

1 **Mountaintop gamma ray observations of three**
2 **terrestrial gamma-ray flashes at the Säntis Tower,**
3 **Switzerland with coincident radio waveforms**

4 **Jeffrey M. Chaffin^{1,6}, David M. Smith¹, Jeff Lapierre², Steve Cummer³,**
5 **John Ortberg¹, Antonio Sunjerga⁴, Amirhossein Mostajabi⁴,**
6 **Marcos Rubinstein⁵, Farhad Rachidi⁴**

7 ¹University of California Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz, CA, USA

8 ²Earth Networks, Germantown, MD, USA

9 ³Duke University, Durham, NC, USA

10 ⁴Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (EPFL), Lausanne, Switzerland

11 ⁵University of Applied Sciences of Western Switzerland (HES-SO), Yverdon-les-Bains, Switzerland

12 ⁶Air Force Institute of Technology, WPAFB, OH, USA

13 **Key Points:**

- 14 • First TGF observations from a mountaintop.
- 15 • First ground observation of a TGF associated with a 'slow pulse' radio spheric
- 16 • Possible stepped leader X-rays preceding a double pulsed TGF

Corresponding author: Jeffrey Chaffin, jeffrey.chaffin.ctr@afit.edu

Abstract

We report on the mountain top observation of three terrestrial gamma-ray flashes (TGFs) that occurred during the summer storm season of 2021. To our knowledge, these are the first TGFs observed in a mountaintop environment and the first published European TGFs observed from the ground. A gamma-ray sensitive detector was located at the base of the Säntis Tower in Switzerland and observed three unique TGF events with coincident radio sferic data characteristic of TGFs seen from space. We will show an example of a 'slow pulse' radio signature (Cummer et al., 2011; Lu et al., 2011; Pu et al., 2019, 2020), a -EIP (Lyu et al., 2016, 2021a; Cummer et al., 2017; Wada et al., 2020), and a double peak TGF associated with an extraordinarily powerful and complicated positive-polarity sferic, where each TGF peak is possibly preceded by a short burst of stepped leader emission.

1 Introduction

Terrestrial gamma ray flashes (TGFs) are submillisecond bursts of radiation (up to 10s of MeV) generated in thunderstorms and closely associated with lightning (Fishman et al., 1994; Cummer et al., 2005; Smith et al., 2005; Stanley et al., 2006; Briggs et al., 2010). The source of the gamma ray production, via the bremsstrahlung mechanism, is understood to be an exponentially growing population of relativistic electrons or relativistic runaway electron avalanches (RREA) within the electric fields associated with the lightning leader process and possibly to an unknown extent the local ambient field (Wilson, 1925; Gurevich et al., 1992; Lehtinen et al., 1996; Dwyer, 2003a; Dwyer et al., 2012). However, the mechanism of the TGF and its connection to lightning leader propagation is not fully understood. This has led to a recent focus on multi-wavelength observations which can shed light on the temporal relationship between TGFs and radio signatures of different lightning processes.

The last decade has seen some compelling multi-wavelength observations in lightning leader radio emission that have linked a subset of TGF satellite observations with two specific types of radio waveforms during lightning leader propagation. 'Slow pulse' events (Cummer et al., 2011; Lu et al., 2011; Pu et al., 2019, 2020), observed in the midst of initial breakdown pulses (IBPs) of relatively small peak current lightning events, are characterized by a distinct slow temporal signature that matches the duration of the associated TGF and is near-simultaneous (within a few microseconds) with the mean of gamma ray arrival times. Dwyer and Cummer (2013) showed how this slow pulse can be interpreted as an observable current moment of the TGF electron avalanche process itself.

The second kind of characteristic pulse, energetic in-cloud pulses (EIPs) (Cummer et al., 2017; Lyu et al., 2016, 2021a), are high peak current sferics associated with negative leaders in positive intra-cloud (+IC) lightning. They are complicated and are longer in duration compared to narrow bipolar events, the other kind of powerful IC sferic. TGFs have been found to be time aligned (within about 10 μ s) with +EIP sferics tens to hundreds of microseconds long (Cummer et al., 2011; Lu et al., 2011).

These distinct classes of sferics give a unique perspective into the behavior of the TGF mechanism not possible with gamma-ray observations alone. Although the observation of -EIPs and negative polarity slow pulses have been inferred to correspond with downward TGFs, thus far there have only been two published observations that directly make this connection, Pu et al. (2020) and Wada et al. (2020) which reported on a negative slow pulse and -EIP respectively.

In addition to these two associations we report on the mountaintop observation of three TGF events, to our knowledge the first TGFs observed in a mountaintop environment. We will present multi-wavelength measurements making direct associations between two of the TGFs observed and low frequency radio sferic data of both a slow pulse event and a -EIP. A third TGF observation appears to be a double pulse event coincident with a very strong and complex high peak current radio sferic, and was close enough

70 to the tower to observe the neutron afterglow (Bowers et al., 2017; Enoto et al., 2017;
71 Wada et al., 2019a, 2019b).

72 2 Instrumentation

73 A gamma-ray sensitive detector consisting of a 5×5 " plastic scintillator mounted
74 to a conventional photomultiplier (PMT) tube was located at the base of the Säntis Tower
75 on Mt. Säntis, Switzerland at an elevation of 2.5 km. The analog output of the PMT
76 was routed to a Bridgeport Instruments eMorpho MCA. The MCA uses an 80 MHz ADC
77 and provides a time-tagged photon event list mode with the integrated pulse area (with
78 16-bit resolution) and arrival time (with 32-bit/12.5 ns resolution). Earth Networks To-
79 tal Lightning Network (ENTLN) provided geolocation of individual lightning flashes us-
80 ing an array of ground-based sensors located throughout the European continent using
81 low frequency (LF) radio sferic data.



Figure 1: Earth Networks Total Lightning Network (ENTLN) geo-locations (yellow markers) for each event and distance from the Säntis Tower (red marker)

82 3 Measurement and Analysis

83 On the 9th of June 2021 two TGFs were observed during a series of thunderstorm
84 cells passing over Mt. Säntis. Event 1 was a roughly $150 \mu\text{s}$ duration flash of gamma pho-
85 tons coincident with a -IC (-10 kA) lightning leader at 15:25:21.165148 UTC with an ENTLN
86 location of 3.2 km from the Säntis Tower. Event 2 was a double pulse gamma ray flash
87 lasting $400 \mu\text{s}$ in total. This second event was coincident with a strong (100 kA) and un-
88 usually complex +IC sferic at 17:48:17.847036 UTC located 1 km from the Säntis Tower.
89 Event 3 occurred on the 16th of August 2021 coincident with a -135 kA lightning sferic
90 at 5:38:15.3093 UTC and 5.6 km from the Säntis Tower. Unfortunately, at the time of
91 these observations the instrument computer clock was malfunctioning, and absolute tim-
92 ing can only be certain to 1-2 ms. This is sufficient to associate each event to a light-
93 ning flash but insufficient to say anything quantitative regarding the timing relationship
94 between the TGF observation and the leader progression with time alignment of the data
95 alone.

96 3.1 Event 1

97 Event 1 is associated with an ENTLN radio sferic on 9th of June 2021 at 15:25:21.165148
98 UTC and 3.2 km from the Tower. The gamma ray observation was roughly $150 \mu\text{s}$ in
99 duration and produced 60 counts in the detector with an energy range of 100 keV to 9
100 MeV. Unfortunately, there was significant pileup in the detector electronics during the




Figure 2: Gamma ray energies versus time. Black data points represent a single photon count. The limited number and lack of low energy counts in the middle of the signal is a result of pileup in the detector electronics. The high energy counts in the middle of the scatter plot are likely a sum of several lower energy photons. Blue data points represent simulated photon counts from an electronics response simulation code using a simulated TGF with temporal distribution and number of photon interactions in the detector adjusted to match the dead time and pileup behavior of the real TGF data in black.

101 brightest portion of the TGF resulting in a loss of counts and systematically giving the
 102 few recorded counts during the brightest portion artificially large energies. The sferic shows
 103 a slow pulse signal with negative polarity. The same as that described in Pu et al. (2019)
 104 but of opposite polarity indicating the movement of negative charge downward.

105 The pulse comes in the midst of short ($<10 \mu\text{s}$) IBPs and is similar in duration to
 106 the gamma-ray signal. If this radio sferic slow pulse is a signature of the current moment
 107 of the RREA mechanism then the gamma ray duration should match the slow pulse du-
 108 ration. To determine this we follow the example of Pu et al. (2019) by attempting to fit
 109 the arrival time distribution of the gamma rays to a Gaussian under the assumption that
 110 the RREA current moment follows a normal distribution. The Earth Networks sensors
 111 have a frequency response that is proportional to the radiative far-field electric field which
 112 is proportional to the derivative of the source current dI/dt . Assuming that the current
 113 pulse created by the RREA mechanism is Gaussian, the first derivative of the gamma
 114 ray arrival time distribution should be comparable to the slow pulse in the Earth Net-
 115 works sensor data.

116 Unfortunately as mentioned previously the gamma ray data are significantly piled
 117 up during the brightest portion of the TGF. This makes determining an arrival time dis-
 118 tribution challenging. We rely on a combination of GEANT4 (Agostinelli et al., 2003;
 119 Allison et al., 2006, 2016) Monte Carlo simulations of TGFs and Python code written
 120 to simulate the behavior of the PMT output trace and how the Bridgeport electronics
 121 processes the trace into individual photon counts. A TGF spectrum using the Relativis-
 122 tic Electron Avalanche Model (REAM) discussed in Dwyer (2003a, 2007) and Dwyer and
 123 Smith (2005) was processed through a model of the atmosphere, U.S. Standard Atmo-
 124 sphere (1976), and finally through a model of a plastic scintillator to obtain a simulated
 125 energy spectrum in the detector.

126 The spectrum was then spread out to a Gaussian arrival time distribution and used
 127 as input for the previously mentioned electronics simulation code. Two parameters, the




Figure 3: Left: average derived photon energy in each $5\text{-}\mu\text{s}$ bin; simulations in blue and TGF data in orange. Right: number of counts in each $5\text{-}\mu\text{s}$ bin; simulations in blue and TGF data in orange.




Figure 4: Event 1 radio spheric (black) of a $-IC$ flash of -10 kA peak current. The first derivative (blue) of a $42\text{ }\mu\text{s}$ FWHM Gaussian (purple) is fit to the slow pulse portion of the spheric. The LF sensor was 66 km from the Santis Tower.

128 width of the time distribution and the number of photon interactions in the detector,
 129 were adjusted until the simulation output matched the pile-up/dead time behavior, du-
 130 ration and number of counts in the TGF data. Figure 2 shows the TGF gamma ray en-
 131 ergies versus time scatter plot in black and the simulated TGF with the electronics sig-
 132 nal processing behavior accounted for in blue. Figure 3 shows two plots that use a FWHM
 133 of $42\text{ }\mu\text{s}$ for the simulated TGF Gaussian and roughly 2000 photon interactions in the
 134 detector. In the simulations (blue) 100 different TGFs with random energy and time sam-
 135 ples of this Gaussian parent distribution were used to average the curves together. The
 136 real TGF data are in orange. The plot on the left is the average derived photon energy
 137 in each $5\text{ }\mu\text{s}$ bin, showing the effect of pileup. The plot on the right is the number of counts
 138 in each $5\text{ }\mu\text{s}$ bin, showing the duration and the effect of dead time. To the eye the $42\text{ }\mu\text{s}$
 139 FWHM is a likely best fit with approximate errors of $\pm 5\text{ }\mu\text{s}$ FWHM. In Figure 4 the
 140 first derivative of a $42\text{ }\mu\text{s}$ FWHM Gaussian is over plotted on the radio spheric slow pulse
 141 data and aligned in time with the simulated Gaussian count rate distribution. The first
 142 derivative of the Gaussian is in good agreement with the slow pulse confirming our as-
 143 sumption of a Gaussian source current derived from the gamma ray temporal distribu-
 144 tion. Though the timing precision of the TGF observation isn't sufficient to time align

145 the two data sets, the agreement between the sferic slow pulse and the first derivative
 146 of the Gaussian arrival time distribution along with the work done by Pu et al. (2019,
 147 2020) is compelling evidence that this slow pulse and gamma ray observation are the re-
 148 sult of the same physical mechanism, making this the first ground based TGF observa-
 149 tion linked to a slow pulse sferic.

150 3.2 Event 3

151 Event 3 took place on August 16, 2021. It was associated with an ENTLN sferic
 152 at 5:38:15.3093 UTC that was located 5.6 km from the Säntis Tower. At that distance
 153 from the source the gamma ray observation (Figure 5 bottom) doesn't appear to suffer
 154 from pileup or deadtime but is outside the detection radius of any neutron signal. The
 155 associated radio sferic (Figure 5 top) was a very high peak current (-135 kA) -IC event.
 156 With the exceptionally large peak current, big clear pulse in the low frequency radio data,
 157 and clear negative polarity we immediately suspected this to be a -EIP. To confirm this
 158 we sought to compare a known EIP to the waveform associated with our gamma ray sig-
 159 nal.




Figure 5: **Top:** Event 3 radio sferic of a -IC flash with 135 kA peak current. The flash was located 5.6 km from the Säntis Tower. The radio data is from an LF sensor 256 km from the flash. **Bottom:** TGF counts plotted by energy vs time. Note that the timing alignment between the radio sferic and gamma ray data is purely speculative. We have aligned the 50 μ s of gamma ray counts with the initial 50 μ s of the ground wave.

160 When comparing LF waveforms it is crucial to make sure the comparisons are being
 161 made using sensors that were an equal distance to the source of the signal. The reason
 162 for this is related to the propagation times of both the ground wave and the sky wave.
 163 The closer the LF sensor is to the signal source the greater the time difference between
 164 the arrival of each at the sensor. For instance, you can see in the top plot of Figure 5
 165 the radio sferic of Event 3 as recorded by a sensor 256 km from the source. You can clearly
 166 differentiate the ground wave signal lasting roughly 100 μ s followed closely by the iono-
 167 spheric reflection or sky wave.




Figure 6: Event 3 radio sferic (black) using radio data from an LF sensor 425 km from the current source. Known +EIP (blue) from an ENTLN sensor 436 km from its current source. The known +EIP data have been inverted and over plotted onto the Event 3 waveform for comparison.

168 In contrast, Figure 6 is from a sensor 425 km from the same source signal. The ground
 169 wave and its reflection are too close together to differentiate making the signal appear
 170 quite different. From a collection of unpublished EIPs confirmed by both Duke Univer-
 171 sity sensors and Earth Networks we found a +EIP observation from a sensor 436 km from
 172 the signal source. We inverted the polarity of the known +EIP data and over plotted
 173 it on the Event 3 sferic of a 425 km distant sensor as seen in Figure 6. The signals are
 174 remarkably similar except for the polarity inversion of the known EIP which indicates
 175 the source currents are also similar. We believe that the Sántis signal is consistent with
 176 a -EIP produced during a descending negative leader or upward propagating positive leader.

177 3.3 Event 2

178 We have saved Event 2 for last as it is a more complicated gamma ray observation
 179 and sferic. ENTLN recorded a large amplitude (100 kA) +IC radio sferic on the 9th of
 180 June 2021 at 17:48:17.847036 UTC. The ENTLN location puts the lightning flash 1 km
 181 from the Sántis Tower. The radio waveform (Figure 7 top plot) is atypical of an IC ra-
 182 dio sferic. It has an unusually high number of large amplitude pulses. The pulse dura-
 183 tions of 100-150 μ s are much longer than normal IBPs and the spacing of the largest-
 184 amplitude features matches the spacing of the TGF pulses as shown by the speculative
 185 alignment with the gamma ray data in Figure 7. The ENTLN sensor was only 256 km
 186 from the lightning location. At that distance the ground wave signal will dominate the
 187 associated sky wave. This suggests that the equally large amplitude pulses in this sferic
 188 represent distinct current pulses in the lightning event.

189 This was an extraordinarily powerful sferic compared to other flashes in the local
 190 environment. Figure 8 depicts the 14 highest peak current events identified as +IC by
 191 the European Cooperation for Lightning Detection (EUCLID) in the prior year (2020)
 192 within 30 km of the Sántis Tower out of a total database of 4598 +ICs in that distance
 193 range. The sferic data are from the same ENTLN sensor as our TGF-associated sferic
 194 shown in red at the bottom, and the distances between the current source and sensor
 195 vary between 245-291 km. Qualitatively, it is quite obvious how distinct the TGF as-
 196 sociated trace is compared to the sample of high peak current traces in proximity to the
 197 Sántis Tower.

198 In order to quantify the uniqueness of this sferic we calculated the sum of the square
 199 of the E-field values, a measure of total radiated energy, that were recorded for each trace
 200 and plotted those values against each trace’s peak current as shown in Figure 9. The peak
 201 current is calculated by ENTLN from the single largest amplitude pulse (E-field mea-




Figure 7: Top: Event 2 radio sferic of an +IC flash with 100 kA peak current. The flash was located 1 km from the Säntis Tower. The radio data is from an ENTNLN LF sensor 256 km from the flash. Bottom: TGF counts plotted by energy vs time. Possible double pulse event with a neutron afterglow starting at 400 μ s. Note that the timing alignment between the radio sferic and gamma ray data is purely speculative. We have aligned the 400 μ s of gamma ray counts with the 400 μ s duration of the large peak amplitude and wide pulse width radio data.

202 surement data point) in a trace. The TGF-associated event has a $\sum E^2$ that is 5 times
 203 as large as its nearest competitor while the rest are clustered together. This does a nice
 204 job of capturing the unusualness of the event. Not just that it reaches a high peak cur-
 205 rent, and not just that it has many pulses, but that it has many pulses at an equally high
 206 peak current.

207 From the gamma ray data (see Figure 7 bottom plot) the TGF appears to be a two
 208 peak event, but with significant pile-up and possible periods of detector paralysis. There
 209 is also a clear neutron tail of about 1.5 ms in duration. Downward TGFs during winter
 210 thunderstorms in Japan have been shown to produce a number of neutrons via pho-
 211 tonuclear reactions in the atmosphere (Bowers et al., 2017; Enoto et al., 2017; Wada et
 212 al., 2019a, 2019b). The thermalized neutrons with time scales on the order of millisec-
 213 onds (Babich et al., 2007) interact in our plastic detector material and undergo neutron
 214 capture with hydrogen resulting in the hydrogen isotope deuterium in an excited state.
 215 The excited deuterium immediately relaxes to its ground state emitting a 2.2 MeV gamma
 216 in our detector. The 2.2 MeV gamma deposits only a portion of its energy via Compton
 217 scattering before leaving the detector material resulting in a Compton shoulder at
 218 roughly 2 MeV.

219 We offer an alternative analysis of the gamma-ray arrival time data in Figure 7.
 220 Figure 10 shows roughly 400 μ s of the double pulse TGF. It is possible that there are
 221 actually four distinct signals. The first signal is a short-duration burst of apparent low-
 222 energy counts. This burst could be stepped leader emission that precedes the initial TGF
 223 by about 60 μ s. The TGF is about 150 μ s in duration and the data exhibit detector paral-
 224 ysis and pulse pileup behavior, a period of no low-energy counts (not real), as the count
 225 rate increased. As we begin to see lower energy counts again, we assume that the count




Figure 8: ENTNLN radio data of the 14 largest peak current lightning events, within 30 km of the Sântis Tower from October 2019 - April 2021, and the Event 2 waveform in red. All traces are from the same ENTNLN sensor at similar distances from the current source.

226 rate is decreasing. This is followed by a $20 \mu\text{s}$ gap before a second short burst of low-
 227 energy photons (stepped leader emission?) that precedes the second TGF pulse by 120
 228 μs . To definitively say if the time difference between these signals is real or merely pe-
 229 riods of instrument dead-time due to extremely high count rates, the ADC sampled out-
 230 put of the PMT would need to be analyzed. Unfortunately, the instrument does not have
 231 the capability to save PMT trace data. Lacking data to confirm instrument behavior,
 232 this interpretation remains speculative, but possibly very important.




Figure 9: Sum of the square of the ENTLN electric field data for each trace in Figure 8 plotted with respect to each event’s peak current. The 14 highest peak current events are plotted in black and roughly clustered in the same region of the plot, whereas the Event 2 trace is plotted in red.




Figure 10: Event 2 double pulse TGF listmode gamma ray data. Speculative interpretation of four separate x- and gamma-ray emissions within the 400 μ s duration of the event. Two possible stepped leader bursts each preceding one of the two TGFs.

233 A possible explanation for the unusualness of the Event 2 waveform may be directly
 234 connected to the multi-pulse TGF observation just described. Could this be a multi-pulse
 235 +EIP? We know Event 3 to be an example of a confirmed -EIP observed by the same
 236 radio sensor as Event 2 and from an equivalent distance from the source. We compare
 237 the Event 2 waveform to the Event 3 -EIP by inverting the Event 3 sferic and summing
 238 two versions of the inverted data but separated in time. In Figure 11 the green dashed
 239 lines are separated by 210 μ s. This appears to be the time separation between the most
 240 piledup/paralyzed moments in each TGF pulse. This comes earlier for the 2nd pulse,
 241 which is why it is shorter than the delay between the starts of the pulses. Top panel is




Figure 11: Top: Event 3 waveform inverted. Middle: Two inverted Event 3 waveforms separated by $210 \mu\text{s}$ and summed. Bottom: Event 2 waveform.

242 Event 3 inverted. Middle panel has two "Event 3s" spaced by $210 \mu\text{s}$ and summed. The
 243 bottom panel is Event 2. It is of course speculative but the behavior appears to have sim-
 244 ilarities and may explain Event 2's multiple pulses at equally high peak current.

245 The final enigma of Event 2 is its clear positive polarity. The ENTLN sensors clas-
 246 sified this lightning event as being a +IC, which describes an intra-cloud leader chan-
 247 nel moving negative charge upward. Depending on the source altitude of the TGF, which
 248 is unknown, this could be a reverse beam observation from the ground as first modeled
 249 in Ortberg et al. (2020). It is also possible that the event was lateral to or lower in al-
 250 titude with respect to the observation point (2.5 km) making the main beam visible to
 251 the tower and instrument. A detailed meteorological analysis of the storm and its pos-
 252 sible charge structure and altitudes would need to be done to begin to answer this ques-
 253 tion.

254 4 Conclusion

255 The vast majority of TGFs have been detected by spaced-based instruments (Fishman
 256 et al., 1994; Smith et al., 2005; Briggs et al., 2010; Marisaldi et al., 2010; Østgaard et
 257 al., 2019; Neubert et al., 2020) and are dominated by associations with positive IC light-

ning leaders. TGFs however have turned out to be linked to a wide variety of lightning types and atmospheric conditions, as evidenced by these unique Mt. Säntis events and the numerous ground based observations of downward directed TGFs (Dwyer & Cummer, 2013; Dwyer et al., 2003b, 2004b, 2004a; Tran et al., 2015; Hare et al., 2016; Bowers et al., 2017; Enoto et al., 2017; Colalillo, 2017; Smith et al., 2018; Abbasi et al., 2022; Wada et al., 2022).

As challenging as ground observations are, the potential to observe the finer details of the relationship between the gamma ray fluence and the lightning leader current fluctuations cannot be overstated. Though orbital observations have provided large data sets and continue to contribute to our understanding of the TGF mechanism there are clear advantages to observations made within a few km of the TGF source. They include the ability to observe the varied particle physics associated with TGFs such as photo-neutrons (Bowers et al., 2017), positrons, and certain radioactive decay elements (Enoto et al., 2017). As speculated in this paper it may also be possible to observe stepped leader emissions that precede and are possibly integral to the TGF mechanism.

A further possibility of ground or airborne observations is obtaining photon arrival time distributions unaffected by the 100s of km of atmospheric transport between storm cloud altitudes and orbital spacecraft with sufficient numbers of counts to be statistically robust. These in situ observations could help determine whether there is an underlying behavior of discrete bursts of emission in the overall TGF time profile. As of November 2021 one of the six THOR instruments developed by the high energy atmospheric physics group at the University of California Santa Cruz has been deployed to the base of the Säntis Tower and the other five have been deployed elsewhere around the globe including Japan, New Mexico and Florida. We hope that over the next few years the observations made by these instruments, along with radio sferic data, will contribute to a greater understanding of the lightning-TGF relationship.

5 Open Research

The data files (Chaffin, 2023) used in this work are available online via Dryad <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.r2280gbjf>

Prior to publication private access to download the data files is available through this unique URL <https://datadryad.org/stash/share/b-EA2Y7Xi5SpwRshRW19r0E1osnNj8MN-qGq9x87Ttc>

Acknowledgments

J. M. C., and D. M. S. acknowledge the support of the National Science Foundation award AGS-2235299

References

- Abbasi, et al. (2022). First high-speed camera observations of the optical counterpart of a terrestrial gamma-ray flash. *eprint arXiv:2205.05115*.
- Agostinelli, Allison, Amako, Apostolakis, Araujo, Arce, et al. (2003). Geant4 - a simulation toolkit. *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research*. doi: 10.1016/S0168-9002(03)01368-8
- Allison, Amako, Apostolakis, Araujo, Dubois, A., Asai, et al. (2006). Geant4 developments and applications. *IEEE Transactions on Nuclear Science*. doi: 10.1109/TNS.2006.869826
- Allison, Amako, Apostolakis, Arce, Asai, Aso, et al. (2016). Recent developments in geant4. *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research*. doi: 10.1016/j.nima.2016.06.125
- Babich, L. P., Kudryavtsev, A. Y., Kudryavtseva, M. L., & Kutsyk, I. M. (2007, July). Terrestrial gamma-ray flashes and neutron pulses from direct sim-

- 307 ulations of gigantic upward atmospheric discharge. *Soviet Journal of Ex-*
308 *perimental and Theoretical Physics Letters*, *85*, 483-487. doi: 10.1134/
309 S0021364007100037
- 310 Bowers, G. S., Smith, D. M., Martinez-McKinney, G. F., Kamogawa, M., Cummer,
311 S. A., Dwyer, J. R., ... Kawasaki, Z. (2017, October). Gamma Ray Signatures
312 of Neutrons From a Terrestrial Gamma Ray Flash. *Geophys. Res. Let.*, *44*, 10.
313 doi: 10.1002/2017GL075071
- 314 Briggs, M. S., Fishman, G. J., Connaughton, V., Bhat, P. N., Paciesas, W. S.,
315 Preece, R. D., ... Chekhtman, A. (2010). First results on terrestrial gamma
316 ray flashes from the Fermi Gamma-ray Burst Monitor. *J. Geophys. Res.*, *115*,
317 A07323. doi: 10.1029/2009JA015242
- 318 Chaffin, J. (2023). *Mountaintop gamma ray observations of three terrestrial*
319 *gamma-ray flashes at the säntis tower, switzerland with coincident radio*
320 *waveforms* [dataset]. Dryad. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.5061/](https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.r2280gbjf)
321 [dryad.r2280gbjf](https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.r2280gbjf) doi: 10.5061/dryad.r2280gbjf
- 322 Colalillo, R. (2017). Peculiar lightning-related events observed by the surface detec-
323 tor of the Pierre Auger Observatory. In *Proceedings of 35th International Cos-*
324 *mic Ray Conference — PoS(ICRC2017)*. doi: 10.22323/1.301.0314
- 325 Cummer, S. A., Lu, G., Briggs, M. S., Connaughton, V., Xiong, S., Fishman, G. J.,
326 & Dwyer, J. R. (2011, July). The lightning-TGF relationship on microsecond
327 timescales. *Geophys. Res. Let.*, *38*, 14810. doi: 10.1029/2011GL048099
- 328 Cummer, S. A., Lyu, F., Briggs, M. S., Cramer, E., Stanbro, M., Roberts, O., &
329 Smith, D. M. (2017). The connection between terrestrial gamma-ray flashes
330 and energetic in-cloud lightning pulses. *AGU 2017 Fall Meeting, New Orleans,*
331 *LA..*
- 332 Cummer, S. A., Zhai, Y., Hu, W., Smith, D. M., Lopez, L. I., & Stanley, M. A.
333 (2005). Measurement and implications of the relationship between lightning
334 and terrestrial gamma-ray flashes. *Geophys. Res. Let.*, *32*, L22804.
- 335 Dwyer. (2003a). A fundamental limit on electric fields in air. *Geophys. Res. Let.*,
336 *30*(20), 2055.
- 337 Dwyer, & Cummer, S. A. (2013). Radio emissions from terrestrial gamma-ray
338 flashes. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 3769–3790. doi:
339 10.1002/jgra.50188
- 340 Dwyer, J., Smith, D., & Cummer, S. (2012). High–Energy Atmospheric Physics:
341 Terrestrial Gamma-Ray Flashes and Related Phenomena. *Space Sci Rev*, *173*,
342 133–196. doi: 10.1007/s11214-012-9894-0
- 343 Dwyer, J. R. (2007). Relativistic breakdown in planetary atmospheres. *Physics of*
344 *Plasmas*, *14*, 042901. doi: 10.1063/1.2709652
- 345 Dwyer, J. R., Rassoul, H., Al-Dayeh, M., Caraway, L., Chrest, A., Wright, B., ...
346 Smyth, C. (2004a). Measurements of x-ray emission from rocket-triggered
347 lightning. *Geophys. Res. Let.*, *31*, L05118. doi: 10.1029/2003GL018770
- 348 Dwyer, J. R., Rassoul, H., Al-Dayeh, M., Caraway, L., Chrest, A., Wright, B., ...
349 Smyth, C. (2004b). A ground level gamma-ray burst observed in associa-
350 tion with rocket-triggered lightning. *Geophys. Res. Let.*, *31*, L05119. doi:
351 10.1029/2003GL018771
- 352 Dwyer, J. R., & Smith, D. M. (2005). A comparison between Monte Carlo simu-
353 lations of runaway breakdown and terrestrial gamma-ray flash observations.
354 *Geophys. Res. Let.*, *32*, L08811. doi: 10.1028/2005GL023848
- 355 Dwyer, J. R., Uman, M. A., Rassoul, H. . K., Al-Dayeh, M., Caraway, L., Jer-
356 auld, J., ... Wright, B. (2003b). Energetic radiation produced during
357 rocket-triggered lightning. *Science*, *299*(5607), 694-697. doi: 10.1126/
358 science.1078940
- 359 Enoto, T., Wada, Y., Furuta, Y., Nakazawa, K., Yuasa, T., Okuda, K., ... Tsuchiya,
360 H. (2017, November). Photonuclear reactions triggered by lightning discharge.
361 *Nature*, *551*, 481-484. doi: 10.1038/nature24630

- 362 Fishman, G. J., Bhat, P. N., Mallozzi, R., Horack, J. M., Koshut, T., Kouveliotou,
363 C., ... Christian, H. J. (1994). Discovery of intense gamma-ray flashes of
364 atmospheric origin. *Science*, *264*, 1313-1316.
- 365 Gurevich, Milikh, G. M., & Roussel-Dupré, R. A. (1992). Runaway electron mech-
366 anism of air breakdown and preconditioning during a thunderstorm. *Physics*
367 *Letters A*, *165*, 463.
- 368 Hare, B. M., Uman, M. A., Dwyer, J. R., Jordan, D. M., Biggerstaff, M. I., Caicedo,
369 J. A., ... Bozarth, A. (2016, June). Ground-level observation of a terrestrial
370 gamma ray flash initiated by a triggered lightning. *Journal of Geophysical*
371 *Research (Atmospheres)*, *121*, 6511-6533. doi: 10.1002/2015JD024426
- 372 Lehtinen, N., Walt, M., Inan, U., Bell, T., & Pasko, V. (1996). γ -ray emission
373 produced by a relativistic beam of runaway electrons accelerated by quasi-
374 electrostatic thundercloud fields. *Geophys. Res. Let.*, *23*(19), 2645-2648.
- 375 Lu, G., Cummer, S. A., Li, J., Han, F., Smith, D. M., & Grefenstette, B. W. (2011,
376 March). Characteristics of broadband lightning emissions associated with ter-
377 restrial gamma ray flashes. *Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics)*,
378 *116*(A15), A03316. doi: 10.1029/2010JA016141
- 379 Lyu, F., Cummer, S. A., Briggs, M., Marisaldi, M., Blakeslee, R. J., Bruning, E.,
380 ... Stanbro, M. (2016). Ground detection of terrestrial gamma ray flashes
381 from distant radio signals. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 8728-8734. doi:
382 10.1002/2016GL070154
- 383 Lyu, F., Cummer, S. A., Briggs, M., Smith, D. M., Mailyan, B., & Lesage, S.
384 (2021a). Terrestrial gamma-ray flashes can be detected with radio measure-
385 ments of energetic in-cloud pulses during thunderstorms. *Geophysical Research*
386 *Letters*. doi: 10.1029/2021GL093627
- 387 Marisaldi, M., Fuschino, F., Labanti, C., Galli, M., Longo, F., Del Monte, E., ...
388 Salotti, L. (2010, March). Detection of terrestrial gamma ray flashes up to 40
389 MeV by the AGILE satellite. *Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics)*,
390 *115*, 0. doi: 10.1029/2009JA014502
- 391 Neubert, T., Østgaard, N., Reglero, V., Chanrion, O., Heumesser, M., Dimitri-
392 adou, K., ... Eyles, C. J. (2020). A terrestrial gamma-ray flash and iono-
393 spheric ultraviolet emissions powered by lightning. *Science*, *367*. doi:
394 10.1126/science.aax3872
- 395 Ortberg, J., Smith, D. M., Li, J., Dwyer, J., & Bowers, G. (2020). Detecting an up-
396 ward terrestrial gamma ray flash from its reverse positron beam. *JGR Atmo-*
397 *spheres*. doi: 10.1029/2019JD030942
- 398 Pu, Y., Cummer, S. A., Huang, A., Briggs, M., Mailyan, B., & Lesage, S. (2020).
399 A Satellite-Detected Terrestrial Gamma Ray Flash Produced by a Cloud-
400 to-Ground Lightning Leader. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *47*. doi:
401 10.1029/2020GL089427
- 402 Pu, Y., Cummer, S. A., Lyu, F., Briggs, M., Mailyan, B., Stanbro, M., & Roberts,
403 O. (2019). Low Frequency Radio Pulses Produced by Terrestrial Gamma-
404 Ray Flashes. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *46*, 6990-6997. doi: 10.1029/
405 2019GL082743
- 406 Smith, D. M., Bowers, G. S., Kamogawa, M., Wang, D., Ushio, T., Ortberg, J., ...
407 Stock, M. (2018). Characterizing upward lightning with and without a ter-
408 restrial gamma ray flash. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *123*.
409 doi: 10.1029/2018jd029105
- 410 Smith, D. M., Lopez, L. I., Lin, R. P., & Barrington-Leigh, C. P. (2005). Terrestrial
411 gamma-ray flashes observed up to 20 MeV. *Science*, *307*, 1085-1088.
- 412 Stanley, M. A., Shao, X., Smith, D. M., Lopez, L., Pongratz, M., Harlin, J., ...
413 Regan, A. (2006). A link between terrestrial gamma-ray flashes and
414 intracloud lightning discharges. *Geophys. Res. Let.*, *33*, L06803. doi:
415 10.1029/20005GL025537
- 416 Tran, et al. (2015). A terrestrial gamma-ray flash recorded at the Lightning Ob-

- 417 servatory in Gainesville, Florida. *Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial*
418 *Physics*.
- 419 Wada, Y., Enoto, T., Nakamura, Y., Furuta, Y., Yuasa, T., Nakazawa, K., ...
420 Tsuchiya, H. (2019b). Gamma-ray glow preceding downward terrestrial
421 gamma-ray flash. *Nature, Communications Physics*, 2.
- 422 Wada, Y., Enoto, T., Nakamura, Y., Morimoto, T., Sato, M., Ushio, T., ...
423 Tsuchiya, H. (2020). High peak-current lightning discharges associated with
424 downward terrestrial gamma-ray flashes. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 125.
425 doi: 10.1029/2019JD031730
- 426 Wada, Y., Enoto, T., Nakazawa, K., Furuta, Y., Yuasa, T., Nakamura, Y., ...
427 Tsuchiya, H. (2019a). Downward terrestrial gamma-ray flash observed in a
428 winter thunderstorm. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*
- 429 Wada, Y., Morimoto, T., Nakamura, Y., Wu, T., Enoto, T., Nakazawa, K., ...
430 Tsuchiya, H. (2022). Characteristics of low-frequency pulses associated with
431 downward terrestrial gamma-ray flashes. *Geophysical Research Letters*. doi:
432 10.1029/2021GL097348
- 433 Wilson, C. T. R. (1925). The electric field of a thundercloud and some of its effects.
434 *Phys. Soc. London Proc.*, 32D, 37.
- 435 Østgaard, N., Balling, J. E., Bjørnsen, T., Brauer, P., Budtz-Jørgensen, C., Bujwan,
436 W., ... Yang, S. (2019). The modular x- and 1 gamma- ray sensor (mxgs) of
437 the asim payload on the international space station. *Space Sci. Rev.*, 215.