

Manuscript Number: ASR-D-15-00358R1

Title: 20 March 2015 solar eclipse influence on sporadic E layer

Article Type: EM -Earth Magnetosphere/Upper Atmosphere

Keywords: midlatitude ionosphere; E sporadic layer; solar eclipse; gravity wave; height time intensity

Corresponding Author: Dr. Michael Pezzopane,

Corresponding Author's Institution: Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia

First Author: Michael Pezzopane

Order of Authors: Michael Pezzopane; Marco Pietrella; Alessio Pignalberi; Roberta Tozzi

Abstract: This paper shows how the solar eclipse occurred on 20 March 2015 influenced the sporadic E (Es) layer as recorded by the Advanced Ionospheric Sounder by Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia (AIS-INGV) ionosondes installed at Rome (41.8°N, 12.5°E) and Gibilmanna (37.9°N, 14.0°E), Italy. In these locations, the solar eclipse was only partial, with the maximum area of the solar disk obscured by the Moon equal to ~54% at Rome and ~45% at Gibilmanna. Nevertheless, it is shown that the strong thermal gradients that usually accompany a solar eclipse, have significantly influenced the Es phenomenology. Specifically, the solar eclipse did not affect the Es layer in terms of its maximum intensity, which is comparable with that of the previous and next day, but rather in terms of its persistence. In fact, both at Rome and Gibilmanna, contrary to what typically happens in March, the Es layer around the solar eclipse time is always present. On the other hand, this persistence is also confirmed by the application of the height-time-intensity (HTI) technique. A detailed analysis of isoheight ionogram plots suggests that traveling ionospheric disturbances (TIDs) likely caused by gravity wave (GW) propagation have played a significant role in causing the persistence of the Es layer.

Response to Reviewers:

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed a revised versions of the paper **“20 March 2015 solar eclipse influence on sporadic E layer”** by M. Pezzopane, M. Pietrella, A. Pignalberi, and R. Tozzi to be considered for publication in the *Journal of Advances in Space Research*.

The paper was revised according to all comments and suggestions made by both reviewers. Concerning the request made by the Reviewer#2 to contextualize the topic of the work in the St. Patrick’s Day geomagnetic storm we involved our geomagnetist colleague Roberta Tozzi, who is now a co-author of the paper.

Sincerely Yours
Michael Pezzopane

20 March 2015 solar eclipse influence on sporadic E layer

M. Pezzopane^{a,*}, M. Pietrella^a, A. Pignalberi^{b,c} and R. Tozzi^a

^aIstituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia, 00143, Rome, Italy

^bDipartimento di Ingegneria dell'Informazione, Elettronica e Telecomunicazioni, Università di Roma "La Sapienza", 00185, Rome, Italy

^cIstituto per la Scienza dell'Atmosfera e del Clima, CNR, 00133, Rome, Italy

email corresponding author: michael.pezzopane@ingv.it

Abstract

This paper shows how the solar eclipse occurred on 20 March 2015 influenced the sporadic E (Es) layer as recorded by the Advanced Ionospheric Sounder by Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia (AIS-INGV) ionosondes installed at Rome (41.8°N, 12.5°E) and Gibilmanna (37.9°N, 14.0°E), Italy. In these locations, the solar eclipse was only partial, with the maximum area of the solar disk obscured by the Moon equal to ~54% at Rome and ~45% at Gibilmanna. Nevertheless, it is shown that the strong thermal gradients that usually accompany a solar eclipse, have significantly influenced the Es phenomenology. Specifically, the solar eclipse did not affect the Es layer in terms of its maximum intensity, which [is comparable](#) with that of the previous and next day, but rather in terms of its [persistence](#). In fact, both at Rome and Gibilmanna, contrary to what typically happens in March, the Es layer around the solar eclipse time is always present. On the other hand, this [persistence](#) is also confirmed by the application of the height-time-intensity (HTI) technique. A detailed analysis of isoheight ionogram plots suggests that traveling ionospheric

1 disturbances (TIDs) likely caused by gravity wave (GW) propagation have played a significant role
2 in causing the [persistence](#) of the Es layer.
3
4
5

6 7 **1. Introduction** 8

9
10 The occurrence of an eclipse generally gives the opportunity of making special observations
11 related to the solar control on the Earth's atmosphere and, in the last decades, it has been well
12 established that the Earth's ionosphere undergoes substantial changes during a solar eclipse
13 event. Specifically, during a solar eclipse, the moon rapidly shadows the Sun and the
14 photochemical activity in the ionosphere decreases almost to nighttime levels. Typically, the
15 ionospheric response is manifested as a decrease of the total electron content (Salah et al., 1986;
16 Afraimovich et al., 1998; Baran et al., 2003; Krankowski et al., 2008; Jakowski et al., 2008), an
17 instantaneous decrease of the critical frequencies of the E and F1 layers (Adeniyi et al., 2007), and
18 a delayed decrease of the critical frequency of the F2 layer (Cheng et al., 1992; Adeniyi et al.,
19 2007). [Another physical phenomenon related to solar eclipses is an enhancement of acoustic
20 gravity waves \(AGWs\) detected at ionospheric heights \(Šauli et al., 2006, 2007\).](#)
21
22

23 Many studies were also focused on the eclipse-induced gravity waves (GWs) (Fritts and Luo, 1993;
24 Altadill et al., 2001, [2004](#); Zerefos et al., 2007; Gerasopoulos et al., 2008), that can be retained
25 responsible for most of the ionospheric eclipse-related phenomena. With regard to this issue,
26 Chimonas and Hines (1971) were the first who suggested that the supersonic speed of the lunar
27 shadow could disturb the thermal balance of the atmosphere and generate gravity waves.
28
29

30 A smaller number of papers is about the solar eclipse effect on sporadic E (Es) layer and the
31 corresponding results are conflicting. A decrease of the top frequency of Es (ftEs) was observed by
32 Minnis (1955) and Stoffregen (1955), while an increase was reported by Datta (1973) and Chen et
33 al. (2010). Overall, it seems that the decreasing solar radiation characterizing a solar eclipse has a
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 little direct impact on Es, even though the indirect effects of the eclipse, like the thermal gradient
2 and the GWs, cannot be ignored (Chen et al., 2011).
3

4
5 In this study, the ionograms recorded during the solar eclipse occurred on 20 March 2015 by the
6
7 Advanced Ionospheric Sounder by Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia (AIS-INGV)
8
9 ionosondes (Zuccheretti et al., 2003) installed at Rome (41.8°N, 12.5°E) and Gibilmanna (37.9°N,
10
11 14.0°E), Italy, are considered to show how the Es dynamics is clearly influenced by the solar eclipse
12
13 conditions. The path of totality passed across the North Atlantic and the Arctic Ocean, moving
14
15 from the northwest Europe to the northeast Europe, and the only populated sites from which the
16
17 totality could be seen were the Faroe Islands and Svalbard in the northern Europe. Anyway, the
18
19 shadow of the eclipse was visible in varying degrees all over Europe.
20
21
22
23
24

25 At Rome and Gibilmanna the solar eclipse was only partial, with the maximum area of the solar
26
27 disk obscured by the Moon equal to ~54% and ~45% respectively.
28
29
30

31 Nevertheless, the features characterizing the Es layer the day of the eclipse are significantly
32
33 different than those usually characterizing the month of March and specifically the previous and
34
35 next day of solar eclipse.
36
37

38 Our work wants also to be an additional proof of the evidence that GWs are triggered by eclipse
39
40 conditions. Moreover, thanks to both the application of the height-time-intensity (HTI) technique
41
42 proposed by Haldoupis et al. (2006) and the analysis of isoheight ionogram plots, the paper aims
43
44 at highlighting, that the solar eclipse induced GWs have likely played a significant role in causing
45
46 the [persistence](#) of the Es layer through the wind-shear mechanism.
47
48
49

50
51 The analyses and the results are described in detail in Section 2. The discussion of the results and
52
53 the conclusions are the subject of Section 3.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62

2. Analysis and Results

1
2 The ionograms used in this study were those recorded at Rome and Gibilmanna on 19, 20, and 21
3
4
5 March 2015 by the AIS-INGV ionosondes.

6
7 The sweeping frequency range and the sounding repetition rate were respectively set up from 1
8
9
10 MHz to 16 MHz and to 15 minutes at both stations. From each ionogram the ftEs expressed in
11
12 MHz was manually validated through the graphical user interface of the software *Interpre*
13
14 (Pezzopane, 2004). It was decided to refer to ftEs and not to the maximum frequency (foEs) of the
15
16 Es ordinary mode of propagation because the AIS-INGV ionosonde cannot tag the different modes
17
18 of propagation, that is the extraordinary (X) and the ordinary (O) one, and for most of ionograms it
19
20 was practically impossible to distinguish between foEs and the maximum frequency (fxEs) of the Es
21
22 extraordinary mode. The characteristic ftEs represents an [indirect](#) estimate of the maximum
23
24 electron density of the Es layer, and it is directly associated to the efficiency of the wind-shear
25
26 theory.
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 Figure 1 shows the plots of ftEs validated data recorded at Rome and Gibilmanna on 19, 20, and 21
34
35 March 2015. The most striking feature shown by Fig. 1 is that the Es layer between 02:30 and
36
37 10:15 universal time (UT) at Rome, and between 04:00 and 11:00 UT at Gibilmanna, is always
38
39 present on 20 March 2015, which is a feature not characterizing the previous and next day, and in
40
41 general each day of the considered month. By taking into account that the start and end times of
42
43 the partial solar eclipse as recorded at the ground at Rome and Gibilmanna were about 08:30 UT
44
45 and 10:30 UT, this suggests that the solar eclipse conditions have somehow influenced the Es
46
47 dynamics.
48
49
50
51

52
53 This is why we decided to apply first the HTI technique, for investigating the Es layer vertical
54
55 motion and its variability, and then to generate isoheight plots of electron density to look for the
56
57 possible presence of traveling ionospheric disturbances (TIDs) caused by GW propagation.
58
59
60
61

1 An ionogram represents a snapshot of the ionosphere at the time of the sounding, for definite
2 height and frequency ranges. Hence, from a single ionogram it would not be possible to derive the
3 dynamics of the ionospheric layers. On the contrary, the HTI analysis proposed by Haldoupis et al.
4 (2006), and recently used by Pignalberi et al. (2014), and Oikonomou et al. (2014), to investigate
5 how tidal waves influence the Es dynamics, considers a specific frequency range and, by using a
6 series of ionograms, allows the study of the aforementioned dynamics. The output of the HTI
7 analysis is a plot of the intensity of the energy received by the ionosonde, after being reflected by
8 the ionosphere, versus the 24 h of the day, for a definite frequency range, and for the same height
9 range of the ionogram. With regard to this issue, it is worth noting that the HTI technique has
10 been also used in the recent past to analyze the behavior of the Es layer during some solar eclipse
11 events for frequency ranges of 0.1 MHz (Koucká Knížová and Mošna, 2011).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Figures 2 and 3 show the three HTI plots, one for each of the considered days, calculated for a
29 frequency range between 1 and 5 MHz by considering the ionograms recorded respectively at
30 Rome and Gibilmanna. This means that each of the plots shown in Figs 2 and 3 is based on the 96
31 ionograms recorded at Rome and Gibilmanna during each of the three considered days. The
32 maximum of the height range, compared to that of the ionogram, is restricted for simplicity to 210
33 km. Indeed, the interest of this paper is to highlight phenomena associated with Es layers that are
34 characteristic of altitudes lower than 150 km. In order to generate the HTI plots, an upper limit of
35 5 MHz was chosen because, as it is possible to infer from Fig. 1, during the considered period the
36 ftEs values are never too much higher than 5 MHz. Figures 2 and 3 show that the HTI plots
37 generated for the 20 March 2015 are characterized by a very distinct Es layer, starting from an
38 altitude of about 125 km at 02:30 UT at Rome and at 04:30 UT at Gibilmanna, and lowering to an
39 altitude of about 100 km where it stops its descent at 12:00 UT at Rome and at 14:00 UT at
40 Gibilmanna. The same pattern is not seen at all in the HTI plots of the previous and next day at
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 both stations. Actually, descent traces seem to be visible also the day after the eclipse but these
2 are fictitious. In fact, at first sight, also these traces could be attributed to the Es layer, but a
3 careful check of the ionograms reveals that this effect is actually caused by the cusp associated
4 with the electron density maximum of the E region, which is characteristic of the Es layer of type
5 "c" (see also Figure 2 of Pignalberi et al. (2014)). On the other hand, we are sure that the same
6 artifact does not typify the HTI plot related to the eclipse day because most of the ionograms
7 recorded the 20 March 2015 between 02:00 and 10:00 UT were characterized by blanketing Es
8 layers of type "f" or "l" between 1 and 5 MHz.
9

10 In order to look for the possible presence of TIDs caused by gravity wave (GW) propagation, the
11 ionogram traces recorded at Rome and Gibilmanna on 19, 20, 21 March 2015 from 07:00 to 12:00
12 UT were manually digitized, obtaining a sequence of couples of values (N , h') for each ionogram,
13 where N is the electron density and h' is the virtual height of reflection. Then, inversion from the
14 ionogram trace (N , h') to the profile (N , h), where h is the real height of reflection, was performed
15 using the POLAN inversion technique (Titheridge, 1988). From the profiles (N , h) isoheight curves
16 $N(h = \text{const} = 150, 160, 170, 180, 190, 200, 210, 220, 230, 240, 250 \text{ km})$ were then obtained and
17 plotted in Figs 4 and 5 for Rome and Gibilmanna respectively. Both figures show that on 20 March
18 2015, between 08:00 and 09:00 UT, maximum N variations occur first at higher altitudes and then
19 at lower altitudes, showing a downward phase shift which is characteristic of GW propagation in
20 the ionospheric medium (Hines, 1960). This kind of feature is instead perceivable neither on the 19
21 March nor on the 21 March 2015.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 **3. Discussion and Conclusions**

55 The mid-latitude ionospheric Es layers, a phenomenon that has been investigated for many years
56 (see reviews by Whitehead, 1989; Mathews, 1998; Haldoupis, 2011, 2012), are thin and dense
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 layers of plasma forming mostly in the region between 90 and 130 km, a region characterized by
2 complicated dynamics and nonlinear plasma processes. The Es layer itself is representative of the
3
4 complex interaction between the neutral atmosphere and the ionosphere which occurs right in
5
6 this region.
7
8

9
10 The ftEs characteristic, associated with the ionic content of the ionospheric E region, presents its
11
12 maximum values in June and July, which is a well known feature of the mid-latitude Es layer (e.g.,
13
14 Pignalberi et al., 2014; Chu et al., 2014).
15

16
17 The Es occurrence frequency itself shows a behavior which is very similar to that of ftEs; Es layers
18
19 with lifetimes of 5 h both over Rome and Gibilmanna are observed with the highest percentages of
20
21 occurrence (80% - 90%) during summer time (Pietrella et al., 2014).
22
23

24
25 In fact, in June and July it is not uncommon for the Es layer to be present throughout the day,
26
27 implying a long persistence of the phenomenon ([when talking about persistence we want to stress](#)
28
29 [the fact that we mean a series of consecutive ionograms showing the presence of an Es layer](#)). The
30
31 same cannot be said for the rest of the months, for which the presence of the Es layer is not
32
33 absolutely continuous.
34
35

36
37 Specifically, at the ionospheric stations of Rome and Gibilmanna, in March 2015 there is no day for
38
39 which the Es layer is continuously present for about 7/8 hours; with regard to this issue, the
40
41 reader can refer to the electronic Space Weather upper atmosphere database (eSWua)
42
43 (<http://www.eswua.ingv.it/>) (Romano et al., 2008).
44
45

46
47 The only day that has a persistence of Es layer in the ionogram trace for at least 7/8 hour, from
48
49 about 03 to 11 UT at Rome and from about 04 to 11 UT at Gibilmanna, is the eclipse day (Fig. 1).
50
51

52
53 Both periods of time include the duration time of the partial solar eclipse as recorded at the
54
55 ground at Rome and Gibilmanna, suggesting as a consequence that the solar eclipse conditions
56
57 have in some way influenced the Es dynamics.
58
59

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

In particular, the solar eclipse did not affect at all the Es layer in terms of its maximum intensity, as it was already reported by other authors (e.g. Datta, 1973; Chen et al., 2010); in fact, the ftEs values do not show any magnitude difference if compared with that of the previous and next day (Fig. 1). This could be due to the fact that the meteoric influx, associated with the ionic content of the ionospheric E region, is in this season, at least in the Northern hemisphere, less than in summer (Haldoupis et al., 2007).

The Es layer is then influenced in terms of its persistence. This persistence is confirmed by the application of the HTI technique proposed by Haldoupis et al. (2006). Figures 2 and 3 in fact show that on 20 March 2015, both at Rome and Gibilmanna, in a period of time including that of the solar eclipse, a very distinct Es layer starts at an altitude of about 125 km and lowers to an altitude of about 100 km where it stops its descent; on the contrary, the same pattern does not characterize the previous and next day.

It is believed that the formation of the Es layer relies on vertical wind shears in the neutral horizontal winds, which can force, along with the combined action of ion-neutral collisional coupling and geomagnetic Lorentz forcing, the metallic ions of meteoric origin to move vertically and converge into dense and thin plasma layers localized at the convergence node of the neutral horizontal wind vertical profile.

This Es triggering mechanism was formulated in the early sixties studies mostly associated with the atmospheric gravity waves (Axford, 1963; Chimonas and Axford, 1968).

In Hines and Chimonas (1970) and in Chimonas (1970), it has been shown that, during a solar eclipse, the Moon's cool shadow going through the atmosphere can act as a continuous source of internal gravity waves while running at supersonic speeds across the Earth. Moreover, theoretical considerations of the magnitudes of the pressure perturbations generated from these waves are

1 found to be sufficient to develop TIDs in the ionospheric region that, through the wind-shear
2 mechanism, can cause the appearance of an Es layer.
3

4
5 In the light of these considerations the clear and [persistent](#) descending traces visible in Figs 2 and
6
7 3 on 20 March 2015 are associated right with a [persistent](#) descending convergence node that
8
9 characterizes the neutral wind profile.
10

11
12 The HTI analysis shows however that [persistent](#) Es layers become visible in Rome at 02:30 UT and
13
14 in Gibilmanna at 04:30 UT, that is at times earlier than those characterizing the eclipse period
15
16 (08:30-10:30 UT), so that one could also think that the Es [persistence](#) is not affected by the eclipse
17
18 phenomenology. Nevertheless, the wind-shear mechanism causing a [persistent](#) descending
19
20 convergence node, is in all likelihood due to a GW propagation, as it is shown by the isoheight
21
22 curves in Figs 4 and 5 where a downward phase shift, characteristic of GW propagation in the
23
24 ionospheric medium (Hines, 1960), is clearly visible on 20 March 2015 both at Rome and
25
26 Gibilmanna, between 08:00 and 09:00 UT, that is a time interval included in that of the partial
27
28 solar eclipse as recorded at the ground. In addition, a careful inspection of Fig. 5 points out
29
30 another downward phase shift around 09:30 UT, thus indicating the presence of a GW wave train
31
32 over Gibilmanna. The same cannot be said for Rome, because some ionograms were characterized
33
34 by blanketing Es which prevented from observing the upper ionospheric layers.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 The considerations made above support the fact that the wind-shear system induced by GWs has
45
46 most likely contributed to the Es [persistence](#) observed during the eclipse, the conditions of which
47
48 have somehow influenced the Es dynamics.
49

50
51 This is even more convincing if you observe that in the isoheight curves calculated for the previous
52
53 and next day of the eclipse the downward phase shift is not visible at all.
54
55

56
57 This is why we think that the uninterrupted presence of a [persistent](#) Es layer for 7/8 hours
58
59 observed on 20 March 2015 in the ionogram traces was caused [mainly](#) by the strong thermal
60
61

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

gradient related to the solar eclipse, which triggered an internal GW, which in turn caused a stable wind-shear mechanism.

Nonetheless, although it is now widely agreed that Es formation at middle latitudes is justifiable according to the wind shear mechanism, from some numerical simulations related to Es layers observed during the Aladdin 1 rocket campaign, it has emerged that the inclusion of an ad hoc small constant electric field at times can be important to mitigate the discrepancies between modelled and experimental results (MacLeod et al., 1975). Specifically, the effects of the ionospheric ambient electric field have been proved important in producing a persistent Es layer which otherwise by wind effects alone would be rapidly dispersed by diffusion (Rees et al., 1976). With regard to this issue, it is noteworthy to highlight that the solar eclipse occurred right in the recovery phase of the geomagnetic storm known as St. Patrick's Day geomagnetic storm. This storm commenced on March 17, 2015 with the arrival at Earth of a coronal mass ejection. As can be observed by Fig. 6 the Dst index reached a minimum value of about -200 nT that, together with a Kp index equal to 8, makes of this event a severe magnetic storm.

Even if the mechanism is still not well understood, it is known that the interplanetary electric field can penetrate to the low and mid-latitude ionosphere due to the interaction among the solar wind, magnetosphere, and ionosphere. Under perturbed geomagnetic conditions this phenomenon can substantially alter the plasma density distribution mainly at low latitudes and mainly during the storm main phase (Wei et al, 2015). So far, little is known on the relation between geomagnetic storms and the Es layer occurrence. Actually, few investigations have been carried out on this relation (e.g. Huang, 1965; Batista and Abdu, 1977; Abdu et al., 2013), all of them focussing on low latitudes, being these latitudes the most significantly influenced by the penetration electric field and dealing with the enhancement of Es in terms of electron density rather than on its persistence. However, concerning the case here considered, we can deduce

1 from Fig. 6 that solar wind parameters and interplanetary magnetic field do not exhibit notable
2 differences during the interval 19-21 March. Even if it cannot be excluded that the persistence we
3 observe on March 20 in the Es layer is the effect of the St. Patrick's Day geomagnetic storm, it is
4 not even straightforward to ascribe the observed persistence to either direct or indirect changes in
5 the solar forcing.
6
7
8
9
10
11

12 In virtue of these considerations, the Es persistence as it has been recorded on 20 March 2015, is
13 more likely to have been triggered by a wave-like activity in terms of GWs caused by thermal
14 gradients related to the solar eclipse, even if we cannot exclude that it could be partly due to the
15 additional electric fields related to the geomagnetically perturbed environment characterizing the
16 period under investigation. A detailed investigation of the latter triggering mechanism is however
17 out of the scope of the present work.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **Acknowledgements**

32 We acknowledge use of NASA/GSFC's Space Physics Data Facility's OMNIWeb service, and OMNI
33 data.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

1
2 Abdu, M.A., Souza, J.R., Batista, I.S., Fejer, B.G., Sobral, J.H.A., 2013. Sporadic E layer development
3
4 and disruption at low latitudes by prompt penetration electric fields during magnetic storms. J.
5
6 Geophys. Res. 118, 2639-2647, doi:10.1002/jgra.50271.
7

8
9
10
11
12 Adeniyi, J. O., Radicella, S. M., Adimula, I. A., Willoughby, A. A., Oladipo, O. A., Olawepo, O., 2007.
13
14 Signature of the 29 March 2006 eclipse on the ionosphere over an equatorial station. J. Geophys.
15
16 Res. 112, A06314, doi:10.1029/2006JA012197.
17
18

19
20
21
22
23 Afraimovich, E. L., Palamartchouk, K. S., Perevalova, N. P., Chernukhov, V. V., Likhnev, A. V.,
24
25 Zalutsky, V. T., 1998. Ionospheric effects of the solar eclipse of March 9, 1997, as deduced from
26
27 GPS data. Geophys. Res. Lett. 25(4), 465–468, doi:10.1029/98GL00186.
28
29

30
31
32
33 Altadill, D., Solé, J. G., Apostolov, E., 2001. Vertical structure of a gravity wave like oscillation in the
34
35 ionosphere generated by the solar eclipse of August 11, 1999. J. Geophys. Res. 106 (A10), 21,419–
36
37 21,428, doi:10.1029/2001JA900069.
38
39

40
41
42
43 Altadill, D., Apostolov, E.M., Boska, J., Lastovicka, J., Sauli, P., 2004. Planetary and gravity wave
44
45 signatures in the *F*-region ionosphere with impact on radio propagation predictions and variability.
46
47 *Annals of Geophysics*, 47 (2/3), doi: 10.4401/ag-3288.
48
49

50
51
52
53
54 Axford, W.I., 1963. The formation and vertical movement of dense ionized layers in the ionosphere
55
56 due to neutral wind shears. J. Geophys. Res. 68 (3), 769-779.
57
58
59
60
61

1 Baran, L.W., Ephishov, I.I., Shagimuratov, I.I., Ivanov, V.P., Lagovsky, A.F., 2003. The response of
2 the ionospheric total electron content to the solar eclipse on August 11, 1999. *Adv. Space Res.* 31
3
4
5 (4), 989–994.
6

7
8
9
10 Batista, I.S., Abdu, M.A., 1977. Magnetic storm associated delayed sporadic E enhancements in the
11
12 Brazilian geomagnetic anomaly. *J. Geophys. Res.* 82, 4777-4783.
13

14
15
16
17
18 Chen, G., Zhao, Z., Yang, G., Zhou, C., Yao, M., Li, T., Huang, S., Li, N., 2010. Enhancement and HF
19
20 Doppler observations of sporadic-E during the solar eclipse of 22 July 2009. *J. Geophys. Res.* 115,
21
22 A09325, doi:10.1029/2010JA015530.
23

24
25
26
27
28 Chen, G., Zhao, Z., Zhang, Y., Yang, G., Zhou, C., Huang, S., Li, T., Li, N., Sun, H., 2011. Gravity waves
29
30 and spread Es observed during the solar eclipse of 22 July 2009. *J. Geophys. Res.* 116, A09314,
31
32 doi:10.1029/2011JA016720.
33

34
35
36
37
38 Cheng, K., Huang, Y.-N., Chen, S.-W., 1992. Ionospheric effects of the solar eclipse of September
39
40 23, 1987, around the equatorial anomaly crest region. *J. Geophys. Res.* 97 (A1), 103–111,
41
42 doi:10.1029/91JA02409.
43

44
45
46
47
48 Chimonas, G., Axford, W.I., 1968. Vertical movement of temperate-zone sporadic E layers. *J.*
49
50 *Geophys. Res.* 73 (1) , 111-117.
51

52
53
54
55
56 Chimonas, G., 1970. Internal gravity-wave motions induced in the earth's atmosphere by a solar
57
58 eclipse. *J. Geophys. Res.* 75 (28), 5545-5551.
59

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Chimonas, G., Hines, C. O., 1971. Atmospheric gravity waves induced by a solar eclipse, 2. J. Geophys. Res. 76 (28), 7003–7005.

Chu, Y. H., Wang, C. Y., Wu, K. H., Chen, K. T., Tzeng, K. J., Su, C. L., Feng, W., Plane, J. M. C., 2014. Morphology of sporadic E layer retrieved from COSMIC GPS radio occultation measurements: Wind shear theory examination. J. Geophys. Res. 119, 2117–2136, doi:10.1002/2013JA019437.

Datta, R. N., 1973. Solar eclipse effect on sporadic E ionization, 2. J. Geophys. Res. 78 (1), 320-322.

Fritts, D. C., Luo, Z., 1993. Gravity wave forcing in the middle atmosphere due to reduced ozone heating during a solar eclipse. J. Geophys. Res. 98 (D2), 3011–3021, doi:10.1029/92JD02391.

Gerasopoulos, E., Zerefos, C. S., Tsagouri, I., Founda, D., Amiridis, V., Bais, A. F., Belehaki, A., Christou, N., Economou, G., Kanakidou, M., Karamanos, A., Petrakis, M., Zanis, P., 2008. The total solar eclipse of March 2006: Overview. Atmos. Chem. Phys. 8, 5205–5220, doi:10.5194/acp-8-5205-2008.

Haldoupis, C., 2012. Midlatitude sporadic E. A typical paradigm of atmosphere-ionosphere coupling. Space Science Reviews 168, 441-461, doi:10.1007/s11214-011-9786-8.

Haldoupis, C., 2011. A tutorial review on sporadic E layers, in *Aeronomy of the earth's atmosphere and ionosphere*, IAGA Special Sopron Book Series 2, 381-394, doi:10.1007/978-94-007-0326-1_29.

1 Haldoupis, C., Meek, C., Christakis, N., Pancheva, D., Bourdillon, A., 2006. Ionogram height-time
2 intensity observations of descending E layers at mid-latitude. *J. Atmos. Sol.-Terr. Phys.* 68, 539-
3
4 557, doi:10.1016/j.jastp.2005.03.020.
5
6
7

8
9
10 Haldoupis, C., Pancheva, D., Singer, W., Meek, C., MacDougall, J., 2007. An explanation for the
11
12 seasonal dependence of midlatitude sporadic E layers. *J. Geophys. Res.* 112, A06315,
13
14 doi:10.1029/2007JA012322.
15
16
17

18
19
20 Hines, C.O., 1960. Internal atmospheric gravity waves at ionospheric heights. *Can. J. Phys.* 38,
21
22 1441–1481, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1139/p60-150>.
23
24
25

26
27
28 Hines, C. O., Chimonas, G., 1970. Atmospheric gravity waves induced by a solar eclipse. *J. Geophys.*
29
30 *Res.* 75, 875.
31
32
33

34
35
36 [Huang, Y.N., 1965. Geomagnetic activity and occurrence of sporadic E in far East. *J. Geophys. Res.*](#)
37
38 [70, 1187-1194.](#)
39
40
41

42
43
44 Jakowski, N., Stankov, S.M., Wilken, V., Borries, C., Altadill, D., Chum, J., Buresova, D., Boska, J.,
45
46 Sauli, P., Hruska, F., Cander, Lj.R., 2008. Ionospheric behavior over Europe during the solar eclipse
47
48 of 3 October 2005. *J. Atmos. Solar Terr. Phys.* 70, 836–853.
49
50
51

52
53
54 [Koucká Knížová, P., Mošna, Z., 2011. Acoustic–Gravity Waves in the Ionosphere During Solar](#)
55
56 [Eclipse Events, Acoustic Waves - From Microdevices to Helioseismology, Prof. Marco G. Beghi](#)
57
58 [\(Ed.\), ISBN: 978-953-307-572-3, InTech, DOI: 10.5772/19722. Available from:](#)
59
60
61

1 [http://www.intechopen.com/books/acoustic-waves-from-microdevices-to-](http://www.intechopen.com/books/acoustic-waves-from-microdevices-to-helioseismology/acoustic-gravity-waves-in-the-ionosphere-during-solar-eclipse-events)
2 [helioseismology/acoustic-gravity-waves-in-the-ionosphere-during-solar-eclipse-events](http://www.intechopen.com/books/acoustic-waves-from-microdevices-to-helioseismology/acoustic-gravity-waves-in-the-ionosphere-during-solar-eclipse-events)
3

4
5
6
7 Krankowski, A., Shagimuratov, I.I., Baran, L.W., Yakimova, G.A, 2008. The effect of total solar
8 eclipse of October 3, 2005, on the total electron content over Europe. *Adv. Space Res.* 41, 628–
9 638, doi:10.1016/j.asr.2007.11.002.
10
11
12

13
14
15
16
17
18 [MacLeod, M.A., Keneshea, T.J., Narcisi, R.C., 1975. Numerical modelling of a metallic ion sporadic-](#)
19 [E layer. *Radio Sci.* 10 \(3\), 371–388.](#)
20
21

22
23
24
25 Mathews, J.D., 1998. Sporadic E: current views and recent progress. *J. Atmos. Sol.-Terr. Phys.* 60
26 (4), 413-435.
27
28

29
30
31
32
33 Minnis, C. M., 1955. Ionospheric behaviour at Khartoum during the eclipse of 25th February 1952.
34 *J. Atmos. Terr. Phys.* 6, 91–112.
35
36

37
38
39
40
41 Oikonomou, C., Haralambous, H., Haldoupis, C., Meek, C., 2014. Sporadic E tidal variabilities and
42 characteristics observed with the Cyprus Digisonde. *J. Atmos. Sol. Terr. Phys.* 119, 173-183,
43 doi:10.1016/j.jastp.2014.07.014.
44
45
46
47

48
49
50
51 Pezzopane, M., 2004. *Interpre*: a Windows software for semiautomatic scaling of ionospheric
52 parameters from ionograms. *Comp. & Geosci.* 30, 125-130, doi:10.1016/j.cageo.2003.09.009.
53
54

55
56
57 Pietrella, M., Pezzopane, M., Bianchi, C., 2014. A comparative sporadic-E layer study between two
58 mid-latitude ionospheric stations, *Adv. Space Res.* 54(2) 150-160, doi: 10.1016/j.asr.2014.03.019.
59
60
61

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Pignalberi, A., Pezzopane, M., Zuccheretti, E., 2014. Sporadic E layer at mid-latitudes: average properties and influence of atmospheric tides. *Ann. Geophys.* 32, 1427-1440, www.ann-geophys.net/32/1427/2014/.

[Rees, D., Dorling, E.B., Lloyd, K.H., Low, C., 1976. The role of neutral winds and ionospheric electric fields in forming stable sporadic E layers. *Planet. Space Sci.* 24 \(5\), 475–478.](#)

Romano, V., Pau, S., Pezzopane, M., Zuccheretti, E., Zolesi, B., De Franceschi, G., Locatelli, S., 2008. The electronic Space Weather upper atmosphere (eSWua) project at INGV: Advancements and state of the art. *Ann. Geophys.* 26, 345-351, doi:10.5194/angeo-26-345-2008.

Salah, J.E., Oliver, W.L., Foster, J.J., Holt, J.M., Emery, B.A., Roble, R.G., 1986. Observation of the May 30, 1984, annular solar eclipse at Millstone Hill. *J. Geophys. Res.* 91 (A2), 1651–1660.

[Šauli, P., Abry, P., Boška, J., Duchayne, L., 2006. Wavelet characterisation of ionospheric acoustic and gravity waves occurring during the solar eclipse of August 11, 1999. *J. Atmos. Sol. Terr. Phys.*, 68 \(3-5\), 586-598, doi:10.1016/j.jastp.2005.03.024.](#)

[Šauli, P., Roux, S.G., Abry, P., Boška, J., 2007. Acoustic-gravity waves during solar eclipses: Detection and characterization using wavelet transforms. *J. Atmos. Sol. Terr. Phys.*, 69 \(17-18\), 2465-2484, doi:10.1016/j.jastp.2007.06.012.](#)

Stoffregen, W., 1955. Variation of fEs during solar eclipses, *Nature* 176, 610.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Titheridge, J.E, 1988. The real height analysis of ionograms: a generalized formulation. *Radio Sci.* 23 (5), 831–849, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/RS023i005p00831>.

Wei, Y., Zhao, B.Q., Li, G.Z., Wan, W.X., 2015. Electric field penetration into Earth's ionosphere: a brief review for 2000-2013. *Science Bulletin* 60, 748-761, doi: 10.1007/s11434-015-0749-4.

Whitehead, J.D., 1989. Recent work on mid-latitude and equatorial sporadic-E. *J. Atmos. Terr. Phys.* 51 (A5), 401-424.

Zerefos, C. S., Gerasopoulos, E., Tzagouri, I., Psiloglou, B. E., Belehaki, A., Herekakis, T., Bais, A., Kazadzis, S., Eleftheratos, C., Kalivitis, N., Mihalopoulos, N., 2007. Evidence of gravity waves into the atmosphere during the March 2006 total solar eclipse. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 7, 4943–4951, doi:10.5194/acp-7-4943-2007.

Zuccheretti, E., Tutone, G., Sciacca, U., Bianchi, C., Arokiasamy, B.J., 2003. The new AIS-INGV digital ionosonde. *Annals of Geophysics* 46 (4), 647-659.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure 1. Plots of ftEs validated data recorded at (left) Rome and (right) Gibilmanna on 19, 20, and 21 March 2015. The vertical red lines highlight the start (\approx 08:30 UT) and the end (\approx 10:30 UT) times of the partial solar eclipse occurred on 20 March 2015, as recorded at the ground. The short black vertical lines at the bottom of each plot mean that the Es layer is not present in the ionogram trace.

Figure 2. HTI plots for the 19, 20, and 21 March 2015, for a frequency range of 1-5 MHz, calculated by considering the ionograms recorded at Rome. The vertical red lines highlight the start (\approx 08:30 UT) and the end (\approx 10:30 UT) times of the partial solar eclipse occurred on 20 March 2015 as recorded at the ground.

Figure 3. Same as Fig. 2 for Gibilmanna.

Figure 4. Electron density variations for the real height range 150–250 km computed for the 19, 20, and 21 March 2015 from 07 to 12 UT, by considering the ionogram traces recorded at Rome. The oblique line in the middle plot highlights the downward phase shift typical of gravity wave propagation, characterizing the 20 March 2015. The vertical dashed lines highlight the start (\approx 08:30 UT) and the end (\approx 10:30 UT) times of the partial solar eclipse occurred on 20 March 2015 as recorded at the ground.







Figure 5. Same as Fig. 4 for Gibilmanna.

Figure 6. From top to bottom: Dst index, plasma speed (V), flow pressure (P), interplanetary magnetic field vertical component (Bz) and interplanetary electric field (E) during 15 March – 1


April 2015 as contained in the OMNI dataset. Green lines indicate March 20 (dotted) and March 19
and 21 (dashed), respectively.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65


Figure_1




Figure_2




Figure_3




Figure_4



Figure_5



Figure_6



Response to Reviewer#1

Page.8 Line.54. You often use the term «Es stability». Can you explain, what do you mean? In several papers I think the similar term «persistent» sporadic E layer was used. (for example, Takashi Maruyama et al., JOURNAL OF GEOPHYSICAL RESEARCH, 2003). Maybe it would be better to use this term?

The authors accepted the suggestion made by the reviewer and the words “stable” and “stability” were replaced respectively with the words “persistent” and “persistence” throughout the text.

Page.6 Line.57 «Haldoupis et al. (2007) have recently proposed the meteoric influx as a justification of this seasonal dependency of the Es».

In my opinion this statement is controversial. I see a good correlation between daily meteor counts and mean daily sporadic E critical frequency in the Northern Hemisphere, but what about Southern Hemisphere, where typical annual variability of sporadic E critical frequencies have the opposite trend. (see fig.1 from Haldoupis et al. (2007))

We have seen the Figure 1 from Haldoupis et al. (2007)) and we thank the reviewer for remarking this issue. Since Rome and Gibilmanna are located in the Northern hemisphere, we think that what was stated at page 6 line 57 (old version) and at page 7 lines 44-49 (old version) remains still valid. Anyway, we have deleted the sentence at page 6 line 57 (old version) and modified the sentence at page 7 lines 44-49 (old version) that now is at between pages 7-8 of the revised version as follows:

“This could be due to the fact that the meteoric influx, associated with the ionic content of the ionospheric E region, is in this season, at least in the Northern hemisphere, less than in summer (Haldoupis et al., 2007)”.

Page.4 Line.23 The characteristic ftEs represents an estimate of the maximum electron density of the Es layer. This proposal seems to me to be false. Maybe better to say « ... *indirect* estimate of the maximum electron density...»

The authors accepted the suggestion made by the reviewer and the sentence at page 4 was accordingly modified.

Page.7 Line.44 «...ftEs does not show any particular variation...» Is it a misprint? What sense do you mean by the words « particular variation» (any oscillations are always particular (except sinusoidal)?)

The words “particular variation” were erased and the text was a little bit rearranged, see the Abstract and the text at page 7.


If you talk about GWs with typical duration 4-6 hours (as it was stated by David Altadill et al., 2001, David Altadill et al., 2004) caused «the stabilization of the Es layer», why the Es observed for 7-8 hours?

The most striking feature the authors want to highlight is the *persistence* of the Es layer characterizing the solar eclipse day. When talking about *persistence* the authors mean a series of consecutive ionograms showing the presence of an Es layer. If we look carefully at the ftEs


plots of 19 and 21 March 2015, we can see that the persistence of the Es layer is less than 2 hours on 19 March 2015 and less than 4 hours on 21 March 2015, while on 20 March 2015 the persistence of Es layer is higher than 7 hours, in correspondence to the time interval of the eclipse. Specifically, at the ionospheric stations of Rome and Gibilmanna, in March 2015 there is no day for which the Es layer is present continuously for about 7/8 hours; with regard to this issue, the reader can refer to the electronic Space Weather upper atmosphere database (eSWua) (<http://www.eswua.ingv.it/>) (Romano et al., 2008).

This means that for about 7 hours the consecutive ionograms recorded both at Rome and Gibilmanna on 20 March 2015 showed the presence of an Es layer. It is opinion of the authors to believe that this persistence was caused by the strong thermal gradients related to the solar eclipse, which triggered internal GWs, which in turn caused a stable wind-shear mechanism.

The authors agree with the reviewer when he talks about GWs with typical duration of 4-6 hours (concerning this, the additional reference Altadill et al. (2004) suggested by the reviewer was considered and cited in the paper) and they think that this is not in contrast with the Es persistence of about 7 hours recorded at Rome and Gibilmanna. The authors think that in the absence of the eclipse the ftEs plot could have been like for instance the following one for Rome (the red arrows show time intervals for which the authors imagine that the Es layer could have been not present in the absence of the eclipse and which are included in a time interval of 4-6 hours, which is a typical duration of a GW)



and the following one for Gibilmanna (again the red arrow show a time interval for which the authors imagine that the Es layer could have been not present in the absence of the eclipse and which is less than 4-6 hours, which is a typical duration of a GW)



As it is shown in fig.1 (by the ionosonde installed at Rome) the Es is observed from 20 UT 19.03.2015 to 10 UT 20.03.2015. The presence of GWs caused by solar eclipse was not possible at 19.03.2015, nevertheless the Es existed.

The reviewer is right, the Es is observed from 20 UT 19.03.2015 to 10 UT 20.03.2015. But during this time interval the Es layer is not *persistent*. What the authors want to stress, as on the other hand it has been highlighted in the previous point, is the *persistence* of the Es layer characterizing the solar eclipse day, that is the record of a series of consecutive ionograms showing the presence of an Es layer, and this Es persistence is visible only on 20 March 2015 from about 03 to 10 UT at Rome and from about 04 to 11 UT at Gibilmanna.

Your article announce about 7-8 hour presence of the Es layer caused by GWs, but why the time scales (X axis) of figures, associated with GWs (fig.4,5), does not correspond to the time of the Es presence?

The time scale of figures 4 and 5 varies from 07 to 12UT because we wanted to consider a time interval large enough only to include the start and end times of the partial solar eclipse (08:30 – 10:30 UT) and see if inside this interval the signature of a GW could be found. This just to be sure that the thermal gradients characterizing a solar eclipse could be considered as the GW triggering mechanism.

It is obvious that some relationship (between solar eclipse and Es) exists, but your explanation seems too general. Probably in this relationship the electric fields are more important.

In fact the interpretation of the Es layer existence is explained by sending the reader to the Axford, 1963; Chimonas and Axford, 1968.

The observation made by the reviewer was considered. In the “Discussion and Conclusions” section, the following text, and additional references, were added to improve the discussion and take into account what it was remarked by the reviewer:

“Nonetheless, although it is now widely agreed that Es formation at middle latitudes is justifiable according to the wind shear mechanism, from some numerical simulations related to Es layers observed during the Aladdin 1 rocket campaign, it has emerged that the inclusion of an ad hoc small constant electric field at times can be important to mitigate the discrepancies between modelled and experimental results (MacLeod et al., 1975). Specifically, the effects of the ionospheric ambient electric field have been proved important in producing a persistent Es layer which otherwise by wind effects alone would be rapidly dispersed by diffusion (Rees et al., 1976). With regard to this issue, it is noteworthy highlighting that the solar eclipse occurred right in the recovery phase of the geomagnetic storm known as St. Patrick’s Day geomagnetic storm. This storm commenced on March 17, 2015 with the arrival at Earth of a coronal mass ejection. As can be observed by Fig. 6 the Dst index reached a minimum value of about -200 nT that, together with a Kp index equal to 8, makes of this event a severe magnetic storm.

Even if the mechanism is still not well understood, it is known that the interplanetary electric field can penetrate to the low and mid-latitude ionosphere due to the interaction among the solar wind, magnetosphere, and ionosphere. Under perturbed geomagnetic conditions this phenomenon can substantially alter the plasma density distribution mainly at low latitudes and mainly during the storm main phase (Wei et al, 2015). So far, little is known on the relation

between geomagnetic storms and the Es layer occurrence. Actually, few investigations have been carried out on this relation (e.g. Huang, 1965; Batista and Abdu, 1977; Abdu et al., 2013), all of them focussing on low latitudes, being these latitudes the most significantly influenced by the penetration electric field and dealing with the enhancement of Es in terms of electron density rather than on its persistence. However, concerning the case here considered, we can deduce from Fig. 6 that solar wind parameters and interplanetary magnetic field do not exhibit notable differences during the interval 19-21 March. Even if it cannot be excluded that the persistence we observe on March 20 in the Es layer is the effect of the St. Patrick's Day geomagnetic storm, it is not even straightforward to ascribe the observed persistence to either direct or indirect changes in the solar forcing.

In virtue of these considerations, the Es persistence as it has been recorded on 20 March 2015, is more likely to have been triggered by a wave-like activity in terms of GWs caused by thermal gradients related to the solar eclipse, even if we cannot exclude that it could be partly due to the additional electric fields related to the geomagnetically perturbed environment characterizing the period under investigation. A detailed investigation of the latter triggering mechanism is however out of the scope of the present work."

Response to Reviewer #2

Paper "20 March 2015 solar eclipse influence on sporadic E layer" by authors Michael Pezzopane, Marco Pietrella and Alessio Pignalberi deals with an interesting topic. After moderate revision it should be published.

The authors investigate behavior of the sporadic E during solar eclipse. The most important fact that is completely omitted in the work is that this event was preceded by the geomagnetic storm. Hence the measurements of the drop to the recovery phase of the storm. It could be seen on the plots involved in the paper. This fact must be noted in the text even if it makes the situation more difficult to discuss.

Regarding the scaling of the critical frequency I would recommend a paper by Lastovicka et al. High historical values of foE(s)-Reality or artefact?, JASTP, 2012.

The authors knew the paper suggested by the reviewer. Anyway, they decided not to cite it in the work both because the dataset used is small and also because the ionospheric characteristic considered is ftEs and not foEs.

Occurrence of the AGW during solar eclipses has been discussed in the papers by Sauli et al. 2007. Acoustic-gravity waves during solar eclipses: Detection and characterization using wavelet transforms, JASTP, 69, 17-18, 2465-2484.

Sauli et al., 2006. Wavelet characterization of ionospheric acoustic and gravity waves occurring during the solar eclipse of August 11, 1999. JASTP 68, 3-5, 586-598.

These two reference were properly inserted in the Introduction section at page 2.

HTI technique has been already used for analysis of Es behavior during eclipse events 2005 and 2011 and published in the INTECH book Acoustic Waves - from Microdevices to Helioseismology, edited by Marco G. Beghi, 2011. Chapter 14, Koucká Knížová and Mošna - Acoustic-Gravity Waves in the Ionosphere During Solar Eclipse Events. <http://www.intechopen.com/>

This reference was properly inserted at page 5.

On the plots 2, I do not see that big difference between the day of eclipse and the day after in qualitative sense. On both panels, the layer descends from aprox.125km down to 100km.

The reviewer is right, in Figure 2 there is not a big difference between the day of the eclipse and the day after. Actually, the descent trace visible the day after the eclipse is fictitious. In fact, at first sight, this phenomenon could be attributed to the Es layer, but a careful check of the ionograms reveals that this effect is actually caused by the cusp associated with the electron density maximum of the E region, which is characteristic of the Es layer of type "c" (see also Figure 2 of Pignalberi et al. (2014)). On the other hand, we are sure that the same artifact does not characterize the plot related to the eclipse day because most of the ionograms recorded the 20 March 2015 between 02 and 10 UT were characterized by blanketing Es of type "f" or "l" between 1 and 5 MHz. With regard to this issue a clarifying sentence was added between pages 5-6.

According to my opinion, there are two different agents influence the ionosphere during solar eclipse event. They are overlapping each other, hence the discussion must be provided with respect to the geomagnetic conditions and wave-like activity related to that.

The observation made by the reviewer was considered. In the “Discussion and Conclusions” section, the following text, and additional references, were added to improve the discussion and take into account the geomagnetic conditions related to the St. Patrick’s Day geomagnetic storm:

“Nonetheless, although it is now widely agreed that Es formation at middle latitudes is justifiable according to the wind shear mechanism, from some numerical simulations related to Es layers observed during the Aladdin 1 rocket campaign, it has emerged that the inclusion of an ad hoc small constant electric field at times can be important to mitigate the discrepancies between modelled and experimental results (MacLeod et al., 1975). Specifically, the effects of the ionospheric ambient electric field have been proved important in producing a persistent Es layer which otherwise by wind effects alone would be rapidly dispersed by diffusion (Rees et al., 1976). With regard to this issue, it is noteworthy highlighting that the solar eclipse occurred right in the recovery phase of the geomagnetic storm known as St. Patrick’s Day geomagnetic storm. This storm commenced on March 17, 2015 with the arrival at Earth of a coronal mass ejection. As can be observed by Fig. 6 the Dst index reached a minimum value of about -200 nT that, together with a Kp index equal to 8, makes of this event a severe magnetic storm.

Even if the mechanism is still not well understood, it is known that the interplanetary electric field can penetrate to the low and mid-latitude ionosphere due to the interaction among the solar wind, magnetosphere, and ionosphere. Under perturbed geomagnetic conditions this phenomenon can substantially alter the plasma density distribution mainly at low latitudes and mainly during the storm main phase (Wei et al, 2015). So far, little is known on the relation between geomagnetic storms and the Es layer occurrence. Actually, few investigations have been carried out on this relation (e.g. Huang, 1965; Batista and Abdu, 1977; Abdu et al., 2013), all of them focussing on low latitudes, being these latitudes the most significantly influenced by the penetration electric field and dealing with the enhancement of Es in terms of electron density rather than on its persistence. However, concerning the case here considered, we can deduce from Fig. 6 that solar wind parameters and interplanetary magnetic field do not exhibit notable differences during the interval 19-21 March. Even if it cannot be excluded that the persistence we observe on March 20 in the Es layer is the effect of the St. Patrick’s Day geomagnetic storm, it is not even straightforward to ascribe the observed persistence to either direct or indirect changes in the solar forcing.

In virtue of these considerations, the Es persistence as it has been recorded on 20 March 2015, is more likely to have been triggered by a wave-like activity in terms of GWs caused by thermal gradients related to the solar eclipse, even if we cannot exclude that it could be partly due to the additional electric fields related to the geomagnetically perturbed environment characterizing the period under investigation. A detailed investigation of the latter triggering mechanism is however out of the scope of the present work.”