

## ***Interactive comment on ““Earth-like” planetary magnetotails as non-linear oscillators” by Robert J. Burston***

**Robert Burston**

arbieroo@gmail.com

Received and published: 26 May 2020

The reviewer replaces argument with pejorative language, which is entirely unacceptable: I re-iterate that I did not “just” do anything. Nothing is “unfortunate” about this paper and there absolutely is no sense in which it is “premature.” These terms belittle my work without providing any logical or scientific argument refuting anything in the paper. If one removes the pejorative term “just” the first sentence of the reviewer’s latest comment is simply a statement of fact. There is no argument about anything in it. Similarly, in the second sentence, if the pejorative word, “Unfortunately,” is removed, it becomes a statement of fact. In the final sentence, if the word “premature,” is removed it becomes completely meaningless. None of these represents an argument. The remainder, beginning, “If I were you,” again completely ignores, rather than attempts to

C1

refute, the argument and evidence presented that studying analogous systems is a useful contribution to science. It also insists, without justification, that there should be some kind of one-to-one mapping between the spring model and the magnetotail for it to be useful. If such a thing existed there would be no point to the spring model, as one would have a model of the magnetotail. As for comparison with models of the magnetotail, that is insisting that this theory paper become an experimental paper without justifying why I should do so: Theory papers and experimental/observational papers have been considered acceptable as separate entities in physics for centuries. Since the analogy has been used before in articles by respected authors in respected journals, I have no real need to justify the use of the analogy now, but I have done so at length, already. In conclusion, the reviewer has twice failed to provide any attempt at a logical or scientific argument refuting the content of the paper, nor produced any justification at all for recommending rejection of the paper but has instead resorted to a subtle form of abuse i.e. pejorative language.

---

Interactive comment on Ann. Geophys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/angeo-2020-12>, 2020.

C2