

# ***Interactive comment on “A case study of the spectral parameters of ULF fluctuations before substorms with no evident trigger in the interplanetary space” by Nataliya Sergeevna Nosikova et al.***

**Jonathan Rae (Referee)**

jonathan.rae@unorthumbria.ac.uk

Received and published: 9 November 2020

This manuscript is a case study of ultra-low frequency (ULF) waves that occur in the magnetosphere and ionosphere before an isolated substorm. These ULF waves are proposed to be either from the solar wind, or from processes inside of the magnetosphere. If these waves are generated by either the solar wind or generated inside of the magnetosphere, then the proposition is that these ULF waves may be considered as a pre-conditioning of the magnetosphere or trigger for the substorm.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



If I understand correctly, the solar wind is ruled out as a generation mechanism, and hence these waves are generated inside of the magnetosphere and these waves could play a role in substorm onset physics.

Most of my concerns are on the conclusions, which are that Pc5 pulsations were observed several hours before the substorm and these pulsations could be related to substorm onset. The substorm starts at 2030 UT. The Pc5 waves occur between ~1500-1800 UT. I'm sorry to say that I can't see the causal link between ULF pulsations that occur 2-3 hours before a small substorm bay and the manuscript does not say how this link really works. I found the analysis of the Pc5 waves to be a very nice study of their coherence, but I'm sorry to say that I don't see the relationship between these waves and a substorm that happens 2-3 hours later. For example, the average substorm cycle is around 2-3 hours, and the average substorm expansion phase is ~minutes, and so it is not clear to me how these waves and this substorm are related when they are observed hours apart.

I do have a suggestion, which is that I think that the Pc5 wave analysis is very good and very clear. It is possible that this analysis and interpretation could form a manuscript all by itself without the link to substorms. Whether that is something that the authors were intending and I misunderstood I do not know but if I did misunderstand then I apologise. In summary, I would suggest either the manuscript is clearly rewritten to make clear how the Pc5 waves are related to the substorm, or to just concentrate on the very nice analysis of the Pc5 waves themselves and not relate them to the substorm onset process which is not quite demonstrated at this point. At the moment the manuscript seems to be somewhere in between these two points of view.

A few more comments on the general introduction and discussion. I would recommend that the referencing of the relevant publications in the field could be added to. There are plenty of references on ULF waves as a trigger for substorm onset, originating with the seminal work of Samson and most of those references could be found within Rae et al. [2014] and Smith et al. [2019] - that itself cites a wide range of Samson

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



and other relevant papers with which the literature review could be improved. This is also true in the Introduction, where there are very few substorm references to be found (lines 20-30) other than the Bland et al. reference. Some of these papers might not be relevant but I offer these as papers who discuss ULF waves, Pc5 waves and potential triggering of substorm onset. I'm happy to provide more references to the authors if that is helpful.

I would recommend that the introduction could be expanded to include some of the literature that discusses the physics of triggering of substorm onset by the solar wind and by internal processes.

Data Processing. I would recommend that the data processing aspects of the work are discussed in the sections closer to the Figures that are being described. I think that it would aid in the readability of the manuscript if the data processing were to be close to the Figures being described.

Figures. I would recommend using Universal Time for the figures, instead of "time since 1530 UT". It would really help the readability of the paper to use a common time for each plot so that the reader can understand where each plot starts and finishes relative to the others.

References Rae, I. J., Murphy, K. R., Watt, C. E. J., Rostoker, G., Rankin, R., Mann, I. R., Hodgson, C. R., Frey, H. U., Degeling, A. W., and Forsyth, C. (2014), Field line resonances as a trigger and a tracer for substorm onset, *J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics*, 119, 5343–5363, doi:10.1002/2013JA018889. Samson, J. C., D. D. Wallis, T. J. Hughes, F. Creutzberg, J. M. Ruohoniemi, and R. A. Greenwald (1992), Substorm intensifications and field line resonances in the nightside magnetosphere, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 97, 8495–8518, doi:10.1029/91JA03156. Smith, A. W., Rae, I. J., Forsyth, C., Watt, C. E. J., & Murphy, K. R. (2020). On the magnetospheric ULF wave counterpart of substorm onset. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 125, e2019JA027573. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JA027573>

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Interactive comment on Ann. Geophys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/angeo-2020-65>, 2020.

**ANGEOD**

---

Interactive  
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

