

Interactive comment on “Even moderate geomagnetic pulsations can cause fluctuations of foF2 frequency of the auroral ionosphere” by Nadezda Yagova et al.

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 moder-

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



ate 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. A figure illustrating the automated detection of the critical frequencies would be helpful for the reader. 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. There is also some inconsistency in the paper about at what frequency the coherence is taken (f_1 vs f_2 : statistics in Fig 10 vs. case studies). Results presented in Fig 11 again suggest a link to f_2 (at least based on the case studies). The relative occurrence of coherent events is very low ($\sim 3\%$). 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. 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

I 97: "about 10 nT and 0.08 MHz": Revise these values based on Fig 3!

I 100 what is the significance level for the coherence values in these calculations?

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

I 126: A MLT distribution of occurrence of the foF2 variations → The MLT distribution

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



of the occurrence of foF2 variations Under what conditions? What criteria define an event?

I 128: "frequency distributions of geomagnetic and foF2 pulsations": in general? I guess the distribution is based geomagnetic pulsation events simultaneous with foF2 events.

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

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?

I 131: "spectral coherence at SOD" : at what frequency? coherence at f1?

I 132: Give the significance level!

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

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

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

I 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?

I 165: "3-hour mean values of BZ and V and 3-hour maximal value of ΔP_{sw} ": in which interval? (same issue as above)

I 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.

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

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

Further comments:

I 1: "variations of the critical frequency": maybe "modulation" of the critical frequency could also be used here

I 1: o-mode radiowave → o-mode radio waves

I 2: in 1–5 mHz → in the 1–5 mHz

I 4: delete "daytime Pc5/Pi3 geomagnetic pulsations and" [foF2 is obviously not detected in geomagnetic pulsations]

I 6: at SOD station → observed at SOD station

I 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

I 8: Meanwhile, → "At the same time," OR "However,"

I 8: "the analysis of geomagnetic and foF2 variations show intervals with noticeable coherence for both horizontal components" → "the analysis of geomagnetic and foF2 variations shows intervals of significant [OR remarkable] coherence with both horizontal geomagnetic components" [foF2 does not have any components]

I 11: averaged → the average

I 11: coherent to → coherent with

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



I 13: show → shows

I 14: show → shows [I suggest to use some synonym of 'show', such as 'reveal', 'indicate'. Use an online Thesaurus for finding synonyms]

I 19: Majority of publications are based on the radar observation → Majority of publications on the topic are based on radar observations

I 20: of electron concentration at certain altitude → of the electron concentration at a certain altitude

I 23: with mainly compressional mode of MHD wave in the magnetosphere → with mainly compressional mode magnetospheric waves

I 26: An effect of TEC modulation by ULF wave → The effect of TEC modulation by a ULF waves

I 27: and zones → and also from zones

I 28: observed pulsations → the observed pulsations [a large number of articles are missing from the text, check!]

I 31: the recovery phase of the magnetic storm → the recovery phase of a magnetic storm

I 33: aimed on variations → aimed at comparing variations

I 37: It makes an ionogram → It obtains an ionogram recording

I 40: 10 s sampling rate → 10 s sampling period/interval

I 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

I 42: To analyzed → To analyze

I 43: and also Dst and AE indexes are used → as well as Dst and AE indexes

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

I 46: with quality and time resolution enough → with good quality and time resolution is enough

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

I 58: Lorentsonian → Lorentzian

I 60: 235 km → 235 km.

I 60: Coefficients f_1 , $\Delta f = f_2 - f_1$, k , and α are found as a result of fitting procedure, described below. → A fitting procedure described below is used to find f_1 , $\Delta f = f_2 - f_1$, k , and α . [$f_1, \Delta f, \alpha$ are not coefficients] What are the meaning of f_1 (I guess f at h_1) and f_2 ?

I 61: boundary is determined as a line → boundary consists of a set of (h, f) points

I 62: Signal intensity I at the boundary should be high → Signal intensity I is high

I 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?]

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

I 64: organized and a parameter → organized. A parameter

I 65: over the "cross" in space of parameters → over the parameter space [?]

I 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 ?]

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

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



I 68: time dependence $f(t)$: Do you mean the time dependence $f_{F2}(t)$?

I 69: give a typical value of t_1 !

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

I 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.

I 76: pictures → plots

I 79: Note, that the ionograms are rotated by 90° in respect to usual $f - H$ presentation: This sentence should come earlier! (with respect to)

I 80: $f_{F2} \rightarrow$ f_{F2} values

I 84: Statistical analysis: Statistical analysis of what?

I 84: interval → intervals

I 85: We studied → We studied the effect/influence of on...

I 87: resolution, enough → resolution high enough

I 90: Cross-spectra are calculated for f_{F2} variations, on one hand, and components of the geomagnetic field pulsations, on the other hand. → Cross-spectra are calculated between f_{F2} variations and components of the geomagnetic field pulsations.

I 100: "at low frequency part of spectrum $f < 2$ mHz" → "in the low frequency part ($f < 2$ mHz) of spectrum"

I 101: peak with maximal $y_2 = 0.6 \rightarrow$ peak with $y_2 = 0.6$

I 129: "with frequencies ($f_1 > 3.7$ mHz)" → "with frequencies above 3.7 mHz"

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



I 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"

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

I 138: "the geomagnetic pulsations" → "a subset of the geomagnetic pulsations"

I 139: " with all the intervals, selected" → " with all the events selected"

I 142: "calculated with the weight functions, which are found from" → "calculated with weight functions derived from"

I 143: "coherent and pulsations and averaged" → "coherent pulsations and averaged"

I 151: indexes → indices

I 159: "limited by" → "limited to"

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

I 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).

Interactive comment on Ann. Geophys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/angeo-2020-16>, 2020.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

