

## A possible explanation for the mysterious hot solar corona

Anil Raghav<sup>1</sup>

© Springer ....

**Abstract** The coronal heating has remained a puzzle for decades since its observation in 1940. Several space missions have been planned to resolve this conundrum in the past and many more intend to target this issue in the future. The unfolding of this issue will not only advance the fundamentals of astrophysical science but also promise an improvement in space weather prediction. Its origin has been debated without complete convergence; the acoustic waves, magneto-hydrodynamic waves, and micro/nano-flares are the strongest candidates so far to explain the mystery of coronal heating. However, none of these processes significantly justifies the million-degree temperature of the solar corona and the problem remains unsolved to date. Here, we propose a new physical mechanism to explain the observed heating of the solar corona. The statistical energy created during the interaction of the spin magnetic moment of the plasma particles with the turbulent and continuously evolving coronal magnetic field could substantiate the observed million-degree coronal temperature.

**Keywords:** Corona, Magnetic fields

The corona is the outermost layer of the Sun's atmosphere, which can be observed as the thin white glow during a total solar eclipse (Saito & Tandberg-Hanssen, 1973). The spectroscopic measurements in 1940 discovered that the temperature of the corona is up to million degrees (Edlén, 1937; Grotian, 1939; Lyot, 1939; Edlén, 1945). Even eight decades after this discovery, here is still no concrete theory that explains this shooting up of temperature. However, in light of the significant improvement in the last two decades in observations, theory, and computer simulations, researchers could explore this problem in a more thorough manner. In this journey, many theories based on various aspects have been proposed and discredited as none of them could completely substantiate the temperature reaching million degrees. The density of the corona is  $\sim 10^{8-9}$

---

✉ A.N. Raghav  
raghavanil1984@gmail.com

<sup>1</sup> University Department of Physics, University of Mumbai, Vidyanagari, Santacruz (E), Mumbai-400098, India

$\text{cm}^{-3}$ , which is much smaller as compared to the density of photosphere, i.e.,  $\sim 10^{17} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ . Therefore, the second law of thermodynamics does not permit the flow of heat from the photosphere to the corona which could elevate the coronal temperatures 200 – 300 times higher than the photosphere (Sakurai, 2017). Thus, the question was raised that what causes coronal heating? The physical mechanism that can heat the corona to  $\sim 10^6 \text{ K}$  and accelerate the supersonic solar wind has not yet been identified conclusively. In fact, several conventional direct current (DC) and alternating current (AC) heating mechanisms have been proposed for coronal heating; however, none of them fully explains the observed features (see listed review articles and reference therein (Cranmer & Winebarger, 2019; Billings, 1966; Withbroe & Noyes, 1977; Kuperus et al., 1981; Narain & Ulmschneider, 1990; Low, 1996; Aschwanden, 2006; Klimchuk, 2006; Golub & Pasachoff, 2010; Parnell & De Moortel, 2012; Reale, 2014; Schmelz & Winebarger, 2015; Velli et al., 2015; Shimizu et al., 2018)).

In 1948, the first theory based on the acoustic (sound) waves was proposed to justify the coronal heating process (Biermann, 1948). It was suggested that the acoustic waves are generated during the granulation process in the photosphere, where convection would lead to pressure perturbations (Schwarzschild, 1948). When these waves propagate into a relatively lower dense chromosphere and corona, and their amplitude would increase; ultimately the waves would steepen due to the nonlinearity in the wave propagation, which would then result in a shock wave formation. Finally, the dissipation of the shock waves would heat the chromosphere and corona. Even though the initial theory looked promising, the quantitative estimation of the flux of the acoustic waves failed to explain the observed temperature in corona (Lighthill, 1954; Unno, 1966; Athay & White, 1978; Cranmer et al., 2007).

Recent studies have explored the magnetic nature of the corona. It is observed that the plasma  $\beta$  (the ratio of thermal pressure to magnetic pressure)  $> 1$  in the photosphere, whereas  $\beta \ll 1$  in the corona and the active region of the chromosphere. Thus, it is believed that the magnetic field leads to the heating process. The primary assumption in these studies is that the magnetohydrodynamic waves, i.e., the fast mode and the slow mode (compressible mode), or the Alfvén mode (incompressible) are generated at the solar surface and propagate in chromosphere and corona (Osterbrock, 1961). The slow mode dissipates in the chromosphere like acoustic waves. However, the lower gradient of density decrease in corona does not allow amplitude growth for fast mode waves. Thus, these would propagate far up into the corona. Further, the nonlinearity would create shock waves, resulting in their dissipation. The Alfvén waves would dissipate through nonlinear wave-wave interaction (Chin & Wentzel, 1972), the resonant absorption (Davila, 1987) or phase mixing (Heyvaerts & Priest, 1983; Sakurai & Granik, 1984).

However, the observational studies have found an acoustic wave flux of  $10^4 \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$  at the top of the chromosphere, which is far smaller than the energy flux that would be required for coronal heating. In addition, the coronal emission line suggests a very small wave amplitude (Mein & Schmieder, 1981; Sakurai et al., 2002). This implies that shock dissipation and reflection of the acoustic waves decrease their flux while propagating upward (Matsumoto &

Suzuki, 2012). The measurements of non-thermal widths during the observation of coronal loops suggest only minor contribution (25 % or less) of Alfvén like waves (Hara & Ichimoto, 1999). Besides this, the nonlinear turbulent cascade is considered to be present in the photosphere (Petrovay, 2001) and chromosphere (Reardon et al., 2008), and it is certainly observed in the *in situ* solar wind (Bruno & Carbone, 2013). Various scaling laws indicate their dissipation and heating rate, but the physical mechanism behind the heating has not been understood. The multiple dissipation mechanisms were proposed that include both collisional effects (heat conduction, viscosity, or resistivity) and collisionless kinetic effects (Landau damping, ion-cyclotron resonance, stochastic Fermi acceleration, Debye-scale electrostatic acceleration, particle pickup at narrow boundaries, and multistep combinations of instability driven wave growth and damping) (Cranmer & Winebarger, 2019).

Another idea that has been proposed to explain the coronal heating relates it to X-ray emission from the Sun, however, it is dominantly controlled by the magnetic field or the rotation of the Sun via dynamo effects (Sakurai, 2012). The X-ray observations unfold many events such as flares, micro-flares, nano-flares (Lin et al., 1984; Parker, 1988; Shibata & Magara, 2011). These flare events do not allow a significant build-up of nonpotential magnetic energy. Their power-law distribution suggests a common underlying process, which is believed to be the magnetic reconnection. However, these flare events can only provide at the most 20% of the energy required to heat the corona (Shimizu, 1995; Priest et al., 2018). Furthermore, the Sun sometimes generates highly twisted field lines in the form of filaments, flux ropes, and sigmoid-shaped cores of active regions. The magnetic twist in these regions may be considered as a reservoir of energy, but the rate of energy release from the reservoir is constrained by a requirement to conserve magnetic helicity (Taylor, 1974). Recently, a slightly different DC-type model has been proposed that is based on the additional magnetic reconnection at the chromospheric footpoints to induce the large-scale heating (Priest et al., 2018).

There exist several theoretical models that describe plasma-heating mechanisms and are probably suitable for operating in the coronal environment. However, the output of these models has simply not been comparable to the observed data. Here, we propose a physical mechanism to explain the observations from a new perspective based on the interaction between particle spin magnetic moment and the coronal magnetic field.

The observations of the photosphere suggest it has a structure of very clumpy magnetic field that is concentrated into elemental flux tubes which further extend upward into the corona (Solanki, 1993; Muller, 1994; Stenflo et al., 1998). The photosphere's evolving pattern caused by turbulent convection act upon the footpoints of strands. The translational motion tangle the strands about each other, whereas rotational motion twists them. Parkar (1972) proposed that the photospheric flows (slow footpoint motions) slowly stress the coronal magnetic field line in such a way that it becomes tangled, twisted, and braided (Parker, 1972). To prevent infinite build-up of stress, the field lines must reconnect. The corona has a mixed polarity and at a particular location in corona, the

magnetic reconnection process is either between open-open (bipolar), or open-closed (tripolar), or closed-closed (quadrupolar) magnetic field lines, thus making the magnetic configuration complex. However, the eclipse picture of the outer corona represent outward flow of particles imply that the complex configuration of the field finally evolved outward.

## 1. Possible mechanism

Coronal heating is an impulsive process, which implies that the quantum mechanical features may be involved in the underlying physical mechanism. The coronal plasma dominantly consists of protons and electrons, which have intrinsic magnetic moments due to their intrinsic spin property ( $\pm \frac{1}{2}\hbar$ ) and electric charge. Therefore, there exist only two possible orientations for spin magnetic moments (for reference,  $\uparrow$  up and  $\downarrow$  down).

Initially, the spin magnetic moment of each particle is aligned with elemental magnetic field strands to minimize the statistical energy of the magnetic system. The magnetic reconnection process of mixed polarity, tangled, twisted, and braided magnetic field lines induces local change in coronal magnetic configuration. The intrinsic spin magnetic moment of the particles respond to the new *in situ* configuration of the magnetic field. Thus fraction of particles aligned their spin magnetic moment along the new magnetic field. From the first law of thermodynamics,

$$\Delta U = Q - W. \quad (1)$$

As the total energy of this magnetic system is conserved, i.e.,  $\Delta U = 0$ ; therefore, the magnetic interaction energy (work done) is converted to heat energy, i.e.,  $Q = W$ .

To estimate this energy associated with the alignment of magnetic moment of fraction of spin half particles, let us assume that ‘N’ particles are aligned to the new field and in contact with a heat reservoir at temperature  $T = 0$  (the corona is in contact with interplanetary medium with no heat source; let us also neglect the heat transfer from chromosphere). For one ion, the textbook statistical physics gives the partition function  $\xi$  as

$$\xi = \sum_{\text{all states of } r} e^{-\beta E_r} = e^{\beta \mu B} + e^{-\beta \mu B}. \quad (2)$$

For ‘N’ particles, the partition function  $Z$  will be,

$$Z = \xi^N = (e^{\beta \mu B} + e^{-\beta \mu B})^N. \quad (3)$$

The mean energy can be calculated as

$$\bar{E} = -\frac{\partial \ln Z}{\partial \beta} = -N \frac{\partial \ln \xi}{\partial \beta} = -N \mu B \tanh\left(\frac{\mu B}{KT}\right), \quad (4)$$

here, ' $\mu$ ' is the spin magnetic moment of a single particle and  $B$  is the change in the magnetic field i.e. change in direction (sign).

The spin magnetic moment of the proton or electron is invariant. Thus, Equation 1 implies that the change in kinetic energy of each particle will be the mean statistical interaction energy generated during magnetic moment allignment process, which is given as,

$$\Delta(\frac{1}{2}mv^2) = -N\mu B \tanh(\frac{\mu B}{KT}). \quad (5)$$

The kinetic theory of gases suggests,

$$\frac{3}{2}K \Delta T = \Delta(\frac{1}{2}mv^2). \quad (6)$$

Thus, the rise in temperature is

$$\Delta T = \frac{2}{3} \frac{N\mu B \tanh(\frac{\mu B}{KT})}{K}. \quad (7)$$

The recent study found coronal magnetic field strengths of  $32 \pm 5$  G above the sunspot, which decrease rapidly to values of approximately 1 G over a lateral distance of 7,000 km (Jess et al., 2016; Morgan & Taroyan, 2017). For the sake of calculation, let us assumed the magnetic field as 10 G; The estimation of the number of particles that respond to a given field is very crucial. It is understood that the plasma particle is electrostatically influenced by all of the other particles within its Debye sphere with a radius of Debye length. Similarly, in presence of magnetic field, we assumed that the particle spin magnetic moment will be affected by all other particles within its gyroradius in 3 dimensions. Thus,

$$N_g = \frac{4\pi}{3} r_g^3 n \quad (8)$$

here, ' $n$ ' is the particle density in corona i.e.  $10^{15} m^{-3}$ . To estimate gyroradius ( $r_g$ ) following parameters have been used. Boltzmann constant  $K = 1.38 \times 10^{-23} m^2 kg s^{-2} K^{-1}$ , mass of the proton  $m_p = 1.6 \times 10^{-27} kg$ , magnetic field  $B = 10^{-3} T$ ; charge of proton  $q = 1.6 \times 10^{-19}$ ; The particle speed is estimated using  $v = (3KT_c/m)^{1/2}$ . Here temperature is taken as  $T_c = 4000 K$ , since particle entering in the corona comes from chromosphere. The gyroradius  $r_g = (mv_{\perp})/(qB) = 0.1017 m$ ; We assume that only 50% of them respond the change in magnetic field and aligned their spin magnetic moment. Thus,  $(N_g) = 2.2053 \times 10^{12}$ . The proton spin magnetic moment is  $\mu = 1.41 \times 10^{-26} J T^{-1}$ . In equation 7, we have assumed  $T = 0$ , Thus  $\tanh(\frac{\mu B}{KT}) = 1$ ,

Substituting above values in the equation 7, we get

$$\Delta T = \frac{2}{3} \times \frac{2.2053 \times 10^{12} \times 1.41 \times 10^{-26} \times 10^{-3}}{1.38 \times 10^{-23}} = 1.5 \times 10^6 K.$$

This order of the value closely matches the order of coronal temperature. Note that the output is highly depend on the fraction of protons that actually participated in spin allignment process during the change in a magnetic field. Based on

this temperature, one can estimate the kinetic energy of the proton in corona as  $\sim 129$  eV, which will impart the thermal speed ( $v = \sqrt{2 \times K.E./m} \sim 160$  km  $s^{-1}$ ). Also note that the plasma beta is much less than 1, indicating frozen-in flux condition in corona (Klimchuk, 2015). Thus, eventhough the gravitational inward pull on protons may be negligible, the magnetic rigidity will definitely oppose them to flow out of corona. Moreover, the electron magnetic moment is  $-9.284764 \times 10^{-24}$  JT $^{-1}$ , i.e., approximately 658 times higher than the magnetic moment of the proton. But the gyroradius decrease by factor of 41.93. It imply their negligible contribution in coronal heating.

To understand the proposed coronal heating model, it is assumed that the plasma particles are homogeneously distributed across the corona and the initial temperature is  $T_0$  (same as the chromosphere). At a certain height above the chromosphere, the magnetic reconnection process between tangled and twisted field lines induces a change in local coronal magnetic field configuration. Let us consider proton flux start interacting to this changed coronal field at time  $t = 0$ . The magnetic interaction generates the heat power of ‘P’ per unit volume. This heat is continuously transferred to the coronal environment. Thus, the temperature distribution inside the corona is governed by the heat propagation equation with heat sources as (Holman, 2002)

$$\rho c \frac{\partial T(\mathbf{r}, t)}{\partial t} = k \nabla^2 T(\mathbf{r}, t) + P \quad (9)$$

where  $\rho$ ,  $c$ , and  $k$  are the mass density, specific heat (J/g.K), and thermal conductivity (W/m.K), respectively. The solution of this differential equation may reflect temperature gradients across the coronal region and also have different temperature evolutions for different local regions. Considering ideal isoperibol condition and assuming linear losses between the sample and its environment, the heat power balance can be written as (Holman, 2002; Andreu & Natividad, 2013)


$$C \frac{dT}{dt} = P - L[T(t) - T_0]. \quad (10)$$

Here,  $C = \sum c_i m_i$  is the heat capacity (J/K) and  $L$  is the coefficient accounting for heat losses. Note that the values of  $C$ ,  $P$ , and  $L$  undergo significant changes with temperature. However, for coronal temperature, these parameters are considered as independent of  $T$ . In this case, the solution of the above differential equation is

$$T(t) = T_0 + \Delta T_{max} [1 - e^{-\frac{t}{\tau}}], \quad (11)$$

where  $\Delta T_{max} = P/L$  and  $\tau = C/L$ . When the heat generated becomes equal to the heat lost, the coronal temperature remains constant at the value of  $T_{max} = T_0 + \Delta T_{max}$ .

The author would like to stress that the presented estimations are at first level approximation. The number of plasma particles that actually contribute to the collective statistical interaction energy may be different than what we have



**Figure 1.** The artistic demonstration of the solar atmosphere and corresponding temperature profile based on the above-discussed model with approximation (not to the scale). The chromosphere thickness is negligible compared to the other regions. Also, there is no specific boundary between an outer layer of corona and solar wind. However, it is displayed to map with model output (with arbitrary input parameter and knowledge of the maximum temperature of the corona) with the region of the solar atmosphere. The Sun is the source of all the particles. Thus, the particles present in the inner layer spend less time there as compared to the next subsequent layer of the solar atmosphere and so on. Therefore, it is assumed that the unit volume of space of each layer along the single line of the solar atmosphere represents their time evolution from inner to the outer layer. So the given temperature-time evolution profile could be compared with the temperature height profile presented in the literature. Surprisingly, both the trends are similar in coronal region. One can select the appropriate parameters to overlap the profile. The temperature-height profile shows a small rise in temperature for some range of height just before the temperature spike. This could be caused by the heat transferred from the actual heated region of corona, but it is not possible to observe this in temporal evolution.

considered. We conclude that the statistical energy generated during the collective interaction between spin magnetic moments of charged particles (plasma) with the changing coronal magnetic field configuration could be the underlying physical mechanism for the observed million-degree temperature of the corona. The detailed observational, theoretical, and simulation studies are essential to verify this proposed first level approximation and to develop a more precise theory considering secondary and tertiary effects, which will further advance our present understanding and be applicable to the other branches of physics.

## References

- Andreu I., Natividad E., 2013, International Journal of Hyperthermia, 29, 739  
 Aschwanden M., 2006, Physics of the solar corona: an introduction with problems and solutions. Springer Science & Business Media  
 Athay R. G., White O., 1978, The Astrophysical Journal, 226, 1135  
 Biermann L., 1948, Zeitschrift fur Astrophysik, 25, 161  
 Billings D. E., 1966, A guide to the solar corona. Academic Press  
 Bruno R., Carbone V., 2013, Living Reviews in Solar Physics, 10, 2  
 Chin Y.-C., Wentzel D. G., 1972, Astrophysics and Space Science, 16, 465  
 Cranmer S. R., Winebarger A. R., 2019, Annual Review of Astronomy and Astrophysics, 57, 157  
 Cranmer S. R., Van Ballegoijen A. A., Edgar R. J., 2007, The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series, 171, 520



- Davila J. M., 1987, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 317, 514
- Edlén B., 1937, *Zeitschrift für Physik*, 104, 407
- Edlén B., 1945, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 105, 323
- Golub L., Pasachoff J. M., 2010, *The solar corona*. Cambridge University Press
- Grotian W., 1939, *Naturwissenschaften*, 27, 214
- Hara H., Ichimoto K., 1999, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 513, 969
- Heyvaerts J., Priest E., 1983, *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 117, 220
- Holman J. P., 2002, *Heat Transfer-Si Units-Sie*. Tata McGraw-Hill Education
- Jess D. B., et al., 2016, *Nature Physics*, 12, 179
- Klimchuk J. A., 2006, *Solar Physics*, 234, 41
- Klimchuk J. A., 2015, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 373, 20140256
- Kuperus M., Ionson J. A., Spicer D. S., 1981, *Annual Review of Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 19, 7
- Lighthill M. J., 1954, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 222, 1
- Lin R., Schwartz R., Kane S. R., Pelling R., Hurley K., 1984, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 283, 421
- Low B., 1996, *Solar Physics*, 167, 217
- Lyot B., 1939, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 99, 580
- Matsumoto T., Suzuki T. K., 2012, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 749, 8
- Mein N., Schmieder B., 1981, *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 97, 310
- Morgan H., Taroyan Y., 2017, *Science advances*, 3, e1602056
- Muller R., 1994, in , *Solar surface magnetism*. Springer, pp 55–72
- Narain U., Ulmschneider P., 1990, *Space Science Reviews*, 54, 377
- Okamoto T. J., Sakurai T., 2018, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 852, L16
- Osterbrock D. E., 1961, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 134, 347
- Parker E., 1972, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 174, 499
- Parker E., 1988, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 330, 474
- Parnell C. E., De Moortel I., 2012, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 370, 3217
- Petrovay K., 2001, *Space Science Reviews*, 95, 9
- Priest E., Chitta L., Syntelis P., 2018, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 862, L24
- Reale F., 2014, *Living Reviews in Solar Physics*, 11, 4
- Reardon K., Lepreti F., Carbone V., Vecchio A., 2008, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 683, L207
- Saito K., Tandberg-Hanssen E., 1973, *Solar Physics*, 31, 105
- Sakurai T., 2012, in *Progress in Solar/Stellar Physics with Helio-and Asteroseismology*. p. 247
- Sakurai T., 2017, *Proceedings of the Japan Academy, Series B*, 93, 87
- Sakurai T., Granik A., 1984, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 277, 404
- Sakurai T., Ichimoto K., Raju K., Singh J., 2002, *Solar Physics*, 209, 265
- Schmelz J., Winebarger A., 2015, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 373, 20140257
- Schwarzschild M., 1948, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 107, 1
- Shibata K., Magara T., 2011, *Living Reviews in Solar Physics*, 8, 6
- Shimizu T., 1995, *Publications of the Astronomical Society of Japan*, 47, 251
- Shimizu T., Imada S., Kubo M., 2018, *First Ten Years of Hinode Solar On-Orbit Observatory*. Vol. 449, Springer
- Solanki S. K., 1993, *Space Science Reviews*, 63, 1
- Stenflo J., Keller C., Gandorfer A., 1998, *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 329, 319
- Taylor J. B., 1974, *Physical Review Letters*, 33, 1139
- Unno W., 1966, *Transactions of the International Astronomical Union, Series B*, 12, 555
- Velli M., Pucci F., Rappazzo F., Tenerani A., 2015, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 373, 20140262
- Withbroe G. L., Noyes R. W., 1977, *Annual review of astronomy and astrophysics*, 15, 363