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Abstract We have investigated the effect of key solar wind driving parameters on solar wind-magnetosphere coupling efficiency during sheath and magnetic cloud-driven storms. The particular focus of the study was on the coupling efficiency dependence with Alfvén Mach number ($M_A$). The efficiency has been estimated using the dawn-dusk component of the interplanetary electric field ($E_Y$), Newell and Borovsky functions as a proxy for the energy inflow and the polar cap potential (PCN), and auroral electrojet (AE) and SYM-H indices as the measure of the energy output. We have also performed a time delay analysis between the input parameters and the geomagnetic indices. The optimal time lag and smoothing window length depend on the coupling function used and on the solar wind driver. For example, turbulent sheaths are more sensitive to the time shift and the averaging interval than smoother magnetic clouds. The results presented in this study show that the solar wind-magnetosphere coupling efficiency depends strongly on the definition used, and it increases with increasing $M_A$. We demonstrate that the PCN index distinctively shows both a Mach number dependent saturation and a Mach number independent saturation, pointing to the existence of at least two underlying physical mechanisms for the saturation of the index. By contrast, we show that the AE index saturates but that the saturation of this index is independent of the solar wind Mach number. Finally, we find that the SYM-H index does not seem to saturate and that the absence of saturation is independent of the Mach number regime. We highlight the difference between the typical $M_A$ conditions during sheath regions and magnetic clouds. The lowest $M_A$ values are related to the magnetic clouds. As a consequence, sheaths typically have higher solar wind-magnetosphere coupling efficiencies than magnetic clouds.

1. Introduction

As the solar wind reaches Earth, it interacts with its magnetosphere and disturbs its near space environment. The strongest geomagnetic disturbances are typically driven by interplanetary coronal mass ejections (ICMEs). An ICME consists of two main geoeffective structures with distinct solar wind plasma and magnetic field properties [Guo et al., 2010; Kilpua et al., 2013a]: first, an ejecta with typically smooth solar wind driving parameters preceded by a turbulent sheath region. The subset of ejecta can be described as magnetic flux ropes, i.e., magnetic clouds (Burlaga, 1988), which have a smoothly rotating magnetic field direction over an interval of about a day, combined with low plasma beta. Second, sheath regions are typically characterized by large amplitude magnetic field variations and compressed solar wind plasma.

Several studies have demonstrated that different solar wind conditions, for example, the sheath and the ejecta, lead to differences in the solar wind-magnetosphere coupling and magnetospheric activity [Huttunen et al., 2002, 2004, 2006; Pulkinen et al., 2007; Nikolaeva et al., 2011; Guo et al., 2011; Yermolaev et al., 2012; Lu et al., 2013; Jing et al., 2014]. Huttunen and Koskinen [2004] showed by analyzing the behavior of various geomagnetic indices that sheath regions typically lead to strong enhancements of high-latitude ionospheric currents ($AE$, $AL$, and also $Kp$), while magnetic clouds are more effective in enhancing the equatorial ring current ($DST$ and SYM-H). Yermolaev et al. [2012] demonstrated that sheath regions have a higher coupling efficiency than magnetic clouds. The authors determined the coupling efficiency of different interplanetary drivers using the ratio of magnetospheric indices ($DST$, $AE$, and $Kp$) to the integrated interplanetary magnetic field (IMF) $Z$ component ($B_Z$) and solar wind driving electric field $E_y$. In turn, Guo et al. [2011] found similar
energy partitioning and efficiencies for sheath and ICME-driven intense (Dst < −100 nT) storms, while the means of the input energy and auroral precipitation were significantly different. The study used the methods outlined in Turner et al. [2009] to estimate the total energy dissipation in the ring current and in the ionosphere through Joule heating and precipitation. To estimate the coupling efficiency between the solar wind and the magnetosphere, Guo et al. [2011] [see also Guo et al., 2010 and Pulkkinen et al., 2015] used the Newell formula [Newell et al., 2007] and the Borovsky function [Borovsky, 2008].

The reasons behind different magnetospheric responses to the sheaths and magnetic clouds are currently not well understood. Sheath regions have significantly higher level of turbulence which may enhance the transfer of solar wind plasma and energy into the magnetosphere through increased viscous interaction and instabilities at the magnetopause, e.g., Kelvin-Helmholtz vortices [Borovsky and Funsten, 2003; Kilpua et al., 2013b; Kavosi and Raeder, 2015]. It is also shown by Jing et al. [2014] that the traditional coupling functions which use the upstream solar wind measurements, like Akasofu’s epsilon parameter [Akasofu, 1981], do not include any hysteresis effects. Jing et al. [2014] studied the sudden turnings of IMF orientation on 5 June 1998 using the MHD simulations and showed that the epsilon parameter and mechanical and electromagnetic energy fluxes change slowly and consistently with the relatively stable B2 direction and density solar wind. However, during and after dramatic changes in density and B2 direction, the response of epsilon parameter and energy fluxes is slightly different. The sheath regions are more fluctuating than magnetic clouds, and typically consists of rapid changes in IMF magnitude and orientation. Thus, the absence of the hysteresis effects can cause differences for the observed solar wind-magnetosphere coupling between these structures when the efficiency is defined using the traditional coupling functions.

In other recent studies the importance of the solar wind Alfvénic Mach number (Ma, ratio of the flow velocity to the Alfvén speed) for solar wind-magnetosphere coupling has been highlighted [Lavraud and Borovsky, 2008; Lopez et al., 2010].

Before reaching the magnetopause the solar wind is transmitted through the bow shock. As the plasma is super Alfvénic and supersonic, the properties of plasma and magnetic field changes across the shock depend on the value of the upstream Ma [e.g., Lavraud et al., 2007, 2013]. The Ma is thought to influence the saturation of the electric potential across the polar cap. The cross polar cap potential (CPCP) is the difference between the maximum and the minimum of the potential in one hemisphere, and it can be considered as a measure of the magnetospheric convection state. It is known that during intense solar wind driving, CPCP saturates [Reiff et al., 1981; Reiff and Luhmann, 1986; Weimer et al., 1990; Russell et al., 2001; Raeder and Lu, 2005; Hairston et al., 2005; Wilder et al., 2011]. This means that the response of the CPCP to solar wind electric field (Ey) driving becomes less efficient with increasing Ey.

When Ma is low, CPCP can saturate also during moderate Ey [Lavraud and Borovsky, 2008; Lopez et al., 2010]. Low Ma periods are typically observed during magnetic clouds [Lavraud and Borovsky, 2008; Guo et al., 2011], while in the sheath regions Ma is typically higher and more variable. Guo et al. [2011] noted, using a superposed epoch analysis, that the peak value of the Borovsky coupling parameter is larger for sheath-driven storms than for CME-driven storms, while no such a difference was observed for the Newell parameter. The high Borovsky parameter value was related to times when the sheath regions had higher Ma values than the ICMEs.

In this study we investigate the effect of key solar wind driving parameters on the solar wind-magnetosphere coupling efficiency and saturation of the polar cap potential during sheath and magnetic cloud-driven storms. The above-discussed studies emphasized the importance of Ma in controlling the coupling efficiency and CPCP saturation, and therefore, a particular focus is on the dependence with Ma. We examine here the instantaneous driving efficiency using several coupling functions.

The first part of the paper studies the time dependence between the geomagnetic indices and the interplanetary electric field Y component (Ey, GSM coordinate system), Newell and Borowsky functions. Since we are studying the instantaneous coupling efficiency instead of average efficiencies over solar wind structure, we need to take into account the time lag between the solar wind and the magnetosphere. The time delay analysis is presented in section 3 to motivate the methods which are used later in the study of the coupling efficiency. Section 4 presents the actual results, and sections 5 and 6 conclude the paper with discussion and summary.
2. Data and Methods
2.1. Data

We have used satellite measurements of the IMF and electric field components in GSM coordinates, the solar wind speed \( v_{SW} \), the dynamic pressure \( P_{dyn} \), the solar wind proton density \( n \), temperature \( T \), magnetosonic \( M_{MS} \), and Alfvén \( M_A \) Mach numbers. These data are obtained through the Near-Earth Heliospheric Data Base (OMNI, http://omniweb.gsfc.nasa.gov/) with 1 min resolution. OMNI data is composed of the solar wind measurements from several spacecraft in geocentric or Lagrangian point L1 orbits (at the time of this study the data consists mainly of Wind and ACE measurements). The data are propagated to the assumed bow shock location. The geomagnetic index data \( PCN, AE, \) and SYM-H) are also downloaded from OMNIWeb with 1 min resolution.

2.2. Event Selection and Distributions of Solar Wind Parameters During Sheath Regions and Magnetic Clouds

The sheath and magnetic cloud intervals analyzed in this work are selected using the ACE interplanetary coronal mass ejection (CME) catalog maintained at the ACE Science Center. The catalog gives the shock time and the start and end times of the magnetic cloud. The typical sheath and magnetic cloud solar wind signatures are discussed, e.g., in Zurbuchen and Richardson [2006] and Kilpua et al. [2013b]. We selected in this study the events where either a sheath or magnetic cloud (or both) drove at least a moderate magnetic storm \( (SYM-H < -50 \text{ nT}) \). In addition, the included events have a clear transition from the sheath to the magnetic cloud. To increase sheath-related data points, we also included events where a clear sheath region was observed, but no clear magnetic cloud followed, e.g., the CME was intercepted from the flanks and may rather be called ejecta in such cases.

Figure 1 shows the distributions of several solar wind parameters during the studied magnetic clouds (blue curves) and sheath regions (red curves). The sheath regions are shorter in duration than the magnetic clouds (in our data set the average durations were 11.44 h and 25.43 h for sheaths and magnetic clouds, respectively), and thus, the sheaths have fewer data points.

While the solar wind speed and IMF magnitude distributions are rather similar between sheaths and magnetic clouds, the solar wind density and temperatures tend to be much higher in sheath regions (Figure 1). As a consequence, sheaths have typically higher \( P_{dyn} \), \( M_A \), and \( V_A \), and higher plasma beta than magnetic clouds. Low Alfvén Mach numbers \( (M_A < 5) \) are observed predominantly during magnetic clouds.

2.3. Coupling Efficiency and Coupling Functions

The coupling efficiency \( (eff) \) is defined as the ratio of the output to input into the magnetosphere-ionosphere system

\[
\text{eff} = \frac{\text{output}}{\text{input}}
\]

We use three solar wind-magnetosphere coupling functions to estimate the energy input: \( E_Y \), Newell [Newell et al., 2007] and Borovsky functions [Borovsky, 2008]. The Newell function is

\[
\frac{d\Phi}{dt} = v_{SW}^{4/3} B_T^{2/3} \sin^{4/3} \left( \frac{\theta}{2} \right)
\]

where \( B_T \) and \( \theta \) are the magnetic field perpendicular to the Sun-Earth line and the IMF clock angle. The Newell function has been constructed by “tuning” the best coupling functions in the literature. It describes the amount of the magnetic flux opening by magnetic reconnection at the magnetopause.

The Borovsky function has been derived using a different approach. It is based on the assumption that reconnection is a local process. The function is derived based on the Cassak-Shay formula [Cassak and Shay, 2007], and it states that dayside reconnection depends on the magnetic field strength and the mass density in the magnetosheath and in the magnetosphere. The Cassak-Shay formula was parametrized using global MHD simulations and the Earth’s magnetosheath properties. The physical interpretation of the function is that whatever controls these four free parameters in the Cassak-Shay formula controls the reconnection rate, and according to the Borovsky function, these parameters are mostly controlled by the solar wind pressure and \( M_A \). The definition of the Borovsky function is

\[
R = 0.4 \rho v^2 \sin \left( \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \rho v^2 \left( 1 + 0.5 M_{MS}^2 \right) (1 + \beta_s)^{-1/2} \cdot \left[ C \rho + (1 + \beta_s)^{-1/2} \rho_m \right]^{-1/2} \left[ (1 + \beta_s)^{1/2} + 1 \right]^{-1/2}
\]
Figure 1. Distributions of the solar wind parameters during the studied magnetic cloud and sheath regions. The vertical dashed lines represent the median values of the distributions.

where $\beta_s$ is the plasma beta of the magnetosheath,

$$\beta_s = 3.2 \cdot 10^{-2} M_A^{1.92}$$

and $C$ is the compression ratio of the bow shock

$$C = \left[\frac{1}{4}\right]^6 + \frac{1}{(1 + 1.38 \log_e(M_A))}\right]^{-1/6}$$

$\rho_m$ is the magnetospheric mass density, which is set to zero since there is no information available about this value for the present statistical analysis. The same was done by Borovsky [2008]. The physical interpretation of
the term including $\rho_m$ is to take into account the plasmasphere effect, which may reduce the reconnection rate on the dayside magnetopause. Thus, by setting $\rho_m$ to zero we make the assumption that the plasmaspheric plume does not affect the reconnection rate in a major way. However, even if the plasma plumes may be infrequent enough to impact the results of this study, in general, this assumption should be treated with caution. There are statistical evidence that the reconnection jet velocity is lowered by the plasma plumes which may be a sign of lower reconnection efficiency [Walsh et al., 2013].

Both the Newell and the Borovsky functions show a good correlation with geomagnetic activity [Newell et al., 2007; Borovsky, 2008]. The differences between the functional form of the formulas are that the Borovsky function explicitly takes into account the Mach number and solar wind pressure dependence of the dayside reconnection rate. The study by Guo et al. [2010] showed that the average behavior of the Borovsky and Newell functions during magnetic clouds and their sheath regions are similar except during the high $M_A$ and dynamic pressure conditions.

### 2.4. Geomagnetic Indices

The energy output is estimated using the geomagnetic indices $PCN$, $AE$, and $SYM-H$. Similar definitions of the coupling efficiency have been used earlier, e.g., by Palmroth et al. [2007] and Yermolaev et al. [2012]. The geomagnetic indices measure different magnetospheric phenomena and current systems (i.e., different energy sinks). The $AE$ index represents the overall activity of the auroral electrojets. The $AE$ index is derived from geomagnetic variations in the horizontal component observed at nine high-latitude magnetometer observatories along the auroral zone in the northern hemisphere [Rostoker, 1972]. The $PCN$ index represents polar cap magnetic variation relation to magnetospheric convection above the polar cap. It is derived from ground based geomagnetic measurements within the northern polar cap [Troshichev et al., 1988]. Observations from only one station (Thule) are used. $SYM-H$ is a 1 min index describing the ring current activity. The $SYM-H$ is derived using six magnetometer stations near the equator [Iyemori and Rao, 1996].

### 3. Time Delay and Time Window Analysis

As a first step, we investigate the optimal time delay, as well as averaging window length used to smooth the solar wind parameters for studying the coupling functions. We combine instantaneous, 1 min values of geomagnetic indices with the solar wind energy input using the three coupling functions described in section 2.2.

#### 3.1. Summary of Past Studies

There are several past studies investigating the time lag between geomagnetic indices and solar wind parameters/coupling functions, summarized in Table 1. For instance, Ridley et al. [1998] studied the changes in ionospheric convection associated with changes in the IMF $Y$ and $Z$ components at the magnetopause. The obtained communication time between the IMF and the onset of reconfiguring of the ionospheric convection pattern was $8.4 \pm 8.2$ min. Eriksson et al. [2000] found $70$–$75$ min time lags between the $5$ min averaged IMF $Z$ component and epsilon parameter and geomagnetic indices $Dst$, $SYM-H$, and $ASY-H$. The cross polar cap potential ($\Phi_{PC}$) showed several time lags: $15$, $55$, and $105$ min. The $\Phi_{PC}$ was estimated based on the $37$ polar cap crossings of the FAST and Wind satellite measurements. In turn, Stauning and Troshichev [2008] found a $20$ min time delay between the geoeffective electric field $E_M$ ($E_M = v_{SW}B_Z \sin^2 \left( \frac{\theta}{2} \right)$) at $12$ $R_E$ and $PCN$, but the first response from the dynamic pressure pulse was seen in only $5$ min.
Furthermore, the magnetospheric-ionospheric system is suggested to be insensitive to fast variations of the solar wind input parameters, and to act like a low-pass filter [Clauer et al., 1981; Takalo et al., 2000; Ilie et al., 2010]. Takalo et al. [2000] concluded in their study that the high-frequency part of $AE$ is produced by intrinsic dynamics of the magnetosphere, while the low frequencies are well correlated with $\nu_{SW}B_5$, where $B_5$ is defined by

$$B_5 = 0, B_2 \geq 0 \quad B_5 = -B_2, B_2 < 0$$ (6)

In addition, simulations have shown that small timescale fluctuations do not affect CPCP. Ilie et al. [2010] used the Space Weather Modeling Framework (SWMF) [Toth et al., 2005] to analyze CPCP response to different solar wind parameters for four sliding average window lengths (4, 60, 120, and 180 min). The results showed that CPCP had very similar behavior in all cases, which indicates that small timescale fluctuations do not affect the cross polar cap potential in the simulations.

### 3.2. Our Approach

Contrary to previous studies which only searched for the time lag ($\tau$), we also investigate the optimal time window, which is used to average the solar wind parameters. Both the time lag and the window length are expected to depend on the coupling function and on the geomagnetic index used (as they partly reflect different regions where energy is dissipated and different energy transfer mechanisms). The following procedure has been used to obtain the most optimal $\tau$ and time window pair:

1. The correlation coefficient is computed between the coupling function and the geomagnetic index when time window is kept fixed and the time lag is varied.
2. Computed correlation coefficients are stored into matrix elements.
3. The time window value is changed.
4. The correlation coefficients with the new time window value are computed again by varying the time lag.

The following steps are repeated until the wanted maximum time window length is achieved. As a result, we get a matrix which rows represent different time window and the columns time lag values.

For the $PCN$ and $AE$ indices the time lag is varied from 1 to 60 min and for the $SYM-H$ from 1 to 120 min. Time window is centered on $\tau$, and thus, the maximum window length can be only twice the $\tau$ value. This means that the maximum time window for $PCN$ and $AE$ is 120 min and for the $SYM-H$ 240 min.

We calculate correlation coefficients using two approaches: Spearman’s rank correlation and Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. The Spearman’s rank correlation uses a nonparametric dependence between two parameters, and it measures the monotonic relationship of the parameters. The Pearson correlation is a measure of the linear dependence between normally distributed parameters. Earlier studies have shown that the dependence between $E_y$ and the $PCN$ index is mostly linear, but the saturation of the polar cap causes nonlinearity to the relationship, as discussed in section 1. Since we want to avoid preconception on the linear dependence between the solar wind parameters and the geomagnetic indices, we did the correlation analysis study using both of these definitions.

It is also worth mentioning that in previous publications [Bargatze et al., 1985; Stauning and Troshichev, 2008], correlation studies between $E_y$ and geomagnetic indices have been done using only positive $E_y$ values. We compute the correlation using all $E_y$ values.

The most optimal values for $\tau$ and window length obtained using our method are listed in Table 2. The table shows the results for all three coupling functions and geomagnetic index combinations for sheath and magnetic clouds separately and for these structures combined using both the Spearman and Pearson correlation coefficients. For sheath regions we added two extra hours before the shock to observe the effect of the time shift more clearly.

### 3.3. Correlation Coefficient Analysis for Magnetic Cloud Events

The color maps based on Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient for magnetic clouds are shown in Figure 2. The horizontal axis represents the time lag and the vertical axis the averaging time window. The color of the bin shows the value of the correlation coefficient with related color bar plotted on the right of each plot. Equivalent maps were also created using the Pearson’s correlation coefficients (not shown). For the $PCN$, these maps were found to be similar as the Spearman’s maps, while for $AE$ and $SYM-H$ there were some differences. We decided to use the Spearman correlation coefficient because it does not include any assumption on how the parameters are distributed and it gives the highest correlations.
Table 2. The Result of the Time Lag and Window Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>SW Parameter</th>
<th>Sheath + Cloud</th>
<th>Sheath</th>
<th>Cloud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lag</td>
<td>Window</td>
<td>Lag</td>
<td>Window</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCN</td>
<td>Spearman</td>
<td>$E_Y$</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCN</td>
<td>Spearman</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCN</td>
<td>Spearman</td>
<td>Borosky</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCN</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>$E_Y$</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCN</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCN</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>Borosky</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Spearman</td>
<td>$E_Y$</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Spearman</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Spearman</td>
<td>Borosky</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>$E_Y$</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>Borosky</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYM-H</td>
<td>Spearman</td>
<td>$E_Y$</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYM-H</td>
<td>Spearman</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYM-H</td>
<td>Spearman</td>
<td>Borosky</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYM-H</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>$E_Y$</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYM-H</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYM-H</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>Borosky</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For $AE$ (Figure 2, middle column) and $SYM-H$ (right column) the correlation coefficient maps have similar patterns for all three coupling functions. For $SYM-H$ the correlation increases steadily with $\tau$ over the entire range up to 120 min. Hence, it is possible that the highest correlations are outside the studied time interval. The high $\tau$ value is expected because $SYM-H$ is affected by the symmetrical part of the ring current [Iyemori and Rao, 1996] which builds up slowly [Gonzalez and Echer, 2005].

The correlations between the coupling functions and $AE$ increases up to 20 min and after that the value seems to saturate. The saturation is probably related to the substorm cycle, which strongly controls the $AE$ activity. The typical substorm cycle duration is between 2 and 4 h [Tanskanen et al., 2002].

The correlation increases for $PCN$ (Figure 2, left column) with increasing time lag until the maximum value is reached around 20–30 min. After this local maximum, correlation starts to decline. This is true for all the input parameters. This indicates that $PCN$ reacts quickly to the solar wind driving, but it has a short memory.

The color pattern of the correlation coefficient maps differs for each coupling function. For $E_Y$ the regions of the highest correlation are found when $\tau$ and window are both high (window < 60 min and $\tau$ < 30 min). In the case of the Newell function the highest correlation coefficients can be found near $\tau = 20$ min for $PCN$, and the correlation increases with increasing window length. The area of high correlation is narrower and stands out more clearly for the Borovsky function. The Borovsky function also gives the smallest $\tau$ and the window lengths (Table 2) for $PCN$ and $AE$, but on the other hand, the Newell function and $E_Y$ give very similar results.

However, all maps show some similar features regardless of the coupling function and geomagnetic index. The correlation increases with increasing time window, and the region of high correlation is spread over a wide area. The trend that the correlation stays high and almost fixed when $\tau$ is kept constant and the window length is increased can be explained by the fact that when the window becomes larger than the smallest fluctuations in the solar wind, the effect of the averaging decreases and the correlation coefficient saturates. The correlation mostly comes from large fluctuations. Small fluctuations only add noise and lower the correlation.

We find that the correlation coefficient maps are very similar for the sheath and magnetic cloud combined (not shown) than for to ones including only magnetic clouds. This is due to the fact that magnetic clouds are often longer in duration than the sheath regions (see section 2.2). Hence, the combined maps are not shown here or discussed further.
3.4. Correlation Study During the Sheath Regions

The results for sheath regions are shown in Figure 3. There are some clear differences between the correlation coefficient maps for sheaths and magnetic clouds. (1) The highest correlations occur during the magnetic clouds, (2) the range of the correlation coefficient values are wider during the sheath regions, (3) the region of the highest correlation stands out more clearly during sheath regions, and (4) for magnetic clouds all the maps showing the correlation between the coupling functions and PCN have similar patterns. In the case of the sheath regions the PCN maps for \( E_y \) is clearly different from the PCN maps for Newell and Borovsky functions.

The differences in the correlation coefficient maps highlight different solar wind conditions during magnetic clouds and their sheaths (see section 2.2). Because of the smoother variations of the solar wind input parameters during magnetic clouds, the time shift has a smaller effect on the correlation during magnetic clouds than during sheath regions. As a consequence, the correlation is not very sensitive to time delay for magnetic clouds. Because turbulent sheath regions have a more complicated structure, the correlation is more sensitive to the time shift. This explains why the correlation coefficient values have a broader distribution and the area of the highest correlations is more localized.

To further highlight the differences between magnetic clouds and their sheath regions, we show in Figure 4 time series of \( E_y \), Newell and Borovsky parameters as well as the \( AE \) and PCN indices during one of the events studied. This event occurred on 20 November 2003. It consists of a fluctuating sheath region between 20 November 2003 08:05 and 20 November 2003 11:45 UT and a smooth magnetic cloud between

![Figure 2. Correlation coefficients between geomagnetic indices (PCN, AE, and SYM-H) and input parameters (\( E_y \), Newell function and Borovsky function) during magnetic clouds. The horizontal axis shows the used time lag values and the vertical axis the averaging time window length.](image)
Figure 3. Correlation coefficients between geomagnetic indices (PCN, AE, and SYM-H) and input parameters (E_y, Newell function and Borovsky function) during sheath regions. The horizontal axis shows the used time lag values and the vertical axis the averaging time window length.

20 November 2003 11:45 and 21 November 2003 07:28 UT, marked by vertical red lines. The correlation coefficient maps for the PCN (and AE) and E_y for the magnetic cloud (Figure 4, top left) and sheath region (Figure 4, top right) are also shown. The maps show that the correlation is very high and almost constant during the cloud but the values vary a lot during the sheath region.

Based on the previously mentioned differences between the sheath regions and magnetic clouds, we conclude that the more structured sheath regions are more suitable for the time lag and window determination. Thus, we will use the time lag and window length values defined using the sheath region data and the Borovsky coupling function. The Borovsky function gives the lowest value for the time lag and window for PCN and AE indices and are close to values determined in past studies. The selected window and time lag values are listed in Table 3.

4. Results

4.1. Solar Wind Parameter Dependence of the PCN, AE, and SYM-H Indices

We investigate here how the responses of PCN, AE, and SYM-H as a function of solar wind driving electric field $E_y$ are organized by solar wind parameters. The solar wind parameters were averaged using the time window values given in Table 3. The used time lags between the solar wind input values and the indices can be found in the same table. The results are shown in Figure 5 (see also Figures S1 and S2 in the supporting information). All the studied data points (sheath + magnetic cloud combined) were divided into four groups based on the solar wind parameter distributions. The division into quartiles was done separately for each solar wind driving
Figure 4. Case study example of the time delay analysis for the sheath and magnetic cloud event. The correlation coefficient during the (top left) magnetic cloud and (top right) during the sheath region. (bottom) The time series for the PCN and AE indices and $E_y$, Newell and Borovsky functions. The sheath region (20 November 2003 08:05–20 November 2003 11:45 UT) and magnetic cloud (20 November 2003 11:45–20 November 2003 07:28 UT) are marked using the red vertical lines.
Figure 5. The PCN index as a function of $E_Y$ during different (a) Alfvén Mach number, (b) dynamic pressure (nPa), (c) speed (km/s), (d) temperature (K), (e) density (n/cc), (f) Alfvén speed (m/s), (g) plasma beta, and (h) IMF magnitude (nT) levels during magnetic clouds and sheath regions.
parameters ($M_A$, $v_{SW}$, $P_{dyn}$ etc.). The limits for each parameter are shown in Table 4. We have limited the study to time steps when $E_Y$ is positive.

To show the underlying trend of the scattered data in each group, 2700-point running average is applied. The running average is plotted using different color for each group: the blue curve shows the lowest and the black curve the highest quartile of the parameters in question. Even if each group has around the same amount of data points, the points may be unevenly distributed as a function of $E_Y$. Thus, all curves do not cover the entire range of $E_Y$ values. The data coverage for the highest $E_Y$ is relatively low, which causes larger fluctuations in that regime.

Figure 5 (left column, first row) shows PCN as a function of $E_Y$ for different $M_A$ conditions. The figure shows a clear separation of the curves for $E_Y > 4$ mV/m. The most visible difference is between the blue (the lowest $M_A$) and the black (the highest $M_A$) curves. The blue curve exhibits saturation in the range $4$ mV/m < $E_Y$ < $10$ mV/m, while the other $M_A$ curves increase more linearly. The interesting feature is that the black curve ($M_A > 7.2$) also saturates, but the saturation occurs for higher PCN values than for the low $M_A$ curve. The fact that the saturation occurs for high $M_A$ suggests that $M_A$ is not necessarily the only factor causing the saturation. The investigation of the other panels in Figure 5 reveals that $M_A$ is the parameter, among all studied solar wind parameters, which shows the most significant influence on polar caps saturation. For $AE$ and $SYM-H$ (see Figures S1 and S2 in the supporting information) we did not find any obvious dependence with any of the investigated parameters, but discuss the relation to $M_A$ further in the next section.
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**Figure 6.** The geomagnetic indices (PCN and AE) as a function of $E_Y$, Newell and Borovsky functions during different Alfvén mach number levels.
Table 5. The $E_y$ Limits for Different Driving Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driving Condition</th>
<th>$E_y$ (mV/m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>1–2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2.5–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intense</td>
<td>5–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>&gt; 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. Coupling Functions Versus Geomagnetic Indices During Different $M_A$ Conditions

In the previous section geomagnetic indices were displayed as a function of $E_y$ during different solar wind conditions. $PCN$ revealed a clear $M_A$ dependence when $E_y > 4$ mV/m. To investigate how each coupling function accounts for the saturation, the top panels of Figure 6 show $PCN$ as a function of $E_y$ (left panel), Newell function (middle panel) and Borovsky function (right panel). The colored curves represent again different $M_A$ ranges, similar to Figure 5. The $M_A$ dependence of $PCN$ is clearly visible when the input energy is estimated using the $E_y$ and Newell functions, but the dependence almost disappears when the Borovsky function is used. This comes from the fact that the Borovsky function explicitly includes $M_A$ (see equation (5)). The $PCN$ index as a function of the Newell function and $E_y$ shows the influence of $M_A$ and a clear saturation, i.e., the nonlinearity between the index and the coupling function. The $AE$ index does not show much dependence on $M_A$ and thus does not depend much on the coupling function used.

4.3. Coupling Efficiency as a Function of Alfvén Mach Number

In this section the coupling efficiencies are examined using equation (1). The input parameter is the solar wind driving electric field $E_y$. The output was estimated using $PCN$, $AE$, and $SYM-H$. All data points were divided into four different groups based on the intensity of $E_y$. The groups are called weak, moderate, intense and strong, and the limiting $E_y$ values are listed in Table 5. The coupling efficiency in each group is plotted again as a function of $M_A$ in Figure 7. The curves have been normalized based on the maximum value of the blue (weak driving) curve. Data points were smoothed using a moving average, with a window length which is 20% of the total number of data points in each group.

The following conclusions can be drawn from Figure 7: The efficiency decreases when the intensity of solar wind driving increases. The efficiency of $PCN$ increases with increasing $M_A$. These results show that if $PCN$ saturation is quantified by efficiency parameters, an $M_A$ independent saturation process exists as a baseline and decreases the efficiency by over a factor of two (blue curve compared with the other curves). $PCN$ saturation is however further enhanced through a $M_A$ dependent effect, by a factor greater than 2, for all driving conditions, i.e., all curves decrease at low $M_A$. However unlike the $PCN$ index, these results clearly show that the saturation of the $AE$ index does not depend on $M_A$ (all curves are essentially horizontal). The $AE$ index also shows saturation, i.e., the efficiency decreases when $E_y$ increases compared to weak (blue) driving. Finally, $SYM-H$ does not saturate much, if at all, compared to $PCN$ and $AE$. All the curves for $SYM-H$ are very close to each other.

4.4. Error Analysis

Figures 5 and 7 show that saturation occurs even during high $M_A$ conditions, which means that saturation is not primarily due to low $M_A$ effect suggested before, for example, by Lavraud and Borovsky [2008] and Lopez et al. [2010]. In order to convincingly demonstrate that the saturation is not due to poor statistics in the nonlinear regime, we focus further analysis on the breakpoint (“knee,” see Figure 5) from linear to nonlinear behavior.
Figure 8 shows the smoothed curves for PCN as a function of $E_Y$ for the highest ($M_A > 7.2$) and lowest ($M_A < 3.4$) $M_A$ groups. The smoothing method is the same as explained in section 4.1. The error bars show the standard deviation of the PCN measurements within the window; thus, the bars describe the scatter of the points. The error bars are plotted more frequently near the knee point.

During low $M_A$ conditions (red curve) the standard deviations are considerably smaller than during high $M_A$ conditions (blue curve). The standard deviation for low $M_A$ does not vary much when $E_Y < 8$ mV/m. When $E_Y$ exceeds 8 mV/m and the number of data points is significantly reduced the standard deviation starts to increase. The standard deviation for the red curve (low $M_A$) is also smaller than the distance between the two smoothed curves when $E_Y$ is between 4 to 11 mV/m. Data points are more scattered (larger error bars) during high $M_A$ conditions. The standard deviation increases as $E_Y$ increases, but it does not show any sudden increase around the knee regime, i.e., near $E_Y \approx 5$ mV/m.

Figure 9 shows all data points with $M_A > 7.2$. The color of the data points represents the $M_A$ value and the color panel on the left shows the scale. The black curve shows the 2700-point running average. We have also fitted a linear curve (red) to the data when $E_Y < 5$ mV/m. Because the smoothed (black) curve shows non-linearity between $E_Y$ and PCN when $E_Y$ exceeds 5 mV/m, the linear fit was done using the data points only from the linear part of the plot. Figure 9 reveals that the highest $M_A$ values are nearly evenly distributed on both sides, above and below, of the linear prediction curve.

Figure 9 also shows very clearly that the linear prediction overestimates PCN when $E_Y$ is above 5 mV/m. To illustrate this, we computed the distance of each data point from the linear regression. Distances are calculated in such a way that the measured value of PCN is subtracted from the linear prediction value ($PCN_{\text{predicted}} - PCN_{\text{measured}}$). Thus, a positive error means that the measured value is less than the predicted PCN and a negative error that the measured value exceeds the prediction. Distances are presented in histograms.
Figure 10. Histograms show the distance of the measurement points from the linear regression line (error = \( PCN_{\text{predicted}} - PCN_{\text{measured}} \)). The left histograms shows the error values when \( E_y < 5 \text{ mV/m} \) and the right when \( E_y > 5 \text{ mV/m} \).

in Figure 10. Figure 10 (left) shows a histogram for the errors when \( E_y < 5 \text{ mV/m} \), and Figure 10 (right) when \( E_y > 5 \text{ mV/m} \). There is a clear difference in the shape of the histograms. During the linear part of the \( PCN-E_y \) relation the errors are distributed almost symmetrically on both sides of zero. However, when \( E_y \) is greater than 5 mV/m, histogram is biased on the side of positive errors, which is due to the fact that the linear prediction systematically overestimates the \( PCN \) value. Errors are also significantly higher during the nonlinear regime, because of the larger scatter of the data points.

As a summary, it is evident that the relationship between \( PCN \) and \( E_y \) is more complicated during high \( M_A \) conditions than during low \( M_A \) conditions. Despite of the large scatter for high \( M_A \) conditions, it is clear that there is nonlinearity between \( PCN \) and \( E_y \) when the solar wind driving exceeds 5 mV/m.

5. Discussion

The causes behind the CPCP saturation are still a controversial topic. Several models have been presented in the literature, which evoke different mechanisms to explain the observed CPCP saturation. Previous studies have shown that the saturation occurs over a wide range of \( E_y \) values (see the introduction by Ridley [2005]). The smallest \( E_y \) when the saturation has been observed is 3 mV/m [Russell et al., 2000], but there are studies which have reported that the saturation occurs only at considerably higher \( E_y \) values, e.g., with a threshold \( E_y \) up to 15 mV/m [Shepherd et al., 2002]. These differences in the limiting \( E_y \) values may be explained by the fact that many solar wind parameters, like \( M_A \), affect the saturation. In our study, during low \( M_A \) (<3.3) conditions the saturation for \( PCN \) started to occur when \( E_y \) exceeded ∼3 mV/m and in the high \( M_A \) regime (>7.2) when the \( E_y \) exceeded 5 mV/m. The \( AE \) saturation occurred above 6 mV/m independent of \( M_A \).

The existing saturation models can be roughly divided into those where the saturation occurs due to decreasing dayside reconnection rate and those where the saturation is related to physical processes after the reconnection, i.e., coupling processes in the inner magnetosphere. We discuss below a few of these models, for a detailed description see, e.g., Borovsky et al. [2009].

The dayside magnetic reconnection at the magnetopause during positive \( E_y \) conditions feeds the Region 1 current system via the MHD generator. The saturation model by Hill et al. [1976] suggests saturation of CPCP due to lowered reconnection rate at the dayside magnetopause during strong \( E_y \) driving. According to the model, the reconnection is affected by the negative feedback from the enhanced Region 1 currents which close in the high-latitude ionosphere. The Region 1 currents create a magnetic field which opposes the Earth’s dipole field at the dayside magnetopause. Hence, in the Hill model, the saturation would occur at times when the magnetic field induced by the enhanced Region 1 currents significantly weakens the magnetospheric side of the reconnecting magnetic field. Weakening of the magnetic field limits the reconnection rate by lowering the Alfvén speed at the reconnection site.

Raeder and Lu [2005] suggested that saturation is related to a shortened reconnection X line. The reduced X line length can decrease the total amount of reconnected flux between the solar wind and the magnetosphere and thus limits the CPCP. The authors studied CPCP saturation during the Bastille Day Storm and noted that the empirical model, which takes into account the X line length, gave the best predictions of the polar cap potential from the investigated models.
It is also expected that the CPCP saturation depends on the solar wind Alfvén Mach number. Alfvén wings form during the extreme case of sub-Alfvénic solar wind conditions, when the magnetic field bends around a conducting obstacle  [Neubauer, 1980]. The bending launches Alfvén waves, which propagate with the Alfvén speed ($v_A$) along the magnetic field lines. The plasma flow still affects the magnetic field lines and the Alfvén waves travel with angle $\theta = (M_A^{-1})$. The interaction with the flow velocity and the Alfvén wave creates a cavity which the flow characteristics are different to those in the surrounding plasma. The electric field within the wing is lower than within the medium, which may be a reason for saturation of the projected electric potential in the polar cap. Chané et al. [2012] presented observational evidence of Alfvén wings at the Earth.

The formation of the Alfvén wings at the Earth’s magnetosphere was studied by Ridley [2007] using MHD simulations. It was shown that the CPCP saturation occurs near the point when the solar wind becomes sub-Alfvénic. The analysis was later extended [Kivelson and Ridley, 2008] to define the CPCP using the solar wind and ionospheric properties. The idea behind such CPCP expression is that the impedance difference between the solar wind and the ionosphere causes a partial reflection of the Alfvén waves propagating into the ionosphere which limits the ionospheric potential. Thus, this reflection can be observed as a saturation of the $E_y$.

The Alfvén Mach number is also decisive as it controls how the bow shock compresses the solar wind plasma and magnetic field before they impinge on the Earth’s magnetopause. Indeed, we found that the solar wind-magnetosphere coupling efficiency increases with increasing $M_A$. The effect of low solar wind $M_A$ on the magnetosheath properties was extensively studied by Lavraud and Borovsky [2008] using global MHD simulations [see also Lavraud et al., 2007, 2013]. These effects primarily arise from the fact that low $M_A$ solar wind leads to low thermal beta ($\beta$) in the magnetosheath. In low $\beta$ plasma the magnetic forces become dominant compared to the plasma pressure gradient. The magnetic tension and the magnetic pressure gradient forces cause particle acceleration perpendicular to the magnetic field along the flow streamlines. The acceleration enhances magnetosheath flows along the flanks of the magnetopause for south-north IMF orientations. Lavraud and Borovsky [2008] suggested that altered magnetosheath flows affect the CPCP saturation. During low $M_A$, the flow streamlines are more diverted around the magnetospheric obstacle. For a given $E_y$ in the solar wind this enhanced diversion reduces the amount of magnetic flux available for the reconnection. This scenario was also studied and supported by the simulations done by Lopez et al. [2010]. The impact of magnetosheath flow properties to polar cap saturation have also been mentioned by Merkin et al. [2005].

Consistent with previous works [Ridley, 2005; Lavraud and Borovsky, 2008; Lopez et al., 2010], our study shows a clear and in fact additional saturation of $PCN$ for low $M_A (< 3.3)$ conditions. The low $M_A$ saturation can be explained by the altered magnetosheath flow pattern during low plasma beta as discussed above. Our results show that $PCN$ saturates also during high $M_A$ ($M_A > 7.3$) conditions (Figure 7 in particular), which indicates that the $PCN$ saturation also has $M_A$-independent characteristics. In addition, as $PCN$ increases almost linearly during intermediate $M_A$ values ($3.3 < M_A < 7.3$, Figure 5), it is possible that the dominant mechanism causing the saturation is different for low and high $M_A$ conditions. High $M_A$ conditions arise, for example, when the solar wind density is high, and thus, such periods are related to a significant global compression in the size of the magnetosphere. This compression leads to the shortening of the X line, which could reduce CPCP (see also above discussion).

However, global MHD simulations by Lavraud and Borovsky [2008] suggest that the shortening of the X line cannot be the fundamental process in the CPCP saturation. On the contrary, Lavraud and Borovsky [2008] show that CPCP increases with increasing solar wind density (see their Figure 14). Thus, our observations raise the question whether the decreasing effect related to the X line length shortening becomes dominant over the density effect reported by Lavraud and Borovsky [2008] when $M_A$ exceeds a certain threshold (about $M_A = 7.2$ according to our study).

Nine existing saturation models were compared against a global MHD simulation in the extensive study by Borovsky et al. [2009]. Simulation results did not support the models, which are based on the assumption that the saturation is caused by variations in the total amount of reconnection, like the X line length model. However, it should be noted that this simulation was done during moderate solar wind driving conditions ($v_{SW} = 300$ km/s, $B_Z = -10$ nT, and $E_y = 3$ mV/m) and only for one $M_A$ value of 1.9. Only the ionospheric Pedersen conductivity was varied in the simulations. In our study, the saturation during high $M_A$ occurs when the $E_y$ is above $E_y > 5$ mV/m.
Table 6. The Seasonal Occurrence of Sheath and Magnetic Cloud Events in Our Data Set

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Number of Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our results have interesting implications for magnetic cloud and sheath-driven storms. These differences can be traced to different key solar wind conditions in these structures (see Figure 1). Sheaths have a clear tendency for high $M_A$ conditions, while magnetic clouds are related to the lowest $M_A$ values. As a consequence, sheaths typically have higher solar wind-magnetosphere coupling efficiencies than magnetic clouds. In addition, based on the considerations discussed above, it seems that sheaths and magnetic clouds have a different dominant $M_A$-dependent CPCP saturation mechanism. For magnetic clouds, the saturation may occur primarily due to the magnetosheath flow diversion (or other $M_A$-related mechanisms), while for sheaths, the dominant cause may be the shortening of the X line length due to global magnetospheric compression.

The $AE$ index also reveals interesting and unexpected features. When plotted against the solar wind driving $E_Y$, the index did not show any organization with $M_A$ nor with any other investigated solar wind parameter. The reason why the $AE$ index does not depend on $M_A$ is not clear for the authors. While the $PCN$ reacts rather rapidly to solar wind changes (see section 33.3), the $AE$ responds in a more complicated manner. Auroral electrojets react to changes in magnetospheric convection, similar to polar cap potential, but they also depend on the reconnection and substorm processes in the magnetotail. It is possible that the $M_A$ dependence is masked by these processes. This idea is supported by the fact that if $AE$ is plotted as a function of $E_Y$ using the same time lag and window as for the $PCN$ index (see Table 3), it shows $M_A$ dependence (data not shown) but not as clearly as for the $PCN$. The auroral electrojets have seasonal variations [Guo et al., 2014], which may also affect the results. Table 6 shows that our events occurred during all seasons, but there are significant differences, e.g., during the autumn there were 29 events, while during the winter only 12.

Lopez et al. [2009] studied the saturation of the ring current during high solar wind $V_{BS}$ conditions. The ring current injection rate is typically estimated using the Burton formula [Burton et al., 1975]

$$ aV_{BS} = \frac{Dst^*}{\tau} + \frac{\partial Dst^*}{\partial t}, $$

where $a$ describes the geoeffectiveness, $Dst^*$ is the pressure-corrected $Dst$, and $\tau$ is an empirically determined ring current decay time. The right-hand side of the equation is referred to as the ring current injection rate and it depends on $V_{BS}$. Because the polar cap potential saturates during high driving, as shown in this paper, it is expected that the ring current would saturate as well. However, this is not the case based on the simulations done by Lopez et al. [2009] and our results (See Figure S2 in supporting information). Lopez et al. [2009] suggested that during periods of strong $B_z$, the magnetosphere forms a quasi-steady reconnection region in the magnetotail which moves earthward and produces flux tubes that have plasma content lower than average, allowing them to enter the inner magnetosphere.

6. Conclusions

In this paper we have investigated the effect of key solar wind driving parameters on the solar wind-magnetosphere coupling efficiency and the saturation of the cross polar cap potential during sheath and magnetic cloud-driven magnetospheric storms. We also developed a method to define the most optimal time delay and window between the solar wind-magnetosphere coupling functions and the geomagnetic indices. The main conclusions of the present study are summarized as follows:

1. The $PCN$ index shows a clear solar wind $M_A$ dependence, while $AE$ and $SYM-H$ do not.
2. $PCN$ and $AE$ indices saturate, but $SYM-H$ does not.
3. $AE$ saturation is $M_A$ independent, while $PCN$ saturation depends clearly on $M_A$.
4. The coupling efficiency decreases with increasing solar wind driving electric field and increases with increasing $M_A$.

We report the first clear statistical evidence on polar cap potential saturation during high $M_A$ conditions. This high $M_A$ saturation occurred during intense solar wind driving. According to the authors' knowledge, none of the existing CPCP saturation models are able to describe the saturation during all $M_A$ conditions. Thus, it is
possible that the mechanism for the saturation is different during low and high $M_A$ regimes. CME sheaths and flux ropes have distinctly different $M_A$ values and hence different coupling efficiencies. In addition, sheaths and magnetic clouds showed distinct differences in optimal time lags and window lengths. Turbulent sheath regions are more sensitive to the time shift and the averaging interval than smoother magnetic clouds.

The results presented in this study confirm that the solar wind-magnetosphere coupling efficiency depends strongly on the definition used. It is important to understand what different input functions and geomagnetic indices are describing and to what kind of assumptions they are based on. For example, despite the fact that both the PCN and AE are high-latitude indices, the former shows $M_A$ dependence on the efficiency and the latter does not.
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