Incompressive Energy Transfer in the Earth’s Magnetosheath: Magnetospheric Multiscale Observations
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ABSTRACT

Using observational data from the Magnetospheric Multiscale (MMS) Mission in the Earth’s magnetosheath, we estimate the energy cascade rate using different techniques within the framework of incompressible magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) turbulence. At the energy containing scale, the energy budget is controlled by the von Kármán decay law. Inertial range cascade is estimated by fitting a linear scaling to the mixed third-order structure function. Finally, we use a multi-spacecraft technique to estimate the Kolmogorov-Yaglom-like cascade rate in the kinetic range, well below the ion inertial length scale. We find that the inertial range cascade rate is almost equal to the one predicted by the von Kármán law at the energy containing scale, while the cascade rate evaluated at the kinetic scale is somewhat lower, as anticipated in theory (Yang et al. 2017a). Further, in agreement with a recent study (Hadid et al. 2018), we find that the incompressive cascade rate in the Earth’s magnetosheath is about 1000 times larger than the cascade rate in the pristine solar wind.
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1. INTRODUCTION

One of the long standing mysteries of space physics is the anomalous heating of the solar wind. Assuming adiabatic expansion, the temperature profile of the solar wind is expected to scale as $T(r) \sim r^{-4/3}$, where $r$ is the radial distance from the Sun. Yet, the best fit to Voyager temperature observation (Richardson et al. 1995) results in a radial profile $T(r) \sim r^{-1/2}$. Turbulence provides a natural explanation, supplying internal energy through a cascade process that channels available energy, in the form of electromagnetic fluctuations and velocity shear at large scales, to smaller scales and ultimately into dissipation and heating. In collisionless plasmas, such as the solar wind, the magnetosheath etc., the situation is more complicated due to kinetic effects. Nevertheless, magnetohydrodynamics, which models the plasma as a single fluid, has proven to be a very successful theoretical framework in describing even weakly collisional plasmas such as the solar wind, provided one focuses on large-scale features and processes. In the last few decades, there have been extensive studies related to energy cascade rate and dissipation channels in collisionless plasmas (Politano & Pouquet 1998a; MacBride et al. 2008; Sorriso-Valvo et al. 2007; Osman et al. 2011; Coburn et al. 2015), largely based on ideas originating in MHD studies. Recently there has been an effort to understand the more complex pathways of energy cascade in plasmas (Howes et al. 2008; Yang et al. 2017a,b; Servidio et al. 2017). Prior to presenting new observational results on this timely subject, to provide context, we now briefly digress on this history.

Kolmogorov (1941), in one of his three famous 1941 papers, derived the so-called third-order law for homogeneous, incompressible, isotropic neutral fluids from
the Navier-Stokes equation, based on only few general assumptions. Even before Kolmogorov’s work, Taylor (1935), in 1935 had suggested, based on some heuristic arguments, that the decay rate in a neutral fluid is controlled by the energy containing eddies. Later de Kármán & Howarth (1938) derived Taylor’s results more rigorously assuming that the shape of the two-point correlation function remains unchanged during the decay of a turbulent fluid at high Reynolds number. Hossain et al. (1995) attempted to extend von Kármán phenomenology for magnetized fluids based on dimensional arguments. Politano and Pouquet (Politano & Pouquet 1998a,b)(PP98) extended Kolmogorov’s third-order law to homogeneous, incompressible MHD turbulence using Elsasser variables.

Following these theoretical advances, the third-order law has been used in several studies to estimate the energy cascade rate in the solar wind (Sorriso-Valvo et al. 2007; MacBride et al. 2008; Coburn et al. 2012, 2014, 2015). Density fluctuations in the solar wind are usually low enough so that incompressible MHD works well. Carbone et al. (2009) and Carbone (2012) first made an attempt, based on heuristic reasoning, to include density fluctuations for estimating compressible transfer rate using the “third-order” law. Recently, Banerjee & Galtier (2013) (BG13) worked out an exact transfer rate for a compressible medium. Hadid et al. (2015; 2018) compared the cascade rates derived from BG13 and PP98 in weakly and highly compressive media in various planetary magnetosheaths and solar wind (Banerjee et al. 2016). It was found that the fluxes derived from the two theories lie close to each other for weakly compressive media and the deviation starts to become significant as the plasma compressibility becomes higher, as expected.

Parallel to observational works in space plasma systems, on the theoretical side there have been numerous efforts to refine the “third-order” law derived for incompressible homogeneous MHD, by including more kinetic physics, like two-fluid MHD (Andrés et al. 2016), Hall MHD (Andrés et al. 2018), electron MHD (Galtier 2008), by incorporating the effect of large-scale shear, slowly varying mean field (Wan et al. 2009, 2010) etc. One would expect, as kinetic effects become important in a plasma, such corrections would need to be taken into account. In this work we consider only incompressible, homogeneous MHD phenomenologies.

In this study we focus on the Earth’s magnetosheath. While similar to the turbulence observed in the pristine solar wind, the shocked solar wind plasma in the magnetosheath, downstream of Earth’s bow-shock, provides a unique laboratory for the study of turbulent dissipation under a wide range of conditions like plasma beta, particle velocities, compressibility etc. Past studies, both numerical (Karimabadi et al. 2014) and observational (Sundkvist et al. 2007; Huang et al. 2014; Chasapis et al. 2015; Breuillard et al. 2016; Yordanova et al. 2016; Chasapis et al. 2017) have probed the properties of turbulent dissipation in the magnetosheath. Such studies have established the contribution of intermittent structures such as current sheets to turbulent dissipation in the kinetic range. However, the properties of turbulence at kinetic scales and quantitative treatments of energy dissipation at those scales remain scarce (Huang et al. 2017; Hadid et al. 2018; Gershman et al. 2018), H. Breuillard et al. ApJL (2018, in press).

Here, we investigate the energy transfer at kinetic scales using the state-of-the-art capabilities of the the Magnetospheric Multiscale (MMS) mission (Burch et al. 2016). The combination of high-time-resolution plasma data with multi-spacecraft observations at very small separations allows us to carry out estimation of the cascade rate using several strategies employing a single data interval.

2. DATA SELECTION AND OVERVIEW

We use burst resolution MMS data obtained in the turbulent magnetosheath on 2017 January 18 from 00:45:53 to 00:49:43 UT. An overview of the interval is shown in Fig. 1. During this time period a clear Kolmogorov scaling (\( \sim f^{-5/3} \)) can be seen in the magnetic energy spectra (See Fig. 2). A break in spectral slope from \( \sim f^{-5/3} \) to \( \sim f^{-8/3} \) is observed near 0.5Hz. Some important plasma parameters of the selected turbulent interval are reported in Table 1. The density fluctuations and the turbulent Mach number are low (see Table 1), similar to those commonly observed in the pristine solar wind, justifying the applicability of an incompressible MHD approach for the selected interval. Contrary to the pristine solar wind, the ratio of root mean squared (rms) fluctuations to the mean is high for the magnetic field, indicating isotropy, thus making this interval suitable for this study since we only consider incompressible, isotropic MHD here.

The separation of the four MMS spacecraft was \( \approx 8 \) km, which corresponds to about half the ion inertial length (\( d_i \approx 16 \) km). We used MMS burst resolution data which provides magnetic field measurements (FGM) at 128 Hz (Torbert et al. 2016; Russell et al. 2016), and ion density, temperature and velocity (FPI) at 33Hz (Pollock et al. 2016). The small separa-
by Osman et al. (2011) at the very small scales of the turbulent dissipation range.

3. ENERGY CONTAINING SCALE: $\epsilon_1$

It is reasonable to expect that the global decay is controlled, to a suitable level of approximation, by von Kármán decay law, generalized to MHD (Hossain et al. 1995; Politano & Pouquet 1998a,b; Wan et al. 2012),

$$\epsilon_1 = -\frac{d(Z^\pm)^2}{dt} = \alpha_{\pm} \frac{(Z^\pm)^2Z^\mp}{L_{\pm}},$$ (1)

where $\alpha_{\pm}$ are positive constants and $Z^\pm$ are the rms fluctuation values of the Elsässer variables defined as

$$Z^\pm(t) = V(t) \pm \frac{B(t)}{\sqrt{\mu_0 m_p n_i(t)}},$$ (2)

where the mean local values have been subtracted from $V$ and $B$, respectively the plasma (ion) velocity and the magnetic field vector. Here $\mu_0$ is the magnetic permeability of vacuum, $m_p >> m_e$ are proton and electron mass, respectively and $n_i$ is the number density of protons.

An important quantity in turbulence is the two-point, single-time correlation function, which under conditions of the Taylor “frozen-in” flow hypothesis (Taylor 1938; Jokipii 1973), is related to the two-time correlation at the spacecraft position. This is computed from the Elsässer variables, and defined operationally as

$$R^\pm(\tau) = \langle Z^\pm(t) \cdot Z^\pm(t + \tau) \rangle_T.$$ (3)

Here $\langle \cdots \rangle_T$ is the time average of the total time span of the data. We have used the standard Blackman-Tukey method, with subtraction of the local mean, to evaluate equation (3). The correlation time and length are computed by

$$R^\pm(\tau^\pm) = \frac{1}{e},$$ (4)

$$L_{\pm} = |\langle V \rangle|\tau^\pm.$$ (5)

With these conventions, we first calculate $Z^\pm$ based on ion velocity. We calculate normalized correlation functions for maximum lag of 1/5th of the total dataset. We show the plots of normalized correlation function for each Elsässer variable in Fig. 3. Fitting an exponential function to each of the normalized correlation function gives correlation time $\tau^+ = 5.6$ s and $\tau^- = 4$ s. $^1$

We perform the same calculation for all four spacecrafts listed in Table 2. Obtained values of $\epsilon^+_i$ are reported in Table 3.

4. INERTIAL SCALE: $\epsilon_2$

To estimate $\epsilon_2$, the energy transfer rate in the inertial scale, we use Kolmorovg-Yaglom law, extended to isotropic MHD,

$$Y^\pm(r) = -\frac{4}{3} \epsilon^\pm r,$$ (10)

where $Y^\pm(r) = \langle \hat{r} \cdot \Delta Z^\mp(r) | \Delta Z^\pm(r) |^2 \rangle$, are the mixed third-order structure functions. Equation (10) has been the standard approach in estimating the inertial range energy transfer rate in the solar wind although it is clearly not an isotropic system ($\delta B/|B| \sim 1$). However, even when strong assumptions about anisotropy are made (as in (Stawarz et al. 2009)), the results have been quite comparable with the isotropic case.

For MMS spacecraft data the field’s components are given in the cartesian $RTN$ reference frame, where $R$ (radial) indicates the Sun-spacecraft direction, centered

\[\text{In Table 2 we report the required statistics obtained for the Elsässer variables for this interval. Putting these values in equation (1) we find}\]

$$\epsilon^+_i = \alpha_+ \frac{(Z^+)^2Z^-}{L_+} = \alpha_+ 168 \times 10^6 \text{ J kg}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}. \text{ (6)}$$

$$\epsilon^-_i = \alpha_- \frac{(Z^-)^2Z^+}{L_-} = \alpha_- 177 \times 10^6 \text{ J kg}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}. \text{ (7)}$$

The values of the von Kármán constants $\alpha_{\pm}$ are required to proceed further. The values of the constants are expected to be of order unity. Following Appendix B of Usmanov et al. (2014), for isotropic and low cross helicity case, $\alpha = 4C_\epsilon/(9\sqrt{3})$, where $C_\epsilon$ is the dimensionless dissipation rate. In Usmanov et al. (2014), it was assumed $C_\epsilon \approx 0.5$ because that is the value found for fluid turbulence (Pearson et al. 2002, 2004). Recent investigations show that in MHD the value of $C_\epsilon$ is quite low compared to the fluid value. In a series of papers Linkmann et al. (2015; 2017) showed that for isotropic, low cross helicity MHD, $C_\epsilon \approx 0.265$. Therefore, for low cross helicity, $C^+ \approx C^- \approx 0.133$. Using this value, we obtain $\alpha^+ \approx 0 \approx 0.03$. Inserting these in equations (6) and (7) for MMS1 data in Table 2 we get

$$\epsilon^+_i \approx 5.0 \times 10^6 \text{ J kg}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}. \text{ (8)}$$

$$\epsilon^-_i \approx 5.3 \times 10^6 \text{ J kg}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}. \text{ (9)}$$

$^1$ Note that these magnetosheath correlation times are much shorter than the analogous time scales in the ambient solar wind.
Table 1. Description of some plasma parameters

| $\langle B \rangle$ | $\delta B / \langle B \rangle$ | $\langle n_e \rangle$ | $\delta n_e / \langle n_e \rangle$ | $\langle n_i \rangle$ | $\delta n_i / \langle n_i \rangle$ | $d_i$ | $d_e$ | $\langle |V| \rangle$ | $\delta V / \langle |V| \rangle$ | $M_t$ | $\beta_p$ |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------|-------|------------------|------------------|-------|-------|
| (nT)             | (cm$^{-3}$)      | (cm$^{-3}$)      | (km)             | (km)             | (km s$^{-1}$)    |      |      | (km s$^{-1}$)    | (km s$^{-1}$)    |      |      |
| 13.1             | 1.9              | 169              | 0.11             | 202              | 0.12             | 17.5 | 0.4   | 135              | 0.42             | 0.2   | 13   |

Note—Data obtained from MMS1 on 2017 January 18 from 00:45:53 to 00:49:43 UT. rms fluctuation amplitude is defined as $\delta B = \sqrt{\langle [B(t) - \langle B \rangle]^2 \rangle}$ and similarly for other quantities. Ion inertial length, $d_i$, electron inertial length, $d_e$, ion velocity, $V$, turbulent Mach number, $M_t = \delta V/v_{th}$, and the proton plasma beta, $\beta_p = v_{th}^2/V_A^2$ are also reported.

Figure 1. Overview of the MMS observations in magnetosheath turbulence selected for this study. The data shown is from the FGM and FPI instruments on-board the MMS1 spacecraft. Panel A) shows the magnetic field measurements in GSE coordinates. Panel B) shows the ion density. Panel C) shows the ion temperature. Panel D) shows the ion velocity in GSE coordinates.

Table 2. Derived variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>$Z^+$</th>
<th>$L_+$</th>
<th>$Z^-$</th>
<th>$L_-$</th>
<th>$\sigma_c$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(km)</td>
<td>(km)</td>
<td>(km)</td>
<td>(km)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMS1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMS2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMS3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMS4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note—Elsässer amplitudes $Z^\pm$, correlation lengths $L^\pm$, and normalized cross helicity defined as $\sigma_c = [(Z^+)^2 - (Z^-)^2]/[(Z^+)^2 + (Z^-)^2]$.

Table 3. Global decay rate estimates from von Kármán law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>$\epsilon_1^+$</th>
<th>$\epsilon_1^-$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(J kg$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>(J kg$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMS1</td>
<td>$5.0 \times 10^6$</td>
<td>$5.3 \times 10^6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMS2</td>
<td>$6.0 \times 10^6$</td>
<td>$5.6 \times 10^6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMS3</td>
<td>$6.0 \times 10^6$</td>
<td>$5.6 \times 10^6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMS4</td>
<td>$6.3 \times 10^6$</td>
<td>$5.9 \times 10^6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$(5.8 \pm 0.5) \times 10^6$</td>
<td>$(5.6 \pm 0.2) \times 10^6$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note—The last row is average of all four spacecraft measurements listed in the first four rows. The uncertainty is the standard deviation of the four measurements.

on the spacecraft and pointing out of the Sun, $N$ (normal) lies in the plane containing the radial direction and the Sun’s rotation axis, while $T$ completes the right-
here moving averages are designated by the notation \( Y \). Mixed third-order structure function increments \( \Delta Z \) from the time series \( Z \) and \( r \), respectively, are related approximately through the Taylor hypothesis, \( r \approx -(V_z)_{\tau} \tau \) (note the sign). From the time series \( Z^\pm(t) \), we compute the time increments \( \Delta Z^\pm(\tau; t) = Z^\pm(t + \tau) - Z^\pm(t) \) and obtain the mixed third-order structure function \( Y^\pm(\tau) = \langle \Delta Z^\pm(\tau; t)^2 \Delta Z^\pm(\tau; t) \rangle \). Note that to avoid confusion, here moving averages are designated by the notation \( \langle \cdots \rangle \).

The solid vertical line represents \( kd_i = 1 \) with the wave vector \( k \approx (2\pi f)/(|V|) \).

![Figure 2](image2.png)

**Figure 2.** Spectral power density of magnetic field measured by MMS1. Kolmogorov scaling \( \sim f^{-5/3} \) is shown for reference. The solid vertical line represents \( kd_i = 1 \) with the wave vector \( k \approx (2\pi f)/(|V|) \).
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**Figure 3.** Normalized correlation function vs. time lag (seconds) for the Elsasser variables, derived from the measurements obtained from MMS1. Spatial lags \( L \) may be estimated using the Taylor hypothesis with solar wind speed (Table 1) 135 km/s [See equation (5)].

![Figure 4](image4.png)

**Figure 4.** Absolute values of the mixed third-order structure functions, derived from measurements by MMS1. A linear scaling is shown for reference.

**Table 4.** Inertial range cascade rate estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>( \epsilon_2^+ ) (J kg(^{-1}) s(^{-1}))</th>
<th>( \epsilon_2^- ) (J kg(^{-1}) s(^{-1}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMS1</td>
<td>( 5.6 \times 10^6 )</td>
<td>( 3.9 \times 10^6 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMS2</td>
<td>( 7.7 \times 10^6 )</td>
<td>( 5.1 \times 10^6 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMS3</td>
<td>( 7.4 \times 10^6 )</td>
<td>( 5.0 \times 10^6 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMS4</td>
<td>( 7.6 \times 10^6 )</td>
<td>( 5.1 \times 10^6 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>( (7.1 \pm 0.9) \times 10^6 )</td>
<td>( (4.8 \pm 0.5) \times 10^6 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note—These are based on PP98 MHD adaptation of the Yaglom law using different spacecraft measurements. The last row is average of all four spacecraft measurements listed in the first four rows. The uncertainty is the standard deviation of the four measurements.

In Figure 4, we have plotted the absolute values of the mixed third-order structure functions for MMS1. A linear scaling is indeed observed and interpreted here according to \( |Y^\pm(\tau)| = (4/3)\epsilon^\pm(V_z)_{\tau} \). We call this \( \epsilon_2 \). The approximations represented by inserting the absolute value will be discussed below. The precise derivation of the signed third-order law for MHD is due to Politano & Pouquet (1998a). By fitting a straight line in the inertial range we obtain for MMS1,

\[
|Y^+(\tau)| \approx 1014\tau, \quad (11)
\]

\[
\frac{4}{3} \epsilon_2^+ (V_z)_{\tau} \tau \approx 1014\tau, \quad (12)
\]

\[
\epsilon_2^+ \approx 5.6 \times 10^6 \text{ J kg}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}.
\]

We follow the same procedure for all four spacecrafts and obtain the values listed in Table 4.
5. KINETIC SCALE: $\epsilon_3$

Moving to the kinetic range, we make use of the small MMS spacecraft separation to carry out a direct evaluation that has not been previously possible. For the present interval, average separation between MMS2 and MMS4 is about 7.16 km which is intermediate between $d_i = 17.5$ km and $d_e = 0.4$ km. Energy cascade at these small scales is expected to be well into the kinetic regime and may not be described well by MHD inertial scale phenomenologies.

Our perspective is that the cascade fragments and becomes complex at kinetic scales, as described, e.g., in Yang et al. (2017a,b). In that reference one finds that transfer due to advective nonlinearity of the proton fluid persists, at an attenuated level, in the kinetic range, while there are also additional channels for energy conversion and transfer. Thus, in the present context, our goal is evaluating the “MHD-like” transfer in the kinetic range and not “total transfer” in the kinetic range. It is not intended to argue or assume that kinetic effects are not present. Instead we evaluate one channel of several through which energy flows in the kinetic range. A similar approach was adopted by Hellinger et al. (2018).

To estimate this contribution to energy transfer, we make formal use of the Kolmogorov-Yaglom law, for incompressible, homogeneous MHD, written in terms of the Elsasser variables $Z^\pm$ as

$$\nabla \cdot \langle \Delta Z^\mp | \Delta Z^\pm |^2 \rangle = -4\epsilon^\pm. \quad (13)$$

Note that this equation does not assume any form of spectral distribution while equation (10) requires isotropy. This more general result is implicit in the work of Politano & Pouquet (1998a) as has been pointed out by MacBride et al. (2008). In exchange for this generality, solution of equation (13) is not algebraic, but requires, in effect, Gaussian integration over a closed surface, as has been extensively discussed in the literature (Wan et al. 2009; Stawarz et al. 2009; Osman et al. 2011).

To use this approach using spacecraft data requires either additional assumptions or a multi-spacecraft dataset with broadly distributed inter-spacecraft orientations. Furthermore, it turns out that MMS data, having wide angle coverage along with measurement from four spacecraft, is suitable for adopting a multi-spacecraft estimate of the cascade rate using the more general form of the Kolmogorov-Yaglom law equation (13), without assuming isotropy etc. By adopting this approach we also have no need to employ the Taylor hypothesis, as we use only two-spacecraft correlation estimates.

Proceeding accordingly, a field angle $\theta_{SB}$ is defined as the acute angle between the time-lagged spacecraft separation vector and the field direction. Good coverage in $\theta_{SB}$ is needed to accurately evaluate equation (13). Using Gauss’s law and integrating over a sphere, we find

$$\int_0^{\pi/2} \langle F^\pm \rangle \sin \theta_{SB} d\theta_{SB} = -\frac{4}{3} \epsilon^\pm |r|, \quad (14)$$

where $F^\pm = \langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \Delta \mathbf{Z}^\mp \rangle |\Delta \mathbf{Z}^\pm|^2$ is the flux density. We call this estimate of the cross-scale energy transfer rate $\epsilon_3$. MMS has four spacecraft, so a total of six pairs are possible to evaluate equation (14). Each pair has slightly different separation, so we calculate the left-hand-side of equation (14) and $r$ separately for each pair. An example using the two spacecrafts MMS2 and MMS4, is shown in Fig. 5. The data is then binned and averaged. $d\theta_{SB}$ in equation (14) corresponds to the bin widths while $\langle F^\pm \rangle$ corresponds to arithmetic mean of $F^\pm$ within a bin. We report values obtained from equation (14) for all combinations of spacecraft pairs in Table 5.

6. CONCLUSIONS

In this study we have employed the special characteristics of the MMS spacecraft and instrumentation to provide distinct estimates of the cascade rate using three methodologies that span a wide range of scales. Using the MHD extension of the the von Kármán decay law, the decay rate at energy-containing scales is estimated in magnetosheath spacecraft observations, for the first time, as far as we are aware. The PP98 third-order law provides the basis for an inertial range cascade rate estimate. Finally, a multi-spacecraft technique has been used at the kinetic scale, also we believe for the first time, to estimate the partial energy transfer transfer rate via incompressible channel using the Kolmogorov-Yaglom law.

In Table 6, we list the average values of $\epsilon^\pm$, estimated using different methods in three ranges of scale.
This is beyond the scope of that the decay rate, obtained from kinetic scale plasma turbulent as described in the literature Schekochihin et al. (2009); Boldyrev et al. (2013); Kunz et al. (2018); Eyink (2018). A more complete statistical study of a large sample of data is required to confirm such conclusions. We are in the process of performing similar study with a wider variety of datasets.

Another interesting observation from Table 6 is that although the spacecraft separations |r| are almost equal, the cascade rates are quite widely distributed. As discussed before, equation (13) does not assume isotropy. Therefore the spread in cascade rate for different spacecraft pairs may be a result of small scale inhomogeneity and anisotropy becoming progressively stronger as smaller scales are probed, as previously investigated in MHD systems (Shebalin et al. 1983; Oughton et al. 1994; Milano et al. 2001). This is beyond the scope of the present paper, but we wish to address this issue in the future. Also, for each case, ε+ and ε− lie within each other’s uncertainty limits, which is expected, because cross helicity is very low for the selected interval.

Finally, we note the comparison of estimated cascade rates in the magnetosheath and in the solar wind. For convenience, we designate the incompressible cascade rate in the magnetosheath as ε_{MSH}, and the corresponding rate in the pristine solar wind as ε_{SW}. We only consider nearly incompressible, nearly isotropic, low cross helicity plasma, as varying these conditions might change the situation. Previously Hadid et al. (2018) (HadidEA hereafter) also calculated the cascade rate in Alfvénic incompressible magnetosheath turbulence, finding

\[ \frac{\epsilon_{\text{MSH}}}{\epsilon_{\text{SW}}} \bigg|_{\text{HadidEA}} \simeq \frac{10^{-13} \text{ J m}^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1}}{10^{-16} \text{ J m}^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1}} = 10^{3}. \]  
(15)

From our analysis we find

\[ \frac{\epsilon_{\text{MSH}}}{\epsilon_{\text{SW}}} \bigg|_{\text{we}} \simeq \frac{5 \times 10^6 \text{ J kg}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}}{50 \times 10^2 \text{ J kg}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}} \simeq 10^3, \]  
(16)

where we use the Osman et al. (2011) value for \( \epsilon_s \approx 50 \times 10^2 \text{ J kg}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \). Thus, in accord with Hadid et al. (2018) we conclude that the Earth’s magnetosheath cascade rate is much higher than that of the solar wind. This is presumably due to strong driving of the magnetosheath by the solar wind through compressions and streaming through the bow shock, amplifying the pre-existing turbulence activity. Due to the nature of this driving, the magnetosheath is nominally more compressive and hotter than the nearby solar wind, while the high value of plasma beta allows the turbulent Mach number to remain relatively low (see Table 1). From a theoretical point of view, this places magnetosheath turbulence in a somewhat different category than pristine

### Table 5. \( \epsilon_3 \) for different spacecraft pairs

| S/C pair | \(|r|\) (km) | \( \epsilon_3^+ \) (J kg\(^{-1}\) s\(^{-1}\)) | \( \epsilon_3^- \) (J kg\(^{-1}\) s\(^{-1}\)) |
|----------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1-2      | 8.252 ± 0.003 | 0.95 × 10^6       | 0.34 × 10^6       |
| 1-3      | 8.490 ± 0.005 | 0.35 × 10^6       | 0.13 × 10^6       |
| 1-4      | 9.85 ± 0.02   | 0.66 × 10^6       | 0.71 × 10^6       |
| 2-3      | 6.435 ± 0.004 | 0.53 × 10^6       | 1.07 × 10^6       |
| 2-4      | 7.169 ± 0.007 | 2.49 × 10^6       | 3.34 × 10^6       |
| 3-4      | 8.02 ± 0.02   | 1.04 × 10^6       | 3.10 × 10^6       |
| Average  | –            | (1.0 ± 0.7) × 10^6| (1 ± 1) × 10^6    |

**Note:** The first column represents the spacecraft pairs used for study. The last row is the average of all of the previous rows. The uncertainty has been evaluated by calculating the standard deviation.

### Table 6. Estimation of cascade rate at different scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \epsilon_1 ) (J kg(^{-1}) s(^{-1}))</th>
<th>( \epsilon_2 ) (J kg(^{-1}) s(^{-1}))</th>
<th>( \epsilon_3 ) (J kg(^{-1}) s(^{-1}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \epsilon^+ ) (5.8 ± 0.5) × 10^6</td>
<td>(7.1 ± 0.9) × 10^6</td>
<td>(1.0 ± 0.7) × 10^6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \epsilon^- ) (5.6 ± 0.2) × 10^6</td>
<td>(4.8 ± 0.5) × 10^6</td>
<td>(1 ± 1) × 10^6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen from Table 6 that the decay rate, obtained from von Kármán decay phenomenology and the inertial range cascade evaluated from the third-order law are in agreement with each other, within uncertainties. Interestingly, the cascade rate evaluated at the kinetic range, using multi-spacecraft method is slightly lower than the inertial range and the von Kármán decay rate. This may be expected, since in the kinetic range additional channels, not present in single-fluid MHD, open up for energy conversion and transfer, as described in recent theoretical works (Howes 2008; Howes et al. 2008; Del Sarto et al. 2016; Yang et al. 2017a,b). These additional pathways may be associated with wave-particle interactions, kinetic activity related to reconnection, compressive and incompressive cascades, distinct cascades for different species, and so on. This is a much more complex scenario than a single incompressible Kolmogorov cascade, which is often the standard viewpoint at MHD scales. The values of \( \epsilon_3 \) are somewhat lower than that of \( \epsilon_1 \) and \( \epsilon_2 \). This demonstrates that, at least for such weakly compressible, collisionless systems such as the present interval, the standard Kolmogorov cascade may be operative in the kinetic scales, as an ingredient of a complex cascade, and therefore at a diminished intensity. A more rigorous approach would be to derive the appropriate third-order law relevant to the...
solar wind turbulence. Understanding their relationship provides an interesting further challenge for plasma turbulence theory. In this regard, it would be interesting to compare the findings of this paper with other cases with high compressibility, high cross helicity etc. We plan to perform these studies in the future.
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