

Interactive comment on “Ionospheric Pc1 waves during a storm recovery phase observed by CSES” by Xiaochen Gou et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 24 April 2020

Review of the second revised version of “Ionospheric Pc1 waves during a storm recovery phase observed by CSES” by X. Gou et al.

The authors have responded helpfully to nearly all of the comments and suggestions made by this reviewer. However, their responses to two points are unsatisfactory. The second of these points was also a concern of the other reviewer.

The first point concerns references to papers by Park et al. [2013] and Kim et al. [2014].

Lines 72-78: “According to the statistical analysis of CHAMP satellite data during one solar cycle, Park et al. [2013] found that Pc1 waves are mostly linearly polarized, having a peak occurrence at sub-auroral latitudes, and weakly dependent on magnetic

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



activity and the solar wind velocity. The Swarm data show a peak occurrence rate of Pc1 waves 75 at middle latitude including sub-auroral region. Moreover, these waves are linear 76 polarization dominated, propagating oblique to the background magnetic field, and 77 preferably occur during the late recovery phase of magnetic storms [Kim et al. 2018a]. “

The authors’ reply is the following: “Surely, Park et al., 2013 and Kim et al., 2018 all proved that the peak occurrence rate of Pc1 waves is at midlatitude including sub-auroral region, so we used “sub-auroral region” instead of “auroral zone” (see line: 73).”

The authors’ reply is technically correct, but only to the extent that data in the auroral zone was excluded from these two studies. This was stated explicitly in the Park et al. (2013) paper, and was implicit in the Kim et al. (2018) paper as well. If the authors’ reply is taken literally, it contradicts numerous studies of Pc1 waves using high altitude spacecraft, which travel in regions where these waves are generated. The exclusion of data from the auroral zone in these two studies needs to be stated in this paper as well,

The second point concerns Figure 10 and its description in the text and figure caption.

Lines 225-233: “The blue dots correspond to the position of the plasmopause and the red star represents the conjugate location of Pc1 waves observed by CSES in the Southern hemisphere. From 11 to 21 MLT there is a plume rotating with the plasmasphere in the eastward direction. Such plumes are mostly formed during geomagnetic storm recovery phase [Pierrard and Cabrera, 2005]. Additionally, the plasma refilling process after the geomagnetic storms and substorms is included in this kinetic plasmasphere model. Between 02 and 05 MLT, two blue dots correspond to the inner edge of the refilling region and the outer edge of the plasmasphere and plasma refilling is expected in this intermediate region [Pierrard and Cabrera, 2005].”

First, the dots (asterisks?) appear to have two different colors: blue and purple. The

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



blue dots appear to trace the plume between 16 and 21 MLT, and two dots beyond L = 6 are blue, but all of the other dots appear to be purple.

Second, between 02 and 05 MLT there are two series of purple dots (not two dots).

This reviewer recommends changing one of the two colors of the dots/asterisks, and correcting the text to better match what is in this figure. As the other reviewer noted, local time should also be labeled (6, 12, 18, 0 or 24).

Interactive comment on Ann. Geophys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/angeo-2020-10>, 2020.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

