

Interactive comment on “Horizontal electric fields from flow of auroral $O^+(^2P)$ ions at sub-second resolution” by Sam Tuttle et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 13 April 2020

General comments

This work continues the efforts in the community of understanding the link between dynamic auroral features and the electric fields in the ionosphere connected to the electrodynamics of ionosphere-magnetosphere system. The work combines new techniques with existing techniques to come up with a new method of estimating ionospheric horizontal electric fields at high temporal resolution, associated with dynamic auroral features. The electric fields are inferred from plasma flow velocity which is got through a combination of ground based optical observations (ASK) at high spatial (100m) and temporal (0.05s), and modelling. Usually, these high temporal variations of the electric field (plasma flow velocities) associated with the dynamic auroral features are a challenge to capture. This paper precisely presents steps to derive the

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



plasma velocities incorporating cross validation with observations at different stages. In addition to the high resolution, by use of optical emissions observations at three wavelengths, it is possible to separate the brightening due motions of the source are from motion of the plasma. This has been a challenge in earlier work. Throughout the work presented, different steps have been taken to minimize the uncertainties, one of which is the correction of the position of the magnetic zenith.

Generally, the proof of concept has been precisely presented and supported by the large degree of agreement with observations for the case study used. Possible suggestions for improvement of method are also well presented. The work presented in this article is well written and important to the community. I have a few suggestions and comments.

Specific comments

For the title, may be add the word 'temporal' before 'resolution'

In lines 350-352 and 406-407 and Figure 8, It is stated that the superDARN velocity is representative of the background velocity based on the close agreement in magnitude and direction with average for period before and after brightness enhancement (i.e., outside shaded period on color bar in figure 8). However, this is true for direction but not clear for magnitude. **Suggestion:** Add an extra line in figure 8 or separate figure with just the black dashed line and a line showing the average for the period before and after the brightness enhancement (period outside the shaded period on color bar of figure 8). The close agreement with the background flow will be clearer to see.

Technical corrections

Line 2: Replace the word 'beside' with another word like 'associated with'

Line 30: Missing reference

Figure 1: Add a vertical axis label for panels d-f

Figure 9: Mention what numbers 1-4 mark in the figure caption.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Figure 10: Mention that the orange circle marks the ASK field of view

Interactive comment on Ann. Geophys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/angeo-2020-11>, 2020.

ANGEOD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

