

Reconstruction of a bipolar magnetic signature in an earthward jet in the tail: Flux rope or 3D transient reconnection?

Hiroshi Hasegawa[1]; Rumi Nakamura[2]; Masaki Fujimoto[3]; Victor Sergeev[4]; Elizabeth A. Lucek[5]; Henri Reme[6]; Yuri Khotyaintsev[7]

[1] ISAS/JAXA; [2] IWF,OEAW; [3] ISAS, JAXA; [4] Inst. Phys., St. Petersburg State Univ.; [5] Imperial Coll.; [6] CESR; [7] Swedish Inst. Space Phys.

Southward-then-northward magnetic perturbations are often seen in the tail plasma sheet, along with earthward flows, but the generation mechanism of such bipolar signatures (magnetic flux rope resulting from multiple X-line reconnection, transient reconnection, or else) has been controversial. At ~ 2313 UT on 13 August 2002, the Cluster spacecraft encountered a bipolar signature at the leading edge of an earthward jet, with one spacecraft (Cluster 3) in close proximity of the current sheet center. Application to this bipolar structure of Grad-Shafranov (GS) reconstruction technique for recovery of two-dimensional (2D) magneto-hydrostatic structures (Sonnerup et al., JGR, 2006) suggests that a flux rope with diameter $\sim 2 R_E$ was embedded in the flow. To investigate the validity of the GS result, we tested the method, using synthetic data from a 3D MHD simulation in which a bipolar field can be produced, without invoking multiple X-lines, through localized reconnection under the presence of guide-field B_y (Shirataka et al., JGR, 2006). A flux rope-like (closed field loop) structure, which does not really exist in the simulation, was erroneously produced from the GS method, but with a shape elongated in the flow direction. Unambiguous identification of which (flux rope or 3D transient reconnection) leads to an observed bipolar structure thus seems difficult. However, we infer that a flux rope was responsible for the bipolar signature in the Cluster event, because the magnetic structure reconstructed is nearly circular, suggesting a relaxed minimum-energy state. Our results also suggest that one needs to be cautious about interpretation of some (e.g., force-free, or magneto-hydrostatic) model-based results.