

The 10 October 2024 geomagnetic storm may have caused the premature reentry of a Starlink satellite

Denny M. Oliveira^{1,2,*}, Eftyhia Zesta², Dibyendu Nandy^{3,4}

¹Goddard Planetary Heliophysics Institute, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, United States ²Geospace Physics Laboratory, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD, United States ³Department of Physical Sciences, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research Kolkata, Mohanpur, West Bengal, India ⁴Center of Excellence in Space Sciences India, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research Kolkata, Mohanpur, West Bengal, India

Correspondence*:
Denny M. Oliveira
denny@umbc.edu

ABSTRACT

In this short communication, we qualitatively analyze possible effects of the 10 October 2024 geomagnetic storm on accelerating the reentry of a Starlink satellite from low-Earth orbit (LEO). The storm took place near the maximum of solar cycle (SC) 25, which has shown to be more intense than SC24. Based on preliminary geomagnetic indices, the 10 October 2024, along with the 10 May 2024, were the most intense events since the well-known Halloween storms of October/November 2003. By looking at a preliminary version of the Dst index and two-line element (TLE) altitude data of the Starlink-1089 (SL1089) satellite, we observe a possible connection between storm main phase onset and a sharp decay of SL1089. The satellite was scheduled to reenter on 22 October, but it reentered on 12 October, 10 days before schedule. The sharp altitude decay of SL1089 revealed by TLE data coincides with the storm main phase onset. Therefore, we call for future research to establish the eventual causal relationship between storm occurrence and satellite orbital decay. As predicted by previous works, SC25 is already producing extreme geomagnetic storms with unprecedented satellite orbital drag effects and consequences for current megaconstellations in LEO.

Geomagnetic storms, solar flares, thermospheric mass density, satellite orbital drag, satellite reentry

1 INTRODUCTION

Intense solar wind perturbations, such as coronal mass ejections (CMEs), can greatly disturb the Earth's magnetic field due to the occurrence of geomagnetic storms (Akasofu, 1966; Gonzalez et al., 1994). Geomagnetic storms are global phenomena characterized by intense magnetospheric energy input into the ionosphere-thermosphere (IT) system. This magnetospheric energy primarily enters the IT system leading the thermosphere to heat and upwell globally due to the propagation of large-scale gravity waves and atmospheric wind surges (Bruinsma and Forbes, 2007; Prölss, 2011; Emmert, 2015). While flying in low-Earth orbit (LEO, below 1000 km altitude), due to increased levels of atmospheric density, satellites then experience enhanced levels of drag forces which in turn enhance orbital drag effects. Such effects

are quantified by many parameters, including satellite geometry, drag coefficient, area-to-mass ratio, and thermospheric neutral mass density, which is derived from drag acceleration measurements (Sutton et al., 2005; Chen et al., 2012; Mehta et al., 2023). Thermosphere heating and subsequent orbital drag effects usually occur during geomagnetic storms of different levels, but they are much more intense during extreme events (Krauss et al., 2015; Oliveira and Zesta, 2019; Zesta and Oliveira, 2019).

SpaceX is a private company that has recently launched thousands of satellites into LEO. That satellite megaconstellation is named Starlink, with the primary goal to provide internet service worldwide (Ren et al., 2022). One of the most recent examples of storm-time satellite orbital drag effects experienced in LEO is provided by Starlink satellites. According to Hapgood et al. (2022), 49 Starlink satellites were deployed on 3 February 2022 while a weak geomagnetic storm, classified as a G1 event, was ranging on. As a result, 38 satellites did not make it to their intended altitude due to storm effects. At least by early February 2022, SpaceX launched their satellites to altitudes near 210 km where electric thrusters were turned on to uplift the satellite to operational altitudes around 500 km (Hapgood et al., 2022). However, the satellites used to perform a few orbits before being lifted up, but the environment was quite perturbed due to the minor geomagnetic storm occurrence (Dang et al., 2022; Fang et al., 2022; Berger et al., 2023).

If a weak geomagnetic storm can bring down satellites from LEO, what can an extreme event do? In this short communication, we briefly discuss possible effects of the extreme geomagnetic storm of 10 October 2024 on forcing the premature reentry of a Starlink satellite. Although our observations were performed with preliminary versions of and limited data sets, it is very likely that the storm cut short the reentry process of the satellite. However, solid causal relationships can only be achieved with further investigations using multi-data sets and conduction of numerical/empirical simulations. As predicted before, solar activity is increasing in the current solar cycle and they are already impacting satellite orbits in LEO, as recently shown by Starlink satellites.

2 DATA AND OBSERVATIONS

Figure 1, available at <https://svs.gsfc.nasa.gov/14703/>, shows a Solar Dynamic Observatory (SDO) image of a solar flare whose peak occurred at 0156 UT of 9 October 2024. The flare, originated from active region (AR) 3848, is indicated by the intense flash in the image at the center slightly above the Sun's equator. The figure shows a blend of light with wavelengths of 171, 304, and 131 Å, which indicate extreme ultraviolet light. The solar flare is classified as an X1.8 flare, which belongs to the extreme edge of solar flare classifications (Bai and Sturrock, 1989; Schrijver and Siscoe, 2010; Saini et al., 2024).

A CME (coronal mass ejection) associated with the X1.8 solar flare was observed by Solar and Heliospheric Observatory (SOHO) to be ejected from AR3848 on 9 October 2024 at 0212 UT (<https://kauai.ccmc.gsfc.nasa.gov/CMEscoreboard/prediction/detail/3670>). This particular CME impacted Earth on 10 October 2024 at around 1500 UT. Thus, the average speed of the CME on its way to 1 AU was ~ 1200 km/s. Some of the space weather consequences of that CME are described below.

Figure 2a shows the north-south component of the interplanetary magnetic field (IMF) vector observed by ACE (Advanced Composition Explorer) satellite (Smith et al., 1998). The 5-minute averaged IMF B_z shows a positive jump from nearly null values to more than 20 nT on 10 October 2024 at around 1500 UT. Later, IMF B_z dips to values below -40 nT. The first (positive) B_z enhancement is due to the CME shock arrival, whereas the second (negative) enhancement is presumably due to the arrival of a magnetic cloud or magnetic material following the shock at the CME leading edge (Illing and Hundhausen, 1985; Szabo et al., 2001; Zurbuchen and Richardson, 2006; Kilpua et al., 2019). Therefore, IMF observations by ACE




Figure 1. Solar Dynamics Observatory (SDO) observation of an X1.8 solar flare (bright region a few degrees above the Sun's equator) associated with Active Region 3848 on 9 October 2024 at 0212 UT. That active region also ejected a CME that struck the magnetosphere on 10 October 2024 nearly at 1500 UT, inducing one of the two most extreme geomagnetic storms of solar cycle 25.

indicate that the 10 October CME was an extremely intense solar wind driver (Klein and Burlaga, 1982; Gonzalez and Tsurutani, 1987; Wang et al., 2003).

Figure 2b shows quick-look (real-time) Dst data from 28 August 2024 to 15 October 2024. The hourly Dst data has been extensively used since its creation in 1957 during the International Geophysical Year (IGY) (Sugiura, 1964). The real-time (quick-look) Dst data is intended to be used for forecasting, diagnostic, and monitoring since its values are derived from eventually inaccurate raw data. According to World Data Center for Geomagnetism, Kyoto et al. (2015), the real-time Dst data may contain noises and inaccurate baseline shifts that will be scrutinized later in the future before the release of the definitive Dst version (https://wdc.kugi.kyoto-u.ac.jp/dst_realtime/index.html). However, most likely the October 2024 storm will hold its status of an intense geomagnetic storm.

It is clear from the figure that a classic storm sudden commencement (SSC) signature is shown by the quick-look Dst data. That event occurred at approximately 1500 UT of 10 October 2024. The SSC amplitude is 58 nT, and the minimum real-time Dst value is -341 nT, which occurred nearly 11 hours after SSC onset. This is compared to the other extreme storm of SC25: the event of May 2024. The SSC of that event occurred on 10 May at ~ 1700 UT and had amplitude of 44 nT. The storm main phase developed in approximately 10 hours, with minimum quick-look Dst = -412 nT (Hayakawa et al., 2024). The most




Figure 2. Interplanetary magnetic field, geomagnetic activity, and Starlink-1089 ephemeris data for the time interval of 28 August 2024 to 15 October 2024. The red dashed vertical line indicates the time of the storm main phase onset at ~ 1500 UT of 10 October 2024.

equatorward naked eye observations of the aurora reported by citizen scientists occurred in Chirimoyos (Mexico, $N23^{\circ}26'$, $W105^{\circ}48'$, 31.0° MLAT) in the northern hemisphere, and in the southern hemisphere, in Bromfield Swamp (Australia, $S17^{\circ}22'$, $E145^{\circ}33'$, -24.5° MLAT) (Hayakawa et al., 2024). According to aurorassaurus.org, preliminary results show that the most equatorward observation of the aurora took place in the northern hemisphere near Ochopee, Florida ($N25^{\circ}54'$, $W81^{\circ}19'$, 35.36° MLAT), and in the southern hemisphere, near Fishers Hill, Australia ($S32^{\circ}29'$, $E151^{\circ}32'$, -41.74° MLAT). Aurora observations at such low latitudes are quite common during extreme events (Boteler, 2019; Hayakawa et al., 2019; Bhaskar et al., 2020). More detailed and conclusive analyses of the most equatorial observations of the aurora during October 2024 using worldwide observations as performed by Hayakawa et al. (2024) are under way.

Perhaps the most striking result of this paper is shown in Figure 2(c). The panel shows two-line element (TLE) altitude data of a specific satellite named Starlink-1089/2020-001BF, hereafter SL1089. SL1089 was launched into orbit on 11 October 2020 with orbital inclination of 53.04° . Right after IMF B_z assumes highly negative values and the storm main phase onset, SL1089 underwent a drastic and severe altitude decay. Although there were a couple of moderate storms in September 2024, drag effects caused by those events are not clearly seen in the figure. In addition, Figure 2(d) shows that the satellite's velocity starts

to increase with orbital decay because its gravitational potential energy becomes kinetic energy (Pröls, 2011). Possible reasons and implications of this sudden orbital decay will be discussed below.

3 DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, AND SUGGESTIONS

Space Era is defined to have begun with the launching of Sputnik, the first satellite sent to space (Launius, 2004). Sputnik was launched in 1957, the solar maximum year of SC19 (Clette et al., 2023). Ephemeris data provided by one of the first Sputnik satellites was used by Jacchia (1959) to arguably observe storm-time drag effects in LEO for the first time in history. Curiously, the highest yearly sunspot number observation also occurred in SC19 during 1957 (Clette et al., 2023). Zesta and Oliveira (2019) define geomagnetic storms with Dst/SYM-H indices below the threshold of -250 nT to cause extreme effects on thermospheric neutral mass density and subsequent satellite orbital drag (Oliveira and Zesta, 2019), and it is well known that higher density enhancements result from more intense storms (Krauss et al., 2018; Oliveira and Zesta, 2019; Krauss et al., 2020). Although Meng et al. (2019) reported on the occurrence of nearly 40 extreme geomagnetic storms recorded with minimum Dst < -250 nT since the IGY, there are very few extreme events available to be studied with thermospheric neutral mass data derived from drag acceleration data collected by high-accuracy accelerometers. Oliveira and Zesta (2019) and Zesta and Oliveira (2019) identified only 7 extreme events recorded by CHAMP and GRACE since early 2000's. As pointed out by Oliveira et al. (2021), this makes our understanding of extreme storm-time thermospheric dynamic response and subsequent enhanced satellite orbital drag effects quite limited. Therefore, more extreme geomagnetic storms are needed to enhance our understanding of the effects described above.

Oliveira et al. (2021) suggested two possible paths that can be undertaken in order to improve our understanding of extreme satellite orbital drag: look into extreme events and superstorms of the past or expect for new extreme events in the upcoming solar cycles. The first approach was already taken by Oliveira et al. (2020), who studied drag effects in LEO on hypothetical satellites flying in the atmosphere during three historical superstorms (October/November 1903; September 1909; and May 1921) along with the well-known, space-era geomagnetic storm of March 1989. The authors defined two storm characteristics: storm intensity, defined by the minimum Dst value at the beginning of the recovery phase, and storm duration, defined as the time between the (presumably) impact of the driving CME on the magnetosphere and the end of the main phase. The authors concluded that storm duration can be more effective in comparison to storm intensity when determining the severity of drag effects, as occurred in the case of the March 1989 event. As pointed out by Bhowmik and Nandy (2018), Nandy (2021), McIntosh et al. (2023), SC25 was expected to be stronger than SC24 based on sunspot number predictions. This magnetic activity causally connects solar phenomena to direct space weather impacts around planetary objects such as the Earth and human technologies (Nandy et al., 2023). The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) announced on 16 October 2024 that the Sun has reached the peak of SC25 on 15 October 2024 (<https://tinyurl.com/3vcpt947>). According to the Royal Observatory of Belgium, the maximum daily count of sunspot numbers in SC24 (167) occurred in January 2014, while the same for SC25 occurred on 16 October 2024 (<https://www.sidc.be/SILSO/datafiles>). As a result, two more extreme geomagnetic storms occurred in SC25: the event of May 2024 (Hayakawa et al., 2024) and the event of October 2024. We expect more intense solar driven geomagnetic storms to occur over the next few years around the peak of the current sunspot cycle.

The Starlink event of February 2022 taught us that even a minor/moderate geomagnetic storm can significantly enhance satellite orbital drag in LEO. For instance, Fang et al. (2022) demonstrated with Starlink density data and empirical model (NRL-MSISE-00) results that the thermosphere was quite perturbed between the altitudes of 200 km and 400 km, with density increases of 50%-125% with respect

to pre-storm values. Since the satellites were flying low in the thermosphere (at altitudes mostly around 200 km), the satellites encountered downfall before the thrusters were activated for further uplift to higher altitudes (Hapgood et al., 2022). As clearly seen in figure 1 of Oliveira et al. (2021), orbital drag effects dramatically increase at altitudes below 300 km (see CHAMP and GOCE altitudes during decommissioning) due to increasing density levels, even during quiet times. Therefore, decommissioning satellite operations deserve special attention for tracking during orbital decay, particularly during geomagnetic storms for safe and accurate reentry operations.

SpaceX has made a commitment to safely de-orbit Starlink satellites in a time period of 2-5 years in order “to keep[ing] space safe, sustainable and accessible, protect[ing] astronauts and satellites in orbit and the public on the ground”. (<https://www.starlink.com/updates>). Since SL1089 was commissioned in October 2020, it was already in reentry process at its fourth lifetime year when the October 2024 storm took place. As clearly seen in Figure 2(c), SL1089 decayed nearly 200 km within 48 hours (10 October to 12 October). Although the satellite was scheduled to be decommissioned on 22 October 2024, as clearly seen in the smooth altitude decay since early September 2024 and reported by space-track.org, the satellite reentered on 12 October 2024. Ashruf et al. (2024) attributed the losses of 12 Starlink satellites to space weather conditions surrounding the 10 May 2024 extreme geomagnetic storm. However, though the satellites decayed nearly 200 km in 3 days, the authors did not make it clear whether the satellites had already begun their reentries before the storm. As seen in Figure 2(b), the extreme storm of October 2024 event had a minimum (quick-look) Dst value of -341 nT. Although the main phase of extreme geomagnetic storms tend to develop quite fast within a few hours (Aguado et al., 2010; Cid et al., 2013), the October 2024 event had a relatively long storm development duration (~ 11 hours). Such a combination of storm intensity and duration can cause extreme enhancements of thermospheric neutral mass density and subsequent orbital drag in LEO (Oliveira et al., 2020). As a result, the extreme geomagnetic storm of October 2024 cut the reentry process short by 10 days. This observation indicates that reentry operations of satellites should be monitored closely during storm times, particularly during extreme events. Such approach will help improve premature losses of satellites, accurate reentry locations, and effective collision-avoidance procedures. Such extreme orbital decay effects should be considered in the future since the number of extreme storms and the number of satellites in LEO will be even larger in the years to come (Oliveira et al., 2021).

Finally, it should be pointed out that this is a preliminary analysis of the premature reentry of Sarlink-1089 in October 2024. This is due to the use of preliminary data (quick-look Dst index, provisional ACE IMF data), and the current lack of density data provided by the satellite. Therefore, we recommend further analyses of this event as performed before for the Starlink even of February 2022 by approaching data analyses and numerical/empirical model investigations (Dang et al., 2022; Fang et al., 2022; Berger et al., 2023; Baruah et al., 2024).

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

IMF data provided by ACE was downloaded from <https://izw1.caltech.edu/ACE/ASC/browse/viewBrowseData.html>. The real-time (quick-look) Dst data, provided by World Data Center for Geomagnetism, Kyoto et al. (2015) was obtained from https://wdc.kugi.kyoto-u.ac.jp/dst_realtime/index.html. The Starlink TLE altitude and velocity data was downloaded from space-track.org.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

This perspective article was written by the first author. The manuscript was read and approved by the co-authors.

FUNDING

DMO and EZ thank the financial support provided by the NASA HGIO program through grant 80NSSC22K0756. DMO and EZ also acknowledge financial support by NASA's Space Weather Science Applications Operations 2 Research. DN's involvement in space weather research is sustained by the Ministry of Education, Government of India and a private philanthropic grant at the Center of Excellence in Space Sciences India, IISER Kolkata.

REFERENCES

- Aguado, J., Cid, C., Saiz, E., and Cerrato, Y. (2010). Hyperbolic decay of the Dst index during the recovery phase of intense geomagnetic storms. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 115. doi:10.1029/2009JA014658
- Akasofu, S.-I. (1966). Electrodynamics of the magnetosphere: Geomagnetic storms. *Space Science Reviews* 6, 21–143. doi:10.1007/BF00213406
- [Dataset] Ashruf, A. M., Bhaskar, A., Vineeth, C., Pant, T. K., and M, A. V. (2024). Loss of 12 Starlink Satellites Due to Pre-conditioning of Intense Space Weather Activity Surrounding the Extreme Geomagnetic Storm of 10 May 2024. arXiv:2410.16254 [physics.space-ph]. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2410.16254
- Bai, T. and Sturrock, P. A. (1989). Classification of Solar Flares. *Annual Review of Astronomy and Astrophysics* 27, 421–467. doi:10.1146/annurev.aa.27.090189.002225
- Baruah, Y., Roy, S., Sinha, S., Palmerio, E., Pal, S., Oliveira, D. M., et al. (2024). The loss of the Starlink satellites in February 2022: How moderate geomagnetic storms can adversely affect assets in Low-Earth orbit. *Space Weather* 22, e2023SW003716. doi:10.1029/2023SW003716
- Berger, T. E., Dominique, M., Lucas, G., Pilinski, M., Ray, V., Sewell, R., et al. (2023). The Thermosphere Is a Drag: The 2022 Starlink Incident and the Threat of Geomagnetic Storms to Low Earth Orbit Space Operations. *Space Weather* 21, e2022SW003330. doi:10.1029/2022SW003330
- Bhaskar, A., Hayakawa, H., Oliveira, D. M., Blake, S., Silverman, S., and Ebihara, Y. (2020). An analysis of Trouvelot's Auroral Drawing on 1/2 March 1872: Plausible Evidence for Recurrent Geomagnetic Storms. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics* 125, e2020JA028227. doi:10.1029/2020JA028227
- Bhowmik, P. and Nandy, D. (2018). Prediction of the strength and timing of sunspot cycle 25 reveal decadal-scale space environmental conditions. *Nature Communications* 9. doi:10.1038/s41467-018-07690-0
- Boteler, D. H. (2019). A Twenty-First Century View of the March 1989 Magnetic Storm. *Space Weather* 17, 1427–1441. doi:10.1029/2019SW002278
- Bruinsma, S. L. and Forbes, J. M. (2007). Global observations of traveling atmospheric disturbances (TADs) in the thermosphere. *Geophysical Research Letters* 34. doi:10.1029/2007GL030243
- Chen, G.-m., Xu, J., Wang, W., Lei, J., and Burns, A. G. (2012). A comparison of the effects of CIR- and CME-induced geomagnetic activity on thermospheric densities and spacecraft orbits: Case studies. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 117. doi:10.1029/2012JA017782

- Cid, C., Palacios, J., Saiz, E., Cerrato, Y., Aguado, J., and Guerrero, A. (2013). Modeling the recovery phase of extreme geomagnetic storms. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 118, 4352–4359. doi:10.1002/jgra.50409
- Clette, F., Lefèvre, L., Chatzistergos, T., Hayakawa, H., Carrasco, V. M. S., Arlt, R., et al. (2023). Recalibration of the Sunspot-Number: Status Report. *Solar Physics* 298. doi:10.1007/s11207-023-02136-3
- Dang, T., Li, X., Luo, B., Li, R., Zhang, B., Pham, K., et al. (2022). Unveiling the Space Weather During the Starlink Satellites Destruction Event on 4 February 2022. *Space Weather* 20, e2022SW003152. doi:10.1029/2022SW003152
- Emmert, J. T. (2015). Thermospheric mass density: A review. *Advances in Space Research* 56, 773–824. doi:10.1016/j.asr.2015.05.038
- Fang, T.-W., Kubaryk, A., Goldstein, D., Li, Z., Fuller-Rowell, T., Millward, G., et al. (2022). Space Weather Environment During the SpaceX Starlink Satellite Loss in February 2022. *Space Weather* 20, e2022SW003193. doi:10.1029/2022SW003193
- Gonzalez, W. D., Joselyn, J. A., Kamide, Y., Kroehl, H. W., Rostoker, G., Tsurutani, B. T., et al. (1994). What is a geomagnetic storm? *Journal of Geophysical Research* 99, 5771–5792. doi:10.1029/93JA02867
- Gonzalez, W. D. and Tsurutani, B. T. (1987). Criteria of interplanetary parameters causing intense magnetic storms ($Dst < -100$ nT). *Planetary and Space Science* 35, 1101–1109. doi:10.1016/0032-0633(87)90015-8
- Hapgood, M., Liu, H., and Lugaz, N. (2022). SpaceX – Sailing close to the space weather? *Space Weather* 20, e2022SW003074. doi:10.1029/2022SW003074
- [Dataset] Hayakawa, H., Ebihara, Y., Mishev, A., Koldobskiy, S., Kusano, K., Bechet, S., et al. (2024). The Solar and Geomagnetic Storms in May 2024: A Flash Data Report. arXiv:2407.07665v1 [astro-ph.SR]. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2407.07665
- Hayakawa, H., Ebihara, Y., Willis, D. M., Toriumi, S., Iju, T., Hattori, K., et al. (2019). Temporal and Spatial Evolutions of a Large Sunspot Group and Great Auroral Storms around the Carrington Event in 1859. *Space Weather* 17, 1553–1569. doi:10.1029/2019SW002269
- Illing, R. M. E. and Hundhausen, A. J. (1985). Observation of a coronal transient from 1.2 to 6 solar radii. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 90, 275–282. doi:10.1029/JA090iA01p00275
- Jacchia, L. G. (1959). Corpuscular radiation and the acceleration of artificial satellites. *Nature* 183, 1662–1663. doi:10.1038/1831662a0
- Kilpua, E. K. J., Lugaz, N., Mays, M. L., and Temmer, M. (2019). Forecasting the structure and orientation of earthbound coronal mass ejections. *Space Weather* 17, 498–526. doi:10.1029/2018SW001944
- Klein, L. W. and Burlaga, L. F. (1982). Interplanetary magnetic clouds at 1 AU. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 87, 613–624. doi:10.1029/JA087iA02p00613
- Krauss, S., Behzadpour, S., Temmer, M., and Lhotka, C. (2020). Exploring thermospheric variations triggered by severe geomagnetic storm on August 26, 2018 using GRACE Follow-On data. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics* 125. doi:10.1029/2019JA027731
- Krauss, S., Temmer, M., and Vennerstrom, S. (2018). Multiple satellite analysis of the Earth's thermosphere and interplanetary magnetic field variations due to ICME/CIR events during 2003–2015. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics* 123, 8884–8894. doi:10.1029/2018JA025778
- Krauss, S., Temmer, M., Veronig, A., Baur, O., and Lammer, H. (2015). Thermosphere and geomagnetic response to interplanetary coronal mass ejections observed by ACE and GRACE: Statistical results. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics* 120, 8848–8860. doi:10.1002/2015JA021702
- Launius, R. D. (2004). *Frontiers of Space Exploration* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press)

- McIntosh, S. W., Leamon, R. J., and Egeland, R. (2023). Deciphering solar magnetic activity: The (solar) hale cycle terminator of 2021. *Frontiers in Astronomy and Space Sciences* 10. doi:10.3389/fspas.2023.1050523
- Mehta, P. M., Paul, S. N., Crisp, N. H., Sheridan, P. L., Siemes, C., March, G., et al. (2023). Satellite drag coefficient modeling for thermosphere science and mission operations. *Advances in Space Research* 72, 5443–5459. doi:10.1016/j.asr.2022.05.064
- Meng, X., Tsurutani, B. T., and Mannucci, A. J. (2019). The Solar and Interplanetary Causes of Superstorms (Minimum Dst ≤ -250 nT) During the Space Age. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics* 124, 3926–3948. doi:10.1029/2018JA026425
- Nandy, D. (2021). Progress in Solar Cycle Predictions: Sunspot Cycles 24–25 in Perspective. *Solar Physics* 296. doi:10.1007/s11207-021-01797-2
- Nandy, D., Baruah, Y., Bhowmik, P., Dash, S., Gupta, S., Hazra, S., et al. (2023). Causality in heliophysics: Magnetic fields as a bridge between the Sun's interior and the Earth's space environment. *Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics* 248, 106081. doi:10.1016/j.jastp.2023.106081
- Oliveira, D. M. and Zesta, E. (2019). Satellite Orbital Drag During Magnetic Storms. *Space Weather* 17, 1510–1533. doi:10.1029/2019SW002287
- Oliveira, D. M., Zesta, E., Hayakawa, H., and Bhaskar, A. (2020). Estimating satellite orbital drag during historical magnetic superstorms. *Space Weather* 18, e2020SW002472. doi:10.1029/2020SW002472
- Oliveira, D. M., Zesta, E., Mehta, P. M., Licata, R. J., Pilinski, M. D., Kent Tobiska, W., et al. (2021). The current state and future directions of modeling thermosphere density enhancements during extreme magnetic storms. *Frontiers in Astronomy and Space Sciences* 8. doi:10.3389/fspas.2021.764144
- Prölss, G. (2011). Density perturbations in the upper atmosphere caused by the dissipation of solar wind energy. *Surveys in Geophysics* 32, 101–195. doi:10.1007/s10712-010-9104-0
- Ren, Y., Jin, S., Lu, Y., Gao, H., and Sun, S. (2022). The Development Status of Starlink and Its Countermeasures. *Modern Defense Technology* 50, 11–17. doi:10.3969/j.issn.1009-086x.2022.02.002
- Saini, K., Alshammari, K., Hamdi, S. M., and Boubrahimi, S. F. (2024). Classification of Major Solar Flares from Extremely Imbalanced Multivariate Time Series Data Using Minimally Random Convolutional Kernel Transform. *Universe* 10. doi:10.3390/universe10060234
- Schrijver, C. J. and Siscoe, G. L. (2010). *Heliophysics - Space Storms and Radiation: Causes and Effects* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press)
- Smith, C. W., L'Heureux, J., Ness, N. F., Acuña, M. H., Burlaga, L. F., and Scheifele, J. (1998). The ACE magnetic fields experiment. *Space Science Reviews* 86, 613–632. doi:10.1023/A:1005092216668
- Sugiura, M. (1964). Hourly Values of Equatorial Dst for the IGY. In *Annals of the International Geophysical Year* (Oxford, United Kingdom: Pergamon Press), vol. 35, 9–48
- Sutton, E. K., Forbes, J. M., and Nerem, R. S. (2005). Global thermospheric neutral density and wind response to the severe 2003 geomagnetic storms from CHAMP accelerometer data. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 110, 1–10. doi:10.1029/2004JA010985
- Szabo, A., Lepping, R. P., Merka, J., Smith, C. W., and Skoug, R. M. (2001). The evolution of interplanetary shocks driven by magnetic clouds. In *Solar Encounter: Proceedings of the First Solar Orbiter Workshop*, eds. B. Battrock and H. Sawaya-Lacoste (Noordwijk, Holland: ESA Publications Division), 383–387
- Wang, Y. M., Ye, P. Z., Wang, S., and Xue, X. H. (2003). An interplanetary cause of large geomagnetic storms: Fast forward shock overtaking preceding magnetic cloud. *Geophysical Research Letters* 30. doi:10.1029/2002GL016861
- [Dataset] World Data Center for Geomagnetism, Kyoto, Nose, M., Iyemori, T., Sugiura, M., and Kamei, T. (2015). Geomagnetic Dst index. [Data Set]. (Version v1). World Data Center. doi:10.17593/14515-74000

- Zesta, E. and Oliveira, D. M. (2019). Thermospheric heating and cooling times during geomagnetic storms, including extreme events. *Geophysical Research Letters* 46, 12,739–12,746. doi:10.1029/2019GL085120
- Zurbuchen, T. H. and Richardson, I. G. (2006). In-situ solar wind and magnetic field signatures of interplanetary coronal mass ejections. *Space Science Reviews* 123, 31–43. doi:10.1007/s11214-006-9010-4