

Interactive comment on “A correlation study regarding the AE index and ACE solar wind data for Alfvénic intervals using wavelet decomposition and reconstruction” by Fernando L. Guarnieri et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 25 August 2017

Report for Nonlinear Process in Geophysics

Manuscript number: npg-2017-42

Title: "A correlation study regarding the AE index and ACE solar wind data for Alfvénic intervals using wavelet decomposition and reconstruction"

Authors: F. Guarnieri, B. Tsurutani, L. Vieira et al.

The auroral electrojet (AE) index, first introduced by Davis and Sugiura in 1966, provides a way to monitor the level of geomagnetic disturbances resulting from the electro-

jects and can be used as a proxy to specify the state of the magnetosphere. Assuming the existence of non-negligible correlations between the AE index and variations of the z-component (Bz) of the interplanetary magnetic field (IMF), as shown in Guarnieri et al. 2005, the authors present the model for a proxy of AE, here called AE*, based on the wavelet decomposition of the the solar wind (SW) magnetic field. The data used for the analysis are from the ACE spacecraft (located in L1), however the simplicity of the model allows in principle the application to other SW datasets. Future implementations of the model in codes for the nowcast (and forecast) of the AE index are also envisaged. The results interesting and think the manuscript deserves the publication in NPG after the few remarks reported below will be addressed by the authors.

- From the analysis proposed it comes out that the predictive power of the model depends drastically on the filtering applied to Bz. This is clearly stated in lines 3-4 (pag. 6) and 20-22 (pag. 4):

"If one tries to apply equations 1 to 5 to unfiltered Bz data, this may result in a very poor correlation coefficient between the estimated AE* and the observed AE index"

"With a computer routine , each reconstruction level was tested and it was found that the correlation is high up to level A3 (starting from A10)"

However it is also stated (lines 23-25, pag.4) :

"In this work we used reconstructions from A10 to A3... This decision, as well as other assumptions..., were based on several analyses reported in Guarnieri 2005."

Since the elimination of the high frequencies from the reconstructed signals appears to be a rather crucial step to get good correlations between the model and the original AE index, I think some of the conclusions from Guarnieri 2005 should be discussed here and put in the context of the present paper.

- I strongly suggest to add in the introduction a more detailed description of the AE index and how this is used to characterize the state of magnetosphere and ionosphere

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

and their coupling with the interplanetary medium. I understand it is a well known index in the space weather and ionospheric community but...

Minor comments:

- I think the first two lines in section 5 should be rephrased:

"Although correlations between AE* and AE as high as 0.90 have been indicated in this paper, there is a question of why values of 1.00 are never reached.

0.90 is actually a very good correlation and indicates that the model works well. On the contrary the scientific intuition would make me think there is something suspicious in a correlation of 100% between any model and observations.

- I do like particularly the title, it is long and does not convey immediately the idea behind the paper, though I am fine if the authors prefer to keep it as is.

References:

Sugiura, M., and Davis, T. N.: Auroral electrojet activity index AE and its universal time variations, J. Geophys. Res., 71, 30 785-801, 1966.

Guarnieri, F.L.: Study of the solar and interplanetary origin of long-duration and continuous auroral activity events, PhD thesis, INPE – S.J. dos Campos, SP, Brazil, February, 2005.

Interactive comment on Nonlin. Processes Geophys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/npg-2017-42>, 2017.