point was seen. This dispersionless propagation of LG EMPs through the lower
ionosphere exemplified by Figures 1 & 2 is in stark contrast to the characteristics of normal
whistlers. In the following section 3, the detailed behavior of normal whistlers is quantitatively
described. In section 4, unusual dispersion events are discussed. A possible physical explanation
of both the “spread F like” precursors and the delayed bipolar dispersionless pulses will be
discussed in Section 5.

3 Wave Vector Analysis for Normal Whistler Events

3.1 Normal Two Fluid Plasma Dispersion Relations

In (Bennett, 2023) it was empirically found, for propagation angles $\theta$ relative to the local
magnetic field not close to $\pm 90^\circ$, that both the phase and group velocities versus frequency of
fast magnetosonic “whistler” waves for frequencies above the relevant ion cyclotron frequency
and below the electron cyclotron frequency have a square root dependence on frequency
insensitive to ion mass. Numerically the group velocity vs. frequency is approximately

$$V_{group} = 189 \frac{km}{s/Hz} \sqrt{\frac{75 mm^{-3}}{N_e}} \frac{B}{31 \mu T} \sqrt{f}, \quad (1)$$

while the phase velocity is approximately
\[ V_{\text{phase}} = 112 \frac{\text{km}}{s\sqrt{Hz}} \sqrt{\frac{75 \text{ mm}^{-3}}{N_e} \frac{B}{31 \mu T} \sqrt{f \cos(\theta)}}. \] (2)

These general and characteristic features of the classical whistler portion of the dispersion relations (De Jonghe & Keppens, 2021b) are seen in observational data for whistlers in “normal” plasma regions, but are violated in regions of unusual dispersion.

3.2 Normal Dispersion Relation Observations

Figure 3 of the present work shows the scalograms from a 1.6 second portion of the scalograms shown in Figure 5 of (Bennett, 2023). The overall travel time, including the propagation time through the EIWG to the subsatellite location, \( \Delta T_0 \), followed by the passage upwards through the ionosphere to the satellite detectors is given by the integral of the inverse group velocity over the path length as

\[ \Delta T = \int \frac{ds}{V_{\text{group}}(s)} = \Delta T_0 + DC / \sqrt{f}. \] (3)

In the equality on the right hand side of expression (3), the dispersion constant (DC) value implicitly represents the integral over all variations along the path through the ionosphere of the factors in expression (1). Superimposed over the scalograms in Figure 3, the white vertical dashed line shows the arrival time of an LG pulse at a time \( \Delta T_0 \) after the WWLLN observed stroke time. The three curved red dashed lines show three dispersion curves having DC values of 0.1, 12 and 24 s√Hz, and having the same arrival time at the subsatellite location as the white dispersionless case. For DC values much less than 0.1 s√Hz, normal whistlers appear effectively dispersionless, arriving at a time \( \Delta T_0 \) after the associated lightning stroke.

3.3 Wavevector Analysis of Normal Dispersion Observations

Figure 4 of the present work shows a wave vector analysis using the amplitudes along the four superimposed dispersion curves indicated by dashed lines in Figure 3. At each frequency and time along the dispersion curves having DC values indicated in the column titles for Figures 4a, 4f, 4k and 4p, the complex amplitudes of the scalograms for the electric and magnetic fields are used to compute the Poynting vector

\[ S(f) = E(f) \times B^*(f), \] (4)

and the unit Poynting vector

\[ \hat{S}(f) = S(f) / |S(f)|. \] (5)
The absolute values of the scalar product of the unit Poynting vector with each of the unit vectors in the mean field aligned (MFA) coordinate system described in (Min et al., 2017; Ritter et al., 2013) as a function of frequency are shown in the top three rows of Figure 4. The MFA coordinate labels here (µ, φ, and ν) follow the notation of Min et al. (2017). The scalar products along the local magnetic field are indicated by |S•µ| in the ordinate label in 4a. The scalar products along the magnetic East direction in the horizontal plane are indicated by |S•φ| in the ordinate label in 4c. The scalar products along the direction orthogonal to the first two directions, approximately vertical in the equatorial region, are indicated by |S•ν| in the ordinate label in 4b. In 4d, 4i, 4n and 4s, the absolute value of the electric and magnetic field scalogram components are shown as a function of frequency. The random phase approximation (RPA) for the phase velocity as a function of frequency is computed according to the method described by (Bennett, 2023) from the complex scalogram amplitudes along each of the four dispersion curves shown in Figure 3, and is plotted in Figure 4e, 4j, 4o and 4t.

Expression 2 is used to estimate the propagation angles θ in Figure 4e, 4j, 4o and 4t by fitting the high frequency behavior of the four cases. These estimated angles are shown in blue in the last row of Figure 4 and the phase velocity vs. frequency variation of expression 2 is shown by the green line in Figure 4e, 4j, 4o and 4t above the oxygen cyclotron frequency. Below the oxygen cyclotron frequency the phase velocity is shown by the horizontal section of the green line at its long wavelength limit assuming the plasma is predominantly O⁺ ions.

Since the “noise” of other contributions to the scalogram amplitudes along the four dispersion curves is not negligible, significant fluctuations are seen in the estimated Poynting vector projections displayed in the top three rows of Figure 4. Even so, it seems the direction of the energy flow for the low dispersion whistler and its echos are traveling in approximately consistent directions, in contrast to the apparent variation in the direction of the wavevector suggested in the last row of Figure 4. The sign of the energy propagation direction is irrelevant in the plots of the absolute values of the energy propagation direction cosines shown in the top three rows of Figure 4. This whistler and its echos are travelling obliquely in the MFA coordinate system, with unit Poynting vector projections of approximately 0.8, 0.5 and 0.4 along the µ (magnetic field B), ν (~vertical), and φ (magnetic East) directions.

Even though the dispersion constant (DC) values are dramatically different for the four cases displayed in Figure 4, the RPA estimated phase velocities for all four cases are not so different, and are consistent with slightly different cos(θ) angular factors. The reason for the great differences between the DC values is that they represent integrated totals of the dispersion over the full distance (in the last two cases including the echoing path) from source to detector. This sensitivity of the DC values to the integrated dispersion along the full path from source to detection was extensively exploited and discussed in (Bennett, 2023). In contrast, the four dispersiveness coefficients (50, 50, 80 & 112) in the legends in 4e, 4j, 4o and 4t are local measurements, characteristic of the conditions of the ionosphere at the location of the detectors, rather than an integral measure along the full propagation path.

Finally, some measure of the fidelity of the RPA estimates for phase velocity can be judged by the degree to which the scalograms are found to have significant values above the
ambient “noise”. For example, for the Bu component displayed in 3a, scalogram amplitudes for frequencies below 100 Hz appear to decrease to the level of the “background” amplitudes primarily associated with the population of slow magnetosonic waves discussed in (Bennett, 2023). Other components are similarly “lost” in the background noise at a variety of frequency levels. As a guide for the interpretation of which frequencies have meaningful values for both the direction projections shown in the top three rows, and the phase velocities shown in the bottom row of Figure 4, the cyclotron frequencies for Oxygen and Hydrogen are shown by the white and magenta dashed lines in Figure 3 and cyan and magenta dashed lines in Figure 4 in order to more readily identify regions having significant amplitudes for all six electromagnetic components.

4 Wave Vector Analysis for Unusual Disperion Events

4.1 A Region of Unusual Dispersion

Figure 5 of the present work shows the scalograms from a single data burst acquired shortly before the burst scalograms shown in Figure 9 of (Bennett, 2023). In this figure, the arrival times of EMPs from every lightning strike detected by the WWLLN are shown by the vertical dashed white lines. Not a single normally dispersed whistler is observed during this data burst. This data has the character described in (Bennett, 2023) for periods that the Van Allen probe is passing through the root of a plasma bubble contiguously connected to the EIWG. Specifically,

1. the dispersion constant (DC) values become anamolously small relative to the estimate from the international reference ionosphere (IRI) model for the time and location of the satellite,

2. it is observed that the “spikes” in the scalograms corresponding to anamolously small DC values do not extend much above 1 kHz, in contrast to normal, very low dispersion cases outside plasma bubble regions that extend all the way to the Nyquist frequency as seen in Figure 3,

3. the electric field fluctuations become enhanced by several orders of magnitude relative to typical values seen just before or just after entering the bubble region,

4. the magnetic field fluctuations are not especially enhanced relative to typical values outside the bubble region,

5. where both electric and magnetic field fluctuations are significant relative to their surroundings, the estimated phase velocity is orders of magnitude faster than expected relative to the IRI model estimate.

The last three of these points are clearly seen in the spectra, as shown by comparison of the fourth column relative to the first or third columns in Figure 7 of Bennett (2023).

In the first portion of the data shown in Figure 5 prior to the identified “Period of Interest”, there are a great number of dispersionless spikes seen in the electric field scalograms, most of which do not have corresponding well isolated spikes substantially above the ambient clutter noise from the ubiquitous slow magnetosonic waves (Bennett, 2023) in the magnetic field scalograms, so that a wavevector analysis of the sort described for Figure 4 is not feasible because of the high degree of “clutter noise”. The number of spikes is much greater than the number of detected WWLLN strokes during this period. Furthermore, the timing of the WWLLN
stroke arrivals do not line up well with the strong dispersionless spikes in the VAP data. Since
the wavevector analysis shown above in Figure 4 relies on having scalogram amplitudes for all
six electric and magnetic field components that are reasonably stronger than the surrounding
“noise” of other waves, the region indicated by the bracket with arrows labeled “Period of
Interest” has been chosen for further wavevector analysis because of the availability of
significant dispersionless spikes in the magnetic field scalograms. This region is also of interest
as it appears to be at the edge of a plasma bubble, since the dispersionless spikes are suddenly
not seen after this period.

4.2 Scalograms from A Region of Unusual Dispersion and the Cone of Influence

Figure 6 shows in more detail scalograms of the three magnetic and electric field
components for the bracketed region indicated in Figure 5. Superposed on the scalograms are
eight white vertical dashed lines labeled #1 - #8 chosen to pass through peaks in either the
magnetic or electric scalograms. The four dashed red vertical lines are drawn at the predicted
arrival times of LG waves at the subsatellite location, using the WWLLN measured locations and
strike times assuming a propagation speed through the EIWG of 245 km/s. For each of the four
WWLLN detected waves, the angular distance from the subsatellite point to the WWLLN
determined strike location is indicated in 6f by the blue text numbers.

The noisiness of the following wavevector analysis for propagation direction and phase
velocity may be attributed to the variability in the contributions from the numerous other waves
present at the times chosen for analysis. The cone of influence (COI) shown by the curved red
dashed lines superimposed over the scalogram plots in Figure 6 shows the boundary COI, as
described in section 2 above. The COI also represents the “confusion time range” over which
other waves contribute to the scalogram amplitudes associated with a given peak. For example,
the strongest spike in the electric field scalograms, labeled #6, spreads more broadly in time at
lower frequencies just as does the COI shown by the curved white dashed line in 6d, 6e and 6f
centered at peak #6.

4.8 Foamy Behavior of Unusual Dispersion Regions

The wavevector analysis shown in Figure 7 for cases labeled #3, #4, #5 and #8 in Figure
6 displays an unusual phase velocity distribution. At frequencies below the local oxygen
cyclotron frequency, the RPA estimated phase velocity is approximately 30 Mm/s for all four
cases. For cases #3 and #5, above the oxygen cyclotron frequency the RPA phase velocity drops
to approximately 2 Mm/s and is approximately constant. In contrast, cases #4 and #8 in the 2nd
and 4th columns, appear to alternate between 2 Mm/s and 30 Mm/s regions.

The results displayed in Figures 7e and 7o are in stark contrast to the normal variation of
phase velocity as a function of frequency seen in Figures 4e, 4j, 4o and 4t. In the Figure 7e and
7o plots the constancy of the phase velocity above the relevant local cyclotron frequency,
Oxygen in this case, cannot be explained by any normal IRI model. In general, the local plasma
dispersiveness produces a phase velocity increasing as the square root of the frequency, as in
expression 2. Evidence that the phase velocity for these waves is not merely locally
dispersionless, but also nearly dispersionless along their full path through the ionosphere to the
satellite is simply that the appearance in the scalograms such as in Figures 1 or 2 is of purely
vertical spikes with negligible indication of dispersion beyond the Nickolaenko et al. (2004)
model, despite substantial overall propagation delays.

The ionospheric length of the propagation path followed by LG waves cannot be less than
a purely vertical path of approximately 190 km from the EIWGUB to the satellite, and thus the
propagation delays of 12 and 25 ms for events #1 & #2 as indicated in Figure 6a, correspond to
mean speeds no less than 16 and 8 Mm/s. Although the magnetic field scalogram spikes in
Figure 6a, 6b & 6c for events #1 & #2 have such high “clutter noise” that a wavevector analysis
of the type shown in figure 7 is unreliable, these speeds at least do have the same order of
magnitude as the RPA estimates shown in the last row of plots in Figure 7 for peaks #3, #4, #5
and #8.

5 Propagation of Magnetohydrodynamic Waves Through A Model Plasma Foam

Even in the absence of magnetic fields or ionization, the propagation of acoustic waves
through foamy mixtures of gaseous and liquid phases is complex, as discussed for example in
(Benjelloun & Ghidaglia, 2021; Elias et al., 2020; Pierre et al., 2013). Remarkably, prior to
experimental confirmation, in 1941 Wood, on the basis of physical arguments, argued that the
speed of sound in a mixture of two fluids would be that of a single fluid having density equal to
the volumetric mean density of the two fluids, and compressibility equal to the volumetric mean
compressibility. In a mixture of air bubbles in water for example, the speed of sound, according
to Wood’s law, may be orders of magnitude slower than the speed of sound in either water or air.
This is because the mixture density is dominated by the water fraction, while the mixture
compressibility is dominated by the air fraction. It has been found (Elias et al., 2020) that
Wood’s law indeed reliably predicts the velocity of sound in most liquid foams when the bubbles
are much smaller than the acoustic wavelength.

Isolated small air bubbles in water are most likely to be nearly spherical. By contrast, low
density plasma bubbles embedded in higher density plasma at the bottom of the ionosphere are
expected to extend along local magnetic field lines. In the model of a small region of the lower
ionosphere illustrated in Figure 8, “normal” plasma is represented by the gold colored material
while very low plasma density depletion bubbles are represented by voids. In this model, the
bubbles are drawn with circular shapes in the plane perpendicular to \(B\), and with a random
assortment of positions and diameters. The presence of the magnetic field produces a sensitive
dependence on the direction of propagation of magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) waves relative to
\(B\). With the local speed of sound much less than the Alfvén speed, magnetosonic waves tend to
separate into fast waves moving nearly perpendicular to \(B\) and slow waves moving nearly
parallel to \(B\) (Jackson, 1975). As the waves discussed here are fast, I consider waves moving
exactly perpendicular to \(B\). Such waves propagate with a speed dependant on the sum of
hydrostatic and magnetic pressures.

In the plane perpendicular to \(B\), the section of “foamy” plasma shown has dimensions of
a single wavelength in both the East/West and Up/Down directions. With the approximation that
the compressibility of normal density plasma is much less than the compressibility of low density
bubbles, the speed of fast magnetosonic waves in the mixture becomes much less than the speed
in either normal density plasma or low density bubbles. This speed is also a sensitive function of the bubble volumetric fraction, and may vary erratically from one sample to the next. The wide variety of propagation delays seen in Figures 1 and 2 can be explained by this erratic variation.

For wavelengths shorter than the smallest of the plasma bubble radii in this model, MHD waves would tend to propagate only within the circular cross section “waveguides” bounded by the high conductivity plasma “walls”, as either (Jackson, 1975) transverse electric or transverse magnetic modes. With a variety of bubble diameters and plasma densities within the bubbles, the group velocities of short wavelength modes passing through these waveguides would also be variable. The spread in the arrival times of high frequency, short wavelength waves seen in the form of “precursors” in Figures 1 and 2 can be explained by this process. Because of the low plasma density within these effective waveguides, the highest propagation speed may be quite high, and the earliest precursor signals may appear immediately after the arrival of LG pulses at the subsatellite location, as seen in the numerous examples in Figures 1 and 2 and the supplemental figures.

Finally, the frequency spread of the “precursors” is sometimes limited to a narrow range (e.g. from just below to just above 10 kHz in the Figure 1c case), but more often extends over a wider frequency range (e.g. from about 1 kHz to 20 kHz in the Figure 2a case). Examination of the various examples of “precursors” in the first nine supplemental figures reveals that the frequency spread of the “precursors” is relatively consistent over the brief periods shown in these figures. Examination of the numerous examples shown in Figures 1 and 2 and the supplemental figures further reveals that the unusual, nearly dispersionless spikes in the scalograms do not usually extend much above a few kHz. From the dispersion relations for fast magnetosonic waves travelling in a primarily O\(^+\) plasma, as shown in Figure 1d of Bennett (2023), this frequency corresponds to wavelengths of a few km. Both the lower frequency limit of the extent of the “precursors” and the upper frequency limit of the scalogram spikes suggest that the mean spacing of the bubbles in Figure 8 is typically on the order of magnitude of 1 km. This model then naturally explains the lower frequency bound of the “precursors” and the upper frequency bound on the dispersionless scalogram spikes.

6 Discussion and Conclusions

Another characteristic of “foamy” behavior is strong attenuation. This effect is more difficult to prove directly with the Van Allen probe observations. In some rare cases, such as those displayed in Figures 1 and 2, multiple intense strokes of lightning are seen emerging from a single location that may be identified with individual LG pulses measured by the Van Allen probe detectors. With nearly identical paths traversed from source to detector, the correlation between propagation delay and attenuation may be made. However, because of the inherent variability in foamy plasma model illustrated in Figure 8, the uncertainties in these measurements within a single burst of data are quite large. For the data shown in Figure 1, it is found that an attenuation of 49±22% corresponds to a propagation delay of 19±12 ms, while for the data shown in Figure 2, an attenuation of 1±0.7% corresponds to a propagation delay of 131±5 ms. These values plotted in Figure 9 provide suggestive evidence for strong attenuation of fast magnetosonic waves with propagation distance through foamy plasma. A more indirect manifestation of the strong attenuation of LG waves passing through such hypothetical foamy plasma is the fact that most lightning strokes do not produce detectable whistler events in the Van Allen probe data.
In (Zheng et al., 2015) a search for coincident detections of LG events by the Van Allen probe satellites and the WWLLN was made. For the subset of lightning strikes within 18° of the subsatellite location, only 15.3% of the strikes were detected by the Van Allen probe instruments. The relatively low 15% coincidence rate found in this study could be explained by the presence of underlying plasma bubble foam covering approximately 85% of the bottom of the ionosphere. In (Jacobson et al., 2018) it was found that most lightning strokes were not detected by the C/NOFS instruments, while occasionally there was greatly enhanced transmission of LG waves to the satellite. Quantitatively, from line 6 of table 1 of (Jacobson et al., 2018) listing a population of 136-thousand WWLLN strokes having predicted strong Poynting vector fluence at the subsatellite point, the estimated number of coincident Vector Electric Field Investigation (VEFI) whistlers, from line 13 of table 1 was only 19-thousand (14%). These authors suggested that km-scale D-layer irregularities might be responsible for these effects. Frequently appearing foamy plasma bubble roots of the sort discussed here in connection with Figure 8 could explain both the lack of detection for most lightning strokes noted by (Jacobson et al., 2018) and the occasional greatly enhanced transmission. The rare enhanced transmission observations would correspond to cases for which the C/NOFS satellite was either immersed in, or just above, a plasma bubble root, while the more common lack of detection would correspond to foamy, strongly attenuating bubbles not extending up to the C/NOFS satellite that effectively absorbed most of the LG energy. Despite the quite different analysis approaches of (Zheng et al., 2015) and (Jacobson et al., 2018), their coincident rates between satellite observations of whistlers and WWLLN detected lightning strokes are in reasonable agreement.

In conclusion, it is suggested that most (~80%) of the bottom of the nocturnal equatorial ionosphere is covered with a “foamy” layer of plasma bubbles that extend contiguously down to neutral atmosphere. Whether this foam is turbulent is an open question. The detailed spatial structure of this foam is an open question. The possibility of two-phase foamy structure at the base of the ionosphere may complicate theoretical analyses that implicitly assume a single-phase medium. Many other such questions remain open, but it is hoped that follow up observations and theoretical analysis might be stimulated by the present suggestions.
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Figure 1. Scalograms (in a, c, and e) and time resolved plots (b, d, and f) of the electric field components are shown for a period while VAP-A passes through the root of a plasma bubble. In (g) the summation of the radial electric field contributions from all WWLLN detected lightning strokes within this time interval using the (Nickolaenko et al., 2004) model with WWLLN determined amplitudes is plotted. The percentage values shown above the three peaks in f represent the ratios of the observed peak amplitudes to the model amplitudes of the corresponding peaks seen in (g). The predicted arrival times at the subsatellite location using WWLLN/GLM stroke times are shown by the red/white dashed vertical lines in (a, c and e). The GLM times appear systematically later by 2 ms than the WWLLN times. The second of the peaks in (f) was seen by GLM but not detected by WWLLN. In the scalograms, some extraneous radio frequency interference at approximately 2 kHz and harmonics can be seen. The geographic location of the subsatellite point at the start of this data burst is shown in the title. Also shown is the location of the flash responsible for the four peaks in (f). The angular difference between these locations along the great circle is shown as Δθ.

Figure 2. Scalograms and time resolved plots of VAP-A data with the same layout as in the previous figure are shown for a different period. The percentage values shown above the three peaks in (f) represent the ratios of the observed peak amplitudes to the model amplitudes of the corresponding peaks seen in (g). As in the previous figure, and in similar subsequent figures, the angular distance along the great circle containing both the satellite location and the relevant lightning flash location is indicated by the value of Δθ in the figure title.
Figure 3. Scalograms of the three magnetic and electric field components in the spinning U,V, W reference frame are displayed for a 1.6 s sample of EMFISIS data. The dashed line curves represent four distinct dispersion constant (DC) values that track the dispersed waves from a single lighting stroke detected by the WWLLN. In (a, b and c), scalograms for the Bu, Bv and Bw components of the magnetic field are shown. In d, e and f, scalograms for the Eu, Ev and Ew components of the electric field are shown. The approximate location and local solar time (LST) of the satellite at the time of this data collection is shown in the figure title.

Figure 4. The direction and speed for four different DC values are displayed for points along each of the dispersion curves shown in the previous figure. In (a, f, k and p), the absolute values for the projections of the Poynting unit vector $S$ along $\mu$ (the direction of the local magnetic field $B$) are plotted as a function of frequency. Similarly in (b, g, l and q), projections along the $v$ direction (approximately vertical) of the MFA coordinate system are shown. Also similarly in (c, h, m and r), projections along the $\phi$ direction (magnetic East) of the MFA coordinate system are shown. In (d, i, n, s), the magnitudes of the electric and magnetic field amplitudes are shown as a function of frequency. In (e, j, o, and t) the RPA estimated phase velocities are plotted as a function of frequency.

Figure 5. Scalograms of the three magnetic and electric field components in the spinning U,V, W reference frame are displayed for a single burst of EMFISIS data. The white dashed vertical lines are plotted at the times of the arrival at the subsatellite location for every WWLLN event detected during this data burst. In (a, b and c), scalograms for the Bu, Bv and Bw components of the magnetic field are shown. In (d, e and f), scalograms for the Eu, Ev and Ew components of the electric field are shown. In (g), the satellite spin vector coordinates $\lambda$ (in the fashion of latitude) and $\delta$ (in the fashion of longitude), characterizing the spin vector orientation relative to the local magnetic field, are indicated over the course of this data burst. The approximate location and local solar time (LST) of the satellite at the start of this data burst is shown in the legend for section (g).

Figure 6. Scalograms for the indicated subset of the time range in the previous figure are shown here. In (a, b and c), scalograms of the three magnetic field components are shown. In (d, e and f), scalograms of the three electric field components are shown. In (f), the arc distances, (80°, 18°, 162° and 79°), along the great circle containing the subsatellite location and the four WWLLN stroke locations are shown in blue text labels near the four dashed red vertical lines for the estimated arrival times at the subsatellite location of the four WWLLN strokes. The first two strokes appear sufficiently isolated that they may be tentatively identified with the scalogram spikes labelled #1 and #2 in (f).
**Figure 7.** A wavevector analysis with the same layout as that displayed in Figure 4 is shown here for the four times indicated in Figure (6f) by white vertical dashed lines and numbered #3, #4, #5 and #8. The locally dispersionless nature of the scalogram peaks seen in Figure 6 is validated by the nearly constant phase velocity values above the local Oxygen cyclotron frequency seen especially clearly in (e and o).

**Figure 8.** A physical model of a region of “foamy plasma” near the bottom of the ionosphere is illustrated. A sketch of the “Wood’s law” derivation of the estimated speed of sound in the two-phase mixture is shown.

**Figure 9.** The variation of dispersionless pulse attenuation as a function of propagation delay through foamy plasma is plotted. The two points with error bars shown represent the two cases displayed in Figures 1 and 2 above.
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Figures S1 to S12

Introduction

The first nine of these figures provide supporting evidence for the existence of occasional “precursors” to the unusual nearly dispersionless spikes observed in scalograms while the Van Allen probe is located within the root of a plasma bubble. The layout of each of these nine figures follows that of Figure 1 and 2 in the main article.

The last three of these figures provide the supporting evidence for the group velocity of 245 km/s for the propagation of lightning generated EMPs through the Earth-Ionosphere waveguide (EIWG) at the time of the data shown in Figure 2 of the main article. In each of these three figures, the scalograms and time resolved plots of the two horizontal magnetic field fluctuations observed at one of the WERA ground stations are shown. The appearance times for lightning generated (LG) pulses from the three lightning strikes are indicated on the plots by red vertical lines.
Figure S1. The layout of this figure is the same as Figures 1 & 2 in the main article. Scalograms (in a, c, and e) and time resolved plots (b, d, and f) of the electric field components are shown for a period while VAP-A passes through the root of a plasma bubble. In g the radial electric field from all WWLLN detected lightning strokes within this time interval using the (Nickolaenko et al., 2004) model is plotted. This case includes five distinct lightning strokes. The first of these has significant “precursor” activity in Eu and Ev between 3 kHz and 10 kHz, but the presence of corresponding Ew activity is obscured by the high noise level. Only the first two strokes are sufficiently well isolated that their precursors can be seen clearly aligned with the LG pulse arrival times. Because so many spikes appear in the scalograms, it is difficult to properly correlate specific spikes with their precursors.
Figure S2. The layout of this figure is the same as the previous figure. In this case, although the precursor timing is clear, it is very unclear which, if any, of the spikes in the scalograms are associated with it.
Figure S3. The layout of this figure is the same as the previous figure. In this case, although the precursor timing is clear, it is very unclear which, if any, of the spikes in the scalograms are associated with it.
Figure S4. The layout of this figure is the same as the previous figure. In this case, although the precursor timing is clear for the first and third strokes, it is very unclear which, if any, of the spikes in the scalograms are associated with them.
Figure S5. The layout of this figure is the same as the previous figure. In this case, although the precursor timing is clear for the first and second strokes, it is very unclear which, if any, of the spikes in the scalograms are associated with them.
Figure S6. The layout of this figure is the same as the previous figure. In this case, although the precursor timing is clear for five of the six strokes, it is very unclear which, if any, of the spikes in the scalograms are associated with them.
Figure S7. The layout of this figure is the same as the previous figure. In this case, although the precursor timing is clear for both strokes, it is very unclear which, if any, of the spikes in the scalograms are associated with them.
Figure S8. The layout of this figure is the same as the previous figure. In this case, although the precursor timing is clear for strokes #1, #4, #5 and #6, it is very unclear which, if any, of the spikes in the scalograms are associated with them.
Figure S9. The layout of this figure is the same as the previous figure. In this case, although the precursor timing is clear for strokes #1, #4, #5 and #6, it is very unclear which, if any, of the spikes in the scalograms are associated with them.
Figure S10. Scalograms for the two WERA magnetic field components observed at the Patagonia site, along with their time resolved values are shown for the 0.23 s interval centered around the time of the three lightning strokes discussed in Figure 2 of the main article. In (a and c) scalograms for the North/South (NS) and East/West (EW) components of magnetic field are shown. In (b and d) the NS and EW magnetic fields are plotted as a function of time. In (f) the summation of the azimuthal magnetic field contributions from the three WWLLN detected strokes during this time using the (Nickolaenko et al., 2004) model is plotted. In (e) the scalogram of the temporal function plotted in (f) is shown. Red dashed or solid lines show the arrival time assuming the propagation speed of 245 km/s at the subsatellite location for each of the three lightning stroke pulses.
Figure S11. Scalograms and time resolved values for the two WERA magnetic field components observed at the Hylaty site are shown with the same layout as the previous figure.
Figure S12. Scalograms and time resolved values for the two WERA magnetic field components observed at the Hugo site are shown with the same layout as the previous figure. In this case, the NS magnetic field components were noisy and not meaningful.