

Interactive comment on “Contribution of patchy reconnection to the ion to electron temperature ratio in the Earth’s magnetotail” by Chuxin Chen and Chih-Ping Wang

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 30 June 2018

The paper presents a study that calculates T_i/T_e ratio. The authors conclude that T_i/T_e ratio would be preserved if reconnection only happens once. This conclusion is not supported, as outlined below. The biggest problem with the study is the methodology. The authors model reconnection by simply cutting the Tsyanenko magnetic field by half, ignoring the heating associated with reconnection. The authors claim that T_i/T_e would be preserved if the magnetic field line is cut by half. Actually, given the methodology and assumptions, T_i/T_e should still be preserved even when the reconnection happens more than once to the same field line. Can the authors show that using the same methodology, if reconnection happened more than once, T_i/T_e would not be preserved? Why would the authors introduce reconnection? Is this necessary? Why not

C1

just try the methodology without reconnection? The authors claim that the comparison with the observations (Figure 4) is good, but upon close examination, there are some differences. The authors need to discuss these differences. Tsyanenko model is a time independent model with no reconnection built in. How do the authors model the field line after the reconnection in Figure 2? Tsyanenko magnetic field does not cross the equatorial plane at X_{half} in Figure 2. How do the authors force the model to bend the field lines so that they reconnect at X_{half} and how would the authors know what the field line configuration would look like after the reconnection?

It is not clear if the formalism presented by the authors can handle reconnection.

Interactive comment on Ann. Geophys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/angeo-2018-47>, 2018.

C2