ABSTRACT

The solar corona and young solar wind may be characterized by critical surfaces – the sonic, Alfvén, and first plasma-β unity surfaces – that demarcate regions where the solar wind flow undergoes certain crucial transformations. Global numerical simulations and remote sensing observations offer a natural mode for the study of these surfaces at large scales, thus providing valuable context for the high-resolution in-situ measurements expected from the soon-to-be-launched Parker Solar Probe (PSP). The present study utilizes global three-dimensional magnetohydrodynamic simulations of the solar wind to characterize the critical surfaces and investigate the flow in propinquitous regions. Effects of solar activity are incorporated by varying source magnetic dipole tilts and employing magnetogram-based boundary conditions. A magnetohydrodynamic turbulence model is self-consistently coupled to the bulk flow equations, enabling investigation of turbulence properties of the flow in the vicinity of critical regions. The simulation results are compared with a variety of remote sensing observations. A simulated PSP trajectory is used to provide contextual predictions for the spacecraft in terms of the computed critical surfaces. Broad agreement is seen in the interpretation of the present results in comparison with existing remote sensing results, both from heliospheric imaging and from radio scintillation studies. The trajectory
analyses show that the period of time that \textit{PSP} is likely to spend inside the $\beta = 1$, sonic and Alfvén surfaces depends sensitively on the degree of solar activity and the tilt of the solar dipole and location of the heliospheric current sheet.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The expansion of the solar corona into interplanetary space was predicted in 1958 by Parker’s classic model (Parker 1958). Soon after, in-situ spacecraft measurements (Neugebauer & Snyder 1966) confirmed that the interplanetary region is pervaded by solar plasma flowing at supersonic speed.\textsuperscript{1} Research efforts in the following decades have established that the solar wind is a complex and dynamic system that enters centrally into much of space research, and is of relevance to studies of solar, geophysical, and astronomical phenomena. The \textit{Parker Solar Probe} (\textit{PSP}) mission (Fox et al. 2016) is scheduled for a Summer 2018 launch, with the goal of exploring for the first time regions of solar wind that are of crucial importance in establishing the heliosphere. While approaching the Sun closer than any prior spacecraft, \textit{PSP} will provide unprecedented high-resolution measurements of the solar corona and the young solar wind, with its main objectives being discovery of the structure and dynamics of the coronal magnetic field and the processes that heat and accelerate the wind and accelerate and transport energetic particles. As the \textit{PSP} makes its high resolution in-situ measurements, a knowledge of the large-scale environment within which these observations exist is of vital importance. This global context may be provided by remote sensing (Bird & Edenhofer 1990; Vourlidas et al. 2016) and global simulation. The present work is the first of a series of papers focused on contextual predictions for \textit{PSP} using global simulations of the solar wind.

The transition of the solar corona into the solar wind is accomplished by several dynamical changes in the nature of the flow. The inner corona is magnetically structured, subsonic, and sub-Alfvénic,\textsuperscript{1} For a recent historical review of the discovery of the solar wind, see Obridko & Vaisberg (2017).
but as the solar plasma flows out from the corona into the young solar wind, it transforms into a supersonic and super-Alfvénic flow that is dominated by hydrodynamics. Recent work indicates that this transition may coincide with the onset of large-scale turbulence (DeForest et al. 2016; Chhiber et al. 2018) and mark the outer boundary of a zone of preferential ion heating (Kasper et al. 2017).

Useful markers that characterize this transition are the sonic critical surface, the Alfvén critical surface, and the first $\beta = 1$ surface (the plasma-$\beta$ is the ratio of gas to magnetic pressure). In particular, when the flow speed $u$ exceeds the Alfvén speed $V_A$, the magnetic field rigidity can no longer enforce plasma co-rotation (Weber & Davis 1967), or overcome the differential ram-pressure due to shearing interactions between neighbouring wind streams. And when the plasma-$\beta$ increases above unity, gradients in the plasma (thermal) pressure may displace the magnetic field and more isotropic motions are possible (Chhiber et al. 2018). The region in which these two crucial conditions ($u > V_A$ and $\beta \sim 1$) are attained becomes, in effect, the region where the corona gives up control of the solar plasma, and the solar wind as an independent entity is born.

In this work we employ well-tested global magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) simulations of the solar wind (Usmanov et al. 2011, 2012, 2014, 2016a,b; Chhiber et al. 2017, 2018; Usmanov et al. 2018), that are self-consistently coupled with a turbulence transport model, to study and characterize this region of transitions and to make contextual predictions for the PSP mission. We incorporate the effects of long-term solar variability (Cane et al. 1999; Owens & Forsyth 2013) by varying magnetic source dipole tilts and employing magnetogram-based boundary conditions. The simulation results are compared with a variety of remote sensing observations, demonstrating how the two approaches may be combined to gain insights regarding large scale heliospheric conditions in this region. Global simulation and remote sensing thus generate mutual support, and in turn, provide valuable context for the finer details that emerge from in-situ measurements. Subsequent papers in this series on contextual predictions for PSP will focus on turbulence properties along the spacecraft’s trajectory,

---

2 Our use of “transition” here should not be confused with the well-known transition region that lies just above the chromosphere (e.g., Cranmer et al. 2007).
on modifications of Taylor’s hypothesis for PSP (Matthaeus 1997; Klein et al. 2015), and on solar wind azimuthal flow.

The paper is organized as follows – in Section 2 we provide background on critical surfaces and physically distinct regions of the inner wind, discussing recent work that motivates the present study. An overview of the PSP trajectory is provided in Section 3, and our solar wind model is briefly described in Section 4. Results are presented in Section 5, including comparisons of model output with remote sensing observations and contextual predictions along the PSP trajectory. We conclude with discussion in Section 6.

2. THEORETICAL AND OBSERVATIONAL BACKGROUND

Two critical points are frequently discussed within the context of the solar wind – the sonic and the Alfvénic critical points, where the flow speed equals the sound speed and the Alfvén speed, respectively. One encounters the notion in even the simplest, spherically symmetric, stationary and isothermal model of the solar wind (e.g., Hundhausen 1972). We briefly review the standard presentation below.

The relevant equations may be derived by assuming an equal number density $n$ of protons and electrons, and an equation of state $P = 2nkT$, where $T = \frac{1}{2}(T_e + T_p)$ is the average of electron and proton temperatures. Mass conservation ($4\pi n u r^2$ = constant), combined with the inviscid momentum conservation equation in a gravitational potential

$$nmu \frac{du}{dr} = -2kT \frac{dn}{dr} - nm \frac{GM_\odot}{r^2}, \quad (1)$$

yields

$$\frac{1}{u} \frac{du}{dr} \left( u^2 - \frac{2kT}{m} \right) = \frac{4kT}{mr} - \frac{GM_\odot}{r^2}. \quad (2)$$

Here $u$ is the speed of radial expansion, $m$ is the sum of proton and electron masses, $k$ is the Boltzmann constant, $G$ is the gravitational constant, and $M_\odot$ is the solar mass. The right-hand side

---

3 A mathematical discussion of a critical (or equilibrium) point of a system of ordinary differential equations may be found in standard texts (e.g., Boyce et al. 1969).
of Equation (2) vanishes at the critical radius $r_c = GM_\odot m/4kT$. The left-hand side must also vanish here, for which we must have either a vanishing velocity derivative, or $u^2(r_c) \equiv u_c^2 = 2kT/m$. The solutions of Equation (2) have the well-known ‘X’, or saddle type topology (see e.g., Hundhausen 1972); the solution of physical interest is transonic, with a monotonically increasing velocity which is equal to the sound speed at the critical radius, i.e., at the sonic point.

As additional physical effects are added to a solar wind model, the mathematical structure of the equations changes, and with it the nature of the critical point. For instance, including electrons in a two-fluid model would introduce two sound speeds and two possible critical points. As we will see in Section 5, inclusion of the electron pressure in a two-fluid model shifts the location of the sonic point to a slightly greater heliocentric distance. Therefore, the “singular” aspect of a critical point is of limited physical relevance and it is questionable whether spacecraft data may be used to localize a definite critical point.

Nevertheless, from a physical perspective, these points (which become critical surfaces in a three dimensional context) imply the existence of separate regions in the solar wind which are dominated by different physical effects. For instance, counterpropagating Alfvénic fluctuations may effectively generate turbulence in the inner corona (Matthaeus et al. 1999), but above the Alfvén critical surface the population of inward propagating modes is diminished (Bruno & Carbone 2013), and Alfvén wave collisions are no longer an efficient mode of turbulence production (Verdini & Velli 2007). The Alfvén surface also effects a separation of coronal regions having different angular flow properties; below this surface, the torque produced by the magnetic field is sufficiently strong to transfer angular momentum and produce a corotation of the coronal wind with the sun, while above the critical surface the azimuthal velocity of the solar wind drops rapidly with distance (Weber & Davis 1967).

In addition to the demarcation of different regions by critical surfaces, the general vicinity of the surfaces may be a site of interesting physics, such as enhancement in turbulent fluctuations (Lotova et al. 1985). These surfaces also signify the point beyond which MHD wave modes are unable to communicate upstream, because above the sonic (Alfvénic) critical surface the speed of propagation of information by sonic (Alfvén) modes is smaller than the speed of their advection downstream by
the wind. Further, signatures of different coronal and solar phenomena may be evident in the location and morphology of critical surfaces, and may manifest in their temporal and spatial variability (Grail et al. 1996; Lotova et al. 1997).

Recent observations by DeForest et al. (2016) and subsequent numerical investigations by Chhiber et al. (2018) provide additional current motivation for the present study. Making use of highly processed STEREO images from December 2008, DeForest et al. (2016) found a textural shift in the solar wind flow between heliocentric distances of 20 – 80 $R_\odot$. The images revealed that radially aligned, “striated” patterns gave way to more isotropic structures, termed “flocculae”, at distances of a few tens of solar radii. Chhiber et al. (2018) performed global solar wind MHD simulations, representing nominal large-scale solar wind conditions during December 2008, and superposed plasma-$\beta$ unity surfaces computed from these simulations on the STEREO images. They found that the observed textural shift occurred near the first plasma-$\beta = 1$ surface. The emerging interpretation states that as the solar wind passes into the region where $\beta \equiv 8\pi P/B^2 \geq 1$, mechanical pressure may overcome the organizing influence of the magnetic field $B$, thus enabling the observed isotropic motions, which may be triggered by hydrodynamic shearing between wind streams (e.g., Roberts et al. 1992). A further point of interpretation, consistent with the one above, is that the flocculae may be a manifestation of solar wind fluctuations interacting at the largest scales that are causally related through turbulence in the expanding solar wind (Chhiber et al. 2018). The existence of such a maximum length scale of interaction is clear based on the finite amount of available propagation time, combined with the assumption that the relevant correlations must be produced by signals propagating at magnetohydrodynamic speeds.

The Alfvén and $\beta = 1$ surfaces may also be of significance to the phenomenon of preferential ion heating in the solar wind (e.g., Marsch 2006). Recently, Kasper et al. (2017) found evidence for a zone, extending from just above the transition region ($\sim 0.3 R_\odot$) to a distance of tens of solar radii, where $\alpha$-particles are heated preferentially over protons. The outer boundary of this zone is likely associated with the Alfvén and $\beta = 1$ surfaces. Further discussion of this point will be made in Section 5.
3. SAMPLING OF THE THREE DIMENSIONAL HELIOSPHERE BY PARKER SOLAR PROBE

The preceding section serves to emphasize the importance and relevance of critical surfaces. Yet, spacecraft missions hitherto have not been able to sample these in-situ (to date, the closest heliocentric distance of approach was that of Helios at 0.29 au (\(\sim 62 \ R_\odot\))). PSP is set to change this by spending “a total of 937 hours inside 20 \(R_\odot\), 440 hours inside 15 \(R_\odot\), and 14 hours inside 10 \(R_\odot\)” over its 7-year nominal mission (Fox et al. 2016). The spacecraft will most likely spend a very substantial amount of time under the first \(\beta = 1\) surface, which is inferred to lie between 20 and 60 \(R_\odot\) (DeForest et al. 2016; Chhiber et al. 2018). According to observations and models, the Alfvén surface lies between \(\sim 10 – 30 \ R_\odot\) (Mullan 1990; Lotova et al. 1997; Cranmer et al. 2007; Verdini et al. 2010; DeForest et al. 2014; Chhiber et al. 2018), and PSP could spend a substantial time under this surface as well. The sonic surface may lie below the PSP’s lowest perihelion at 9.86 \(R_\odot\), since coronal models often predict a location of 2 – 5 \(R_\odot\), although these predictions are applicable mainly to coronal hole regions. At low latitudes, the sonic point may lie as far as 20 \(R_\odot\) (Lotova et al. 1997). Since the periods in which the spacecraft will probe the regions within these surfaces will be of special significance to the success of the PSP mission, it becomes a matter of some importance to estimate when these periods might occur.

Figure 1 shows a three-dimensional (3D) perspective of the PSP trajectory. The spacecraft ephemeris was extracted from a NASA SPICE kernel, and the trajectory is presented here in the Heliocentric Inertial (HCI) coordinate system (e.g., Fränz & Harper 2002). Here the \(XY\)-plane is defined by the Sun’s equator of epoch J2000; the +\(Z\)-axis is parallel to the Sun’s rotation axis of epoch J2000, pointing toward the Sun’s north pole; the +\(X\)-axis is the ascending node of the Solar equatorial plane on the ecliptic plane of J2000; and the origin of the coordinate system is the Sun’s center of mass. The PSP trajectory in 3D space is shown in red, while the blue curves represent

\footnote{The location of the Alfvén and first unit beta surfaces may dip below 10 \(R_\odot\) at the heliospheric current sheet (HCS). It must be noted that global models are likely to overestimate the spatial extent of the HCS due to their coarse resolution. This issue is discussed further in Section 5.}
Figure 1. *PSP* trajectory in HCI coordinates (see text for details). The origin is the Solar center of mass and the *XY*-plane is the Solar equatorial plane. The red curves show the trajectory in 3D space and the blue curves are its projections onto the *XY*, *XZ*, and *YZ* planes. The ‘*’ symbol and blue dot represent the positions of the Sun and Earth, respectively.

As *PSP* makes its high resolution in-situ measurements, a knowledge of the large-scale environment within which these observations exist is of vital importance. In the next section we describe the solar wind model we have used to study the critical surfaces/regions and to make context predictions for the *PSP* trajectory.

4. SOLAR WIND MODEL
A long-standing problem in heliospheric physics has been the identification of physical mechanisms that heat and accelerate the solar wind (e.g., Hundhausen 1972; Leer et al. 1982; Meyer-Vernet 2007), in particular the fast wind that emanates from coronal holes. The source of this additional energy presumably lies in the solar photosphere (e.g., Cranmer & van Ballegooijen 2005, and references therein), but it must be transported across the chromospheric transition region and dissipated in the corona. Candidate mechanisms that enable this transport and dissipation include magnetic reconnection, wave and wave-particle interactions, and turbulence. Investigation of the finer details of these processes requires a kinetic description (e.g., Schekochihin et al. 2009; Servidio et al. 2015; Howes 2017; Yang et al. 2017), but the large-scale features of the flow are widely regarded as well-represented in a fluid (MHD) description (Tu & Marsch 1995; Goldstein et al. 1995; Bruno & Carbone 2013; Matthaeus et al. 2015; Makwana et al. 2015; Parashar et al. 2015).

The MHD description is particularly indispensable for global simulation of the solar wind, where the largest length scales in the system span at least a few solar radii ($1 \ R_\odot = 6.9 \times 10^5$ km). Kinetic effects come into play at the ion-inertial scale, which is roughly 90 km at 1 au (e.g., Schekochihin et al. 2009) and becomes smaller closer to the sun. Current and foreseeable computational resources do not permit the resolution of this wide range of scales (e.g., Schmidt 2015). This makes MHD simulation our tool of choice for the current study that focuses on the global context of PSP observations. However, special provisions need to be made to preserve essential physical information contained in the smaller scale fluctuations, which are necessarily unresolved, even if the macroscopic features are well represented. The large scales traversed by PSP orbits are illustrated strikingly in Figure 1, which serves to reinforce the appropriateness of this approach.

Fluid models of the solar wind have adopted various approaches to the problem of incorporating a source of heating and acceleration, including parametric heat deposition (Habbal et al. 1995; McKenzie et al. 1995), WKB waves in a weakly inhomogeneous background (Jacques 1978; Usmanov et al. 5 One objection might be that magnetosonic modes may be heavily damped in kinetic theory (Barnes 1979); an effect absent in MHD. However, compressive modes may represent a small fraction of the energy in the weakly compressive interplanetary medium, and in any case the dissipation rate due to linear damping may be small compared to the cascade rate that leads to turbulent dissipation (Matthaeus et al. 2014).
and MHD turbulence driven by Alfvén waves interacting with large-scale gradients (Matthaeus et al. 1999; Dmitruk et al. 2002; Verdini et al. 2010). We use an approach with a fully self-consistent and dynamical coupling of bulk solar wind flow with small-scale MHD turbulence – bulk flow influences the turbulence, and in turn, turbulence dynamically feeds back into the bulk wind flow. In addition to turbulent heating and acceleration, the model incorporates two-fluid energy equations, heat conduction due to electrons, and proton-electron Coulomb collisions. We briefly describe the bulk flow equations below, and refer the reader to Usmanov et al. (2018) for a detailed discussion of the turbulence model and closure approximations.

Formally, the model is based on the Reynolds-averaged Navier-Stokes approach, with a Reynolds decomposition (e.g., Monin & Yaglom 1971) applied to MHD. All physical fields, e.g., $\tilde{a}$, are separated into a mean and a fluctuating component:

$$\tilde{a} = a + a', \quad (3)$$

making use of an averaging operation: $a = \langle \tilde{a} \rangle$. This ensemble average is associated with the large scales of motion, assumed to be deterministic. The quantity $a'$ is a fluctuating component, here assumed to be of arbitrary amplitude, random in nature, and residing at small scales. By construction, $\langle a' \rangle = 0$.

The model as implemented here assumes that the solar wind is a fully ionized plasma composed of electrons and protons. The two species are described as fluids with separate energy equations and it is assumed that the bulk velocity is the same for the two species (Hartle & Sturrock 1968; Hundhausen 1972; Isenberg 1986). The latter assumption is justified since the electron contribution to the bulk flow momentum is small compared to that due to the heavier protons, despite the electrons being faster (e.g., Marsch 2006). To derive the mean-flow equations, the velocity and magnetic fields are Reynolds-decomposed into mean and fluctuating components: $\tilde{v} = v + v'$ and $\tilde{B} = B + B'$, and the decomposed fields are substituted into the momentum and induction equations in the frame of reference corotating with the Sun. The ensemble averaging operator $\langle \ldots \rangle$ is then applied to these two equations, which yield, together with the continuity and two-fluid pressure equations, the following
set of 3D time-dependent equations for the large-scale, mean flow (Usmanov et al. 2014, 2018):

\[
\frac{\partial N_S}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (N_S \mathbf{v}) = 0, \tag{4}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial (\rho \mathbf{v})}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \left[ \rho \mathbf{v} \mathbf{v} - \frac{1}{4\pi} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{B} + \left( P_S + P_E + \frac{(B'^2)}{8\pi} + \frac{B^2}{8\pi} \right) \mathbf{I} + \mathcal{R} \right] \\
+ \rho \left[ \frac{GM_\odot}{r^2} \mathbf{r} + 2\Omega \times \mathbf{v} + \Omega \times (\Omega \times \mathbf{r}) \right] = 0, \tag{5}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \mathbf{B}}{\partial t} = \nabla \times (\mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B} + \sqrt{4\pi \rho \varepsilon_m}), \tag{6}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial P_S}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla) P_S + \gamma P_S \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} = (\gamma - 1) \left( \frac{P_E - P_S}{\tau_{SE}} + f_p Q_T \right), \tag{7}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial P_E}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla) P_E + \gamma P_E \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} = (\gamma - 1) \left[ \frac{P_S - P_E}{\tau_{SE}} - \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q}_E + (1 - f_p) Q_T \right], \tag{8}
\]

where the independent variables are the heliocentric position vector \( \mathbf{r} \) and the time \( t \). The dependent variables are the mean velocity in the corotating frame \( \mathbf{v} \), the mean magnetic field \( \mathbf{B} \), the number density \( N_S \) and thermal pressure \( P_S \) of solar wind (thermal) protons, and the thermal pressure of electrons \( P_E \). Note that we have neglected density and pressure fluctuations (Usmanov et al. 2014, 2018). All pressures are assumed to be isotropic. We neglect the electron mass compared with the proton mass \( m_p \), so the mass density is \( \rho = m_p N_S \). The parameters appearing in the equations are the sidereal solar rotation rate \( \Omega \), the gravitational constant \( G \), the adiabatic index \( \gamma \) (= 5/3), the solar mass \( M_\odot \), and the fraction of turbulent energy absorbed by protons \( f_p \) (Breech et al. 2009; Matthaeus et al. 2016). The unit vector in the radial direction is \( \hat{r} \), and \( \mathbf{I} \) is the unit matrix.

We use the classical Spitzer formula (Spitzer 1965; Hartle & Sturrock 1968) for the proton-electron Coulomb collision time scale \( \tau_{SE} \). The electron heat flux \( \mathbf{q}_E \) below \( 5 - 10 \ R_\odot \) is approximated by the classical collision dominated model of Spitzer & Härm (1953) (see also Chhiber et al. 2016), while above \( 5 - 10 \ R_\odot \) we adopt Hollweg’s “collisionless” model (Hollweg 1974, 1976). Further details on the implementation may be found in Usmanov et al. (2018).
Four turbulence quantities arise in the mean-flow equations: a source term $Q_T$ of energy deposition/extraction due to turbulent dissipation, the Reynolds stress $\mathcal{R} = \langle \rho v'v' - B'B' / 4\pi \rangle$, the magnetic pressure of the fluctuations $\langle B'^2 / 8\pi \rangle$, and the mean turbulent electric field $\varepsilon_m = \langle v' \times B' \rangle (4\pi \rho)^{-1/2}$. These represent the coupling of the bulk flow to the small-scale fluctuations. Recall that we neglect density and pressure fluctuations, so that $\langle \rho \rangle = \rho$ (Usmanov et al. 2014, 2018).

Transport equations for the fluctuations may be obtained by subtracting the mean-field equations (4) – (8) from the full MHD equations. This yields a set of equations that describe the transport of three statistical descriptors for solar wind MHD fluctuations – the turbulence energy, the correlation length of turbulent fluctuations, and the cross helicity – which are coupled to the mean-field equations (4) – (8) through terms involving $Q_T$, $\mathcal{R}$, and $\varepsilon_m$. To close the full set of equations, we employ an MHD analog of the familiar von Kármán-Howarth decay law (de Kármán & Howarth 1938; Wan et al. 2012) for $Q_T$. The Two-Scale Direct Interaction Approximation (TSDIA; for a brief overview see Appendix A of Yokoi 2013) is used for $\mathcal{R}$ and $\varepsilon_m$; they are expressed in term of gradients of the mean velocity and magnetic fields and an eddy (turbulent) viscosity. Further details on the model, including those on numerical implementation, may be found in Usmanov et al. (2014) and Usmanov et al. (2018).

The simulations have been well-tested, and give reasonable agreement with many spacecraft observations of large-scale solar wind fields, turbulence parameters (energy, cross helicity and correlation scale), as well as the temperature, for varying heliocentric distance, and where feasible, varying heliolatitude (Breech et al. 2008; Usmanov et al. 2011, 2012, 2014, 2016a; Chhiber et al. 2018; Usmanov et al. 2018). The model has been used to compute diffusion coefficients for energetic particles, again finding good agreement with spacecraft observations (Chhiber et al. 2017). Recent work (reviewed below) has combined our model’s output with STEREO images to enable a localization of the first $\beta = 1$ surface (Chhiber et al. 2018).
The next section describes various runs of the simulation model performed for this work, and presents results relating to critical surfaces in the solar wind along with predictions along PSP orbits.

5. RESULTS

The present work is based on analysis of two classes of simulation runs: (I) In the first case we employ a dipole magnetic field at the inner boundary, with the dipole tilted at angles of 0°, 5°, 10°, and 30° (Runs I-A, I-B, I-C, and I-D, respectively) relative to the solar rotation axis. A 60° run was also analyzed, but the results were found to be similar to the 30° simulation. The magnitude of the dipolar field is set to 12 G to match the magnitude of the heliospheric magnetic field observed by Ulysses in January 2008. This simple configuration has both open (near the pole of the dipole) and closed (near its equator) magnetic field geometry, and allows for simulation of both coronal-hole-like and streamer-like flows. This gives us a representation of the ambient, large-scale bimodal solar wind flow during periods of minimum solar activity (Cane et al. 1999; McComas et al. 2003; Usmanov & Goldstein 2003; Owens & Forsyth 2013). (II) In the second case the MHD code is driven by a magnetic field at the base obtained from July 1989, July 1994, and December 2008 magnetogram data (Runs II-A, II-B, and II-C, respectively) published by the Wilcox Solar Observatory. Note that the magnetogram runs use a slightly older numerical model with a simpler WKB-wave based treatment of the coronal region (1 – 45 $R_\odot$; see Usmanov et al. 2000; Usmanov & Goldstein 2003; Usmanov et al. 2014).

The simulation domain extends from the coronal surface at 1 $R_\odot$ to 3 au. The following input parameters are specified at the coronal surface: the driving amplitude of Alfvén waves ($\sim 30$ km s$^{-1}$), the density ($\sim 1 \times 10^8$ particles cm$^{-3}$) and temperature ($\sim 1.8 \times 10^6$ K). The magnetic field magnitude is assigned either using a source magnetic dipole on the Sun’s poles (with strength 12–16 G to match values observed by Ulysses) or from solar magnetograms. The input parameters also include the fraction of turbulent energy absorbed by protons $f_p = 0.6$ (Usmanov et al. 2018).

5.1. Surfaces in the Meridional Plane
The significance of the sonic and Alfvén critical surfaces, as well as the first \( \beta = 1 \) surface, was discussed in Section 2. Operationally the Alfvén critical surface is defined by the set of points, scanning outward, at which the solar wind speed first exceeds the Alfvén speed \( V_A = B / \sqrt{4\pi \rho} \). Similarly, the sonic surface is defined by the set of points, scanning outwards from the sun, at which the total solar wind speed becomes larger than the sound speed \( c_s = \sqrt{\gamma P_p / \rho} \). Here \( \gamma \) is the polytropic index and \( P_p \) is the proton pressure. Another definition of the sound speed is \( c'_s = \sqrt{\gamma P / \rho} \), where \( P = P_p + P_e \) includes the electron pressure \( P_e \). We show the sonic surfaces computed using both these definitions to stress that the inclusion of various physical effects may change the location of the surface, and it is perhaps more appropriate to envision a transonic region (Lotova et al. 1997), rather than a highly localized surface. Nevertheless, at the fluid level of description \( P \) may be considered the more appropriate measure of pressure.

The plasma beta is also defined in two ways; in terms of the proton beta, \( \beta_p = 8\pi P_p / B^2 \), and in terms of the total electron plus proton beta, \( \beta_{p+e} = 8\pi (P_p + P_e) / B^2 \). The first \( \beta = 1 \) surface is identified as the set of points, scanning outward, at which \( \beta = 1 \) is first encountered. This is done in the analysis separately for proton beta and for total beta.

Figure 2 depicts the projection of these surfaces onto an arbitrarily selected meridional plane at 37° heliolongitude for Runs I-A and I-D. Unless specified otherwise, simulation data are plotted in the Heliographic Coordinate system (HGC, Fränz & Harper 2002). Heliographic latitude is measured from the solar equator positive towards North, Heliographic longitude is defined in the direction of planetary motion, with the \( XY \)-plane defined by the solar equator.

The surfaces show a laminar appearance, and display a very organized ordering. The two configurations depicted are very similar, with no asymmetry in the zero-tilt case, and only minor asymmetries seen in the north-south direction. For all latitudes well-separated from the current sheet, the \( \beta = 1 \) surface is the most distant, with the Alfvén surface contained well within it, and the sonic surface(s) lower still, in the range 3 – 5 \( R_\odot \). The most dramatic feature is the rearrangement of the surfaces near the heliospheric current sheet region, an effect that can completely reverse the surface to an opposite ordering. In fact one can find a substantial region in which the \( \beta = 1 \) surface lies at lower
Figure 2. Meridional planes from untilted dipole Run I-A (top) and 30° tilted dipole Run I-D (bottom). (Left) $r = 1 - 30 \ R_\odot$. (Right) $r = 1 - 150 \ R_\odot$. The black curves show the sonic surface (solid line using $c_s$ with just proton pressure and dashed line using $c'_s$ which includes proton and electron pressures; see text), the white curve shows the Alfvén surface, and the green curves show the first unity $\beta$ surface (solid line shows $\beta_p = 1$ and dashed line shows $\beta_{p+e} = 1$).
altitudes than the Alfvén surface. There are also regions, much smaller in these particular cases, in which the sonic surface is found at altitudes above the Alfvénic surface. In those small regions, the solar wind would have the somewhat anomalous character of being super-Alfvénic but subsonic. Alfvén wave pressure in such regions may be able to increase the mass flux of the resulting wind at higher radial distances (see Leer et al. 1982).

Before proceeding with further analysis, we want to emphasize that there are unavoidable limitations in using these simulations. One obvious comment is that our MHD solutions are based on simplified data that do not represent the actual boundary conditions corresponding to the solar wind during the PSP passage. More specifically, we emphasize that the discrete spatial resolution of the MHD model limits the thinning of the heliospheric current sheet (HCS). Therefore both the HCS, and the much wider plasma sheet surrounding it (Winterhalter et al. 1994), are expected to be broader in the simulation than in the actual solar wind. A rough estimation based on published data suggests that the real HCS may be a factor of \(\sim 5\) thinner than what we are able to resolve here. Nevertheless, within the resolution parameters of the code, the physics of the simulation is deemed to be accurate, so that, for example, the inversion of critical surfaces is expected to occur, albeit over a thinner region, in the solar minimum conditions seen in some PSP orbits.

5.2. Remote Sensing Context

We recall briefly the novel use of STEREO Heliospheric Imaging (HI) data by DeForest et al. (2016), which examined a series of images of the inner solar wind and argued, based on physical grounds, that the observed striation-flocculation transition occurred in the neighborhood of the first plasma-\(\beta = 1\) surface. Chhiber et al. (2018) employed MHD simulations, similar to those analyzed here, to provide confirming evidence of this interpretation. Figure 3 revisits this analysis, showing that the region in which the striae gives way to flocculae is commensurate with the region in the simulation in which the first \(\beta = 1\) surface is encountered, as the wind transitions from magnetic control to hydrodynamic control.

Recently, Kasper et al. (2017) found evidence for a zone, extending from just above the transition region \((\sim 0.3 \, R_\odot)\) to a distance of tens of solar radii, where \(\alpha\)-particles are heated preferentially over
protons. The lower boundary of this zone would likely be at the chromospheric transition region, where the plasma collisionality changes from high to weak, thus permitting nonthermal physics to produce observed temperature anisotropies (e.g., Marsch 2006). It is conceivable that this zone of preferential heating ends at the first beta unity surface, since kinetic temperature anisotropies are generally associated with $\beta \lesssim 1$ (e.g., Matteini et al. 2012). This zone should be detected by the PSP when it reaches below the first beta unity surface.

The location of the sonic critical surface as a function of latitude was estimated from scintillation data by Lotova et al. (1997). Figure 4 shows the Lotova results and compares them with sonic critical surfaces obtained from two MHD simulations – a solar minimum magnetogram and a solar maximum magnetogram. We note a reasonable qualitative similarity, especially regarding the oblateness at the poles during solar minimum and the spherical but jagged shape during solar maximum. During solar minimum, there exists a clear demarcation between slow wind streams at equatorial latitudes and fast wind in polar regions. As a result, the wind becomes supersonic at larger distances from the Sun.
at low latitudes, while the sonic surface at the poles lies at lower heights. These results suggest that variations in the morphology of the critical surfaces can be used to infer the state of solar activity.

Another look at the properties of the solar wind in the critical region is provided by reproducing the scintillation intensity data of Lotova et al. (1985) in Figure 5. For comparison we show the radial profiles of two parameters obtained with from an untilted dipole simulation (Run I-A). The parameters shown are the radial solar wind speed $V_r$ and the turbulence energy density (per unit mass) $Z^2$ from the simulation (Usmanov et al. 2014, 2018). The scintillation profile (measured through $m\nu$, where $m$ is a scintillation index and $\nu$ is the frequency of observation; see Lotova et al. (1985)) shows a feature in the range of 20 – 30 $R_\odot$ that is interpreted as a region of enhanced turbulence, giving rise to enhanced radio scattering from density irregularities. Shaded regions in the plot indicate the range of radii at which the Alfvén and sonic surfaces are found in the ecliptic region in the simulation. The Figure also shows PSP perihelia for several orbits. We note that the scintillation feature lies very close to the position of the maximum turbulence energy per unit mass $Z^2$ from the simulation, and is also close to the locations of the sonic and Alfvénic critical surfaces in the simulation. This enhancement in turbulence may be caused by the interactions of counter-propagating Alfvén waves (Matthaeus et al. 1999). The acceleration of the wind also begins in this region.

5.3. What PSP will see: Dipole-based Simulations

Using the PSP trajectory and a coordinate transformation to link it to the global MHD solution, one may graphically illustrate the relationship between the PSP orbit and the simulated heliospheric structure. Superposing the orbits on the simulation results should not be construed as a prediction, since the boundary data, even if compatible with projected future conditions, is necessarily imprecise. However this exercise does present a possible context for the PSP mission. Portraying this relationship is not trivial, because the critical surfaces rotate with Sun, while the PSP orbit traces a curve in three-space that does not precisely lie in a single plane in any inertial frame (see Fig. 1).

To produce an illustrative comparison of the orbits and critical surfaces, we may choose to look at a sequence of (non-inertial) meridional planes that always contain the PSP orbit. In this frame the orientation of the solar dipole field rotates at a non-constant angular frequency. Figure 6 depicts such
Figure 4. (a) Transonic regions from Lotova et al. (1997), showing the transition from spherically symmetric but jagged morphology at solar maximum (1989), to oblateness at the poles during solar minimum (1994). Sonic surfaces (solid line using $c_s$ with just proton pressure and dashed line using $c'_s$ which includes proton and electron pressures; see text) from Runs II-A and II-B, using solar maximum (July 1989) and solar minimum (July 1994) magnetograms, respectively. Contours of proton density are shown in the background. The transition from solar maximum (b) to solar minimum (c) is qualitatively consistent with the one seen in Figure 4(a).
Figure 5. Enhanced scintillation ($m\nu$) region from the observations of Lotova et al. (1985), seen as a bump at $\sim20 - 30\ R_\odot$ in the dashed red curve. The radial solar wind speed $V_r$ (dotted blue curve) and the turbulence energy density (per unit mass) $Z^2$ (solid black curve) from Run I-A are also shown, along with shaded bands representing the locations of the Alfvén (pale blue band) and sonic (grey band) surfaces in the ecliptic region of the simulation. The final three perihelia of the $PSP$ are represented as $\oplus$ symbols.

A sequence of meridional planes. The MHD simulation used for this illustration employed a $10^\circ$ tilted dipole boundary condition (Run I-C), representing solar-minimum conditions likely to be sampled by the $PSP$ in its early orbits. The position of $PSP$ in each frame (during the 8th orbit; see Figure 8) is at the center of the yellow ‘＋’ symbol. The times are chosen to correspond to $PSP$ passing over a critical surface. The plots are labeled by time measured in days-from-launch. A video animation of these figures is available as Supplementary Material. An animation illustrating $PSP$ crossings of critical surfaces in the final orbit, during solar-maximum conditions (Run II-A), is also available.

Another interesting way to visualize the relationship between the $PSP$ orbit and the critical surfaces is to tally the time spent in each orbit within the $\beta = 1$ surface (henceforth $\beta$ refers to the “two-fluid” plasma beta $\beta_{p+e}$), the Alfvén surface and the sonic surface. As a first example of this compilation, Figure 7(a) shows the residence time within each of these regions, using the planned $PSP$ orbits,
Figure 6. *PSP* crossings of the critical surfaces are illustrated by a sequence of meridional planes that contain the spacecraft trajectory. The 8th orbit is depicted in a 10° dipole simulation (Run I-C; see Figure 8(a)), representing solar-minimum conditions. The sonic, Alfvén, and first (proton+electron) beta unity surfaces are depicted as solid pink, solid blue, and dashed green curves, which are superposed on contours of proton density. The *PSP* position is at the center of the yellow ‘+’ symbol. A video animation is available as Supplementary Material.
for the case of a solar wind with untilted dipole boundary conditions. The upper section of the plot shows, as functions of time, the variation of orbital radial distances, as well as radial position of the critical surfaces at the angular position (heliolatitude and heliolongitude) of the *PSP*. This directly illustrates *PSP*'s penetration of the critical surfaces at various times.

Referring to the lower section that shows accumulated time within critical surfaces, for each orbit, we see that, beginning with orbit 8, this virtual *PSP* mission penetrates the Alfvén surface for 18 hours or more for all subsequent orbits to 25. Beginning with orbit 10, *PSP* spends between 15 and 40 hours in each plotted orbit below the predicted sonic surface. There are no orbits falling below the \( \beta = 1 \) surface. This set of predictions is somewhat anomalous due to the lack of dipole tilt, so that the orbits almost always fall in the (artificially wide) high-\( \beta \) current sheet region.

Figure 7(b) shows a similar compilation done for a 5° dipole-tilt run. We can see now, as would be expected, that the encounters with critical surfaces have a strong dependence on the dipole tilt angle, which translates into the degree of latitudinal excursion of the HCS. In fact, for this case the critical surfaces are frequently seen at larger heliocentric distances, with significant consequences for the sub-critical-surface residence times. We now see that the \( \beta = 1 \) surface is crossed relatively early, in orbit 4, during which the *PSP* remains inside that surface for more than 50 hours. The pattern of crossing the critical surfaces subsequently become more irregular as the perihelia descend. It is interesting to note that for later orbits, the *PSP* might spend the largest amount of time within any one of the three surfaces. Furthermore, for all orbits after 7, the *PSP* spends at least 20 hours within at least one of the critical surfaces. These 20 to 40 hour periods will represent opportunities for crucial observations. For instance, below the Alfvén surface the *PSP* might detect a large population of inward propagating Alfvén modes, and the enhanced turbulence seen in Figure 5 could be detected in the trans-Alfvénic region.

Two more cases with dipole boundary conditions are shown in Figure 8, with tilt angles of 10° and 30°. The results for a 60° dipole run (not shown) are very similar to the 30° case. It is apparent that the \( \beta = 1 \) surface is found at considerably larger radial distances as the tilt angle is increased. During solar maximum, the *PSP* is therefore likely to spend more than a hundred hours under the
Figure 7. PSP surface crossings from simulations with 0° (a) and 5° (b) dipole tilt. In each plot, the top section shows the radial and latitudinal position of the PSP for each orbit, and the radial position of the critical surfaces at the angular position of the PSP. The bottom section shows the time spent by the PSP under each surface, per orbit. The striped-green, lavender, and narrow-red bars represent the $\beta = 1$, Alfvén, and sonic surfaces, respectively.
first beta unity surface per orbit. Furthermore, Figure 8(b) indicates that no time is spent within the sonic surface during any of the orbits in the 30° dipole case, except for a few hours during Orbit 21. The reason for this can be understood from the discussion of Figure 4 – Since the PSP trajectory stays within low heliolatitudes, it may be able to sample the extended portion of the sonic surface during solar minimum; However, during solar maximum, the height of this surface is generally too low to be crossed at the latitudes sampled by the spacecraft (see also Figure 2(c)).

5.4. What PSP will see: Magnetogram-based simulations

Here we briefly show results for two cases in which the MHD simulation is driven by magnetogram: one from solar minimum conditions (July 1994; Run II-B; Figure 9(a)) and another from solar maximum conditions (July 1989; Run II-A; Figure 9(b)). Examining the solar minimum case, one sees immediately that the residence times below the $\beta = 1$ surface are much more irregularly distributed over the orbits compared to the dipole source cases. This reflects the relative complexity in space of the solar wind due to the complexity of the boundary data. Nevertheless, it is a solar minimum condition, and the residence times within the Alfvén and sonic surfaces rarely, if ever, exceed twenty hours in a single orbit. Figure 9(b) shows a solar maximum case employing a July 1989 magnetogram. The residence times under the $\beta = 1$ surface are again irregular, exceeding 100 hours during orbits 6 and 13. There are only a few orbits in which the Alfvén surface is encountered, and then for no more than about 20 hours in a single orbit (orbit 22 or 24). As indicated by Figure 9(b) (and Figure 8(b)), PSP crossings of the sonic surface are unlikely to occur during solar maximum. A video animation of simulated PSP “surface crossings” in the solar maximum case is available as Supplementary Material.

Compared with the dipole-based results (Figures 7 and 8), the reduced time spent under the surfaces in Figure 9 appears to be due to the rapid radial decay of the higher-order multipole magnetic fields that are implied by a complex magnetogram boundary condition (Réville et al. 2015).

6. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION
Figure 8. *PSP* surface crossings from a simulation with (a) a 10° and (b) a 30° dipole tilt. Further description follows Figure 7.
Figure 9. *PSP* surface crossings for (a) a July 1994 (solar minimum) magnetogram run and (b) a July 1989 (solar maximum) magnetogram run. Further description follows Figure 7. A video animation of simulated *PSP* “surface crossings” in the solar maximum case is available as Supplementary Material.
We have shown here some detailed illustrative exercises in the use of a global heliospheric MHD code with turbulence modeling to simulate context that could be observed by the upcoming *Parker Solar Probe* mission. We emphasize again that these results cannot be construed as predictions, since the boundary data employed are not only imprecise, but also are not appropriate to the conditions at the time when *PSP* will fly, except perhaps in a qualitative sense. Nevertheless it is interesting and even useful to explore the kind of conditions that *PSP* might experience, an approach that we call *context prediction*.

In this paper we have focused on ambient steady-state conditions in the solar wind, driven by boundary conditions that are simple untilted or tilted dipoles, or otherwise magnetograms from previous solar minimum or solar maximum epochs. We note that a sensitive parameter is the total solar dipole strength, and we have used values commonly adopted in other work, which lead to agreement with near-Earth observations ([Usmanov et al. 2014; Chhiber et al. 2018; Usmanov et al. 2018](#)), with the understanding that this value is actually not well constrained ([Riley et al. 2014; Usmanov et al. 2018](#)).

To summarize, the present results are of two major types: First, we find broad agreement in our study with the interpretation of existing remote sensing results, both from heliospheric imaging and from radio scintillation studies. Our results confirm the likely association of the region near the first outgoing $\beta = 1$ surfaces with morphological changes in the solar wind as observed in *STEREO* imaging ([DeForest et al. 2016](#)). Our global simulations also support the idea that a region near the critical Alfvén surfaces may be characterized by a local enhancement of turbulence levels, a feature that may have implications for additional heating and acceleration of the solar wind. Second, the trajectory analyses show that the period of time that *PSP* is likely to spend inside the $\beta = 1$, sonic and Alfvén surfaces depends sensitively on the degree of solar activity and the tilt of the solar dipole and the location of the heliospheric current sheet.

Here we have provided a first set of such context predictions, emphasizing the possible range of positions of the sonic and Alfvénic critical surfaces, and the first plasma beta unity surface. The importance of these surfaces (e.g., [Lotova et al. 1985; DeForest et al. 2016; Chhiber et al. 2018](#)) lies
in the fact that the physical character and conditions of the interplanetary medium are likely to be different on either side of these boundaries, which may in reality be very complex regions, or at least corrugated surfaces. *Parker Solar Probe* seeks to address questions such as the physical mechanisms that heat the corona and accelerate the wind, and to reveal the structure of the electromagnetic fields, plasma and energetic particles in these very regions of the corona and wind. Therefore, a baseline understanding the range of distances at which these regions might be encountered and crossed becomes quite important for anticipating what the mission is likely to measure, for how long, and on which orbits. In a forthcoming paper we will continue these investigations, describing in some detail the turbulence properties that are expected in the regions above and below the critical surfaces and along the *PSP* trajectory, together with an evaluation of the validity of the Taylor hypothesis for *PSP* observations.
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