

# ***Interactive comment on “Quasi 10-day wave modulation of equatorial ionization anomaly during the Southern Hemisphere stratospheric warming of 2002” by Xiaohua Mo***

## **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 20 May 2019

Manuscript angeo-2019-43 Review on “Quasi 10-day wave modulation of equatorial ionization anomaly during the Southern Hemisphere stratospheric warming of 2002” by Xiaohua Mo

This paper is focused on the possible influence of the quasi 10-day planetary waves (PWs), registered in the high-latitude polar stratospheric temperature before and around the Southern Hemisphere (SH) sudden stratospheric warming (SSW) in 2002, on the oscillations of the equatorial ionization anomaly (EIA) crests and their Total Electron Content (TEC). The locations of the EIA crests are calculated from the observations of the two GPS stations in China which are situated near the northern and

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



southern EIA crests and the TEC data are derived from the International GNSS Service global ionospheric TEC maps in Asia. The SH SSW is described by the temperature and zonal mean zonal wind taken from the NCEP while the geomagnetic and solar variability are characterized by the Kp-index and solar radio flux F10.7 respectively. The period from July 21 to October 18, 2002 is considered (day numbers 200-300) and the quasi-10-day variability associated with the SSW is found in both the location of the EIA crests and the TEC between days 220-290. The author suggested that the observed  $\sim 10$ -day oscillation of the EIA region is generated through modulating the equatorial fountain effect.

The topic of the paper is certainly appropriate for the journal. In general, the paper is written clearly; actually it follows the pattern of the previous paper of the author, Mo et al. (2014) cited here. This study is certainly useful for the scientific community working on the vertical coupling of the atmosphere-ionosphere system however, however I think that it has serious deficiencies. Due to this I will suggest the publication of this paper but after serious revision and addressing the comments mentioned below.

Major comments:

(i) I have serious concern about the significance of the observed  $\sim 10$ -d oscillations particularly in the location of the EIA crests because the amplitude of these oscillations is only around  $1.5^\circ$  (Fig. 5a). Additionally, in Lomb-Scargle periodograms these oscillations are significant only above 90% confidence level (Fig. 3) that is not enough. It has been mentioned above that this study is similar to the previous one Mo et al. (2014) however, while there the quasi 16-day oscillations of the EIA crests were evident even in the raw data here the quasi-10-day ones are not. Usually only waves with significance at least above 95% confidence level are considered in studying the atmospheric and ionospheric perturbations. The author does not mention anything about the error in calculating the coordinates of the EIA crests. Without knowing the error in calculating the MLAT of the EIA crests it is difficult to accept the 10-day variability of the EIA region as significant one.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



(ii) In order to propose a mechanism for generating the 10-day variability of the EIA region the authors used indirect approach based on some general references on dynamics as well as references connected with the SH SSW in 2002. The important citations as: Eswaraiah et al. (2018) or Olson et al. (2013) which however present ground-based measurements at high latitudes or at Peruvian longitude sector cannot be considered as serious evidences because the author investigates different region, low latitudes over China. I cannot understand why the author does not use a meteor wind data from a Chinese radar at low latitudes and to check if there are quasi-10-day wave or modulated tides which are able to affect the fountain effect. Further, to see if the electric currents are modulated the author may consider the perturbations in the geomagnetic fields revealed from magnetometer measurements. Only then a solid evidence can be presented in support of the suggested mechanism.

(iii) Important studies on atmospheric dynamics and the ionospheric response to the SSW events are not cited.

Concrete comments:

P. 2, lines 37-38: Please, add the following references: Chau et al. (GRL, 36, L05101, 2009, doi:10.1029/2008GL036785) giving evidence for the vertical plasma drift changes during the SSW and Pancheva and Mukhtarov (JASTP, 73, 1697–1702, 2011, doi:10.1016/j.jastp.2011.03.006) presenting which main characteristics of the EIA and how they are changed during the major SSW.

P. 2, line 38: Please, add Jin et al. (JGR, 117, A10323, doi:10.1029/2012JA017650) where for the first time a comparison between the results from a whole atmosphere-ionosphere coupled model (GAIA) with the COSMIC and TIMED/SABER observations during the major SSW in January 2009 was presented.

P. 2, line 41: “Since planetary waves in the Southern Hemisphere (SH) generally have smaller amplitudes than in the Northern Hemisphere (NH). . . .” generally this is true only for the SPWs; the climatology of some other wellknown PWs, as for example, the

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



quasi-2-day W3 wave or the quasi-6-day W1 wave are both stronger in the SH.

P. 3, line 79: . . . . . $\sim\pm 15^\circ$ N MLAT. . .; please, delete N

P. 4, line 117: “In additional, we . . . . .”; please, delete al

P. 5, lines 126-127: “Note that quasi 10-day oscillations of northern and southern EIA crests are in-phase, which. . . . .”; sorry, both oscillations are not in phase; the oscillation of the NH crest indicates a delay of a day with respect to the SH one. Please, calculate the cross-correlation function between both times, particularly between days 220-290 when they have large amplitudes, and will see that the largest cross-correlation will be found at different from zero time lag.

---

Interactive comment on Ann. Geophys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/angeo-2019-43>, 2019.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

