Differential emission measure distributions in X-ray solar flares
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Abstract

X-ray spectrometer RESIK has observed spectra in the four wavelength bands from 3.3 Å to 6.1 Å. This spectral range contains many emission lines of H- and He-like ions for Si, S, Ar and K. These lines are formed in plasma of coronal temperatures \( T > 3 \text{ MK} \). Analysis of their intensities allows studying differential emission measure distributions (DEM) in temperature range roughly between 3 MK and 30 MK. The aim of present study was to check whether any relationship exists between the character of DEM distribution, the event phase and the X-ray flare class. To do this we have calculated and analyzed the DEM distributions for a set of flares belonging to different GOES classes from the range B5.6–X1. The DEM distributions have been calculated using “Withbroe–Sylwester” multiplicative, maximum likelihood iterative algorithm. As the input data we have used absolute fluxes observed by RESIK in several spectral bands (lines + continuum). Respective emission functions have been calculated using the CHIANTI v. 5.2 atomic data package.
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1. Introduction

The determination of differential emission measure distributions (DEM) is groundwork for the detailed analysis of flaring plasma. The DEM = \( \varphi(T) \) characterizes the distribution of matter according to the temperature \( T \) in the volume \( V \) and is defined as:

\[
\varphi(T) = n_e^2 \frac{dV}{dT}
\]

where \( n_e \) is the plasma electron density.

The calculations of the differential emission measure are associated with solving an inverse problem in which the unknown \( \varphi(T) \) is the continuous function while the amount of available equations is restricted. In solving this problem many methods have been developed. They are described in the papers by: Pottasch (1964), Batstone et al. (1970), Dere et al. (1974), Doschek et al. (1990). In this paper, we calculate DEM distributions using the Withbroe-Sylwester algorithm outlined in the next section. The details one can find in the papers by Withbroe (1975) and Sylwester et al. (1980).

We have performed our study based on the X-ray fluxes observed by RESIK instrument. RESIK was Bragg crystal spectrometer aboard CORONAS-F satellite, which measured X-ray spectra from 3.3 Å to 6.1 Å. The description of the instrument, its calibration and the main lines identification one can find in the paper by Sylwester et al. (2005).

In the previous papers, we have focused our attention on answering the questions whether and how the durations of event (Kepa et al., 2005) and/or different ionization equilibrium approximations used to calculate the theoretical emission functions (Kepa et al., 2006) influence the resulting DEM distributions. In the present contribution our aim is to find whether the relation exists between the shape of DEM distributions, GOES class of event and/or the flare phase.

The theoretical emission functions applied in this study we have calculated using the CHIANTI v. 5.2 atomic data package. According to the results of previous paper (Kepa et al., 2006) the calculations of ionization equilibrium have been taken from Mazzotta et al. (1998).
2. The Withbroe–Sylwester algorithm

The Withbroe–Sylwester code represents an iterative maximum likelihood procedure in which the next approximation of the DEM distribution, \( \varphi_{j+1}(T) \), is calculated from the preceding one, \( \varphi_j(T) \), using the following formula:

\[
\varphi_{j+1}(T) = \varphi_j(T) \sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i w_i(T) \equiv \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i w_i(T)}{\sum_{i=1}^{k} w_i(T)}
\]

where \( c_i \) are the correction factors taken as \( c_i = F_{oi}/F_{ci} \) and \( w_i(T) \) are the weight functions defined as:

\[
w_i(T) = f_i(T) \varphi_j(T) \frac{\int_0^\infty f_i(T) \varphi_j(T) dT}{\int_0^\infty [f_i(T) \varphi_j(T)]^2 dT} \times \left[ \frac{F_{oi} - F_{ci}}{\sigma_i} + 1 \right]^a
\]

Here, \( \sigma_i \) is the uncertainty corresponding to the measured flux in line/band \( i \) (i = 0, 1, 2, ..., \( k \)) and \( a \) is the parameter of optimization: \( a \geq 0 \) for \( F_{oi} \geq F_{ci} \) and \( a < 0 \) for \( F_{oi} < F_{ci} \) (see Sylwester et al., 1980).

The \( F_{oi} \) is the flux observed in line/band \( i \) while the predicted flux \( F_{ci} \) is calculated (in the \( j \)th iteration) using the formula:

\[
F_{ci} = \int_0^\infty f_i(T) \varphi_j(T) dT
\]

where \( f_i(T) \) is the emission function in line/band \( i \).

In the calculations we have used \( \varphi_0(T) = \text{const} \) as the zero approximation.

We have chosen 19 bands (wavelength intervals) for the DEM calculations. Their characteristics (wavelength ranges, and the main line contributed) are presented in Table 1. The appropriate emission functions for these spectral bands contain both line and continuum contribution.

3. The analysis

From a large RESIK database we have selected to the analysis eight representative flares of \( \text{GOES} \) class from B5 to X1. In Table 2 we present the main characteristics of these events ordered according to their intensity. They are: the date, \( \text{GOES} \) class, the maximum temperature (as determined from \( \text{GOES} \) data using flux ratio technique and an isothermal approximation), time intervals covering the rise, maximum and decay phases.

In order to study the DEM dependence on the flare phase we have divided each event’s duration into three intervals covering the rise, maximum and decay phase. To do this we have normalized respective \( \text{GOES} \) lightcurves to the common intensity scale (see Fig. 1).

After the normalization it has been easy to define the corresponding time intervals related to the rise, maximum and decay phases. The maximum phase was defined as the period when the measured flux was above the 0.9 of its maximum value. The rise/decay phases correspond to the preceding and following time intervals, respectively.
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In the last three columns of Table 2 corresponding intervals are indicated for analyzed flares. For DEM calculations, the spectra have been summed according to these intervals. In Fig. 2 the spectra of all flares registered during the maximum phases are presented for purpose of visual cross-comparison.
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Fig. 1. The normalized standard \( \text{GOES} \) lightcurves for eight selected flares. The horizontal solid line at 0.9 of maximum intensity defines the flare phases (see the text for details).
For each analyzed flare we have calculated the fluxes in selected “input” set of bands (see Table 1). This has been done separately for each of the three phases of interest (see Table 2). Additionally to avoid the contribution of non-flaring plasma to calculated DEM distributions, the preflare X-ray fluxes have been subtracted. Thus determined X-ray fluxes constitute the base for the differential emission measure calculations separately for the rise, maximum and decay phases of each event. For some flares the full data coverage have not been available because of the gaps in the RESIK data (spacecraft nights and radiation belts passages). The calculations have been performed in the range of temperatures between 2 MK and 30 MK and have been stopped after 3000 steps of iteration ($\chi^2$ between 1 and 1.8 has been approached). The calculated DEM distributions have been plotted, carefully analyzed and compared.

In order to estimate the uncertainty of the results for each case we have performed 200 Monte-Carlo realizations of DEM calculations. The envelope of a system of obtained curves gives us the upper and lower boundary of errors. This was shown as thin lines in Fig. 3 where the calculated DEM together with the error limits are shown for the rise, maximum and decay phase of third flare from Table 2. It is seen that the flaring plasma is concentrated around two temperatures, with the low temperature component ($T < 5$ MK) and the higher temperature component between 5 MK and 15 MK. The estimated uncertainties indicate that obtained two-component distributions can be regarded as reliable.

4. Results and conclusions

In Fig. 4 the DEM distributions obtained for the rise, max and decay phase are presented (dotted, solid and dashed line, respectively) for eight investigated flares. In order not to obscure the results the error bars have not been presented in this figure. The inspection of Fig. 4 and corresponding analysis of the results allow for the following conclusions to be drawn:

- The calculated DEM distributions are generally two-component independent on the flare class and the evolutionary phase. This indicates for the preferential “self-concentration” of plasma into a cooler and hotter temperature regimes. The physics behind this effect is not yet clear, but most probably is related to presence of two preferred characteristic length scales important for conductive coupling of these coronal regions with the denser chromospheric-type plasma.

- The hotter component is observed to be present even for the lowest intensity B class flares, so probably such a plasma is also present in “non-flaring” active regions as well. Verification of this supposition will be a subject of a separate study. The presence of high temperature emission has been observed for active regions by Yohkoh (Watanabe et al., 1995).

- The “average” temperatures of cooler and hotter components are related to the flare class and clearly depend on the phase of the event. During the rise phase, the plasma is generally hotter.

- The amount of hotter plasma (i.e. integrated emission measure of a hotter component) is much smaller in comparison with the cooler one. Their relative amounts vary, depending on the flare phase and on the event class. The amount of hotter plasma is greater for the stronger flares (M, X class) in comparison with the faint ones (B, C class).

- The average temperature of the flare, as obtained based on the flux ratio technique (a standard GOES analysis method) is generally the indicator of physical
characteristics of the hotter component. Therefore total emission measures derived based on GOES fluxes are lower than those integrated from the RESIK–determined DEM distributions.

Our results are in agreement with previous works presented DEM distributions obtained based on X-rays. Schmelz (1993) calculated differential emission measure distribution for two solar flares registered by Flat Crystal Spectrometer aboard Solar Maximum Mission. She obtained two components distributions with lower temperature component between 3 MK and 10 MK and hotter component with temperature above 10 MK. McTiernan et al. (1999) calculated DEM distributions for 80 flares based on data from Bragg Crystal Spectrometer (BCS) and Soft X-ray Telescope aboard Yohkoh. For 10% of
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analyzed events two-component DEM distributions have been found. The results of multithermal analysis performed for stellar corone of late type stars such as Capella, $\sigma^2$ CrB and Procyon confirmed also the dominance of plasma in two narrow temperature intervals (Mewe et al., 1986; Gu et al., 2006).
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