Magnetic Reconnection, Turbulence, and Particle Acceleration: Observations in the Earth’s Magnetotail
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Abstract We report observations of turbulent dissipation and particle acceleration from large-amplitude electric fields (\(\mathbf{E}\)) associated with strong magnetic field (\(\mathbf{B}\)) fluctuations in the Earth’s plasma sheet. The turbulence occurs in a region of depleted density with anti-earthward flows followed by earthward flows suggesting ongoing magnetic reconnection. In the turbulent region, ions and electrons have a significant increase in energy, occasionally >100 keV, and strong variation. There are numerous occurrences of \(|\mathbf{E}| > 100 \text{ mV/m}\) including occurrences of large potentials (>1 kV) parallel to \(\mathbf{B}\) and occurrences with extraordinarily large \(\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E}\) (\(\mathbf{J}\) is current density). In this event, we find that the perpendicular contribution of \(\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E}\) with frequencies near or below the ion cyclotron frequency \(f_{ci}\) provide the majority net positive \(\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E}\). Large-amplitude parallel \(\mathbf{E}\) events with frequencies above \(f_{ci}\) to several times the lower hybrid frequency provide significant dissipation and can result in energetic electron acceleration.

Plain Language Summary The Magnetospheric Multiscale mission is able to examine dissipation associated with magnetic reconnection with unprecedented accuracy and frequency response. The observations show that roughly 80% of the dissipation is from the perpendicular currents and electric fields. However, large-amplitude parallel electric fields appear to play a strong role in turbulent dissipation into electrons and in electron acceleration.

1. Introduction

Magnetic reconnection in the Earth’s magnetotail is understood to trigger auroral substorms (e.g., Angelopoulos et al., 2008; Nakamura et al., 2001), drive earthward flows (e.g., Angelopoulos et al., 1992; Baumjohann et al., 1989), and eject plasmoids away from Earth (Hones, 1977; Russell & McPherron, 1973). The aftermath of magnetic reconnection can leave a density-depleted plasma sheet in the Earth’s midmagnetotail (15–50 \(R_E\)) with regions of intense magnetic field (\(\mathbf{B}\)) fluctuations and energized ions and electrons. Magnetic reconnection may also be ongoing. In this article, we examine such a region in detail with the Magnetospheric Multiscale (MMS) mission (Burch et al., 2016) to understand the nature of turbulence associated with magnetic reconnection and the path through which ions and electrons are energized.

Plasma turbulence is active in many astrophysical settings (e.g., the interstellar medium Falceta-Gonçalves et al., 2014). It is central to the solar corona (e.g., Cranmer et al., 2015), the solar wind (e.g., Matthaeus et al., 1995), and...
active regions of the Earth’s magnetosphere (Borovsky et al., 1997; Borovsky & Funsten, 2003; Chasapis et al., 2017; Stawarz et al., 2016; Stawarz, Ergun, & Goodrich, 2015; Vörös et al., 2006; Weygand et al., 2005; Zimbardo et al., 2010). In particular, plasma sheet turbulence is well established (ibid). Turbulence enables cross-scale energy transfer and influences energy exchange between electromagnetic fields and particles.

One of the most important yet least understood processes of turbulence in collisionless plasmas is kinetic-scale dissipation (e.g. Karimabadi et al., 2013; TenBarge & Howes, 2013; Wan et al., 2012, 2016; Yang et al., 2017). Turbulence is intimately associated with magnetic reconnection (e.g. Chasapis et al., 2017; Daughton et al., 2014; Eastwood et al., 2009; Ergun, Goodrich, et al., 2016; Gosling, 2007; Retinò et al., 2007; Wan et al., 2013). It appears that magnetic reconnection, particularly that which results in large-scale reconfiguration of the magnetic field, excites turbulence, which, in turn, drives smaller reconnection events.

MMS is designed to study magnetic reconnection, turbulence, and acceleration at high spatial and temporal resolution with four satellites in a tetrahedral formation. In this study, the average plasma density \(n\) is \(\sim 0.03\ \text{cm}^{-3}\), and ion and electron temperatures \(T_i\) and \(T_e\) average \(\sim 10\ \text{keV}\) or more, so Debye lengths \(\lambda_D\) are \(\sim 4\ \text{km}\). The electron skin depth \(\lambda_e\) is \(\sim 30\ \text{km}\), whereas the MMS satellites are separated by \(\sim 15\ \text{km}\). Thus, MMS provides four-point, 3-D electric field \(\mathbf{E}\) observations within a few \(\lambda_D\) and accurate measurements of the current \(\mathbf{J}\) via the curlometer technique (Dunlop et al., 2002) due to separations less than \(\lambda_e\). \(\mathbf{J}\) is close to constant inside of the tetrahedron. Measurements of \(\mathbf{E}\) and \(\mathbf{J}\) support a calculation of the energy exchange between fields and particles \(\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E}\) with unprecedented frequency response and accuracy, which, in turn, enables a detailed investigation of turbulent dissipation and acceleration.

Coincident with the magnetic field turbulence are large-amplitude (>100 mV/m) \(\mathbf{E}\) fluctuations that include an equally large parallel component \(E_{\parallel}\) and events with extraordinarily large energy exchange per particle \(\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E}/n\). The

**Figure 1.** (left column) A 40-min overview of a strong turbulence event. (a and b) High-energy (30–500 keV) electron energy flux and low-energy (\(\sim 10\ \text{eV}\) to \(\sim 25\ \text{keV}\)) electron differential energy flux as a function of energy averaged over all angles. (c) Ion differential energy flux (\(\sim 10\ \text{eV}\) to \(\sim 25\ \text{keV}\)). (d) \(\mathbf{B}\) at 16 samples/s, (e) \(\mathbf{E}\) at 32 samples/s, (f) \(\mathbf{V}_i\) at 5-s resolution. (g) Electron density. (right column) A magnified view of a 90-s period between the solid vertical lines on the left figure. (h and i) High-energy and low-energy electron energy fluxes from Magnetospheric Multiscale 2 (MMS2). (j) \(\mathbf{B}\) from MMS2 at 2,048 samples/s, (k) \(E_{\parallel}\) from MMS2 at 8,192 samples/s. (l) \(\mathbf{E}\) at the barycenter \(\mathbf{E}_{\text{BC}}\) at 2,048 samples/s, (m) \(\mathbf{J}\) at the barycenter of the MMS tetrahedron at 2,048 samples/s, (n) \(\mathbf{J}_{\text{BC}} \cdot \mathbf{E}_{\text{BC}}\).
coincidence between strong $B$ turbulence and large-amplitude turbulent $E$ has been observed before (Ergun et al., 2009, 2015; Stawarz et al., 2015). We show that $E$ has a central role in turbulent dissipation and particle acceleration in the plasma sheet.

2. Observations

Figure 1 (left column) displays 40 min of data that include a region of strong $B$ turbulence in a density-depleted plasma sheet $\sim-23 R_E$ from Earth. Figure 1a plots the omnidirectional electron energy fluxes from 30 to 500 keV as measured by the energetic particle detector (Mauk et al., 2016). These data are at their highest resolution (burst) and have restricted coverage in time. Immediately below (Figure 1b) is the electron differential energy fluxes from $\sim-10$ eV to $\sim-25$ keV that are measured by the fast plasma instrument (Pollock et al., 2016). Figure 1c displays the ion differential energy fluxes in the same fashion. Figure 1d displays $B$ (Russell et al., 2016; Torbert et al., 2016) in geocentric solar equatorial (GSE) coordinates. The colors represent the directions, and the black trace is $|B|$. Below are $E$ (Ergun, Tucker, et al., 2016; Lindqvist et al., 2016; Torbert et al., 2016), the ion velocity ($V_i$), and the electron density. $V_i$ is possibly underestimated due to low density.

The vertical dashed lines demarcate a period of strong fluctuations in $B$ (Figure 1d) and $E$ (Figure 1e). Concurrently, electron and ion fluxes (Figures 1a–1c) show characteristic energies with significant variations. The density is depleted (Figure 1g). $V_i$ indicates a tailward flow from $\sim07:22$ UT (universal time) to $\sim07:30$ UT then earthward flow afterward suggesting ongoing magnetic reconnection. Another magnetic reconnection event occurred about a half hour earlier, indicating an active magnetotail.

Turbulent systems are typically studied using wave number spectra (e.g., Kolmogorov, 1941), but only frequency spectra can be derived from time domain observations when plasma flow is varying. However, frequency spectra can provide useful information (e.g., Stawarz et al., 2016). We divide the spectra into three frequency ranges. The lowest frequency range, $\sim0.016$ to $\sim0.15$ Hz, lies below the average ion cyclotron frequency ($f_{ci}$), which is marked by a vertical dashed line in Figure 2. In this frequency range, the $B$ spectrum shows a power law index that is consistent with an inertial cascade ($\sim5/3$). The $E$ spectrum has a much shallower index ($\sim1.08$). $|E|/|B|$ at the lowest frequency is roughly the average Alfvén speed, so the shallow spectral index in $E$ is consistent with dispersion of kinetic Alfvén waves.

The frequency range between $f_{ci}$ and the average lower hybrid frequency ($f_{lh}$) ($\sim8$ Hz) has a steeper spectral index ($\sim2.54$) in $B$ but a shallower spectral index in $E$ ($\sim0.86$), which indicates further buildup of electrostatic fields. At the highest frequencies ($>$8 Hz), the $B$ spectral index steepens to between $\sim2.7$ and $\sim3.26$, depending on the exact selection of the frequency domain for the fit. Several brief but intense bursts of whistler waves at $\sim100$ and $\sim400$ Hz influence the $B$ spectral index. The $E$ spectral index dramatically steepens at frequencies above $\sim3f_{lh}$ ($\sim20$ Hz). These observations are consistent with previously reported turbulence spectra in the magnetosphere with the exception that $B$ has a shallower spectral index between $f_i$ and $f_{lh}$ (Ergun et al., 2015; Stawarz et al., 2016).

Figure 1 (right column) displays 90 s of data during the time of the ion flow reversal. The period is marked in Figure 1 (left column) with solid vertical lines. Figures 1h and 1i are magnified versions of Figures 1a and 1b. $B$ (Figure 1j) is from MMS2 at 2,048 samples/s combining the search coil and fluxgate magnetometer signals. Figure 1k is the high time resolution $E_{\parallel}$ from MMS2, while Figure 1l plots $E$ averaged from all spacecraft representing $E$ at the barycenter ($E_{BC}$).

Figure 1m displays $J$ at the barycenter of the MMS tetrahedron ($J_{BC}$) calculated with the curlometer technique, $(\nabla \times B)/\mu_0$ (Dunlop et al., 2002), using $B$ signals from DC to 800 Hz. The spacecraft separations are less than $\lambda_s$ so the accuracy of $J_{BC}$ ($\sim0.01$ $\mu$A/m$^2$ for individual measurements) depends mostly on the accuracy.
of **B** (~0.1 nT). The residual calculation, \(<\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B}/\mu_0>_{RMS} = 3.5 \text{ nA/m}^2\), has a nearly Gaussian distribution about 0, which supports the uncertainty of ~0.01 \(\mu\text{A/m}^2\) (3\(\sigma\)) for individual measurements.

**E** has a DC accuracy of <2 mV/m in the spin plane components and < 4 mV/m in the axial component during this period. However, uncertainty in gain of the **E** signals can yield up to 5% errors. As a result, \(\mathbf{J}_{BC} \cdot \mathbf{E}_{BC}\) (Figure 1n) has an accuracy of ~0.5 nW/m^3 for individual measurements. Long-term averages can have

---

**Figure 2.** (a) **B** power spectral density (thick orange-yellow line) averaged over the ~18-min period in Figure 1 (left column). The vertical dashed lines represent the average \(f_{ci}\) and the average \(f_{lh}\). The colored lines are power law fits to specific frequency bands. Strong, short-duration whistler emissions can be seen at ~100 Hz and ~400 Hz. (b) **E** power spectral density. (c) A plot of \((\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E})_{T}/\langle n \rangle\) as a function of \(|\mathbf{E}|\) over the ~17.5-min period marked in Figure 1 (left column). The black trace is the sum of positive occurrences of \((\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E})_{T}\), whereas the dark green trace is the sum of negative occurrences. The difference between the traces is the net energy exchange. The blue trace is the sum of positive occurrences of \((\mathbf{J} \perp \mathbf{E})_{T}\), and the light green trace is the sum of negative occurrences. The red and orange traces show the positive and negative contributions of \((\mathbf{J} \parallel \mathbf{E})_{T}\). (d) The black trace is the contribution of \((\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E})_{T}/\langle n \rangle\) after \(\mathbf{J}\) and \(\mathbf{E}\) are each separated into 16 passbands. Error bars are described in the text. The red trace represents \((\mathbf{J} \parallel \mathbf{E})_{T}/\langle n \rangle\), which is plotted in orange dashed lines if the contribution is negative.
higher accuracy if DC baselines are removed. \( \mathbf{J}_{BC} \cdot \mathbf{E}_{BC} \) (Figure 1m) is plotted in black with the perpendicular contribution in blue and the parallel contribution in red.

Figure 3 shows a 3-s view of \( \mathbf{E} \) and \( \mathbf{J} \). (a) \( \mathbf{E}_\parallel \) at 2,048 sample/s from each of the Magnetospheric Multiscale (MMS) spacecraft. The signals are nearly identical except at ~47.7 UT. MMS1 sees a smaller signal. (b) \( \mathbf{E}_{SP} \), which is the perpendicular component of \( \mathbf{E} \) in the geocentric solar equatorial (GSE) X-Y plane (near the spin-plane). (c) \( \mathbf{E}_{EPZ} \), which is the perpendicular component of \( \mathbf{E} \) near GSE – Z. (d) \( \mathbf{J} \) at the barycenter of the MMS tetrahedron in field-aligned coordinates (FAC). (e) \( \mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E} \). (f) The MMS tetrahedron in GSE coordinates. (g) Reduced electron distributions averaged over 240 ms to increase counting statistics. The black trace is the electron distribution during the \( \mathbf{E}_\parallel \) event as marked in panel e. The blue trace is the electron distribution after the event. The dashed red trace is the electron distribution after the event accelerated by 4 kV.

Figure 3. A 3-s view of \( \mathbf{E} \) and \( \mathbf{J} \). (a) \( \mathbf{E}_\parallel \) at 2,048 sample/s from each of the Magnetospheric Multiscale (MMS) spacecraft. The signals are nearly identical except at ~47.7 UT. MMS1 sees a smaller signal. (b) \( \mathbf{E}_{SP} \), which is the perpendicular component of \( \mathbf{E} \) in the geocentric solar equatorial (GSE) X-Y plane (near the spin-plane). (c) \( \mathbf{E}_{EPZ} \), which is the perpendicular component of \( \mathbf{E} \) near GSE – Z. (d) \( \mathbf{J} \) at the barycenter of the MMS tetrahedron in field-aligned coordinates (FAC). (e) \( \mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E} \). (f) The MMS tetrahedron in GSE coordinates. (g) Reduced electron distributions averaged over 240 ms to increase counting statistics. The black trace is the electron distribution during the \( \mathbf{E}_\parallel \) event as marked in panel e. The blue trace is the electron distribution after the event. The dashed red trace is the electron distribution after the event accelerated by 4 kV. (h) The perpendicular \( \mathbf{V}_e \) in the \( \mathbf{SP} \) direction calculated from \( \mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}/B^2 \) (black trace) and \( \mathbf{V}_e \) calculated from \( \mathbf{J}_{SP}/en \) (blue trace). (i) \( \mathbf{V}_e \) in the \( \mathbf{PZ} \) direction calculated in the same fashion as in panel h. (j) \( \mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E} \). The orange/yellow region represents the uncertainty of individual measurements.

Figure 3 shows a 3-s view of an event with large \( \mathbf{J}_{BC} \cdot \mathbf{E}_{BC} \) (which we shorten to \( \mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E} \) from here on). The period is marked in Figure 1 (right column) with dashed vertical lines. Figures 3a–3c display \( \mathbf{E} \) from each of the four MMS spacecraft in field-aligned coordinates (FAC). Figure 3a plots \( \mathbf{E}_\parallel \) with the colors representing the spacecraft. Since \( \langle \mathbf{B} \rangle = [-14.2, 3.1, 3.5] \) nT during the 3-s period, \( \mathbf{E}_\parallel \) is primarily in GSE – X. \( \mathbf{E}_{SP} \) (Figure 3b) is a
perpendicular component that lies in the GSE X-Y plane ("SP" stands for "spin plane") and is primarily in GSE +Y. \(E_{sp}\) (Figure 3c) is the perpendicular component that lies closest to GSE –Z. Figure 3d plots \(J_{BC}\) in the same FAC system, and Figure 3e plots \(\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E}\).

One noticeable feature in Figures 3a–3c is that \(\mathbf{E}\) from the four spacecraft are nearly identical. However, the large-amplitude \(E_{ll}\) structure at 07:28:47 UT differs in MMS1, which indicates a change on Debye scales. Because MMS1 observes a smaller signal, the velocity of the \(E_{ll}\) structure is difficult to determine by time delay analysis between spacecraft. Three-spacecraft time delays indicate a \(-SP\) (–Y) component. Furthermore, \(\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}/B^2\) is roughly 4,000 km/s in –SP (–Y) and \(-J_{sp}/en\) (see Figure 3d; \(n \approx 0.03\) cm\(^{-3}\)) indicates the same speed in –SP (–Y), so if the structure is embedded in the perpendicular electron flow, it may have a large speed perpendicular to \(\mathbf{B}\). There are no measurable probe-to-probe delays on individual spacecraft, which indicates a structure speed greater than 2,500 km/s. Moreover, the spacecraft positions (Figure 3f) are such that perpendicular travel is needed if an \(E_{ll}\) structure partly misses the MMS1 spacecraft.

Figure 3g displays electron distributions measured by MMS1 during (black trace) and after (blue trace) the \(E_{ll}\) event. MMS1 is positioned in the \(-\mathbf{B}\) (+X) direction (Figure 3f) so electrons should be accelerated toward MMS1. The MMS1 electron distribution during the \(E_{ll}\) event (black trace) is consistent with ~4 kW increase (dashed red trace) of the electron distribution immediately after the \(E_{ll}\) event (blue trace). This ~4 kW increase suggests a 4 kV potential structure at the location of MMS2, MMS3, and MMS4. Given a 4 kV potential and \(<E_{ll}> \approx 100\) mV/m, the \(E_{ll}\) structure should extend roughly 40 km along \(\mathbf{B}\) (~13 \(\lambda_E\)). It appears to be embedded in the electron plasma traveling perpendicular to \(\mathbf{B}\). Its speed along \(\mathbf{B}\) is not determined.

Concurrent with the large-amplitude \(E_{ll}\) signal (Figure 3a) is a large, positive excursion in \(\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E}\) (Figure 3e). If there is no flow, \(\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E} = \nabla \times \mathbf{H}\) (\(\nabla \times \mathbf{H} \approx 0.1\) s) implies energization of 60 keV per particle, which is extraordinarily large. However, the parallel electron velocity (~\(J_{1}/en \approx 8,000\) km/s along \(-\mathbf{B}\) or in the +X direction) indicates that the energy could be shared by up to 20 times \(J_{1}/en = \lambda_E/L \approx 40\) km) the number of particles as in the no-flow case. Considering all factors, the data are consistent with a ~4 kW double-layer-like structure (e.g., Ergun et al., 2009; Newman et al., 2001) that supports strong, positive \(\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E}\).

Figure 3 also provides insight into the perpendicular energy exchange process. Starting at ~07:28:49 UT, there is a large negative \(J_{1} \cdot \mathbf{E}\) (Figure 3e) as \(E_{sp}\) reaches ~250 mV/m (Figure 3b). Figures 3h and 3i plot two components of the estimated electron velocity \((\mathbf{V}_e)\) derived via two methods. The black trace is \(\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}/B^2\), and the blue trace is \(-J_{BC}/en\), which is \(\mathbf{V}_e - \mathbf{V}_p\). \(n\) is set at 0.03 cm\(^{-3}\) during the period, which gives the best agreement (median of difference is 0) between the two signals. In Figure 2, \(\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}/B^2\) and \(-J_{BC}/en\) systematically differ when \(J_{1} \cdot \mathbf{E}_1 \neq 0\).

The electron fluid equation can be written as

\[
\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{V}_e \times \mathbf{B} = -\frac{m_e}{e} \frac{\partial \mathbf{V}_e}{\partial t} - \frac{(\mathbf{V}_e \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{V}_e}{e} - \frac{\nabla \cdot \mathbf{P}_e}{en}
\]

where \(\mathbf{P}_e\) is the pressure tensor and \(m_e\) is the electron mass. If \(\mathbf{V}_p < \mathbf{V}_e\), then \(\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}/B^2\) and \(-J_{BC}/en\) must differ when \(J_{1} \cdot \mathbf{E}_1 \neq 0\) since \(\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B} \cdot \mathbf{E} = 0\). \(\mathbf{V}_p\) cannot account for the majority of energy exchange in this event because \(\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}/B^2\) and \(-J_{BC}/en\) differ by up to ~5,000 km/s, which exceeds possible ion flows. Density variations may make \(-J_{BC}/en\) an inaccurate representation of \(\mathbf{V}_e\), but could not account for the systematic nature of the differences between \(\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}/B^2\) and \(-J_{BC}/en\) when \(J_{1} \cdot \mathbf{E}_1 = 0\). These results imply that electrons are “de-coupling” from \(\mathbf{B}\); that is, \(\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{V}_e \times \mathbf{B} \neq 0\) during occurrences of \(J_{1} \cdot \mathbf{E}_1 \neq 0\) indicating a divergence in \(\mathbf{P}_e\) or convective acceleration.

Importantly, there are several occasions of concurrent increases in energetic electron fluxes during large-amplitude \(\mathbf{E}\) events and large \(\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E}\) events. For example (Figure 1, right column, at 07:29:02 UT—see arrow in panel h), \((\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E}) \cdot \partial t/n = 19\) keV per particle (Figure 1n) in a flux rope-like structure (see arrow in Figure 1j), and, simultaneously, electron energy fluxes are seen over 100 keV (Figure 1h). It appears that acceleration by turbulent \(\mathbf{E}\) can contribute to electron acceleration to over 100 keV.

### 3. Analysis

A case-by-case examination of the large \(\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E}\) events (which includes ~20 events) reveals a pattern in which \(J_{1}E_{ll}\) appears to have a positive bias, while \(J_{1} \cdot \mathbf{E}_1\) has equal positive and negative events. It is clear that that
Taking the investigation one step further, components are not mixed. Figure 2d plots the net contribution \( J \cdot E \) near \( \parallel \) is clearly dominated by (\( \sim 100 \) eV/s per particle) and \( \sim 20\% \) of which is from \( (\langle J \cdot E \rangle /|n|) \sim 100 \) eV/s per particle). These values have high uncertainty (\( \sim 33\% \)). This result appears to contradict the case-by-case examination of large-amplitude events. Furthermore, we observe \( \langle E \rangle = 2.8 \pm 0.5 \) mV/m, so if we estimate \( \langle J \rangle \) to be \( \sim 1 \) nA/m\(^3\) (well below measurement accuracy) using a \( \sim 2 - \) thick plasma sheet (\( B_x \) changes 30 nT in 2 \( R_E \)), then \( (\langle J \cdot E \rangle /|n|) \) could be over 1,000 eV/s per particle.

In Figure 2c, there is a significant net positive energy exchange in \( (J \cdot E)_{\parallel} \) when \( |E| \leq 150 \) mV/m (Figure 2c is a logarithmic plot so the difference at \( |E| \sim 80 \) mV/m dominates), while at larger \( E \), \( (J \cdot E)_{\parallel} \) is systematically positive, which is consistent with the case-by-case examination. There are both net negative and net positive \( (J \cdot E)_{\parallel} \) when \( |E| > 150 \) mV/m, which, again, is consistent with the case-by-case examination.

Taking the investigation one step further, \( J \cdot E \) is separated into frequency bins (Figure 2d). Here baselines do not need to be removed. Since \( J \cdot E \) is a product, the source terms, \( J_{BC} \) and \( E_{BC} \), are each filtered into 16 passbands with center frequencies separated by a factor of 2 (see Cully et al., 2008; Ergun, Tucker, et al., 2016 for details on passband filters). The filtering is performed in FAC so that the parallel and perpendicular components are not mixed. Figure 2d plots the net contribution \( (J \cdot E)_{\parallel} /|n| \) in each of the passbands. The black trace is \( (J \cdot E)_{\parallel} /|n| \). There is one negative value at 9 Hz which is not shown. The red solid line and squares represent \( (\langle J \cdot E \rangle_{\parallel} /|n|) \), which is plotted with dashed orange lines and circles when its value is negative. \( (J \cdot E)_{\parallel} /|n| \) can be deduced by subtracting \( (\langle J \cdot E \rangle_{\perp} /|n|) \) from \( (J \cdot E)_{\parallel} /|n| \). Values of \( (\langle J \cdot E \rangle_{\parallel} /|n|) \) are not valid at the lowest frequencies since calibration routines employ \( E \cdot B = 0 \) over long periods to determine baseline offsets. Values of \( (J \cdot E)_{\parallel} /|n| \) are also questionable at frequencies less than \( f_\text{ci} \) since there is no mathematical basis for separating the two perpendicular components in a strongly fluctuating \( B \) prior to applying the passband filters.

The error bars in Figure 2d are derived by applying several methods of performing the band-pass filtering. In addition to taking the product of the passbands, the product of \( E_{BC} \) (passbands) with \( J_{BC} \) (unfiltered) and the product of \( E_{BC} \) (unfiltered) with \( J_{BC} \) (passbands) are calculated. \( (J \cdot E)_{\parallel} /|n| \) is also derived from GSE signals. To test the sensitivity to the strongly varying \( B \), baseline offsets in all components of \( E_{BC} \) with \( J_{BC} \) are introduced, and the products are recalculated. The error bars (Figure 2d) represent the standard deviation of \( \sim 75 \) different calculations.

This exercise demonstrates that the passband calculations are meaningful for frequencies greater than \( f_\text{ci} \) but standard deviations exceed the mean values if frequencies are less than \( f_\text{ci} \). Strong fluctuations in \( B \) with frequencies less than \( f_\text{ci} \) apparently prohibit calculation of \( J \cdot E \).

A significant feature in Figure 2d is the positive passband contributions of \( (\langle J \cdot E \rangle_{\parallel} /|n|) \) with frequencies between \( f_\text{ci} \) and several times \( f_\text{ci} \). This frequency range has the steepened spectral index of \( B \) (Figure 2a) and a shallow spectral index in \( E \) (Figure 2b), which indicates a buildup of electrostatic \( E \). Positive \( J \cdot E \) at the frequencies near \( f_\text{ci} \) appears to be dominated by \( J \cdot E_{\parallel} \). Furthermore, the case-by-case examination and Figure 2c suggest that \( J \cdot E_{\parallel} \) is dominated by large-amplitude, nonlinear \( E_{\parallel} \) structures and that \( J \cdot E_{\parallel} \) mainly acts on electrons.
Interestingly, a sum of the passband contributions of \( \langle J \cdot E \rangle/(n) \) above \( f_{ci} \) is \( \sim 120 \text{ eV/s per particle} \), which is in agreement \( \langle J \cdot E \rangle/(n) \).

Another interesting feature in Figure 2d is that the positive \( J \cdot E \) in the frequency range just above \( f_{ci} \) is dominated by \( J_\perp \cdot E_\perp \) (Figure 2d), which may involve energy input into ions as well as electrons. Summing the passband components of \( (J \cdot E)/(n) \) at frequencies greater that \( f_{ci} \) yields a net contribution of \( \sim 250 \) eV/s per particle, which is roughly one half of the net of \( (J \cdot E)/(n) = \sim 500 \) eV/s per particle. Thus, there may be a significant contribution of \( J \cdot E \) at frequencies at or below \( f_{ci} \) primarily from \( J_\perp \cdot E_\perp \).

It is difficult to determine if a net positive \( J \cdot E \) is received by ions or by electrons. The case-by-case analysis of the largest \( J \cdot E \) events suggests that electrons are the recipient of most of the net positive energy from turbulence, \( (J \cdot E)/(n) \). However, since \( (J \cdot E)/(n) \) carries roughly 80% of the positive energy exchange and it acts at frequencies near and possibly below \( f_{ci} \), ions may be the recipient of some of the turbulent energy. To complicate matters, it is likely that the ions are the main recipient of the baseline energy exchange \( (J \cdot (E)) \) since they are not gyrotropic (e.g., Speiser, 1965).

As a crude test, we examine ion and electron observations (Figure 1). \( T_e \) rises from \( \sim 5 \) keV outside of the turbulent region to \( >20 \) keV in turbulent region (Figure 1c). Since \( (J \cdot (E))/(n) \) is on the order of \( \sim 1,000 \) eV/s per ion (assuming ions are the recipients of the energy), the baseline is sufficient to energize ions to 20 keV in 15 s. Assuming that ions dwell in the turbulent region on 15-s time scales, this energization rate can sustain the observed \( T_e \).

On the other hand, electrons are likely energized by the higher-frequency fields. As a minimum, the total of \( (J \cdot E)/(n) \) between \( f_{ci} \) and several times \( f_{in} \) is \( \sim 120 \) eV/s per electron (Figure 2d), which is sufficient to account for \( T_e \) increasing from \( \sim 1 \) keV outside of the turbulent region to \( >5 \) keV in turbulent region in less than 1 min. The perpendicular contribution speeds the heating process. As in the case with ions, the energization rate of the electrons appears to be sufficient to sustain the observed \( T_e \) in the turbulent region. Electron and ion heating strongly supports the fact that the net positive energy exchange in \( J \cdot E \) is irreversible (dissipation).

4. Conclusions

We examined an \( \sim 17.5 \)-min period of strong turbulence in a depleted plasma sheet, which presumably started during an earlier magnetic reconnection event. Magnetic reconnection appears to be ongoing. The values of \( \lambda_D \) (\( \sim 4 \) km) and \( \lambda_E \) (\( \sim 30 \) km) with respect the MMS tetrahedron spacing (\( \sim 15 \) km) allow for an unprecedented view into turbulent dissipation. The close spacing with respect to \( \lambda_E \) makes the curlometer technique (Dunlop et al., 2002) exceptionally accurate. The close spacing of a few \( \lambda_D \) yields good coherence between \( E \) from the four spacecraft, so \( J \cdot E \) is remarkably accurate.

A case-by-case examination of large-amplitude events shows that \( J_\perp \cdot E_\perp \) and \( J_\parallel \cdot E_\parallel \) have quite different behavior. \( J_\parallel \cdot E_\parallel \) often has a positive bias, albeit with many events having negative \( J_\parallel \cdot E_\parallel \). The net \( J_\parallel \cdot E_\parallel \) contribution is largely from large-amplitude \( E_\parallel \) events in the form of nonlinear structures such as double layers. To the contrary, large-amplitude \( J_\perp \cdot E_\perp \) events appeared to have a slightly negative bias, if any. A close examination of the events with \( J_\perp \cdot E_\perp \neq 0 \) showed that the electrons must partially decouple from \( B \), implying a divergence in the electron stress tensor.

Evidence of electron acceleration to \( >100 \) keV energies is presented. One of the most convincing events has \( E \) fluctuations \( >50 \text{ mV/m} \) including \( E_\parallel \) embedded in flux rope-like \( B \) structure, with \( (J \cdot E)/dt \sim 19 \) keV/particle, which is extraordinarily large. This event provides persuasive evidence that turbulent \( E \) can directly energize electrons to \( >100 \) keV energies. This evidence supports the fact that that turbulence from reconnection can lead to strong particle acceleration, particularly from \( E_\parallel \) (Egedal et al., 2012).

A statistical analysis of \( J \cdot E \) (Figure 2c) reveals that turbulent energy exchange appears to be dominated by \( J_\perp \cdot E_\perp \) in a characteristic that was not apparent in the case-by-case examination of large-amplitude events. The net positive \( J_\perp \cdot E_\perp \) is in a large number of moderate amplitude (\( 10\text{–}150 \text{ mV/m} \) \( E \)) occurrences, whereas the large-amplitude occurrences of \( J_\parallel \cdot E_\parallel \) have little net contribution. With \( E \) above \( \sim 50 \text{ mV/m} \), \( J_\parallel \cdot E_\parallel \) has a clear net positive bias, which is consistent with turbulent dissipation. Over the entire interval, roughly 80% of the dissipation comes from \( J_\perp \cdot E_\perp \) and 20% comes from \( J_\parallel \cdot E_\parallel \).
\( \mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E} \), when separated into passbands (Figure 2d), reveals that the contribution to turbulent dissipation from \( \mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E} \) is positive in the frequency band just above \( f_{ci} \). A significant positive contribution \( \mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E} \) may lie at or just below \( f_{pe} \). Large-amplitude, small-scale \( \mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E} \) events are shown to act on electrons. Turbulent dissipation from \( \mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E} \) dominates a frequency band that ranges from a few times \( f_{ci} \) to several times \( f_{pe} \) and acts primarily on electrons.

In summary, MMS observations have revealed characteristics of turbulent dissipation and particle acceleration associated with magnetic reconnection. \( \mathbf{E} \) and large-amplitude, nonlinear \( \mathbf{E}_\| \) structures have distinct but dominant roles in turbulent dissipation. Turbulent \( \mathbf{E} \) including significant \( \mathbf{E}_\| \) in a magnetic structure is clearly demonstrated to play a central role in accelerating electrons to greater than 100 keV energies.
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