

CORONAL TEMPERATURE DIAGNOSTICS DERIVED FROM
MULTILAYER OBSERVATIONS WITH THE MULTI-SPECTRAL SOLAR
TELESCOPE ARRAY

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS
AND THE COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE STUDIES
OF STANFORD UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Paul Boerner

July 2004

© Copyright by Paul Boerner 2004

All Rights Reserved

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that, in my opinion, it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Philip Scherrer

Principal Adviser

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that, in my opinion, it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Sarah Church

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that, in my opinion, it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Vahé Petrosian

Approved for the University Committee on Graduate Studies:

ABSTRACT

In recent years, satellite-based extreme ultraviolet multilayer telescopes observing the solar corona have provided some of the most beautiful and fascinating images ever seen. However, our ability to extract quantitative information about the thermodynamic state of the solar atmosphere from these images has been limited by their broad temperature response, uncertain calibration status, and the limited number of bandpasses available. In this dissertation, I present a unique dataset and novel analysis techniques designed to provide rigorous constraints on conditions in the corona with the high spatial and temporal resolution of multilayer images. The data were obtained during the third flight of the Multi-Spectral Solar Telescope Array, a sounding rocket payload which was launched on April 30, 2002. The MSSTA imaged the solar atmosphere in seven different ultraviolet bandpasses, centered on strong emission lines at 150 Å, 171 Å, 180 Å, 195 Å, 211 Å, 1216 Å and 1550 Å. These images, along with satellite observations, can be used to constrain the differential emission measure of the corona in the temperature range of 300,000 to 3,000,000 K; however, uncertainty in the data and fundamental limitations in the emission processes impose strict limits on the range and accuracy of the results. I present spatially-resolved differential emission measure functions obtained from the MSSTA data, and discuss the potential applications of these results, along with an analysis of the limitations of the current data set and of the DEM reconstruction technique.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Much of the work described here was the collaborative effort of a number of people, and in recognition of this fact I have generally used the plural “we” to describe the activity and deliberation of the MSSTA team throughout the text. However, a number of vital contributions are not mentioned in the body of the dissertation, or were so integral to the MSSTA project or my own ability to proceed that they demand explicit recognition.

Arthur B. C. Walker conceived and created the MSSTA payload, so any work derived from that instrument owes him a tremendous debt. Even more importantly, for me, Art was a mentor and a friend. He kept me from giving up on science altogether and sparked my interest in solar physics; taught me to plan and test scientific instruments with a critical eye; and gave me the confidence to pursue my own path. His passing in April of 2001 was devastating for all who knew him. The breadth of his accomplishments, and his brilliance, kindness and courage, have been mourned by many people with more eloquence than I feel I can provide. I will always feel blessed to have known him and learned from him, and owe all the satisfaction I derive from thinking of myself as a solar physicist to him. I am also grateful to Victoria Walker for her compassion, for sharing some part of her admiration and love for Art with me.

Philip Scherrer has been my thesis advisor since 2001, and has been wonderfully supportive, patient and good to me in that time. His guidance ensured that the only obstacles I faced in continuing to work on the MSSTA mission were scientific, and enabled me to continue at Stanford. He has also helped me understand the place of my work in the larger solar physics community, and helped me to connect to other members of that community. I am grateful to the members of Phil’s research group who provided helpful suggestions on the analysis of the MSSTA data, especially Sasha Kosovichev and Rasmus Larsen.

Dennis Martínez-Galarce has managed to be a scientific colleague, an advisor, a beer-drinking comrade, and a supervisor to me, frequently playing all these roles in series within the same 24 hour period, and all without any officially-sanctioned status. He took over the direction of the

MSSTA project in 2001 and demonstrated extraordinary tenacity and ingenuity in ensuring the payload's success. I owe a great deal to his intelligence, experience, and willingness to develop an extremely productive and relaxed working relationship with me.

I'd like to think that T. J. Bay and I worked similarly well together. Certainly T. J. managed to accomplish a tremendous amount despite joining the MSSTA team as launch time approached; he made himself an expert on the payload in less than a year and made invaluable contributions to the calibration experiments, alignment, assembly and pre-flight testing of the telescopes. Ramesh Kumar and AmirAli Talasaz took over the arcane payload electronics and software, and transformed them into a sophisticated camera-control computer through long hours and divine inspiration. Naseem Hakim, Felicia Tam and Dave Robertson all helped keep the payload work moving forward and solved some of the innumerable little problems that make experimental physics interesting. Hakeem Oluseyi and Craig DeForest shared generously of their own experiences on past MSSTA flights and the wisdom they have gained since the completion of their graduate work.

The NASROC team at White Sands Missile Range, lead by Carlos Martínez and Bill Payne, probably worked harder on our payload than on any three other missions, but they never complained, and were never anything but cheerful, professional and skillful. It was difficult not to feel that they could have built and flown the whole experiment in a month if only we members of the science team would get out of their way. Their supreme competence earned my gratitude and awe.

Troy Barbee and Phil Baker were collaborators who were happy to act as teachers when it became clear that I needed more from them than just the work that the original proposal called for. Eric Gullikson and the staff at the ALS, and Hal Tompkins and the staff at SSRL, were similarly helpful and understanding. My dissertation committee – Sarah Church, Vahé Petrosian, Blas Cabrera, and Umran Inan – provided patience and useful feedback.

It goes without saying that I would have failed in a thousand ways over the past seven years without the ceaseless support of my family and friends. To all of you, thank you.

AUTHORSHIP

By its nature, a dissertation requires at least some account of how much of the described work was performed by the individual author, and to satisfy this requirement as well as to absolve the innocent of any blame for my own mistakes of commission or omission, I will attempt to make explicit the extent of my own role in the project here described.

The text of the dissertation is entirely my own writing. With the exception of Section 5.4, which is adapted from (Boerner, Martínez-Galarce et al. 2004), none of the text has been previously published elsewhere. The material in Chapter 1 is essentially a restatement of a large body of existing knowledge, which I have taken pains to cite appropriately; while this is mostly background, with little that is truly new, some of the formalism and all of the arguments presented in Chapter 1 are my own.

The experimental work described in Chapters 2 and 3 was mostly performed between 2000 and 2002. During this time, I was the senior graduate student of the MSSTA team. The planning of the experiment and the day-to-day labor in the lab were truly a team effort involving Dennis, myself, our collaborators and the other students in the group. I take full responsibility for those parts of Chapters 2 and 3 that give the impression that the MSSTA experiment was characterized by somewhat more frequent delays and errors than might be expected from an experienced scientist, and partial responsibility for the rest. I do not describe any of the experimental efforts (such as revision of the flight software) that were predominantly carried out by another member of the team.

The analysis techniques presented in Chapter 4 are my own work; I have cited the results of other authors who have performed similar analyses, but did not work directly with anyone else, outside of brief discussions, in developing these techniques.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 1 | Introduction..... | 1 |
| 1.1 | Overview..... | 1 |
| 1.2 | Background..... | 3 |
| 1.2.1 | The Corona..... | 3 |
| 1.2.2 | X-Ray Solar Physics..... | 4 |
| | The MSSTA..... | 5 |
| 1.3 | Measuring the Solar Atmosphere..... | 7 |
| 1.3.1 | Statement of the Problem..... | 7 |
| 1.3.2 | DEM..... | 8 |
| 1.3.3 | DEM and multilayer observations..... | 15 |
| | The Instrument Temperature Kernel..... | 16 |
| | Chromospheric Instruments..... | 17 |
| | Requirements for Using Temperature Kernels..... | 18 |
| 1.3.4 | Applications of Temperature Kernels..... | 19 |
| 1.4 | Summary..... | 27 |
| 2 | Design and Pre-Flight Calibration..... | 29 |
| 2.1 | Overview..... | 29 |
| 2.1.1 | Introduction..... | 29 |
| 2.1.2 | Design of the MSSTA III..... | 30 |
| | Bandpass Selection..... | 32 |
| | Instrument Assignment..... | 35 |
| 2.2 | Mirrors..... | 39 |
| 2.2.1 | Introduction..... | 39 |
| 2.2.2 | Calibration of the MSSTA III Multilayer Mirrors..... | 41 |
| 2.2.3 | Analysis of the Multilayer Calibration Data..... | 45 |
| 2.2.4 | Noise and Error..... | 47 |
| 2.2.5 | Angle of Incidence Variation..... | 53 |
| 2.2.6 | Mirror Potting..... | 55 |

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 2.3 | Filters | 57 |
| 2.3.1 | Introduction | 57 |
| 2.3.2 | Single vs. Double Filters..... | 58 |
| 2.3.3 | Filter Materials..... | 59 |
| 2.3.4 | Analytical method for MSSTA filter design..... | 61 |
| 2.3.5 | Calibration of EUV filters..... | 65 |
| 2.3.6 | Filter Failure | 66 |
| 2.4 | FUV optics..... | 69 |
| 2.4.1 | Introduction | 69 |
| 2.4.2 | Error Estimates | 73 |
| 2.5 | Film..... | 75 |
| 2.5.1 | Introduction | 75 |
| | Photography in the EUV..... | 75 |
| | Film Calibration..... | 79 |
| 2.5.2 | Calibration Measurements..... | 80 |
| 2.5.3 | Analysis of Calibration Film..... | 84 |
| | Fitting the Transfer Function..... | 88 |
| | Wavelength Dependence and Accuracy of the Film Model | 91 |
| | Selection of Film for Flight | 101 |
| | Film in the FUV Telescopes..... | 105 |
| | Conclusions | 106 |
| 2.5.4 | Applying Film Calibration to Flight Data..... | 108 |
| | Developing Time Correction..... | 109 |
| | Wavelength Correction..... | 111 |
| | Scanner Correction | 112 |
| 2.5.5 | Conclusion | 113 |
| | Final Calibration Function..... | 113 |
| | Calibration Error..... | 115 |
| 2.6 | Summary | 117 |
| 2.6.1 | Temperature Kernels..... | 117 |
| 2.6.2 | Error..... | 121 |
| | Effect of error on Temperature Kernels..... | 121 |
| | Absolute flux error | 123 |
| 2.6.3 | FUV Telescopes..... | 124 |
| 3 | Flight of the MSSTA III | 127 |

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| 3.1 | Construction..... | 127 |
| 3.1.1 | Optics | 127 |
| 3.1.2 | Electronics..... | 130 |
| 3.1.3 | Payload Integration..... | 131 |
| 3.1.4 | Flight Performance | 132 |
| 3.2 | The Dataset | 134 |
| 3.2.1 | Film Development and Cleaning..... | 134 |
| 3.2.2 | Image Coalignment | 136 |
| 3.2.3 | Resolution Analysis..... | 136 |
| 3.2.4 | The Images | 137 |
| | 150 Å Ritchey-Chrétien | 138 |
| | 171 Å Small Ritchey-Chrétien | 139 |
| | 180 Å Small Ritchey-Chrétien..... | 139 |
| | 195 Å Ritchey-Chrétien | 140 |
| | 211 Å Ritchey-Chrétien | 141 |
| | 1216 Å Ritchey-Chrétien | 142 |
| | 1550 Å Ritchey-Chrétien | 143 |
| 3.3 | Post-Flight Calibration..... | 144 |
| 3.3.1 | Atmospheric Absorption | 144 |
| 3.3.2 | Comparison with previous experiments | 145 |
| 3.3.3 | Comparison with theoretical predictions | 147 |
| | Systematic Renormalization..... | 149 |
| | Arbitrary Renormalization | 149 |
| 4 | Data Analysis..... | 151 |
| 4.1 | Techniques of DEM Recovery..... | 151 |
| 4.1.1 | Simulating Observations | 151 |
| 4.1.2 | Matrix Inversion..... | 156 |
| 4.1.3 | Forward Fitting..... | 162 |
| 4.2 | Extracting DEMs from the MSSTA data..... | 172 |
| 4.2.1 | Full-Disk..... | 172 |
| 4.2.2 | Area-Resolved | 177 |
| 4.2.3 | Reliability of Results | 181 |
| 4.3 | Solar Physics Implications..... | 183 |
| 4.3.1 | The 1 MK dip | 183 |

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 4.3.2 | DEM Indeterminacy | 185 |
| 5 | Conclusions..... | 189 |
| 5.1 | Summary of the MSSTA III data | 189 |
| 5.2 | Summary of the DEM reconstruction results..... | 191 |
| 5.3 | Future Prospects..... | 193 |
| 5.3.1 | Applications of MSSTA III data..... | 193 |
| 5.3.2 | Applications of the DEM Reconstruction Technique | 195 |
| 5.4 | The ATSSI | 198 |
| 5.4.1 | Abstract..... | 198 |
| 5.4.2 | Introduction | 199 |
| 5.4.3 | ATSSI System Concept | 199 |
| 5.4.4 | An Active Region in the X-Ray..... | 202 |
| | Bibliography | 205 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|---|-----|
| Table 1. The instruments of the MSSTA III. | 37 |
| Table 2. Summary of the measurements made at the ALS. | 44 |
| Table 3. Results of the bandpass measurements of the MSSTA III multilayers. | 48 |
| Table 4. Relative density specifications for the MSSTA III filters. | 61 |
| Table 5. Description of the filters used on the MSSTA III EUV telescopes. | 64 |
| Table 6. Concentration of solar flux on the MSSTA III EUV filters, and the result. | 67 |
| Table 7. Comparison of the ultraviolet wavelength regimes of the solar spectrum | 70 |
| Table 8. Summary of the efficiency measurements of the MSSTA III FUV optics. | 72 |
| Table 9. Properties of the two photographic films used by the MSSTA. | 78 |
| Table 10. Films and processes calibrated at SSRL. | 83 |
| Table 11. Predicted fluence values for the MSSTA telescopes. | 103 |
| Table 12. Error on the temperature kernels of the MSSTA III EUV telescopes. | 123 |
| Table 13. Pre-flight measurements of telescope resolution. | 130 |
| Table 14. Comparison of the full-disk spectrum. | 146 |
| Table 15. Full-disk fluxes observed by the MSSTA telescopes compared with those predicted based on the spectrum of Malinovsky and Heroux. | 146 |
| Table 16. MSSTA observations of a quiet-sun region and an active region compared with predictions based on the CHIANTI DEMs. | 148 |
| Table 17. Predicted pixel values based on the input DEMs shown in Figure 60. | 155 |
| Table 18. Full-disk observations used to generate disk-averaged DEMs. | 173 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | |
|--|----|
| Figure 1. The ratio of intensity predicted by the best-fit DEM to the observed intensity for each of the 26 strong lines used to constrain the DEM. | 13 |
| Figure 2. Filter ratios used to measure temperature from EIT observations. | 20 |
| Figure 3. Schematic depiction of how EUV spectroheliograms can lead to a better understanding of the solar atmosphere. | 28 |
| Figure 4. Front aperture view of the MSSTA II, showing the placement of the 19 telescopes it pointed at the sun during its flight in 1994. | 31 |
| Figure 5. Synthetic spectrum of a solar active region generated with CHIANTI. | 34 |
| Figure 6. Approximate relative temperature kernels of the MSSTA III EUV telescopes. | 34 |
| Figure 7. High-energy photons are reflected by a multilayer stack of layer spacing $2d$ if their wavelength and angle of incidence satisfy the Bragg condition | 40 |
| Figure 8. Beamline 6.3.2 (taken from (Gullikson, Mrowka et al. 2001)) | 42 |
| Figure 9. Reflectivity of the multilayer mirrors used in the MSSTA III EUV telescopes | 46 |
| Figure 10. Measurements of the 256 Å Ritchey-Chrétien primary mirror. | 49 |
| Figure 11. Measurements of the 211 Å Ritchey-Chrétien primary. | 49 |
| Figure 12. Measurements of the 195 Å Ritchey-Chrétien primary. | 50 |
| Figure 13. Measurements of the 180 Å Ritchey-Chrétien secondary | 50 |
| Figure 14. Measurements of the 171 Å Ritchey-Chrétien primary. | 51 |
| Figure 15. Measurements of the 150 Å Ritchey-Chrétien primary. | 51 |
| Figure 16. Measurements of the 131 Å Herschelien. | 52 |
| Figure 17. Measurements of the 98 Å Herschelien. | 52 |
| Figure 18. Measurements of the 58 Å Herschelien. | 53 |
| Figure 19. Because the effective bandpass of the multilayer depends on the angle of incidence of light, a curved optic behaves slightly differently than a flat optic at normal incidence. | 54 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Figure 20. Varying the angle of incidence on the 58 Å Herschelian | 54 |
| Figure 21. Varying the angle of incidence on the 98 Å Herschelian mirror | 55 |
| Figure 22. The effect of primer spots on the reflectivity of the 58 Å Herschelian | 56 |
| Figure 23. Absorption spectra of the materials used in the MSSTA III filters | 60 |
| Figure 24. Transmission of the filters used on the MSSTA III..... | 64 |
| Figure 25. a) The 131 Å Zr filter after the flight; b) two frames of film from the 131 Å camera after the flight, showing very overexposed solar images | 67 |
| Figure 26. Effective area of the MSSTA III FUV telescopes | 73 |
| Figure 27. Photographic film consists of light-sensitive silver halide crystals embedded in an emulsion, protected by a gelatin overcoat..... | 76 |
| Figure 28. Schematic top view of the experimental chamber used for film calibration measurements at SSRL..... | 82 |
| Figure 29. A typical characteristic curve describing the response of a given film and developing process..... | 85 |
| Figure 30. Generating a characteristic curve means exposing spots on the film with a known fluence and measuring the resulting density on the negative..... | 86 |
| Figure 31. Density of a point in the image depends on how the negative is measured..... | 87 |
| Figure 32. The calibration data for a given film type and development process can be plotted in the form of a characteristic curve..... | 92 |
| Figure 33. Ratio of total beam energy in each of the spots, calculated using the model (E_i')and measured with the photodiode (E_i) | 93 |
| Figure 34. In general, XUV-100 film responds differently to different EUV wavelengths..... | 95 |
| Figure 35. The discrepancy between measured energy and energy calculated from the film model for each of the spots plotted in Figure 34..... | 95 |
| Figure 36. Only two wavelengths were used in studying the D-19 process on XUV-100. Their behavior was sufficiently similar that a single model was used to match both datasets. | 97 |
| Figure 37. The model used for the two wavelengths is clearly a compromise, as the errors show an upwards trend for the 211 Å and a downward trend for 173 Å..... | 97 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Figure 38. Five wavelengths exposed on S-649 film and fit with a single model | 99 |
| Figure 39. The model gives an RMS error <20% for all wavelengths other than 193 Å..... | 99 |
| Figure 40. Inverted film models for the calibration of XUV-100..... | 104 |
| Figure 41. While its sensitivity is noticeably improved by using a concentrated developer, S-649 film is substantially less responsive than XUV-100 | 105 |
| Figure 42. Gas hypersensitization of S-649 film produced a slight overall fogging of the film, with no noticeable change in its sensitivity..... | 107 |
| Figure 43. Calibration film was developed for 20 minutes, flight film for only 10 minutes. | 110 |
| Figure 44. A polynomial correction function was applied to the pixel values in the 150 Å images to account for the wavelength dependence of the development process..... | 111 |
| Figure 45. Complete pixel-to-fluence curves used to calibrate the MSSTA III EUV images | 115 |
| Figure 46. Effective area of the MSSTA III telescopes over a solar active region spectrum. | 118 |
| Figure 47. Normalized temperature kernels of the MSSTA III telescopes..... | 119 |
| Figure 48. Absolute temperature kernels for the MSSTA III EUV telescopes..... | 120 |
| Figure 49. Response of the MSSTA III FUV telescopes showing the spectrum of expected flux at the film plane..... | 125 |
| Figure 50. Running integral of the expected flux at the film plane for the MSSTA FUV telescopes..... | 126 |
| Figure 51. Schematic of the Fizeau interferometer used to assess the wavefront error of the MSSTA Ritchey-Chrétien telescopes..... | 128 |
| Figure 52. Sun's-eye view of the MSSTA III. | 132 |
| Figure 53. MSSTA images, like the 195 Å 40-second exposure shown here, suffer from film cracking as well as dust and scratches | 135 |
| Figure 54. Image from the 150 Å Ritchey-Chrétien telescope. | 138 |
| Figure 55. Images from the small Ritchey-Chrétien telescopes at 171 Å and 180 Å | 139 |
| Figure 56. Image from the 195 Å Large Ritchey-Chrétien telescope. | 140 |
| Figure 57. Image from the 211 Å Ritchey-Chrétien telescope. | 141 |
| Figure 58. Image from the 1216 Å Ritchey-Chrétien telescope. | 142 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Figure 59. Image from the 1550 Å Ritchey-Chrétien telescope. | 143 |
| Figure 60. The DEMs used to simulate observations in order to test data analysis techniques.. | 153 |
| Figure 61. An active region DEM was used to generate noise-free simulated observations in the 5 MSSTA EUV channels | 158 |
| Figure 62. Adding noise to the simulated observations before inverting them quickly destroys the accuracy of the recovered DEM..... | 159 |
| Figure 63. The SVD of the kernel matrix is sensitive to the temperature range and number of bandpasses used..... | 161 |
| Figure 64. The forward-fitting procedure | 164 |
| Figure 65. The red curves show the best-fit DEMs found by forward fitting to noise-free simulated observations | 166 |
| Figure 66. Reconstruction of DEM from simulated datasets | 167 |
| Figure 67. A rather poor DEM recovery in the presence of 25% noise | 170 |
| Figure 68. The best-fit three-point spline to the full-disk average pixel values..... | 174 |
| Figure 69. Relaxing the conditions on the spline only enhances the dip at 10^6 K | 175 |
| Figure 70. On the left, ratios of full-disk observations to those predicted by an optimized flat DEM; on the right, ratios based on a scaled version of the standard quiet sun DEM | 175 |
| Figure 71. The best-fit full-disk DEM shown in Figure 68 is replotted..... | 176 |
| Figure 72. The selected active region and quiet region subframes | 177 |
| Figure 73. Sub-regions analyzed from the MSSTA III dataset..... | 178 |
| Figure 74. Results of sub-region DEM extraction | 179 |
| Figure 75. Pixel values predicted by DEM extraction on 30 arc-second square sub-regions compared with observations from those sub-regions | 180 |
| Figure 76. Effective area of the ATSSI telescope and filters, superimposed on a simulated spectrum from a solar active region at the aperture of the ATSSI. | 201 |
| Figure 77. Simulated result of a 10-sec, single pixel (~6.25 arcsec), observation of an active region by ATSSI. | 203 |