We thank both referees for the helpful comments. Point-by-point answers are given in blue.

Anonymous Referee #1
Received and published: 29 May 2020
Authors: N. Yagova et al.
Title: Even moderate geomagnetic pulsations can cause fluctuations of foF2 frequency of the auroral ionosphere.
The authors investigate the relation between colocated, simultaneous fluctuations in the F2 critical frequency and geomagnetic time series. They developed an automated method for inferring foF2 frequency from the ionograms. Events with foF2 frequencies modulated in the Pc5/Pi3 frequency range are analysed. The properties of a subset of events with coherence greater than 0.5 are compared to the average properties of the whole population of the events. The authors found that coherent events favour moderate geomagnetic conditions and show typical features of field line resonances. At the same time, it is noted that the automated detection of foF2 is not applicable to disturbed conditions. The paper, in general, is difficult to read and follow mainly because of its poor language. We strongly recommend the authors to use some spell-check tool to improve the quality of the presentation of their thoughts.

Thank you very much for your comments. We have rewritten the paper and have tried to improve the language.
A figure illustrating the automated
detection of the critical frequencies would be helpful for the reader.

Figure 1(a) now includes parameters of the approximation and the result of foF2 reconstruction.

 The focus of
the paper is on coherent events, however, neither the 'event' is exactly defined, nor the significance level of the calculated coherence is given.

The significance levels have been added to the paper, and a more detailed classification of the events is now given. This allows to clarify the basis for comparison of the coherent magnetic pulsations with the foF2 pulsations on each step of the data analysis.

There is also some inconsistency
in the paper about at what frequency the coherence is taken (f1 vs f2: statistics
in Fig 10 vs. case studies). Results presented in Fig 11 again suggest a link to f2 (at least based on the case studies).

Now all the frequencies are included into analysis. An additional criterium of frequency correspondence between foF2 and Bx pulsations is included and presented in Figure 10, and described in the text (lines **212-224**). All frequency information is now presented in Figure 10.

The relative occurrence of coherent events is very
low (_ 3%). The statistics support that coherent events tend to occur under moderately
disturbed geomagnetic and interplanetary conditions. However, the significance
of this result is not clear due to 1. the low relative occurrence of coherent events, 2.
the unknown significance level of coherence, 3. the limitations of foF2 detection under
disturbed conditions, 4. the applied normalisation on which limited information is
given. It was also not investigated how often the coherent events show up provided the
conditions are favourable (moderate disturbance). Without this information the study is
not complete and cannot be judged.

This summary of the problems in data analysis is really very important. Now the data
analysis is redone. We use the following classification of time intervals:
1) All the intervals, during the intervals of observations to analyze space weather
   parameters (referred as "All" or group1 in the text)
2) all intervals, for which spectra of geomagnetic variations are calculated (Pc5/Pi3, group
   2). In fact, the IMAGE data are available for the absolute majority of intervals. To avoid
   possible influence of seasonal and diurnal variations, we use for comparison the data
   recorded during the same months and UT intervals as foF2 fluctuations (8-14 UT, April
   2014 – end of 2015).
3) The intervals, for which foF2 spectra can be calculated (foF2, group 3)
4) Intervals with the over-threshold coherence level (coherent foF2-Bx, group 4)

The description of data used for statistical analysis is given in the text (lines **136-155)**. The results
are presented in Figures 9-14 and in the text of Section 3.1.2.
We use the combination 1-3-4 for analysis of dependence of foF2 fluctuations and Space Weather
and the combination 2-3-4 for analysis of inter-relation between foF2 and geomagnetic pulsations.

1. As a result, the present version contains a more clear interpretation of the difference in
   pulsation properties and space weather parameters found in the previous version of the
   MS between the coherent foF2-Bx pulsations and the background. Our analysis has
   shown, that it is the result of the two factors. The first one is related to the possibility to
   register foF2 with time resolution enough for spectral estimates and as a whole it
   corresponds to undisturbed conditions. The second one provides the conditions for
   coherent foF2-B fluctuations. They are registered under enhanced auroral activity, and
   specific properties of geomagnetic pulsations. A detailed description is given in the text
   (lines **225 - 291**)

2. The number of analyzed events are given for all the statistical studies (lines 151-152) .
3. Dispersion and confidence levels of coherence are added (lines 159-164, 176-177).

I recommend a major revision. Below I give a list
of my minor comments in two groups. The first group relates to science, the second to
the language. The latter is far from being complete. It would have been a long list.
Minor comments on the scientific content

We have tried to improve the text in the accordance with the minor remarks listed below. Specific remarks are given below to some questions which need more explanations.
l 97: "about 10 nT and 0.08 MHz": Revise these values based on Fig 3!

The average values are corrected, and the maximal amplitudes are added (lines 171-172).
l 100 what is the significance level for the coherence values in these calculations?

The estimates for coherence dispersion and confidence intervals are added (lines 176-177)

l 112: "about 80 nT and 0.08 MHz": although geomagnetic variations are several times greater here then for event 1, the foF2 variations are smaller. Comment?

Our analysis of pulsation properties on the ground has given no clear answer about a factor which controls different amplitude ratios for these two events. Unfortunately, no satellite data at nearly conjugated positions are available for the intervals analyzed. A hypothesis about possible reasons of this difference is now given in the Discussion (lines **325-348**).

l 126: A MLT distribution of occurrence of the foF2 variations –> The MLT distribution of the occurrence of foF2 variations Under what conditions? What criteria define an event?

Now the statistical results are described in a more clear way in accordance with the classification of intervals.
l 128: "frequency distributions of geomagnetic and foF2 pulsations": in general? I guess the distribution is based geomagnetic pulsation events simultaneous with foF2 events.

This description is rewritten

Figure 9: What is D (vertical axis)? Relative occurrence

Now, for all the statistical results empirical probability function P is used.

Figure 10: Why the distribution of the first spectral peaks is presented. In your example events f2 has the higher coherence and corresponding Psw fluctuations. Are not your examples presented typical for the coupling between foF2 and geomagnetic variations?

Now, a new technique with all the spectral maxima taken into account is applied. A new parameter, indicating, whether frequencies of foF2 and Bx spectral maxima are inter-related is introduced. A description of the method and results is given in the text (lines **207-224**)

l 131: "spectral coherence at SOD" : at what frequency? coherence at f1?
l 132: Give the significance level!

Figure 10 b) Mark the significance level in this plot!

This part of the MS is re-organized. We use the other presentation of data. Now the frequency information is given in Figure 10. The dispersion of coherence estimates is discussed in Section 2.

l 142: some information on the derivation of the weight functions and how they applied to normalize the data is needed

The classification of intervals and the way to suppress seasonal and diurnal variation is changed and described in the text (lines **136-155**)

l 153: "the 4-day minimum Dst and 6-hour maximal AE": intervals centred or preceding the coherent event?

All the parameters are given for the preceding intervals. The details are given in the text (lines **126-135**)

l 158-162 Do coherent events occur under severely disturbed conditions, just they cannot be observed? Or they do not occur under those conditions at all? How does this observational limitation affect your conclusions?

A more detailed classification of events has given a more clear discrimination between the limitations caused by a poor foF2 detection under disturbed conditions and the difference between coherent foF2-Bx pulsations and the general population of foF2-Bx cross-spectra. The results of this analysis is presented in the Figures 10-14 and in the text (lines 207-291). As for the ionosonde data, Pc5s in the F layer can be recorded under extremely disturbed conditions only rarely, because of blanketing or absorption below. This leads to the situation when case studies of rare Pc5 events may be possible, but the amount of data is not enough for statistical analysis.

l 165: "3-hour mean values of BZ and V and 3-hour maximal value of _Psw": in which interval? (same issue as above)

Again, the preceding intervals are used

l 181: "Amplitude of SW dynamic pressure fluctuations show an association with occurrence of coherent foF2 _ B pulsations": only 2 examples were presented in favour of this statement. Figure 13 b) does not yield any information on the spectral content of the pressure variations, and hence their relation to the coherent frequency. You seem to focus your statistics on f1 (first peak, e.g. Fig 10 a; coherence at f1), while your 2 examples had their relation with the SW pressure variations at f2.

The data of SW dynamical pressure have many gaps. That is why we only qualitatively consider some example events and use a standard deviation of Psw fluctuations instead of PSD.

l 185: refer to your observations relevant presented in Fig 11. and show how they support the FLR nature of the coherent subset

FLR properties of coherent foF2-Bx pulsations for the event 1 are shown in Figure 15 and described in the text (lines **300-305**).

l 193: "The picture changed dramatically": be more specific!

Thank you very much for the help with the text. We have taken all the comments into account.
Further comments:
l 1: "variations of the critical frequency": maybe "modulation" of the critical frequency could also be used here
l 1: o-mode radiowave –> o-mode radio waves
l 2: in 1–5â ˘ AL'mHz –> in the 1–5â ˘ AL'mHz
l 4: delete "daytime Pc5/Pi3 geomagnetic pulsations and" [foF2 is obviously not detected in geomagnetic pulsations]
l 6: at SOD station –> observed at SOD station
l 6: with the data of a station pair located at the same magnetic meridian –> using the data of a station pair located along the same magnetic meridian
l 8: Meanwhile, –> "At the same time," OR "However,"
l 8: "the analysis of geomagnetic and foF2 variations show intervals with noticeable coherence for both horizontal components" –> "the analysis of geomagnetic ad foF2 variations shows intervals of significant [OR remarkable] coherence with both horizontal geomagnetic components" [foF2 does not have any components]
l 11: averaged –> the average
l 11: coherent to –> coherent with
l 13: show –> shows
l 14: show –> shows [I suggest to use some synonym of 'show', such as 'reveal', 'indicate'. Use an online Thesaurus for finding synonyms]
l 19: Majority of publications are based on the radar observation –> Majority of publications on the topic are based on radar observations
l 20: of electron concentration at certain altitude –> of the electron concentration at a certain altitude
l 23: with mainly compressional mode of MHD wave in the magnetosphere –> with mainly compressional mode magnetospheric waves
l 26: An effect of TEC modulation by ULF wave –> The effect of TEC modulation by a ULF waves
l 27: and zones –> and also from zones
l 28: observed pulsations –> the observed pulsations [a large number of articles are missing from the text, check!]

l 31: the recovery phase of the magnetic storm –> the recovery phase of a magnetic storm

l 33: aimed on variations –> aimed at comparing variations

l 37: It makes an ionogram –> It obtains an ionogram recording

l 40: 10 s sampling rate –> 10 s sampling period/interval

l 40: and we also use the data of the MAS station, which is a part of IMAGE –> we also use data of recorded at MAS station of the IMAGE network

l 42: To analyzed –> To analyze

l 43: and also Dst and AE indexes are used –> as well as Dst and AE indexes

l 46: with quality and time resolution enough –> with good quality and time resolution is enough

l 56: for the reader's sake refer to your Fig 1 here.

l 58: Lorentsian –> Lorentzian

l 60: 235 km –> 235 km.

l 60: Coefficients f1, _f = f2 _ f1, k, and _ are found as a result of fitting procedure, described below. –> A fitting procedure described below is used to find f1, _f = f2 _ f1, k, and _. [f1,_f, _ are not coefficients] What are the meaning of f1 (I guess f at h1) and f2?

l 61: boundary is determined as a line –> boundary consists of a set of (h,f) points

l 62: Signal intensity I at the boundary should be high –> Signal intensity I is high

l 63: Amplitude ratio R of the signal intensity at the boundary line to the power above it should also be high –> The contrast between the peak and the background (characterized by the amplitude ratio R) is high [or similar, your version is confusing. Intensity to power ratio called amplitude ratio... It is not clear what is 'above'. At higher frequency?]

l 64: As four fitting factors are used –> We then fit Eq(1) to the detected boundary points. As four fitting factors are used

l 64: organized and a parameter –> organized. A parameter

l 65: over the "cross" in space of parameters –> over the parameter space [?]

l 65: where x is a point in the space of parameters, and i is a parameter number –> where 'x' is a point in the parameter space, and 'i' identifies the parameter [and what is c?]

l 64: Give a representative example, e.g. the values of the parameters used to derive the fits presented in Fig 1!

l 68: time dependence f(t): Do you mean the time dependence foF2(t)?

l 69: give a typical value of t1!

l 71: the other [??? or another]

l 73: Examples of approximation curves are given in Figure 1:

Figure 1: Complete the figure caption by including "the fitted curves are plotted over the ionograms in yellow" or similar. Add a reference to the fitting curves in Fig 1 in the main text, as well.

l 76: pictures –> plots

l 79: Note, that the ionograms are rotated by 90â °U ¸e in respect to usual f _ H presentation:

This sentence should come earlier! (with respect to)

l 80: foF2 –> foF2 values

l 84: Statistical analysis: Statistical analysis of what?

l 84: interval –> intervals

l 85: We studied –> We studied the effect/influence of …. on…

l 87: resolution, enough –> resolution high enough

l 90: Cross-spectra are calculated for foF2 variations, on one hand, and components of the geomagnetic field pulsations, on the other hand. –> Cross-spectra are calculated between foF2 variations and components of the geomagnetic field pulsations.

l 100: "at low frequency part of spectrum f < 2 mHz" –> "in the low frequency part (f < 2 mHz) of spectrum"

l 101: peak with maximal y2 = 0.6 –> peak with y2 = 0.6

l 129: "with frequencies (f1 > 3.7 mHz)" –> "with frequencies above 3.7 mHz

l 130: "The distribution of Pc5/Pi3 intervals over foF2 _ b spectral coherence at SOD are shown in Figure 10b for two" –> "The histogram of the foF2 _ b spectral coherence at SOD is shown in Figure 10b for the two"

l 137: "a question arises about the pulsation properties and external parameters, favorable for their occurrence": rephrase!

l 138: "the geomagnetic pulsations" –> "a subset of the geomagnetic pulsations"

l 139: " with all the intervals, selected" –> " with all the events selected"

l 142: "calculated with the weight functions, which are found from" –> "calculated with weight functions derived from"

l 143: "coherent and pulsations and averaged" –> "coherent pulsations and averaged"

l 151: indexes –> indices

l 159: "limited by" –> "limited to"

l 186: "in coherent foF2 _ Bx pulsations" : delete. This information is already given earlier in the sentence.

l 197: "For the first time, a statistical study of foF2 variations in Pc5/Pi3 range and their relation to geomagnetic pulsation in the conjugated position at SOD station and its spatial distribution along a magnetic meridian." Check the sentence (missing predicate).

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 19 August 2020

In their manuscript "Even moderate geomagnetic pulsations can cause fluctuations of foF2 frequency of the auroral ionosphere", Yagova et al. explore variations of the ionosphere F2 region critical frequency (foF2) and ultra-low frequency (ULF) waves in the Pc5 and Pi3 frequency bands detected at auroral latitudes.

Using ground magnetometer and ionosonde data spanning years 2014 and 2015, the authors examine the power, coherence and phase difference of perturbations in the daytime ionosphere and Pc5/Pi3 geomagnetic pulsations, distinguishing a subset of events during periods of magnetic quiescence and moderate magnetic storms with coherence greater than 0.5 from ULF wave signatures in the ionosphere observed under conditions favourable to strong geomagnetic storms. This extends previous studies by Pilipenko et al. (2014a and 2014b) that considered ULF wave-driven oscillations in the ionosphere F2 region during strong and small magnetic storms.

Furthermore, the manuscript presents a new methodology to the automated detection of the foF2 critical frequency from ionograms that could be of interest for the research

community working on determining factors that influence the amplitude and phase of perturbations in the ionosphere as these are detected on the ground. There are, however, several issues that hinder my recommendation of this manuscript for publication in Annales Geophysicae in its present form.

There are major issues with the English language use, several typographical errors and in general, it is poorly written making it difficult to understand the scientific rationale behind this study.

Thank you very much for the comments. We have re-examined the MS and have tried to improve the language.

For example, in line 19, it reads: "Modulation of ionospheric parameters by Pc5 pulsations was reported : : :", without detailing which parameters are meant here. In the same line, it goes on to say: "Majority of publications are based on the radar observation : : :" (which would more correctly read "The majority of publications are based on radar observations : : :"), without making it clear to which publications the authors refer.

The Introduction is rewritten and we tried to make the description of publications more specific

It would be worthwhile to establish in the Introduction the need for a study such as the present by listing past publications focused on perturbations in the ionosphere driven by ULF waves. Early results on geomagnetic pulsations in the ULF wave frequency range associated with total electron content (TEC) fluctuations date back to 1976 and include the following:
- Davies & Hartmann (1976), Short-period fluctuations in total columnar electron content, Journal of Geophysical Research, https://doi.org/10.1029/JA081i019p03431
- Okuzawa & Davies (1981), Pulsations in total columnar electron content, Journal of Geophysical Research, https://doi.org/10.1029/JA086iA03p01355

In the previous version, we have briefly mentioned only auroral Pc5 pulsations, while the papers by Davies (1976) and Okuzawa (1981) were devoted to Pc3-4 pulsations at lower latitudes. In the revision we have extended the Introduction section.

Total electron content variations have been proven a powerful tool in the detection of ionospheric signatures of ULF waves at high latitudes as well as data from ionosondes exploiting the radio-wave reflecting properties of the ionosphere, as it is detailed by Watson et al. (2015). It is not clear to me and perhaps the reader how the results of Watson are different from those of Kozyreva et al. (2019) briefly mentioned in line 29. Nor the difference with those of Pilipenko et al. (2014b) derived from data collected during a different magnetic storm.

This analysis is included into the Introduction section and to Discussion. The difference of physical mechanisms providing different TEC to geomagnetic amplitude ratios is now discussed in the text (lines 325-348).

The following publications could be added to improve the placement of this work in the context of existing literature:
- Baddeley et al. (2005), On the coupling between unstable magnetospheric particle populations and resonant high-m ULF wave signatures in the ionosphere, Annales Geophysicae, https://doi.org/10.5194/angeo-23-567-2005
- Buchert et al. (1999), Ionospheric conductivity modulation in ULF pulsations, Journal of Geophysical Research, https://doi.org/10.1029/1998JA900180

The references have been added to the MS

In lines 31 and 32, the authors note that the association of waves with moderate amplitudes with variations of the foF2 critical frequency have not been studied. However, how their amplitude is defined as moderate is not described nor later in the manuscript. As mentioned in the title of the manuscript, the reader is waiting for more details on these moderate geomagnetic pulsations, in my mind.

In the presented version the data analysis is redone. Now the dependence of foF2-Bx coherence on PSD of geomagnetic pulsations is discussed in the text (lines 251-256 and Figure 12) .

In lines 62 and 63, could the authors explain in quantitative terms how high the signal intensity at the reflection boundary should be as well as the amplitude ratio of the signal intensity at the reflection boundary to the power above it?
Later, in lines 68 and 71, the authors note that a threshold for the time derivative of the foF2 critical frequency is calculated from the variance over a time interval of length t1. Is the variance of the foF2 critical frequency meant? How is the length of the time interval t1 defined?

The description of the approximation procedure is extended and the parameters used are mentioned in the text (lines 86-98).

Section 2.2 would benefit from an ionogram on which the described method has been used to detect the ionosphere F2 region critical frequency, clearly illustrating the new method for the foF2 critical frequency automated detection.

Figure 1, its capture, and the text explaining the procedure is improved to make the detail of the approximation procedure clearer.

In Figures 4 and 7, it would be worthwhile to note the frequency of the primary and secondary maximum in power and provide further explanation at which frequency the coherence is taken for the statistics provided in Section 3.1.2.

Now the statistical analysis is extended and all frequencies of coherence maxima are included into statistics

In Section 3.1.1, in addition to the details offered for the two intervals in March and July 2015, the two examples could be utilised to introduce the criteria set for selecting similar events for subsequent statistical analysis.

The classification of events is improved. The explicit classification is given in the Data processing section (lines 136-155).

In Figures 9, 10, 12 and 13, as these are described in Section 3.1.2, what does "occurrence" and the symbol "D" mean in this context? Do the authors refer to "probability of occurrence"?

Now, for all the statistical distribution empirical probability function P is used.

As they stand, the conclusions reached and briefly summarised in the first paragraph of Section 4 of this manuscript are a bit vague. Although it is suggested that this study is focused on variations of the ionosphere's critical frequency foF2 during quiet and moderately disturbed geomagnetic conditions, the most favourable values of the Dst index lay between -100 and -50 nT. Under such conditions, how often would it be expected to detect events are associated with ULF geomagnetic pulsations? How would the low occurrence rate (3%) of coherent events change if periods of highly disturbed conditions or quiescence were excluded? Please also consider commenting on the solar wind conditions that are favourable for the occurrence of coherent events and specifically, provide the range of solar wind speed and dynamic pressure values.

The new classification of all the intervals analyzed is now used. You are absolutely right, that in the previous version of our MS, the problems caused by the method of foF2 detection from the ionogram in the disturbed ionosphere can hardly be discriminated with the ionospheric Pc5/Pi3 occurrence probability. In the present version we show the difference in average space weather parameters for all the 21 months analyzed and for the foF2 intervals, i.e. those with foF2 quality and time resolution enough for spectral estimates in Pc5 range. For these intervals, the specific features of high coherent b-foF2 pulsations and space weather conditions favorable for their occurrence are analyzed. The results are presented in the Figures 11-14 and in the text (section 3.1.2). Probabilities of coherent b-foF2 pulsations under favorable conditions are given explicitly in the Figures and discussed in the text (lines 256-292).

Lastly, there are inconsistencies in the referencing style and specifically, on page 9 and 10, the year of publication in Mager et al. (2013), Min et al. (2017) and Viall et al. (2009) should be moved to the end of each reference.

The references are corrected

Even moderate geomagnetic pulsations can cause fluctuations of foF2 frequency of the auroral ionosphere

Nadezda Yagova[1], Alexander Kozlovsky[2], Evgeny Fedorov[1], and Olga Kozyreva[1]

[1]Schmidt Institute of Physics of the Earth, Moscow,Russia
[2]Sodankylä Geophysical Observatory, Sodankylä, Finland

Correspondence: N. Yagova(nyagova@ifz.ru)

Abstract. The ionosonde at the Sodankyla Geophysical Observatory (SOD, 67 N, 27 E, Finland) routinely performs vertical soundings once per minute, such that makes possible studying fast ionospheric variations at a frequency of the long-period geomagnetic pulsations Pc5/Pi3 ($1 - 5$ mHz). Using the ionosonde data from April 2014 - December 2015 and collocated geomagnetic measurements, we have investigated a correspondence between the magnetic field pulsations and variations of the critical frequency of radio waves reflected from the ionospheric F2 layer (foF2). For this study, we have developed a technique for automated retrieval the foF2 from ionograms. As a rule, the Pc5 frequency band fluctuations in foF2 were observed in the daytime during quiet or moderately disturbed space weather conditions. In many cases (about 80% of intervals), the coherence between the foF2 variations and geomagnetic pulsations was low. However in some cases (specified as "coherent") the coherence was as large as ($\gamma^2 \geq 0.5$). Favorable conditions for the coherent cases are enhanced auroral activity (6-hour maximal $AE \geq 800$ nT), high solar wind speed ($V > 600$ km/s), fluctuating solar wind pressure, and northward interplanetary magnetic field. In the cases when the coherence was higher at shorter periods of oscillations, the magnetic pulsations demonstrated features typical for Alfven field-line resonance.

Copyright statement. TEXT

1 Introduction

Ionospheric variations at the frequency corresponding to simultaneous geomagnetic pulsations were observed in the total electron content (TEC) and have been interpreted as a modulation of the ionosphere by magnetospheric processes (e.g. Davies and Hartmann (1976); Okuzawa and Davies (1981)). The effect of the ionosheric modulation at a frequency of Pc3-4 geomagnetic pulsations ($6.7 - 80$ mHz) was found at mid- and low latitudes (Davies and Hartmann, 1976; Okuzawa and Davies, 1981). Davies and Hartmann (1976) reported on pulsations in TEC, recorded at non-disturbed conditions and associated with Pc3-4s on the ground. Later, Okuzawa and Davies (1981) confirmed the correspondence between ground and TEC variations in the Pc3-4 range, but they obtained the maximal probability under disturbed conditions.

1

Particle precipitation at auroral latitudes is one of the most intensive processes of the magnetosphere-ionosphere coupling. It is modulated by intensive ultra low frequency (ULF) waves and this was a topic of numerous studies. Clear features of Pc5 pulsations in the Doppler velocities of the F-layer ionospheric irregularities were found by Ruohoniemi et al. (1991) using coherent-scatter radar observations. (Wright et al., 1997) analyzed ionospheric features of auroral Pc4-5s with Doppler sounding. They have shown that large-scale pulsations correlated in the ionosphere and on the ground demonstrated azimuthal wave numbers m typical for ground Pc4-5s and filed line resonance (FLR) features. Particle populations responsible for generation of small-scale (high m) waves and their ionospheric features was studied by Baddeley et al. (2005). The substorm Pc5 waves with intermediate m registered simultaneously in ion flux in the magnetosphere and in radar observation was reported by Mager et al. (2019). James et al. (2016) showed that the energy of precipitating particles and ULF wave number were controlled by the distance from the substorm epicenter.

Publications devoted to Pc5 features in total electron content (TEC) are not so numerous, as radar ones. Watson et al. (2015) presented the large-amplitude TEC variations in the Pc5-6 frequency band detected by GPS receivers. They suggested that these TEC variations were associated with the compressional mode magnetospheric waves. The corresponding pulsations were also manifested in the magnetic field on the ground with two spectral maxima at about 0.9 mHz and 3.3 mHz. This event was observed in the afternoon after a steep increase of solar wind (SW) dynamic pressure up to almost 20 nPa. It was also followed by modulation of electron flux, measured at geostationary orbit. An important feature of the observed oscillations is, that the amplitude of TEC variations is higher than that found by Pilipenko et al. (2014a), although the geomagnetic pulsations on the ground were not so intensive.

Vorontsova et al. (2016) observed the effect of TEC modulation by ULF waves at low latitudes far away from the resonant L-shells and the zones where kinetic modes can occur due to wave-particle interaction. This has allowed to identify the observed ULF waves as fast magnetosonic mode. Kozyreva et al. (2019) investigated the Pc5 frequency band oscillations in the ionosonde data at an auroral station and found an intriguing effect of the ionopheric oscillations at a second harmonic of the simultaneously observed geomagnetic pulsations.

Pilipenko et al. (2014a) have found the effect of ionosphere heating in the F-layer by an intense magneto-hydrodynamic (MHD) wave at the recovery phase of a magnetic storm. It was not associated with noticeable electron precipitation. The TEC variations in this event was then studied in (Pilipenko et al., 2014b) and a Pc5 related TEC variations was retrieved. Pilipenko et al. (2014b) suggested several mechanisms of the TEC modulation by ULF waves associated with Pc5 pulsations and estimated the related amplitudes of TEC variations. For some of them no detectable variations of TEC were found under realistic Pc5 amplitudes. Meanwhile, such mechanisms as Joule heating provide detectable amplitudes for intensive Pc5s.

The efficiency of the TEC modulation by ULF waves depends on the modulation of particle flux in the magnetosphere. However, long-term measurements at geostationary orbit are available for electrons at energies $E > 30$ keV. A data deficit at lower energies can be partly compensated by numerical modelling. Buchert et al. (1999) modeled variations of ionospheric Hall and Pedersen conductivities associated with ULF modulation of electron flux at energies about several keVs. These corresponds to the E-layer of the ionosphere, i.e. the energy of electrons is also too high to control for foF2 fluctuations. However, this study gives a principle opportunity to extend the observational results to softer electrons. Watson et al. (2015) showed experimentally,

that high amplitudes of TEC variations can be observed under lower Pc5 amplitudes than follows from the analysis of ULF wave modulation of the ionosphere without particle flux modulation.

Thus, a question arises about a statistical relationship between geomagnetic and ionospheric pulsations. Till now, a role of MHD waves in a wide range of amplitudes in variations of foF2 critical frequency has not been studied sufficiently. In the present paper we attempt to study statistics of the variations of foF2 critical frequency at the Pc5/Pi3 frequencies and simultaneous geomagnetic pulsations in the same frequency range.

2 Data of observations and their processing

2.1 Data

Data of the ionosphere sounding were obtained from the Sodankylä Geophysical Observatory (SOD, 67.3° N, 26.7° E). The SOD ionosonde routinely performs vertical soundings once per minute. A detailed description of the ionosond can be found in (Kozlovsky et al., 2013). The SOD magnetometer is included in the IMAGE magnetometer network (Taskanen, 2009), and data of the three components of the geomagnetic field are available with 10 s sampling rate. For the analysis of the spatial distribution of geomagnetic pulsations we also use data from another IMAGE magnetometer in Masi (MAS) (Table 1).

The space weather data were obtained from the OMNI database at http://cdaweb.gsfc.nasa.gov. We used data of the interplanetary magnetic field, speed and dynamic pressure of the solar wind, re-calculated to the sub-solar point of the magnetosphere (Bargatze et al., 2005), and the indices of geomagnetic storm and auroral activity, namely the disturbance storm time (Dst) and Auroral Electrojet (AE).

We have looked through the ionosonde and SOD magnetometer data from April 2014 through December 2015 and visually selected intervals for the further analysis according to the following criteria::

– The F trace is clearly seen in the ionograms, such that the foF2 critical frequency can be retrieved;

– Geomagnetic pulsations Pc5 or Pi3 are seen in the northward (BX) component and their peak-to-peak amplitude exceeds 5 nT during at least 2 hours in the daytime, at 8-14 UT corresponding to 11 - 17 magnetic local time, MLT, in SOD

A list of selected intervals is given in Table 2.

2.2 foF2 automatic detection from ionograms

Although visual scaling of the foF2 values from ionograms with clearly identified F traces is easy, the studies of high-frequency variations require scaling of many ionograms, such that one needs an automated procedure for that. The difficulties of this procedure are caused by variability of an intensity of the reflected signals, a background noise, sporadic layers, broadcast interference, etc. Because of these reasons, techniques of the automated foF2 detection can be unstable, even in the cases when visual detection is possible.

In the present study we used a method based on the approximation of the F trace in a wide range of altitudes to reduce the influence of gaps and intensity peaks of reflections at some frequencies. The F trace (i.e., the curve showing dependence of the frequency of reflected wave on the virtual height of reflection) is characterized by a linear growth at low height with gradual transition to saturation at the critical frequency (Figure 1). We approximate this dependence by a Lorentzian shape function such as

$$F(h) = F_1 + \Delta F \frac{k(h - h_1)^\alpha}{k(h - h_1)^\alpha + 1} \tag{1}$$

The approximation was made above a starting height $h_1 = 235$ km. At this altitude $F_1 = F(h_1)$ and $F_2 = F_1 + \Delta F$ is the frequency limit at $h \to \infty$. Actually, foF2 is close to F_2, but a minor difference between these two values indicates that a non-zero positive derivative in the $F(h)$ dependence exists at all the altitudes. Parameters F_1, ΔF, k, and α were obtained in the course of a fitting procedure described below. The trace was determined as a curve where the following two conditions were fulfilled:

– Intensity of the reflection, I, at the trace is high $I \geq I_b$ (in the units, used for the approximation it was $I_b = 4 \cdot 10^4$).

– Ratio of the signal intensity at the trace to that above it, R, is high (> 3)

For the four-factors fitting, a 9-point iteration procedure was applied to maximize a parameter $K_t^2 = cI^2 + (1 - c)R^2$ in the space of parameters $K_t(x_0, x_0 - \Delta x_i, x_0 + \Delta x_i)$, where c is a constant between 0 and 1, x is a point in the space of parameters, and i identifies the parameter. An initial approximation was taken from the database created manually for several typical types of the $F(h)$ dependence. After that, the foF2 was determined as F given by (1) at the heights at which it weakly depends on h. The other requirement was a continuity of the time dependence foF2(t). The threshold value for the time derivative of foF2 was estimated from the foF2 standard deviation, obtained from N previous instants. In the present version of procedure $N = 10$ and the maximal $t - t_0$ difference equal to 2 standard deviations was used. For $t > t_1$, the set of parameters calculated at the previous step was taken as an initial approximation. If the iteration gave a value of foF2 which difference from the previous values exceeded the threshold value, another initial approximation was taken from the database, and the procedure was repeated. If all the initial approximations gave values standing far from the previous ones, this data point was excluded, and the iteration procedure started from the next time instant. Examples of the F trace approximation are shown by white curves in Figure 1 for three ionograms obtained on 24 October 2014. (Note that the ionograms are rotated by $90°$ with respect to traditional presentation.) For the example shown in Figure 1a the critical frequency foF2 obtained from eq.(1) and parameters F_1, F_2 and h_1 are indicated. For this case $\alpha = 1.37$ and $k = 6.5 \cdot 10^{-3}$ were obtained.

The continuity condition allows to reduce effects of multiple reflections and bifurcations. A list of the analyzed intervals (days and time), ASCII files of the data such as retrieved foF2 and parameters of the approximation, and plots of foF2 time series are available as supplementary materials. In all the cases, the results of the automated procedure were tested visually for each tenth data point. The selected intervals form the database for the analysis. As an example, Figure 2 shows a diurnal variation of the critical frequency retrieved by the automated procedure for the case on 3 January 2015.

4

2.3 Pre-processing, statistical and spectral analysis

We have analyzed pulsations in the meridional component of the geomagnetic field denoted as b_X in association with variations of foF2 denoted as ΔfoF2. (The pulsation magnetic field is denoted as b to discriminate it from the main magnetic field B.)

We have studied how the occurrence of foF2 fluctuations in Pc5/Pi3 range and their coherence with geomagnetic pulsations depend on the magnetic local time (MLT), parameters of geomagnetic pulsations, and space weather conditions. The parameters of geomagnetic pulsations are the power spectral density (PSD), polarization quantified as spectral power ratio b_X to b_Y power spectral ratio, and a "South-to-North spectral ratio" which is a ratio of spectral power density of pulsations recorded at different latitudes.

The Dst and AE indices were used as indicators of geomagnetic storms and auroral substorms, respectively. It is known that the most intensive geomagnetic pulsations Pc5/Pi3 occur at the recovery phase of geomagnetic storms (Posch et al., 2003), which lasts from 3 to 7 days. For the analysis of Dst we used 4-day intervals before the time when the variations of foF2 were retrieved. Auroral substorms may influence Pc5/Pi3 activity during several hours (Kleimenova et al., 2002), so that we considered the AE index during 6 hours preceding the time of selected intervals.

The interplanetary parameters controlling the Pc5/Pi3 activity are the vertical component of the interplanetary magnetic field (IMF B_Z), solar wind velocity V, and fluctuations of the solar wind pressure P_{SW} (Baker et al., 2003). Because of numerous short gaps in the P_{SW} data, instead of the spectral power we used the standard deviation of P_{SW} as a characteristic of the P_{SW} fluctuations. In the present analysis we considered the interplanetary parameters during 3 hours preceding the time of selected intervals.

For the further analysis, al the intervals are classified into 4 groups.

– All intervals in April 2014 - December 2015. For them, space weather parameters and geomagnetic activity indices are analyzed (all intervals, group 1).

– The intervals, for which spectra of geomagnetic variations are calculated (Pc5/Pi3 intervals, group 2).

– The intervals, for which foF2 spectra can be calculated (foF2 intervals, group 3).

– The intervals in which the coherence of foF2 variations with geomagnetic pulsations exceeded certain threshold (coherent foF2-b_X intervals, group 4).

The space weather parameters, activity indices, and geomagnetic data are available for the absolute majority of intervals during April 2014 -December 2015. To avoid possible influence of seasonal and diurnal variations, we used data from the same UT time, 8-14 UT, when foF2 data can be available around the year. We used this classification to compare distributions of the space weather parameters for all the intervals (group 1) with those for the foF2 intervals (group 3) and coherent foF2-b_X intervals (group 4). Also, we have investigated which conditions are favorable for observations of the variations in foF2 and for the coherent foF2-b_X events. For that, we have compared the spectral power of geomagnetic pulsations, their polarization, and the meridional distribution for the Pc5/Pi3 intervals (group2), foF2 intervals (group 3), and coherent foF2-b_X intervals (group

150 4). Then, we have compared the MLT distributions for the foF2 intervals (group 3), and coherent foF2-b_X intervals (group 4). The total number of intervals in group 3 is 2764. For the group 4, it is 448 and 105 for $\gamma_b = 0.5$ and 0.64, respectively. Note, that the pulsations at these intervals are not independent because of overlapping.

We compared the distributions of Pc5/Pi3 and space weather parameters for groups 3 and 4 under $\gamma_b^2 = 0.5$. For that an empirical probability function P is used. Besides, the fraction of intervals R_γ with over-threshold maximal γ^2 is presented for 155 the two values of γ_b^2.

The one-minute time resolution of the data of foF2 allows the cross-spectral analysis with the Pc5/Pi3 geomagnetic pulsations. For that, power spectral density (PSD) was estimated using the Blackman-Tukey method (Kay, 1988). The cross-spectra have been calculated between the foF2 variations on one hand, and geomagnetic pulsations on the other hand. For the intervals with high spectral coherence γ^2, a phase difference $\Delta\varphi$ was estimated.

Spectra were calculated for nearly 1-hour ($N_p = 64$ points) intervals with 5 min shift. A 16 point ($M = N_p/4$) was used for calculations. A dispersion of the smoothed coherence spectra can be calculated as

$$var(\gamma^2) = c/K(\gamma^2)(1-\gamma^2)^2,$$

160 where $K = N_p/M$, and c is a constant depending of the spectral window used. The equation shows that the dispersion of coherence depends on the its absolute value (Jenkins and Watts, 1969). It goes to zero for high coherence and to that of non-smoothed spectra at zero coherence. We used two threshold values of coherence in the present study: $\gamma_b^2 = 0.5$ and 0.64 with dispersion levels 0.074 and 0.05 respectively. These means that for $\gamma_b^2 = 0.5$, γ^2 exceed 0.25 at 70% confidence level. For $\gamma^2 = 0.64$, $\gamma^2 > 0.375$ at 75% confidence level.

3 Results

3.1 foF2 variations and geomagnetic pulsations at SOD

3.1.1 Examples

Below we present two examples of foF2 and geomagnetic variations simultaneously recorded at SOD. They are characterized by high foF2-b_X coherence, however amplitudes of geomagnetic pulsations were essentially different in these two cases, 4 nT 170 and 40 nT, respectively. Geomagnetic and foF2 pulsations recorded on 11 March (Day 70) 2015 (event 1) are presented in Figure 3. Peak-to-peak amplitudes of geomagnetic and foF2 pulsations are about 8 nT and 0.05 MHz, respectively. Their maximal values are 12 nT and 0.1 MHz. The normalized PSD spectra P_f^* for both geomagnetic and foF2 pulsations, spectral coherence γ^2 and phase difference $\Delta\varphi$ are presented in Figure 4. P_f^* of geomagnetic pulsations has two broad maxima at $f_1 = 2.3$ and $f_2 = 3.2$ mHz. The spectrum of foF2 variations has a maximum at a frequency $f = 3.8$ mHz. Spectral coherence 175 ($\gamma^2 > 0.75$) in the low frequency part of spectrum $f < 2$ mHz, and a minor coherence peak with $\gamma^2 = 0.6$ near the f_2 frequency is seen. At $f < 1.6$ mHz where $\gamma^2 > 0.9$ the γ^2 dispersion does not exceed $6 \cdot 10^{-3}$, i.e. $\gamma^2 > 0.8$ at 83% confidence level. For $\gamma^2 = 0.75$ and 0.6 the dispersion values 0.027 and 0.056, respectively. Figure 5 shows the space weather conditions for event

1. Zero time in panels (a-e) corresponds to the start time of the interval (10:40 UT). It is seen that geomagnetic conditions were quiet, and Dst > -20 nT (Figure 5a) indicates that no geomagnetic storm occurred during at least four days before the event. However, the auroral activity was essential and maximal AE reached 500 nT (Figure 5b). This activation occurred after a negative (southward) B_Z variation of about 20 nT (Figure 5d). For this event, SW speed V was about 400 km/s (Figure 5c), and the SW dynamic pressure was about 4 nPa (Figure 5e). The P_{SW} fluctuations are shown in more details in Figure 5f. Their amplitude was about 0.7 nPa and their apparent period was about 5 minutes. This corresponds to frequency $f = 3.3$ mHz, i.e. it approximately agrees with the f_2 frequency of pulsations at SOD.

The case on 11 July (Day 192) 2015 (event 2) is presented in Figures 6 and 7, which have the same format, as Figures 3 and 4 for the first event. Peak-to-peak amplitudes of the geomagnetic and foF2 pulsations are about 80 nT and 0.08 MHz, respectively. A clear maximum at $f_1 \approx 2.5$ mHz is seen in both geomagnetic and foF2 PSD spectra (Figure 7a). At the second frequency $f_2 \approx 3.5$ mHz a maximum is seen only in foF2 variations, while in the geomagnetic pulsations this frequency is marked only as a plateau in the PSD spectrum. However, both spectral maxima are seen clearly in the coherence spectrum (Figure 7b), and the phase difference is different for these two frequencies (Figure 7c).

Space weather conditions for this event are summarized in Figure 8, which has the same format as Figure 5. There were no a geomagnetic storm during 4 days before this event, which is indicated by the Dst exceeding $= -30$ nT (Figure 8a). Meanwhile, the auroral activity was high, namely, two auroral activations occurred at $\tau = -8$ and -4 hours hours with maximal AE$= 1300$ nT and (700 nT), respectively (Figure 8b). The first activation occurred after a 2-hours interval of negative IMF B_Z, while the second one was associated with a B_Z turn from -10 to almost $+15$ nT (Figure 8d). For this event, V was about 600 km/s (Figure 8c), whereas a maximal P_{SW} was about 9 nPa, then dropped to 5 nPa and slowly decreased to about 3 nPa (Figure 8e). The amplitude of P_{SW} fluctuations fluctuations during the 45-minutes interval shown in Figure 8f was about 0.5 nPa and their apparent period was about $4-5$ minutes. The main frequency of P_{SW} pulsations is 3.7 mHz, which approximately corresponds to f_2 frequency in foF2 variations, registered at SOD.

3.1.2 Statistics

Figure 9 shows the distributions of the parameters of foF2 variations with the magnetic local time. The upper panel shows a probability for occurrence of a foF2 interval (group 3). One can see from this figure, that the foF2 variations were detected in the near-noon and afternoon MLT sectors with a maximal probability between 13 and 16 MLT. The lower panel shows the distribution of a fraction of coherent intervals R_γ (group 4). It varies in the range $0.13 - 0.21$ for the threshold value $\gamma_b^2 = 0.5$ with a maximum near the noon. For $\gamma_b^2 = 0.64$ its average value is 0.04, and a weak bb maximum with $R_\gamma = 0.05$ is seen near the noon.

Figure 10a shows frequency histograms, for the frequencies of local PSD maxima in b_x and foF2 spectra (groups 2 and 3, respectively). The geomagnetic pulsations demonstrate a maximum at 3.2 mHz, which corresponds to the frequency of the Alfven resonance at the L-shell of SOD. The frequency distribution of foF2 fluctuations has two maxima in the frequency bands centered at 2 and 3.9 mHz. Thus, the Figure has shown that the most probable frequencies of spectral maxima are different for foF2 and geomagnetic pulsations at SOD.

7

However, case studies show pulsations with maxima at the same frequencies in both foF2 and b_X. To check, whether this effect is a result of random co-incidence or the pulsations are interrelated, we have compared frequency distributions of the foF2 and geomagnetic pulsations for random time intervals with those recorded simultaneously. We have calculated a square difference, $\Delta_{f2} = (f_{F2} - f_b)^2$, where f_{F2} and f_b are the frequencies of foF2 and b_X PSD maxima, respectively. The parameter Δ_{f2} was calculated for f_{F2} and f_b taken from the spectra, calculated at randomly selected and simultaneous time intervals. To reduce possible influence of diurnal variation, for each f_{F2}, only those values of Δ_{f2} were used, which were obtained from b_X spectra calculated at a random day at the same MLT with an 1-hour accuracy. Then, its average value was calculated. The difference in average values of Δ_{f2} for simultaneous and random intervals was quantified as a parameter $\delta = \log(\Delta_{f2,0}/\Delta_{f2,R})$, where $\Delta_{f2,0}$ and $\Delta_{f2,R}$ are the mean values of Δ_{f2} for simultaneous and random intervals, respectively. Negative values of δ indicate that the frequencies agree better for simultaneous, than for random intervals. The frequency dependence of δ is shown in Figure 10(b). It is seen from the Figure, that δ is negative in all the frequency bands, besides one centered at 2.5 mHz. A minimum is seen at $f = 3.2$ mHz, i.e. near the Alfven resonant frequency at SOD. Thus, in this frequency band an inter-relation does exist between the frequencies of foF2 and b_X spectral maxima.

This inter-relation was also found in the coherent foF2-b_X pulsations. Then, a question is arising, how the probability to detect a coherent foF2-b_X pulsation depends on the parameters of geomagnetic pulsation and the space weather. To answer this question, we have studied three groups of parameters, namely:

– PSD, polarization and spatial distribution of geomagnetic pulsations;

– indices of geomagnetic storms (Dst) and auroral (AE) activity;

– the interplanetary parameters controlling geomagnetic activity.

First, we compared the parameters of geomagnetic pulsations at SOD for the Pc5/Pi3 intervals (group 2), foF2 intervals (group 3) and coherent foF2-b_X intervals (group 4).

The results are presented in Figure 11. The PSD of geomagnetic pulsations are shown at panel 11a for the Pc5/Pi3 intervals (group 2) and foF2 intervals (group 3). The results for coherent foF2-b_X intervals are almost the same as those for the group 3 (not shown here). An essentially higher PSD is seen at all frequencies for foF2, than for Pc5/Pi3 intervals. We think this is due to the selection criteria for foF2 intervals.

Polarization of the pulsations have been analyzed with a PSD ratio $R_{XY} = PSD_{bx}/PSD_{by}$, and the result is shown in Figure 11b. To test the hypothesis about possible influence of the Alfven field line resonance (FLR) on foF2-b_X interrelation, an additional group of coherent pulsations with a coherence maximum at the high-frequency flank of the band ($f_\gamma > f_b$, where $f_b = 2.7$ mHz) was included into the analysis (referred below as group 5). The difference between Pc5/Pi3 intervals (group 2) and all the foF2 intervals (groups 3-5) is seen in a growth of R_{XY} for the latter at $f > 2$ mHz. The spectral slope is maximal for the group 5 pulsations. Resonant properties are clearly seen in the meridional distribution of the PSD of the pulsations which it is non-monotonous near the resonant latitude. The "South-to-North PSD ratio", which is a ratio of PSD of pulsations recorded at different latitudes $R_\Phi = PSD_{bx}(\Phi)/PSD_{bx}(\Phi + \Delta\Phi)$, where Φ is the geomagnetic latitude, is presented in Figure 11c.

In contrast to the Pc5/Pi3 intervals (group 2), R_Φ spectra for all the foF2 intervals (groups 3-5) are non-monotonous with a maximum at $f = 3.2$ mHz. The curves for the groups 3 and 4 are very similar, and effect is maximal for the group 5. Thus, geomagnetic Pc5/Pi3 pulsations, recorded during foF2 intervals are polarized mostly along the meridian at the high-frequency flank of spectrum. They also demonstrate a maximum in South-to-North PSD ratio at $f = 3.2$ mHz, i.e. near the Alfven resonant frequency at SOD. These effects are most prominent for the group of coherent foF2-b_X pulsations with a coherence maximum at $f > 2.7$ mHz.

The distribution for the Pc5/Pi3, foF2 and coherent foF2-b_X intervals (groups 2-4) over b_X maximal PSD $P_{f,b}$ is illustrated in Figure 12. The upper panel shows the distribution for Pc5/Pi3 and foF2 intervals (groups 2 and 3). The most probable $P_{f,b}$ value is 3 times higher for group 3, than for group 2. The fraction of coherent intervals depends weakly on b_X PSD. For $\gamma_b = 0.5$ it has a maximum in the same PSD band, at which the probability maximum is found. It is important, that this value corresponds to very typical values of PSD: pulsations in this PSD band were observed in approximately each 5-th spectrum.

Statistics of the activity indices is presented in Figure 13. Left panels (13a,c) show distributions over Dst and AE for all, foF2 and coherent foF2-b_X intervals (groups 1, 3, and 4). Right panels (13b,d) demonstrate coherent ratios R_γ for two threshold values $\gamma_b^2 = 0.5$ and 0.64. Probability maximum for the groups 3 and 4 is found for the Dst band $(-50, -25)$ nT, i.e. after weak geomagnetic storms. For both the foF2 and coherent intervals (groups 3 and 4) probability for $(-75, -50)$ nT exceeds that for background (group 1). This corresponds to the recovery phase of a moderate geomagnetic storm. This is compensated by a lower probability the most quiet interval $(-25, 0)$ nT. A difference between foF2 and coherent foF2-b_X intervals is seen in Figure 13 b. A higher fraction of coherent intervals corresponds to lower storm activity: (Dst> -75 nT) for $\gamma_b^2 = 0.5$. For $\gamma_b^2 = 0.64$, R_γ is about 0.04 for all Dst> -100 nT.

The most important difference in the AE distributions of groups 1 (all the intervals) and 3 (foF2 intervals) was found at high $(800 - 1600)$ nT auroral activity (Figure 13c). At this level of AE, probability function is lower for the group 3, comparing to the group 1. This is compensated by enhanced probability of AE in the range $(200 - 800)$ nT for the group 3, comparing to the group 1. For the coherent foF2-b_X intervals, the probability of AE within $(800 - 1600)$ nT is about the same as for the group 1. This is also emphasized in the enhanced R_γ values for this level of AE, which seen in Figure13d. For $\gamma_b^2 = 0.5$, the fraction of over-threshold intervals at this AE level is $R_\gamma = 0.26$ against 0.18 at AE< 400 nT. This effect is also seen for $\gamma_b^2 = 0.64$. Summarizing, we can say that intervals after moderate magnetic storms are favorable for registration of foF2 fluctuations in Pc5/Pi3 range. However, no essential difference in Dst was found between foF2 intervals (group 3) and coherent foF2-b_X intervals (group 4). foF2 fluctuations were registered predominantly under a moderate auroral activity. Meanwhile, higher levels of auroral activity, namely $(800 - 1600)$ nT AE, are favorable to register coherent foF2-b_X pulsations.

The statistical results for the interplanetary parameters are presented in Figure 14. The IMF B_Z controls the energy input from the solar wind to the magnetosphere. Generally, all auroral phenomena, including Pc5/Pi3 pulsations, are more intensive and occur at lower latitudes during negative IMF B_Z. A positive IMF B_Z causes enhanced activity at higher latitudes. The IMF B_Z distributions for the groups 1, 3 and 4 (all, foF2, and coherent foF2-b_X intervals) are shown in Figure 14 a,b. While the distribution for the group 1 is almost symmetrical, both groups 3 and 4 are shifted to positive B_Z values. This effect is stronger for the group 4. Maximal fraction of over-threshold γ was also found for $3 < B_Z < 6$ nT for both $\gamma_b^2 = 0.5$ and

280   0.64 (14b). The results for the SW speed are given in Figure 14 c,d. The main difference between the groups 1 and 3/4 was found in the bands centered at 500 and 300 km/s. The distributions for the latter groups are shifted to higher SW speeds. This might be due to an artifact of the initial selection procedure, which sets a lower boundary for the amplitude of geomagnetic pulsations. An important difference between the groups 3 and 4 is seen in Figure 14d, which demonstrates a maximal fraction of over-threshold coherence for the high SW speed, namely in the band centered at 700 km/s.

285   Results for amplitudes of the SW dynamic pressure fluctuations are given at bottom panels (14 e,f). Here an increase of the most probable amplitude is clearly seen from group 1 to 3 and then to 4. This means that P_{SW} amplitudes for coherent foF2-b_X are higher than that for the foF2 intervals, and for the fof2 intervals they are higher than that for all intervals. This effect is also seen in R_γ dependencies for both $\gamma_b^2 = 0.5$ and 0.64. For $\gamma_b^2 = 0.5$ the maximal $R_\gamma = 0.27$ is found for the ΔP_{SW} band $(1.3 - 1.8)$ nPa. This exceeds more than twice values of R_γ at $\Delta P_{SW} < 0.9$ nPa.

290   To summarize, the foF2 fluctuations were preferably recorded under positive IMF B_Z, moderate $V \approx 500$ km/s SW speed, and the amplitudes of P_{SW} fluctuations within $(0.6 - 0.9)$ nPa.

4   Discussion

The presented study of day-time fluctuations of foF2 in the $1 - 5$ mHz frequency range has been undertaken for quiet and moderately disturbed geomagnetic conditions when foF2 frequency can be unambiguously retrieved from ionograms. For that,

295   a technique of automated scaling of foF2 was developed and verified by visual inspection.

   The foF2 fluctuations coherent with geomagnetic Pc5/Pi3 pulsations occur at typical Pc5 amplitudes. The most probable PSD band for these type of pulsations is recorded as often as at each 5-th Pc5/Pi3 interval. In these cases , the characteristics of magnetic pulsations such as the spectral content, polarization, and amplitude distribution along the meridian allow to interpret them, following to (Baransky et al., 1995), as the Alfven FLR.

300   The Alfven FLR features are also seen in the spatial structure of Pc5 in the events 1 and 2 discussed as examples in Section 3.1.1. The Pc5 records at SOD and MAS for the event 1 are shown in Figure 15 together with South-to-North PSD ratio R_Φ and phase difference. Waveforms of the pulsations are very similar, however, even in time domain, one can notice that the phase is slightly delayed in MAS. The PSD ratio is below 1 at low frequency flank of the spectrum, and it is growing at $f > 2.7$ mHz, reaching a maximum at 3.7 mHz. (Figure 15b). Note, that the f_2 frequency of the second foF2-b_X coherence maximum is near

305   the frequency of maximal R_Φ growth. A phase difference in this frequency band is about $-15°$ (Figure 15 c).

   A similar result was obtained in the comprehensive statistical analysis of the correspondence between geomagnetic pulsations and pulsations in the Cosmic Noise Absorption (CNA) by Spanswick et al. (2005), who found that geomagnetic pulsations with FLR features demonstrate a better correspondence with CNA pulsations than non-FLR Pc5s. However, physical reasons for our and (Spanswick et al., 2005) results may be different, because of different energies of precipitating particle and types

310   of geomagnetic pulsations. A detailed case study of pulsations in the magnetic field and the electron flux at four Cluster satellites located at different L-shells in the magnetosphere and geomagnetic and CNA pulsations on the ground (Motoba et al., 2013) showed rather complicated space distributions and time variations of geomagnetic and electron flux pulsations and their

inter-relation. The pulsation in space was, probably, a mix of compressional and Alfven modes. The authors found that the amplitude of compressional mode was critical for effective modulation of electron flux, but the contribution of shear Alfven

315   resonance was also non-negligible.

The foF2 was automatically retrieved from ionograms preferably near the noon and in the afternoon under moderately disturbed geomagnetic conditions. As a rule, the post-noon Pc5 are characterized by higher azimuthal wave numbers than morningside Pc5s (see Min et al. (2017) and references therein). They are often associated with kinetic modes originated from the wave-particle interactions (see e.g. Mager et al. (2013) and references therein). For these waves, the amplitudes on

320   the ground are strongly attenuated by the ionosphere (Kokubun et al., 1989), while their amplitudes in the magnetosphere both in the magnetic field and in particle flux can be high (Baddeley et al., 2004). High-m waves generated by unstable ion distributions can effectively interact with ULF waves in Pc4 range (Baddeley et al., 2005). A comprehensive analysis of ion distribution functions in the magnetosphere undertaken by Baddeley et al. (2005) proved that the free energy of ion population provided observed magnitudes of high m ULF waves ionosphere.

325   These pulsations typically occur during auroral activations. Auroral substorms are followed by Pi3 pulsations (Kleimenova et al., 2002) and Pc5 waves with high and intermediate azimuthal wavenumbers (Zolotukhina et al., 2008; Mager et al., 2019). The substorm can generate magnetospheric waves with a wide spectrum of azimuthal wave numbers James et al. (2016). The large-scale waves are detected on Earth, whereas the small-scale waves modulate particle flux and are manifested in electron precipitation to the ionosphere. In such a situation, no strong dependence may be expected between the magnetic pulsations

330   observed on ground and simultaneous pulsations in the ionospheric electron density.

Geomagnetic pulsations recorded simultaneously in the magnetosphere and on Earth were studied by Watson et al. (2015). Their study clearly demonstrated that ULF waves effectively modulated electron flux at geostationary orbit and TEC in the ionosphere. Probably, also the flux of softer electrons, than those measured at GOES, was modulated. This allowed to explain observed values of TEC modulation. Different contribution of shear Alfven and compressional modes to the ULF power in

335   the magnetosphere results in different TEC to magnetic field amplitude ratios, for the geomagnetic pulsations recorded on the ground. This can explain the contrast in TEC to geomagnetic pulsations amplitude ratio found byWatson et al. (2015) and Pilipenko et al. (2014a) and between the two example events in the present study.

The foF2 to b_X PSD ratio, R_{F2-b}, is essentially higher in the event 1, than in the event 2. Figure 16 shows a frequency dependence of R_{F2-b} for these two events. The maximal difference is seen at about 2 mHz, and the difference is more than 2

340   orders of magnitude (more than an order of magnitude in the amplitude ratio). At frequencies of the second coherence maxima, the difference is more than an order of magnitude. The main visible difference between geomagnetic pulsations in these two events can be seen in their waveforms. The foF2 and geomagnetic variations during the event 1 have a well-correlated long-period part at $f < 1.6$ mHz. This may be a result of some global process, which is responsible for both geomagnetic pulsations and particle modulation. Fluctuations of SW dynamic pressure are one of the sources of global geomagnetic pulsations inside

345   the magnetosphere (Kepko et al., 2002; Yagova et al., 2007; Viall et al., 2009). Indeed, the coherent foF2-b_X pulsations are preferably associated with fluctuating P_{SW}, and periods of the foF2 fluctuations are often close to those of P_{SW}. However, in

the present study we can't judge whether or not the ULF waves are global. To make such a conclusion a special study will be required with using satellite observations of the magnetic field and electron fluxes.

5   Conclusion

We suggested a technique for the automated detection of foF2 which allows to obtain data suitable for spectral estimates and comparison with Pc5/Pi3 geomagnetic pulsations. The foF2 variations show some inter-relation with Pc5/Pi3 geomagnetic pulsations, not only for extremely high, but for typical values of PSD, as well. Geomagnetic pulsations, for which foF2-b_X coherence is higher at $f > 2.7$ mHz, i.e. near the Alfven resonant frequency at SOD, demonstrate properties of the Alfven FLR.

Variations of the ionospheric critical frequency foF2, which corresponded to simultaneous geomagnetic pulsations Pc5/Pi3, were observed predominantly in the noon and afternoon during quiet or moderately disturbed geomagnetic conditions. The favorable conditions observing the foF2 fluctuations at the Pc5/Pi3 frequencies are the recovery phase of a weak or moderate geomagnetic storm, and moderate auroral activity at 6-hour maximal AE< 800 nT.

The favorable interplanetary conditions are a northward IMF, moderate V (500 km/s), and amplitudes of SW dynamic pressure fluctuations about the 0.7 nPa.

The cases of coherent foF2-b_X intervals tend to occur in the absence of a geomagnetic storm but during an enhanced auroral activity (AE> 800 nT). Comparing to the non-coherent cases, they preferably occur under higher values of positive IMF B_Z, higher SW velocity, and larger amplitudes of SW dynamic pressure fluctuations.

References

Baddeley, L. J., Yeoman, T. K., Wright, D. M., Trattner, K. J., and Kellet, B. J.: A statistical study of unstable particle populations in the global ringcurrent and their relation to the generation of high m ULF waves, Ann. Geophys., 22, 4229–4241, https://doi.org/10.5194/angeo-22-4229-2004, 2004.

Baddeley, L. J., Yeoman, T. K., Wright, D. M., Trattner, K. J., and Kellet, B. J.: On the coupling between unstable magnetospheric particle populations and resonant high m ULF wave signatures in the ionosphere, Ann. Geophys., 23, 567-577, https://doi.org/10.5194/angeo-23-567-2005, 2005.

Baker, G., Donovan, E. F., and Jackel, B. J., A comprehensive survey of auroral latitude Pc5 pulsation characteristics, J. Geophys. Res., 108, 1384, doi:10.1029/2002JA009801, 2003.

Baransky, L. N., Fedorov, E. N., Kurneva, N. A., Pilipenko, V. A., Green, A. W. , and Worthington, E. W.: Gradient and polarization methods of the ground-based hydromagnetic monitoring of magnetospheric plasma, J. Geomagn. Geolect., 47, 1293-1309, 1995.

Bargatze, L.F., McPherron,R. L., Minamora, J., and Weimer, D.: A new interpretation of Weimer et al's solar wind propagation delay technique, J. Geophys. Res., 110, A07105, doi:10.1029/2004JA010902, 2005.

Buchert, S. C., Fujii, R., and Glassmeier, K.-H.: Ionospheric conductivity modulation in ULF pulsations, J. Geophys. Res., 104, 10119-10133, doi:10.1029/1998JA900180,1999.

Davies, K., and Hartmann, G. K.: Short-period fluctuations in total columnar electron content, J. Geophys. Res., 81(19), 3431- 3434, doi:10.1029/JA081i019p03431, 1976.

James, T. K., Yeoman, M. K., Mager, P. N., and Klimushkin, D. Y.: Multiradar observations of substorm-driven ULF waves, J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics, 121, 5213-5232, doi:10.1002/2015JA022102, 2016.

Jenkins, G. M. and Watts, D. G.: Spectral analysis and its application, Holden day, San Francisco, London Amsterdam, 525 pp., 1969.

Kay, S. M.: Modern spectral estimation: Theory and application, Prentice-Hall, New Jersey, USA 543 pp., 1988.

Kleimenova, N. G., Kozyreva, O. V., Kauristie, K., Manninen, J., and Ranta, A.: Case studies on the dynamics of Pi3 geomagnetic and riometer pulsations during auroral activations, Ann. Geophys., 20, 151-159, https://doi.org/10.5194/angeo-20-151-2002, 2002.

Kepko, L., Spence, H. E., and Singer, H. J.: ULF waves in the solar wind as direct drivers of magnetospheric pulsations, Geophys. Res. Lett., 29, 1197, https://doi.org/10.1029/2001GL014405, 2002.

Kokubun, S., Erickson, K. N., Fritz, T. A., and McPherron, R. L.: Local time asymmetry of Pc 4-5 pulsations and associated particle modulations at synchronous orbit, J. Geophys. Res., 94(A6), 6607-6625, doi:10.1029/JA094iA06p06607, 1989.

Kozlovsky, A., Turunen, T., and Ulich, T.: Rapid-run ionosonde observations of traveling ionospheric disturbances in the auroral ionosphere, J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics, 118, 5265- 5276, doi:10.1002/jgra.50474, 2013.

Kozyreva, O. , Kozlovsky, A. , Pilipenko, V., Yagova, N.: Ionospheric and geomagnetic Pc5 oscillations as observed by the ionosonde and magnetometer at Sodankylä, Advances in Space Research, 63, 2052-2065, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asr.2018.12.004, 2019.

Mager, P. N., Klimushkin, D. Yu., and Kostarev, D. V.: Drift-compressional modes generated by inverted plasma distributions in the magne-tosphere, J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics, 118, 4915–4923, doi:10.1002/jgra.50471, 2013.

Mager, O. V., Chelpanov, M. A., Mager, P. N., Klimushkin, D. Y., Berngardt, O. I.: Conjugate ionosphere-magnetosphere observations of a sub-Alfvenic compressional intermediate-m wave: A case study using EKB radar and Van Allen Probes. Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics, 124, 3276-3290, https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JA026541, 2019.

Min, K., Takahashi, K., Ukhorskiy, A. Y., Manweiler, J. W., Spence, H. E., Singer, H. J., Claudepierre, S. G., Larsen, B. A., Soto-Chavez, A. R., and Cohen, R. J.: Second harmonic poloidal waves observed by Van Allen Probes in the dusk-midnight sector, J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics, 122, 3013–3039, doi:10.1002/2016JA023770, 2017.

Motoba, T., Takahashi, K. , Gjerloev, J., Ohtani, S. and Milling, D. K.: The role of compressional Pc5 pulsations in modulating precipitation of energetic electrons, J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics, 118, 7728-7739, doi:10.1002/2013JA018912, 2013.

Okuzawa, T., and Davies, K.: Pulsations in total columnar electron content, J. Geophys. Res., 86, 1355-1363, doi:10.1029/JA086iA03p01355, 1981.

Pilipenko, V., Belakhovsky, V. , Kozlovsky, A. , Fedorov, E. , and Kauristie, K.: ULF wave modulation of the ionospheric parameters: Radar and magnetometer observations, J. Atmos. Sol. Terr. Phys., 108, 68-76, doi:10.1016/j.jastp.2013.12.015, 2014.

Pilipenko, V., Belakhovsky, V. , Murr,D. , Fedorov, E. , and Engebretson M.: Modulation of total electron content by ULF Pc5 waves, J. Geophys. Res. SpacePhysics,119,4358-4369, doi:10.1002/2013JA019594, 2014.

Posch, J. L., Engebretson, M. J., Pilipenko, V. A., Hughes, W. J., Russell, C. T., and Lanzerotti, L. J.: Characterizing the long-period ULF response to magnetic storms, J. Geophys. Res., 108, 1029, doi:10.1029/2002JA009386, A1, 2003.

Ruohoniemi, J. M., Greenwald, R. A., Baker, K. B., and Samson, J. C.: HF radar observations of Pc 5 field line resonances in the midnight/early morning MLT sector, J. Geophys. Res., 96, 15697- 15710, doi:10.1029/91JA00795, 1991.

Spanswick, E., Donovan, E. , and Baker, G.: Pc5 modulation of high energy electron precipitation: Particle interaction regions and scattering efficiency, Ann. Geophys., 23, 1533-1542, 2005.

Tanskanen, E. I.: A comprehensive high-throughput analysis of substorms observed by IMAGE magnetometer network: Years 1993-2003 examined, J. Geophys. Res., 114, A05204, doi:10.1029/2008JA013682, 2009.

Viall, N. M., Kepko, L., and Spence, H. E.: Relative occurrence rates and connection of discrete frequency oscillations in the solar wind density and dayside magnetosphere, J. Geophys. Res., 114, A01201, doi:10.1029/2008JA013334, 2009.

Vorontsova, E., Pilipenko, V., Fedorov, E., Sinha, A.K., Vichare, G.: Modulation of total electron content by global Pc5 waves at low latitudes, Adv. Space Res., 57, 309–319, doi: 10.1016/j.asr.2015.10.041, 2016.

Watson, C., Jayachandran, P. T., Singer, H. J., Redmon, R. J., and Danskin, D.: Large-amplitude GPS TEC variations associated with Pc5-6 magnetic field variations observed on the ground and at geosynchronous orbit, J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics, 120, 7798- 7821, doi:10.1002/2015JA021517, 2015.

Wright, D. M., Yeoman, T. K., and Chapman, P. J.: High-latitude HF Doppler observations of ULF waves. 1. Waves with large spatial scale sizes, Ann. Geophys., 15, 1548-1556, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00585-997-1548-2, 1997.

Yagova N., V. Pilipenko, J. Watermann, K. Yumoto: Control of high latitude geomagnetic fluctuations by interplanetary parameters: The role of suprathermal ions, Annales Geophysicae, 25, N4, 1037-1047, 2007.

Zolotukhina, N. A., Mager, P. N., and Klimushkin, D. Yu.: Pc5 waves generated by substorm injection: a case study, Ann. Geophys., 26, 2053-2059, https://doi.org/10.5194/angeo-26-2053-2008, 2008.

Figure 1. Examples of approximations of F(h) dependence with eq. (1). foF2 and h_1, F_1, F_2 approximation parameters are shown at panel 1(a)

Figure 2. Variation of foF2 frequency during 4.5 hours on day 2015 003 , obtained with eq. (1)

Figure 3. Variation of foF2 and geomagnetic pulsations at SOD during event 1

Figure 4. Spectral parameters for the event 1: (a) normalized PSD spectra of foF2 and b_X pulsations, (b) spectral coherence between foF2 and b_X; (c) phase difference

Figure 5. Space weather conditions for the event 1. (a) Dst index during last four days; (b) AE index during the interval and 12 hours before; (c) SW speed during the interval and 3 hours before; (d) IMF B_Z during the interval and 12 hours before; (e) SW dynamic pressure during the interval and 3 hours before; (f) details of SW dynamic pressure fluctuations during the interval.

Figure 6. Variation of foF2 and geomagnetic pulsations at SOD during event 2

Figure 7. Spectral parameters for the event 2: (a) normalized PSD spectra of foF2 and b_X pulsations, (b) spectral coherence between foF2 and b_X; (c) phase difference.

Figure 8. Space weather conditions for the event 2. (a) Dst index during last four days; (b) AE index during the interval and 12 hours before; (c) SW speed during the interval and 3 hours before; (d) IMF B_Z during the interval and 12 hours before; (e) SW dynamic pressure during the interval and 3 hours before; (f) details of SW dynamic pressure fluctuations during the last hour before the interval.

Figure 9. (a): The average MLT distribution of occurrence of foF2 intervals (group 3). (b): Fraction of coherent (group 4) foF2-b_X intervals R_γ for two values of threshold $\gamma_b^2 = 0.5$ and 0.64.

Figure 10. Frequency histogram, for b_X (group 2) and foF2 (group 3) fluctuations (a) and for the parameter $\delta = \log(\Delta_{f2,0}/\Delta_{f2,R}$, where $\Delta_{f2,0}$ and $\Delta_{f2,R}$ are the mean values of Δ_{f2} for simultaneous and random intervals (b).

Figure 11. Comparison of Pc5/Pi3 parameters for Pc5/Pi3 (group 2), foF2 (group 3), coherent foF2-b_X (group 4), and high frequency coherent foF2-b_X (group 5)intervals: (a) PSD; (b) $R_{X-Y} = PSD_{bx}/PSD_{by}$ spectral ratio; (c) $R_\Phi = PSD_{bx}(\text{SOD})/PSD_{bx}(\text{MAS})$ spectral ratio.

Figure 12. (a): Comparison b_X maximal PSD, $P_{f,b}$, distributions for Pc5/Pi3 (group 2), and foF2 (group 3) intervals. (b): R_{gamma} dependence on $P_{f,b}$.

Figure 13. Comparison of activity indices distributions for all (group 1), foF2 (group 3) and coherent foF2-b_X (group 4) intervals: Dst (a) and AE (c). R_{gamma} dependence on Dst (b) and AE (d).

28

Figure 14. Comparison of SW/IMF parameter distributions for all (group 1), foF2 (group 3) and coherent foF2-b_X (group 4) intervals: IMF B_Z (a), V (c), and ΔP_{SW} (e). R_{gamma} dependence on IMF B_Z (b), V (d), and ΔP_{SW} (f).

Figure 15. Illustration of FLR features of geomagnetic pulsations on 11 March (event 1). Pulsation waveforms at SOD and MAS (a); South-to-North PSD ratio R_Φ (b); phase difference (c).

Figure 16. Comparison of foF2 to b_X PSD ratios R_{F2-b} for the events 1 and 2. The bands of high foF2-b_X coherence are shown with vertical dash lines

Table 1. Coordinates and other parameters of IMAGE stations

Station	Geographic		CGM		L	MLT
	LAT	LON	Φ	Λ		midnight
SOD	67.37	26.63	64.2	106.5	5.37	21:12
MAS	69.46	23.70	66.5	105.5	6.37	21:18

Corrected geomagnetic (CGM) latitude Φ and longitude Λ, apex of the magnetic field line L,

and UT of magnetic local midnight are calculated online with

http://omniweb.gsfc.nasa.gov/vitmo/cgm.html

Table 2. Intervals with foF2 obtained from Eq. (1) checked visually. Years 2014-2015.

Year	Month	Day	DOY	Start UT	Final UT		Year	Month	Day	DOY	Start UT	Final UT
2014	2	24	55	9:00	14:59		2015	1	3	3	9:00	13:20
2014	4	11	101	8:00	15:59		2015	1	22	22	9:00	12:10
2014	5	24	144	7:00	15:00		2015	1	30	30	9:00	12:20
2014	6	8	159	7:00	15:59		2015	2	15	46	9:30	13:10
2014	6	21	172	9:00	15:59		2015	3	8	67	9:00	13:40
2014	8	18	230	8:00	15:59		2015	3	10	69	9:00	15:59
2014	9	13	256	8:00	15:59		2015	3	11	70	10:50	15:00
2014	9	14	257	8:00	15:59		2015	4	4	94	9:00	14:20
2014	9	15	258	8:00	15:59		2015	5	14	134	9:00	14:20
2014	9	16	259	8:00	15:59		2015	5	15	135	9:10	15:59
2014	9	25	268	8:00	15:59		2015	5	19	139	8:40	14:50
2014	10	15	288	8:00	15:10		2015	5	20	140	8:00	11:20
2014	10	19	292	8:00	14:30		2015	5	20	140	12:10	15:59
2014	10	24	297	8:00	12:40		2015	6	12	163	7:20	15:59
2014	10	31	304	8:00	14:59		2015	6	30	181	7:00	8:40
2014	11	6	310	8:00	14:59		2015	6	30	181	9:10	12:20
2014	11	7	311	8:00	14:59		2015	6	30	181	13:30	15:59
2014	11	8	312	8:00	13:30		2015	7	11	192	12:20	15:59
2014	11	10	314	9:00	12:30		2015	7	12	193	7:20	15:30
2014	11	11	315	9:00	14:40		2015	7	15	196	8:20	10:30
2014	11	12	316	9:00	14:59		2015	7	15	196	11:10	15:59
2014	12	7	341	9:00	12:20		2015	7	21	202	8:00	11:10
2014	12	10	344	9:00	14:59		2015	7	21	202	12:50	15:59
2014	12	13	347	9:00	14:00		2015	9	8	251	8:00	12:20
2014	12	27	361	9:00	14:20		2015	9	8	251	12:50	15:20
2014	12	29	363	9:00	12:30		2015	9	16	259	8:00	15:59
							2015	9	22	265	8:00	15:59
							2015	9	23	266	8:00	15:59
							2015	12	25	359	9:00	10:50