On the proper interpretation of ionospheric conductance estimated through satellite photometry
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[1] As a consequence of the electron continuity equation, ionospheric conductance derived from photometric measurements of the aurora represents a root-mean-square over the field of view and exposure time of the photometer, and not a true average. The magnitude of the discrepancy between these estimates depends on the statistical variance of the electron density within the sampling window and is therefore strongly dependent on both the resolution of the sensor and the activity of the aurora. We use high-resolution optical and incoherent scatter radar measurements to quantify the relationship among the instantaneous (“true”) conductance, the average conductance, and the photometrically derived conductance during an auroral substorm over Sondrestrom, Greenland. For a 36 s exposure time (typical for the ultraviolet imager (UVI) sensor on the Polar satellite), we show that the photometric estimate can be biased from the average value by 40% for Hall and 20% for Pedersen; the mean, in turn, can misrepresent the true conductance by more than 150% for Hall and 100% for Pedersen, owing to undersampling small-scale variability. We develop two schemes for correcting (in the former case) and understanding (in the latter case) these effects using conjunctive ground-based diagnostics.

1. Introduction

[2] Spectral photometry of the aurora has long been used to infer the kinetic energy flux of incident electrons [Rees and Luckey, 1974; Strickland et al., 1989] and the associated increase in ionospheric conductance [i.e., Vickrey et al., 1981; Wallis and Budzinski, 1981; Spiro et al., 1982; Germany et al., 1994]. A linear relationship between luminosity and conductance, optical flux arises from the proportionality between energy deposition rate and photon production rate for several wavelength regimes. In such cases, energy flux derived from a photometric measurement can be accurately interpreted as the mean value over the spatial and temporal resolution of the sensor.

[3] The connection between luminosity and conductance, however, is through a continuity rule that relates volume production rate to plasma density in a nonlinear way. This step introduces a bias into estimated ionospheric parameters whenever the temporal and spatial scales of auroral variability are small compared to the resolution of the sensor—a limitation which affects all satellite-based imaging systems (e.g., those on ISIS, AE, DE, Polar, IMAGE, and TIMED); the polar ultraviolet imager (UVI) sensor, for example, is typically operated with an exposure time of 36 s and an E region spatial resolution of ~40 kilometers [Torr et al., 1995]. The discrete aurora, on the other hand, can form in spatial scales of <1 km and on time scales of <1 s during active periods.

[4] The purpose of this work is to quantify the effects of undersampling on photometrically derived conductance, and to develop a framework for treating these effects using higher-resolution diagnostics. Both the magnitude of the errors and the efficacy of the proposed solutions are evaluated using high-resolution ground-based measurements during an auroral substorm over the Sondrestrom, Greenland, incoherent scatter (IS) radar facility. Our approach involves degrading these measurements to the spatial-temporal resolution of a space-based imaging photometer. We use the Polar UVI sensor as a reference, but the results are relevant to any inference of ionospheric density and conductance by optical means. The proper treatment of sampling effects is relevant to efforts that seek to assimilate ground-based and space-based measurements into a coherent picture of magnetosphere-ionosphere coupling [e.g., Kamide et al., 1981; Richmond and Kamide, 1988].

2. Estimating Conductance From Luminosity

[5] The estimation of ionospheric conductance from photometric measurements rests on the premise that the production rate of electron-ion pairs $q$ as a function of field-aligned altitude $z$ can be determined from a discrete set of brightness measurements $e = \{e_1, e_2, \ldots \}$. In the case of Polar UVI, two measurements are used—namely, the Lyman-Birge-Hopfield-long (LBHL) and -short (LBHS) bands of
N₂ [Germany et al., 1994; Torr et al., 1995; Doe et al., 1997]. Referring to these measurements as \( e_L \) and \( e_S \), respectively, this inverse problem can be stated canonically:

\[
q(z) = f(e_L, e_S).
\]  

The problem is ill-posed because it seeks a continuous function from discrete measurements. In practice, spectral brightness is first used to parameterize the incident electron energy spectrum, from which \( q \) is calculated using a numerical model of electron transport and energy deposition [Rees, 1963; Lummerzheim and Lilensten, 1994; Strickland et al., 1989].

[6] For the LBHL emission, photon production rate is proportional to ion production rate such that

\[
e_L = K \int_0^\infty q(z) \, dz,
\]  

where \( K \) is a calibration constant. By comparison with equation (1), we see that evaluating \( f \) is equivalent to inverting equation (2). In this view, the additional measurement \( e_S \) serves to constrain the nonunique inverse problem.

[7] To relate \( q \) to conductivity, a continuity rule is required. In the auroral E region, electron density is governed by particle production and chemical loss, with transport and diffusion negligible, such that

\[
\frac{\partial N}{\partial t} = q - \alpha N^2,
\]  

where \( N \) is electron density, and \( \alpha \) is an effective recombination coefficient acting on an equal number of ions and electrons. A functional form for \( \alpha \) has been proposed by Vickrey et al. [1982] as a reasonable fit to published results,

\[
\alpha = 2.5 \times 10^{-6} \exp \left(-z/51.2 \right) \left[ \text{cm}^3/\text{s}, \right]
\]  

with \( z \) in kilometers.

[8] In the analysis of satellite imagery, steady state is assumed such that continuity is expressed as

\[
q = \alpha N^2.
\]  

This approximation is rarely justified on physical grounds but, rather, the long sampling period required to obtain \( q \) precludes detection of non-steady state conditions. We will demonstrate that violations of the steady state assumption are an important consideration for properly interpreting derived ionospheric parameters during auroral substorms.

[9] Next, the Hall and Pedersen conductivities can be expressed, respectively, as

\[
\sigma_H = N e^2 (k_{He} - k_{Hi})
\]

\[
\sigma_P = N e^2 (k_{Pe} + k_{Pi})
\]

where \( k_{He} \) and \( k_{Hi} \) are the altitude-dependent Hall mobilities per unit charge for electrons and ions, respectively, and \( k_{Pe} \) and \( k_{Pi} \) are the Pedersen mobilities for electrons and ions, respectively, given by

\[
k_{He,j} = \frac{1}{Be} \frac{\omega_{ej}^2}{\omega^2 + \omega_{ej}^2}
\]

\[
k_{Pi,j} = \frac{1}{Be} \frac{\nu_{ej}}{\nu^2 + \omega_{ej}^2}
\]

[Rishbeth and Garriott, 1969] where \( \omega \) is the gyrofrequency, \( \nu \) is the collision frequency, and \( e \) is the charge of an electron. Although equations (8) and (9) differ from the conventional expressions for mobility, defined as a ratio of velocity to electric field, they have the advantage of being valid for both electrodynamic and mechanical forces.

[10] Figure 1 gives a plot of the right-hand terms of equations (8) and (9) versus altitude for typical high-latitude wintertime conditions. These curves can be interpreted
weighting factors that relate electron density to conductivity. Between 85 and 105 km, \((k_{He} - k_{He})\) is nearly constant; electron density is proportional to Hall conductance in this range. By comparison, the sensitivity of Pedersen conductance to electron density is strongly peaked at 120 km.

Integrating equations (6) and (7) over \(z\) gives the conductances,

\[
\sigma_H = \int_0^\infty e^2(k_{He} - k_{He}) N \, dz, \tag{10}
\]

\[
\sigma_P = \int_0^\infty e^2(k_{Pe} + k_{Pe}) N \, dz. \tag{11}
\]

It is insightful to compare this result with the expression for LBHL luminosity \(\epsilon_L\) derived by combining equations (2) and (5):

\[
\epsilon_L = \int_0^\infty K \alpha N^2 \, dz. \tag{12}
\]

Equations (10)–(12) show clearly that conductance is not proportional to luminosity, nor is it proportional to \(\int N \, dz\). To derive conductance photometrically, one must derive the full altitude distribution of \(N\).

Equations (1) through (11) constitute a closed set of relations by which conductivity is estimated from auroral production rate over \(T\); that is, \(\sigma_H\) and \(\sigma_P\) can be exactly derived from \(\epsilon\). We focus, instead, on the resolution limitations of the optical measurement and how these effects propagate through the calculation.

3. Connection With Sensor Resolution

A measurement of auroral luminosity represents an average over the spatial and temporal resolution of the sensor. Consider, first, the time dimension. By equation (2), a photometric measurement at time \(t\) with exposure period \(T\) is equivalent to a measurement of the average production rate over \(T\), that is,

\[
\langle q(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{T} \int_{-T/2}^{T/2} q(t - \tau) \, d\tau, \tag{13}
\]

where the brackets indicate an average. Combining equation (13) with equation (5) and solving for \(N\) gives

\[
\langle N(t) \rangle = \left[ \frac{1}{T} \int_{-T/2}^{T/2} N^2(t - \tau) \, d\tau \right]^{1/2}, \tag{14}
\]

where \(\langle N \rangle = \sqrt{\langle N^2 \rangle}\) is the photometrically derived electron density estimate used to derive conductance. Equation (14) is the root-mean-square (RMS) value over interval \(T\). The true average is simply

\[
\langle N(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{T} \int_{-T/2}^{T/2} N(t - \tau) \, d\tau. \tag{15}
\]

If we are interested in the average conductance over \(T\), equation (15) should be used, but in satellite photometry, equation (14) is implicitly used. The derived density \(\langle N \rangle\) will always be greater than or equal to the true average \(\langle N \rangle\). The two are equal only if \(N\) is constant over \(T\); otherwise, there will be a systematic overestimation of photometrically derived density and conductance.

An analogous bias is introduced by spatial variability. Without loss of generality, we may rewrite equation (13) as

\[
\langle q(r, t) \rangle = \frac{1}{AT} \int_{-A/2}^{A/2} \int_{-T/2}^{T/2} q(r - \gamma, t - \tau) \, d\gamma \, d\tau, \tag{16}
\]

where \(r\) is the spatial coordinate and the spatial integration is over \(S\), the E region surface subtended by the pixel, with \(A\) the pixel’s projected area. Although spatial and temporal variability in the auroral source may have very distinct consequences for magnetosphere–ionosphere coupling, the effects propagate identically in the mathematical derivation of conductance.

We now wish to quantify the significance of this bias for a given pixel size and exposure time. This requires that we sample \(N\) at sufficiently high resolution so as to approximate an instantaneous measurement. From these measurements, we may estimate \(\langle N \rangle\) and \(\langle N \rangle\) in equations (14) and (15) by discrete integration over a typical Polar UVI sampling period. Substituting these results into equations (10) and (11) will allow us to compare the “true” conductance \(\Sigma\) with the average conductance \(\langle \Sigma \rangle\), and the simulated photometrically derived conductance \(\langle \Sigma \rangle\).

4. Experiment Description

An experiment was conducted in February–March, 2001, with the Sondrestrom facility instrumentation to investigate E region variability during an auroral substorm at the highest possible time and spatial resolution. The IS radar operated with a 5 baud Barker coded pulse scheme, providing samples of electron density from 80 to 160 km in the magnetic zenith at 1.5 km altitude resolution and 1.2 s time resolution. This sampling period is small compared to the 36 s exposure time of the Polar UVI sensor and is of the same order as the typical e-folding time of the E region plasma density to an auroral input (typically a few seconds) [Brekke, 1997].

For high-resolution measurements of \(\epsilon\), a narrow-field intensified CCD camera provided images over a 12° × 15° field of view in the magnetic zenith at 40 ms time resolution and 300 m spatial resolution. This instrument used an edge filter to pass only wavelengths longer than 640 nm, thereby rejecting the forbidden transitions of atomic oxygen at 630.0 and 557.7 nm. This instrument allowed us to measure variability in the auroral source on time scales limited only by the detector sensitivity, not by radiative lifetimes of the emitting species. In this wavelength regime, the discrete aurora is dominated by the First Positive band system of \(N_2\) whose intensity is approximately proportional to the integrated ion production rate [Semeter et al., 2001] – similar to LBHL. The measured luminosity in the magnetic zenith can, thus, be considered a high-resolution proxy for \(\epsilon_L\).

5. Results

Figure 2a gives a plot of raw electron density in the magnetic zenith recorded during a 10 min period of auroral...
activity on February 17, 2001. For analysis purposes, the $E$ region enhancements have been organized into five separate events identified by the color-coded bars along the top.

This period shows a considerable range of auroral variability, with density enhancements ranging from $1 \times 10^{11}$ to $2 \times 10^{12}$ m$^{-3}$ over altitudes ranging from 80 to 150 km. To appreciate the degree of spatial and temporal variability in the corresponding optical aurora, Figure 3 shows samples from the video sequence for Event 2 at 2 s intervals. Universal time is shown in the top of each image,

**Figure 2.** Electron densities and conductances derived from Sondrestrom incoherent scatter radar measurements on February 17, 2001, 02:25 to 02:35 UT: a. Electron density (1.5 km x 1.2 s samples). b. Comparison of height-integrated production of electron-ion pairs calculated via IS radar and simulated from ground-based luminosity. c. Comparison of Hall conductance calculated from electron densities in panel at full resolution (red), smoothed over a 36 s sliding window (green), and from the 36 s RMS value (simulating the photometric estimate) (blue). d. Same as c, but for Pederson conductance. e. Relative error between true and average conductance. f. Relative error between average and photometrically derived conductance.
and the projected 1 km spot size of the IS radar beam is given by the circle. Note that this field of view (21 × 26 km) is similar in size to a pixel on the Polar UVI imager at perigee, and the sequence shown is similar in length to a typical UVI exposure time. Figure 3, thus, reveals the detail that would be filtered out in satellite-based imagery of this event.

[26] Figure 2b compares the optical luminosity in the magnetic zenith extracted from the video sequence (blue curve) with height-integrated electron production rate calculated for the radar profiles under the steady state model of equation (12) (red curve). (Optical data were only available before 0230 UT.) The calibration constant $K$ was chosen to best match the optical measurements to the radar-derived production rates during the 02:29 to 02:30 UT interval – a interval of slowly varying luminosity where $\partial N/\partial t$ was small compared to the rate of plasma recombination. The two estimates of production rate agree quite well under this simple model, but some disagreement is evident. Some of the discrepancy is caused by inaccuracies in the Vickrey et al. [1982] parameterization of $\alpha$. Another effect appears during intervals of high variability, where the radar estimate of production rate lags the luminosity (e.g., at 0225:30 UT and 0228 UT). This indicates a violation of the steady state approximation applied in the analysis, an important consideration that we will return to later.

[21] We now wish to quantify the relationship among $\Sigma$, $\langle \Sigma \rangle$ and $\langle N \rangle$. We first calculate $\langle N \rangle$ and $\langle \Sigma \rangle$ via discrete integration of equations (14) and (15). Identifying electron density samples as $N_i$, with the time index and $j$ the altitude index, we form the following discrete estimates:

$$\langle N \rangle_{ij} = \frac{1}{M+1} \sum_{k=-M/2}^{M/2} N^2_{i+k,j}$$

$$\langle \Sigma \rangle_{ij} = \frac{1}{M+1} \sum_{k=-M/2}^{M/2} N_{i+k,j}$$

(17) (18)

where $M = T/\Delta t$ with $t = 1.2$ s and $T = 36$ s. We then substitute $N$, $\langle N \rangle$, and $\langle \Sigma \rangle$ into equations (10) and (11) and perform a discrete integration in altitude to estimate $\langle \Sigma \rangle$ and $\langle N \rangle$. The results are plotted in Figures 2c and 2d for $\Sigma_H$ and $\Sigma_P$, respectively.

[22] Although both $\langle \Sigma \rangle$ and $\langle \Sigma \rangle$ misrepresent the true conductivity $\Sigma$, the significance of each effect is unique. The difference between the $\Sigma$ and $\langle \Sigma \rangle$ arises from filtering of small-scale variability within the 36 s sampling window. The relative error, $(\langle \Sigma \rangle - \Sigma)/\Sigma$, is plotted in Figure 2e for $\Sigma_H$ (red) and $\Sigma_P$ (blue). Although this error can exceed 150% for Hall and 100% for Pedersen (factors of 2.5 and 2, respectively), the significance of the discrepancy depends on the physics being addressed. For example, the spatial-temporal scale of the excursion near 0228:10 UT may not be relevant to the closure of large-scale magnetospheric currents, but may be highly relevant to electrodynamic models of discrete arc formation.

[23] The difference between $\langle \Sigma \rangle$ and $\langle \Sigma \rangle$, on the other hand, represents the systematic bias resulting from the discrepancy between $\langle N \rangle$ and $\langle N \rangle$. Figure 2f gives the relative error introduced by this effect for $\Sigma_H$ (red) and $\Sigma_P$ (blue). As before, the magnitude of the error depends on where the sensor integration period lies with respect to the aural activity. The average error is ~15% for Hall and ~10% for Pedersen, but can reach ~40% for Hall and ~20% for Pedersen during active periods (near 02:28 UT).

6. Discussion

[24] The satellite-based photometric measurements from which global maps of ionospheric conductance are derived represent averages over many small-scale filamentary structures. The physical information lost through temporal averaging is quantified in Figure 2e. This filtering effect has implications for the proper use of satellite-based photometry in studying MI coupling, but will not be the focus of the discussion to follow. We focus, instead, on the error introduced by the interplay between the sensor resolution and the continuity equation, quantified in Figure 2f, which is somewhat less intuitive, and can be addressed quantitatively using ground-based measurements.

6.1. Relation Between Bias and Statistical Variance

[25] Provided $N$ is uniformly distributed within the sampling interval, the variance of $N$ can be expressed in terms of equations (17) and (18):

$$\text{Var}(N) = \langle N \rangle^2 - \langle N \rangle^2.$$  

(19)

This relationship holds whether variance is calculated over the spatial or temporal dimensions. Assuming the mobilities in equations (6) and (7) are stationary, $N$ can be replaced with $\sigma_H$ or $\sigma_P$ in equation (19). Rearranging terms gives an expression for the true average conductivity $\langle \sigma \rangle$ in terms of the photometrically derived estimate $\langle \sigma \rangle$ and the variance of $N$:

$$\langle \sigma_H \rangle = \sqrt{\langle \sigma_H \rangle^2 - \langle k_{He} - k_{He} \rangle^2 \text{Var}(N)}.$$  

$$\langle \sigma_P \rangle = \sqrt{\langle \sigma_P \rangle^2 - \langle k_{Pe} + k_{Pe} \rangle^2 \text{Var}(N)}.$$  

(20)

[26] Within our model assumptions, equation (20) are exact, but they do not offer a practical means of correcting $\langle \sigma \rangle$ since the instantaneous distribution of $N$ over the sampling window cannot be measured. Since we are ultimately interested in estimating height-integrated conductivity $\Sigma$, a more useful tool is a means of correcting $\langle \Sigma \rangle$ from a proxy for $\text{Var}(N)$ derived, preferably, from a higher-resolution ground-based measurement. We will consider two possible measurements: maximum $E$ region electron density (as measured by IS radar) and ground-based luminosity (as measured by photometer or intensified camera).

6.2. Correction Using Maximum Electron Density

[27] The maximum $E$ region density, and the altitude at which it occurs, can be routinely monitored with an IS radar at a reasonably high sample rate (8 Hz for our Barker-coded data, ~2 Hz for a more typical alternating code). The utility of this measurement for correcting conductance estimates
Figure 3. Sample images recorded by the narrow-field, long wavelength (>645-nm), camera during Event 2 of Figure 2. The field of view is 21 x 26 km at 100 km altitude. The spot size of the IS radar beam is indicated by the circle, and universal time is shown at the top.
can be justified by considering a zero-order approximation of the integrals in equations (10) and (11),

\[ \Sigma_H = e^2 (k_{He0} - k_{Hi0})N_0 \Delta z \]
\[ \Sigma_P = e^2 (k_{Pe0} + k_{Pi0})N_0 \Delta z, \]  

(21)

where \( N_0 \) is the maximum density, \( \Delta z \) is the characteristic layer thickness, and the mobilities are evaluated at the altitude of the density maximum. Substitution into equation (19) leads to a relationship between the true average and the UV-estimated average, analogous to equation (20),

\[ \langle \Sigma_H \rangle = \sqrt{\langle \Sigma_H^2 \rangle - C_H} \]
\[ \langle \Sigma_P \rangle = \sqrt{\langle \Sigma_P^2 \rangle - C_P}, \]  

(22)

with variance-based correction terms

\[ C_H = [e^2 (k_{He0} - k_{Hi0}) \Delta z]^2 \text{Var}(N_0) \]
\[ C_P = [e^2 (k_{Pe0} + k_{Pi0}) \Delta z]^2 \text{Var}(N_0). \]  

(23)

Taking the maximum values from Figure 1 of \( (k_{Pe} + k_{Pi}) = 6 \times 10^{23} \text{ s/kg} \) and \( (k_{He} - k_{Hi}) = 1.3 \times 10^{23} \text{ s/kg} \), and assuming \( \Delta z = 30 \text{ km} \), yields the following approximate expressions.

\[ C_H \approx 100 \text{ Var}(N_0/10^{11}), \]
\[ C_P \approx 21 \text{ Var}(N_0/10^{11}). \]  

(24)

where \( N_0 \) is in units of m\(^{-3}\). 

[28] In general, however, it is clear that \( C_H \) and \( C_P \) are not linear functions of \( \text{Var}(N_0) \), but depend also on the assumed layer altitude through \( k_e, k_i, \) and \( \alpha \). In other words, the magnitude of \( C_H \) and \( C_P \) depend not only on the variability of the auroral source, but also on the penetration depth (and, hence, characteristic energy) of the incident electrons.

[29] Rather than further treat these issues theoretically, we evaluated the efficacy of a correction scheme based on \( \text{Var}(N_0) \) directly from the experimental data of Figure 2 as follows. From the calculated values of \( \langle \Sigma \rangle \) and \( \langle \Sigma_H \rangle \) in Figures 2c and 2d we calculated \( C_H \) and \( C_P \) directly from equation (22). We then determined \( N_0 \) for each profile and calculated its variance over a 36 s sliding window. These results are shown in Figures 4 and 5; the color coding corresponds to the five color-coded events identified in Figure 2a.

[30] In order for our statistical analysis to be self consistent, we must have no correction when the aurora is stationary, i.e., \( C_H = C_P = 0 \) when \( \text{Var}(N_0) = 0 \). Statistical uncertainties will cause this condition to be violated. In Figures 4 and 5 we have subtracted a bias from \( \text{Var}(N_0) \) to force this self-consistency requirement. This step is justified if we assume the uncertainty in \( N \) is caused by additive uncorrelated noise [e.g., Papoulis, 1965] – a reasonable model for our IS radar measurements.

[31] As anticipated, the proportionality between \( C \) and \( \text{Var}(N_0) \) in Figures 4 and 5 depends on the nature of the event in question. Event 1, for example, is concentrated above 110 km where Hall conductance is minimal. The magnitude of \( C_H \) is small regardless of \( \text{Var}(N_0) \), indicating that \( \langle \Sigma_H \rangle \) represents an accurate estimate of \( \langle \Sigma \rangle \) for this event. By comparison, \( C_P \) for Event 1 shows a high sensitivity to \( \text{Var}(N_0) \). This is a manifestation of the steep gradient in \( (k_{Pe} + k_{Pi}) \) near 120 km in Figure 1.

[32] The other, higher-energy events show a fairly linear relationship in both \( C_H \) and \( C_P \) versus \( \text{Var}(N_0) \). The stron-
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**Figure 4.** Variance of peak electron density, \( N_0 \), versus the correction factor for Hall conductance, \( C_H \) (from equation (22)), for each of the five color-coded events specified in Figure 2.
gest and most variable of these, Event 2, shows a somewhat steeper slope in $C_H$ versus $\text{Var}(N_0)$ than events 3 or 5. The slope of $C_P$ versus $\text{Var}(N_0)$ is somewhat less event dependent by comparison.

The dashed lines in Figures 4 and 5 give a first-order linear least squares fit to the entire ensemble of data points and have the following functional forms:

$$C_H = 131 \text{ Var}(N_0/10^{11})$$

$$C_P = 24 \text{ Var}(N_0/10^{11})$$

with $N_0$ in units of m$^{-3}$. The coefficients are consistent with the approximations of equation (24). Equation (25) can be used as a first order correction on $g_H$ and $g_P$ in terms of $g_H$ and $g_P$, where $g_H$ now represents any optical measurement of the aurora where equation (2) holds. Applying a zero-order approximation to the integral equation (12):

$$\epsilon_L = K\alpha_0 N_0^2 \Delta z,$$

where the recombination coefficient $\alpha_0$ is evaluated at the altitude of maximum density. Solving for $N_0$ and substituting into equation (23) gives expressions for $C_H$ and $C_P$ in terms of $\epsilon_L$:

$$C_H = \left[ e^2 (k_{He} - k_{He0}) \right]^2 \frac{\Delta z}{K\alpha_0} \text{ Var}(\sqrt{\epsilon_L})$$

$$C_P = \left[ e^2 (k_P + k_{P0}) \right]^2 \frac{\Delta z}{K\alpha_0} \text{ Var}(\sqrt{\epsilon_L})$$

The appropriate variance is, thus, over the square root of the luminosity – another consequence of the continuity equation.

To quantify how this measurement can be used to correct $\langle \Sigma_H \rangle$ and $\langle \Sigma_P \rangle$, we derived an expression for $C_H$ and $C_P$ in terms of $g_H$, where $g_H$ now represents any optical measurement of the aurora where equation (2) holds. Applying a zero-order approximation to the integral equation (12):

$$\epsilon_L = K\alpha_0 N_0^2 \Delta z,$$

Figure 5. Same as Figure 4, but for the Pedersen correction term, $C_P$. 

6.3. Correction Using Auroral Luminosity

A more convenient diagnostic for addressing uncertainties in space-based estimates would come from a ground-based auroral camera. The intensified camera used in this experiment has an $E$ region field of view of 21 × 26 km, consistent with a typical $E$ region projection for a single Polar UVI pixel. This camera, along with its edge filter, can specify the subpixel variability in $\epsilon_L$ at very high time and spatial resolution.
luminosity with height-integrated production rate under a steady state assumption. Although there is good agreement when production is changing slowly (after 02:29 UT), the E region response lags the optical curve during periods of high variability.

[38] Thus, during active periods luminosity becomes a poor proxy for conductivity, regardless of the sampling resolution. This is an important consideration when interpreting ephemeral auroral luminosity; for the purposes of this study, this ionospheric filter impacts the manner in which ground-based photometry would be used in correcting our satellite-based conductance estimate. In particular, $C_H$ and $C_P$ cannot be parameterized by linear functions of $\sqrt{\epsilon_L}$. The solid lines in Figures 6 and 7 give a least squares fit with the following functional forms:

\[
\begin{align*}
C_H &= 1930 \left( 1 - \exp\left(-0.20 \, \text{Var}(\sqrt{\epsilon_L})\right) \right) \\
C_P &= 300 \left( 1 - \exp\left(-0.21 \, \text{Var}(\sqrt{\epsilon_L})\right) \right). 
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 6. Variance of $\sqrt{\epsilon_L}$ versus correction factor $C_H$ in equation (22) for the first two events specified in Figure 2.

Figure 7. Same as Figure 6, but for $C_P$. 
Unlike equation (25), the coefficients of equation (28) are only relevant to this particular optical sensor since the data have not been calibrated to energy flux.

7. Summary and Concluding Remarks

We have described a fundamental systematic error introduced whenever photometric measurements of the aurora are used with a theoretical calculation of ion production to estimate conductivity. This has been the approach of numerous studies [Vickrey et al., 1981; Wallis and Budzinski, 1981; Spiro et al., 1982; Germany et al., 1994], which are generally based on the energy deposition calculations of Rees [1963]. The magnitude of the error depends on the variance of the aurorally produced electron density as described by equation (20). The effect is the same whether the variance is over space or time. We have also quantified the information lost as a result of undersampling auroral variability – a problem inherent to all space-based imaging systems.

Uncertainties in photometrically derived ionospheric density and conductance are typically discussed within the context of three types of errors: (1) photometric calibration (2) geographic registration, and (3) model assumptions imposed in the analysis. The sampling effects discussed herein are of a rather different nature and, to our knowledge, have not yet been treated formally.

We have proposed two approaches to addressing these errors using ancillary diagnostic measurements. Of particular utility is the correction using ground-based optics expressed by equations (22), (27), and (28), and Figures 6 and 7, as it allows both the spatial and temporal variance to be quantified. Such a correction can only be applied to a very limited number of pixels in a satellite image sequence. But the results would be, nonetheless, valuable in understanding the impact of small-scale structuring on global estimates of conductance.

These issues are of particular relevance because of the proliferation of auroral imaging systems on satellites, and the application of these measurements to magnetosphere–ionosphere coupling. A reliable estimate of the global distribution of ionospheric conductance is crucial for data assimilation techniques such as AMIE (Assimilated Mapping of Ionospheric Electrodynamics) [Richmond and Kamide, 1988]. Space-based imaging spectrometers can contribute greatly to this problem, but it is crucial that measurement effects and physical assumptions be properly understood before the results are used in a scientific context.
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