## Calculating the Electron Diffusion Region Aspect Ratio with Magnetic Field Gradients

Steven V Heuer<sup>1</sup>, Kevin J Genestreti<sup>2</sup>, Takuma Nakamura<sup>3</sup>, Roy B. Torbert<sup>1</sup>, James L Burch<sup>2</sup>, and Rumi Nakamura<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of New Hampshire <sup>2</sup>Southwest Research Institute <sup>3</sup>Institute of Physics, University of Graz <sup>4</sup>Space Research Institute

November 23, 2022

#### Abstract

We calculate the aspect ratio of the electron diffusion region (EDR) during symmetric magnetic reconnection using magnetic field gradients measured by the Magnetospheric Multiscale mission (MMS). The technique introduced in this paper is validated using a particle-in-cell (PIC) simulation, compared with the reconnection rate for three MMS-observed magnetotail EDRs, then compared with the EDR aspect ratio predicted by scaling dependencies on asymptotic upstream electron  $\begin{tabular}{ll} beta\begin{tabular}{ll} beta\begin{tabular}{ll} compared by the Magnetospheric magnetic transmission (MMS) and the term of term of$ 







### Calculating the Electron Diffusion Region Aspect Ratio with Magnetic Field Gradients

# S.V. Heuer<sup>1</sup>, K.J. Genestreti<sup>2</sup>, T.K.M. Nakamura<sup>4,5</sup>, R.B. Torbert<sup>1,2</sup>, J.L. Burch<sup>3</sup>, R. Nakamura<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH, USA <sup>2</sup>Southwest Research Institute, Durham, NH, USA <sup>3</sup>Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio, TX, USA <sup>4</sup>Space Research Institute, Austrian Academy of Sciences, Graz, Austria <sup>5</sup>Institute of Physics, University of Graz, Graz, 8010, Austria

#### Key Points:

1

2

3

4

10

11	• A new technique is introduced to calculate the aspect ratio of the electron diffu-
12	sion region (EDR) with magnetic field gradients.
13	• The aspect ratio is determined within 20% uncertainty for a particle-in-cell sim-
14	ulation with added MMS-like errors.
15	• When applied to MMS data the aspect ratio is within uncertainty of the normal-
16	ized reconnection rate measured during three magnetotail EDRs.

Corresponding author: Steven Heuer, steven.heuer@unh.edu

#### 17 Abstract

- <sup>18</sup> We calculate the aspect ratio of the electron diffusion region (EDR) during symmetric
- <sup>19</sup> magnetic reconnection using magnetic field gradients measured by the Magnetospheric
- <sup>20</sup> Multiscale mission (MMS). The technique introduced in this paper is validated using a
- <sup>21</sup> particle-in-cell (PIC) simulation, compared with the reconnection rate for three MMS-
- <sup>22</sup> observed magnetotail EDRs, then compared with the EDR aspect ratio predicted by scal-
- ing dependencies on asymptotic upstream electron  $\beta$ . For the MMS events, we find that
- the EDR aspect ratio determined using the magnetic field gradients are within uncer-
- tainty of the normalized reconnection rate found by previous studies for three MMS-observed
   EDRs. Because the magnetic field gradients are velocity-frame independent and typi-
- EDRs. Because the magnetic field gradients are velocity-frame independent and typically very well measured by MMS, the technique can be used to obtain the normalized
- cally very well measured by MMS, the technique can be used to obtain
   reconnection rate with higher fidelity than established methods.

#### <sup>29</sup> Plain Language Summary

Magnetic reconnection is a plasma process which occurs throughout the universe. 30 It accelerates and heats nearby particles, and can redistribute energy over vast scales. 31 The rate at which it occurs, the reconnection rate, is one of the most important quan-32 tities describing reconnection. Reconnection occurs within an electron-scale region where 33 ions and electrons are decoupled from the magnetic field, known as the electron diffu-34 sion region (EDR). Theory and simulations have shown the dimensions of the EDR scale 35 with the reconnection rate. In this paper, we introduce a new method to determine the 36 aspect ratio of the EDR and show that it is the reconnection rate for reconnection events 37 observed by the Magnetospheric Multiscale (MMS) mission. This new method has fewer 38 sources of error than established methods for determining reconnection rate using space-39 craft data, and could provide a simpler way of studying the mechanisms which control 40 the reconnection rate. 41

#### 42 1 Introduction

#### 43 **1.1 Background**

Magnetic reconnection is a fundamental process in plasmas which converts elec-44 tromagnetic energy stored in magnetic fields to kinetic and thermal particle energy through 45 a change of magnetic field topology (Parker, 1957; Birn & Priest, 2007; Yamada et al., 46 2010). The field line breaking occurs within a region where the plasma is decoupled from 47 the magnetic field lines, known as the diffusion region. Magnetic reconnection is an in-48 herently multi-scale process (Vasyliunas, 1975). Ions are demagnetized in an ion diffu-49 sion region (IDR) at the ion inertial scale, with a smaller electron diffusion region (EDR) 50 embedded within the IDR at the electron inertial scale, where both electrons and ions 51 are demagnetized. Reconnection happens within the EDR, which contains the reconnec-52 tion X-line (Hesse et al., 1999; Shay et al., 1998). 53

The EDR is characterized by strong electron non-gyrotropy (Scudder & Daughton, 2008), non-ideal electric field  $\vec{E'} = \vec{E} + (\vec{V} \times \vec{B}) \neq 0$ , and positive non-ideal energy conversion rate  $\vec{J} \cdot \vec{E'} > 0$  (Zenitani et al., 2011). Elongated perpendicular currents in the outflow region have been predicted by simulations (Daughton et al., 2006; Karimabadi et al., 2007) and observed in situ (Phan et al., 2007; Hwang et al., 2017). These electron jets, sometimes known as the outer EDR, have a non-ideal electric field but negative nonideal energy conversion rate  $\vec{J} \cdot \vec{E'} < 0$  (Zenitani et al., 2011).

The rate of reconnection is of order 0.1 in normalized units (Birn et al., 2001; Liu et al., 2022; Cassak et al., 2017). Precise ensemble measurements of reconnection rate are crucial for in situ determination of the parameters controlling the efficiency of reconnection. However, observational measurements of the reconnection rate typically have compounding sources of error associated with coordinate transformations, velocity frame
determination, and uncertainty in the upstream conditions used for normalization (Fuselier
& Lewis, 2011; Genestreti et al., 2018). Determining the parameters that control the reconnection rate is a principal goal of NASA's Magnetospheric Multiscale (MMS) mission (Burch et al., 2016).

For quasi-2-dimensional steady-state and incompressible reconnection, a simple ge-70 ometric argument using conservation of mass, energy, and magnetic flux can be used to 71 show that the reconnection rate scales as the ratio of the EDR dimensions in the out-72 flow and inflow directions (T. Nakamura et al., 2021). The EDR aspect ratio has been 73 found previously using MMS data by directly determining the dimensions of the EDR 74 using spacecraft timing techniques (Torbert et al., 2018; R. Nakamura et al., 2019), tech-75 niques which place strict requirements on the EDR encounter geometry. The EDR as-76 pect ratio is an intrinsically normalized quantity independent of velocity frame or up-77 stream conditions, and a general method for determining the EDR aspect ratio would 78 be a measure of the reconnection rate with fewer potential sources of error. 79

80

#### 1.2 Theoretical Scaling of the EDR Aspect Ratio

Simulations and theories have shown that the spatial scale of the EDR is determined by the bounce length of electrons trapped within a field reversal (Hesse et al., 1999; Kuznetsova et al., 2000), which has been found analytically (Biskamp & Schindler, 1971). For uniform electron temperature, the aspect ratio  $\delta/l$  is defined as the ratio of magnetic field gradient terms

$$\frac{\delta}{l} \sim \left[ \left( \frac{\partial B_N}{\partial L} \right)^2 / \left( \frac{\partial B_L}{\partial N} \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{4}} \tag{1}$$

where L is the direction of the reconnecting component of the magnetic field, and 86 N is the current sheet normal direction (M, which does not appear in Eq.(1), completes87 the right-handed LMN coordinate system). R. Nakamura et al. (2019) calculated the 88 EDR dimensions using Eq.(1) by determining the magnetic field gradient from the slope 89 of the magnetic field along the inferred trajectory of MMS through the EDR (the meth-90 ods used by Torbert et al. (2018) to estimate the dimensions of the EDR also required 91 knowledge of the spacecraft trajectory). These approaches require specific spacecraft tra-92 jectory geometries that cross the extent of EDR in the vertical and horizontal directions. 93 However, if the magnetic field gradient terms  $\partial B_N/\partial L$  and  $\partial B_L/\partial N$  are spatially uni-94 form within the EDR, the aspect ratio can be evaluated with Eq.(1) at any point within 95 the EDR, as local gradients can be determined with multi-point MMS data without any 96 requirements on the trajectory. 97

Additional scaling relations for the dimensions of the EDR were derived by T. Nakamura et al. (2016) using particle-in-cell (PIC) simulations. The length and width of the EDR  $L_z$  and  $L_x$  respectively, are described as a function of  $\beta_{e\infty}$ , the asymptotic upstream electron  $\beta$ . Using these scaling relations, the aspect ratio  $L_z/L_x$  is predicted to be

$$\frac{L_z}{L_x} = 0.125 \left(\frac{\beta_{e\infty}}{0.1}\right)^{\frac{1}{8}} \left(1 + 0.15 \left(\frac{\beta_{e\infty}}{0.1}\right)^{-1/2}\right)^{1/2} \tag{2}$$

The aspect ratio  $L_z/L_x$  is distinguished from  $\delta/l$ . While both are descriptions of the EDR aspect ratio, they are defined uniquely. Equation (2) gives a theoretical aspect ratio value for a given set of background plasma conditions which can be compared with experimental values of aspect ratio calculated with Eq.(1). The scaling relations used in Eq.(2) were found for reconnection with an anti-parallel magnetic field configuration and a limited range of upstream background densities, and may require modification for guide field reconnection (Divin et al., 2019; Le et al., 2013). The dimensions in Eq.(1) and Eq.(2) are also defined differently: Eq.(1) describes the dimensions of the region where electrons have non-gyrotropic orbits, whereas  $L_z$  and  $L_x$  in Eq.(2) are the dimensions of the region with electron non-gyrotropy and a positive out-of-plane electric field component.

#### 112 **1.3 Outline of this Study**

We introduce a general method to calculate the EDR aspect ratio using Eq.(1) and 113 the magnetic field gradient terms measured by MMS. In the following methodology sec-114 tion, we describe how  $\nabla B$  and  $\beta_{e\infty}$  were measured by MMS (section 2.1) and how Eq.(1) 115 is evaluated. In section 3, we use a fully kinetic 2.5-dimensional particle-in-cell (PIC) sim-116 ulation to quantify the error introduced to Eq.(1) by MMS-like errors in  $\nabla \vec{B}$ , and the 117 accuracy of the technique as a function of distance from the X-line. In section 4, we use 118 Eq.(2) and the three sets of coordinates described in section 2.2 to calculate  $\delta/l$  for three 119 magnetotail MMS reconnection events. We compare  $\delta/l$  with the measured normalized 120 reconnection rate and  $L_z/L_x$ . Finally, we summarize and discuss our findings in section 121 5.122

#### 123 2 Methodology

#### 124 2.1 MMS Data

The Magnetospheric Multiscale (MMS) Mission is comprised of four spacecraft which 125 orbit Earth in a tetrahedral formation (Burch et al., 2016). This study uses the high-126 est time resolution magnetic field data from the MMS Fluxgate Magnetometer (FGM) 127 (Russell et al., 2016), which was smoothed in time with a Savitzky-Golay filter to reduce 128 noise. The magnetic field data is calibrated to  $\leq 0.1$  nT, with the largest uncertainties 129 being in the spin-axis component of the magnetic field (typically corresponding to  $B_N$ 130 in the magnetotail) (Torbert et al., 2016). Particle data used to calculate  $\beta$  was mea-131 sured by the Fast Plasma Investigation (FPI) (Pollock et al., 2016). For each event,  $\beta_{e\infty}$ 132 is calculated by time averaging  $\beta_e$  in the asymptotic upstream region (Table 1). All data 133 was collected during periods when spacecraft separation was on the order of electron in-134 ertial length  $d_e$ . The linear gradient or curlometer method is used to determine the mag-135 netic field gradient and current within the spacecraft tetrahedron (Chanteur, 1998). For 136 the events studied here, the inter-spacecraft separations were such that the current den-137 sity was nearly uniform across the MMS tetrahedron, a necessary condition for the lin-138 ear gradient method. 139

140

#### 2.2 Experimental Calculation of EDR Aspect Ratio

Evaluating Eq.(1) for spacecraft data requires determining the L and N directions, which are found in this study using three different methods

1. Fixed LMN: here we use a fixed (time independent) LMN coordinate system to 143 obtain the EDR aspect ratio from Eq.(1). The fixed LMN system is determined with a hybrid approach (Genestreti et al., 2018; Denton et al., 2018): minimum 145 variance analysis of the electron bulk velocity (MVA- $V_e$ ) or magnetic field (MVA-146 B) are used to determine L (Sonnerup & Scheible, 2000). MVA-B is used when 147 the EDR is crossed in the normal direction.  $MVA-V_e$  is used when the EDR is crossed 148 laterally, from one outflow to the other. The N direction was defined using the 149 maximum directional derivative of the magnetic field (MDD-B) technique (Shi et 150 al., 2005) which determines coordinates as the eigenvectors of the matrix  $(\nabla \vec{B})(\nabla \vec{B})^T$ . 151 The *M* vector  $N \times L/|N \times L|$  completes the right-handed coordinate system. 152 2. MDD-B LMN: here we used the terms of  $\nabla \vec{B}$  in the time-varying LMN coor-153 dinates from MDD-B to evaluate Eq.(1) and determine the aspect ratio  $\delta/l$ . 154

3. **MDD-B Eigenvalue Ratio**: similar to the MDD-B LMN method, we evaluated Eq.(1) with time-varying *LMN* coordinates from MDD-B, but with three additional a priori assumptions: that the EDR is quasi-2-dimensional, inflow-symmetric, and anti-parallel. Under these assumptions, the only non-vanishing terms of  $\nabla \vec{B}$ at the current sheet center are  $\partial B_L / \partial N = \sqrt{\lambda_N}$  and  $\partial B_N / \partial L = \sqrt{\lambda_L}$ , where  $\lambda_N$  and  $\lambda_L$  are the maximum and intermediate eigenvalues of  $(\nabla \vec{B})(\nabla \vec{B})^T$ . Thus the aspect ratio is  $\delta/l = (\lambda_L / \lambda_N)^{1/4}$ .

The three techniques above each yield time-dependent functions  $\delta/l$ . Single, nominal values and approximate uncertainties for  $\delta/l$  are selected for each as the average of the three over an 0.1 second interval around the current sheet (see section 3). The uncertainty is found by taking the standard deviation of the data points over the same interval.

#### <sup>167</sup> 3 Quantifying Errors in the Aspect Ratio with a Simulation

The different sources of error in the calculation of the  $\delta/l$  are characterized using a PIC simulation of the 11 July 2017 magnetotail reconnection event observed by MMS which has been found to be extremely consistent with observations (T. Nakamura et al., 2018). The sources of error considered here are how the absolute error depends on distance from reconnection X-line, and the error introduced from MMS-like uncertainties in magnetic field. In this simulation, the coordinate system is known exactly so there are none of the errors introduced when transforming to an *LMN* coordinate system.

The EDR in the simulation is defined as the region surrounding the X-line where 175 the out-of-plane component of the electron frame electric field is positive,  $E'_M > 0$ . The 176 aspect ratio of the central EDR for this simulation is calculated to be 0.24. An upper-177 bound estimate for the characteristic magnetic field measurement error for MMS of 0.1 178 nT was added to  $\partial B_N / \partial L$  during the aspect ratio calculation and normalized by the av-179 erage spacecraft separation for 11 July EDR encounter  $\Delta R_{SC} = 0.58 d_e$  (Figure 1b and 180 1c). The uncertainty for a nominal MMS-like error of 0.01 nT was also calculated, but 181 no substantial difference from the no error case was observed with uncertainty below 10%182 within the central EDR (not pictured). 183

At the center of the current sheet, aspect ratio from the Fixed LMN and MDD-184 B Eigenvalue Ratio methods are both within 20% of the actual value. In the no error 185 case, the uncertainties in both methods are below 10% within the entire central EDR. 186 As expected, the accuracy of each technique depends on the relative position of the MMS 187 tetrahedron within the reconnection region. The aspect ratio determined with the Fixed 188 LMN method is more accurate along the separatrices, compared with the aspect ratio 189 from the MDD-B Eigenvalue Ratio method (Figure 1c and 1d). This is expected, as the 190 assumptions made about reconnection geometry for the MDD-B Eigenvalue Ratio are 191 only accurate where the out-of-plane gradient is small, such as the central EDR and along 192 the current sheet center (see section 2.2). When these conditions are satisfied, the MDD-193 B Eigenvalue Ratio method can be more accurate than the Fixed LMN method. The 194 1-dimensional cuts of the aspect ratio along the reconstructed MMS trajectory for 11 July 195 (Figure 1e and 1f) show that both Fixed LMN and MDD-B Eigenvalue Ratio derived 196 aspect ratios should be within 20% of the EDR aspect ratio for nominal MMS-like er-197 rors at the center of the current sheet, which is observed in the MMS data (Figure 3c). 198

The low uncertainty close to the center of the current sheet shows that the magnetic field gradient can be used to accurately measure the aspect ratio of the EDR within the central EDR, even with upper-bound MMS-like magnetic field errors. Additionally, Figure 2 also suggests that measurements beyond the central EDR may also accurately measure the EDR aspect ratio. However, further work is necessary to determine whether the aspect ratio of the outer EDR generally corresponds to that of the central EDR.



Aspect Ratio Uncertainity

Figure 1. Panels (a), (b) and (c), (d) show the uncertainty in the aspect ratio determined using the Fixed LMN and the MDD-B Eigenvalue Ratio techniques and magnetic field gradients from the PIC simulation of the 11 July 2017 event. Panels (a) and (c) are displayed with no error, while (b) and (d) have MMS-like errors added to  $\nabla \vec{B}$  before calculating the aspect ratio. Panels (e) and (f) show a 1-dimensional cut of the along the reconstructed MMS trajectory, compared with the aspect ratio of 0.24 and the 20% uncertainty indicated with blue shading. The X-line and Max  $J_M$  are defined as the reversal of  $B_N$  and maximum  $J_M$  along the reconstructed trajectory, respectively.



Figure 2. Diagram showing the approximate trajectories for the three events used in this study relative to the central EDR determined using the reconnection electric field  $E'_M$  from the 11 July PIC simulation.

**Table 1.** Calculated parameters for the three EDR encounters.  $L_z/L_x$  is the aspect ratio calculated using Eq.(2), and  $\delta/l$ , the average aspect ratio at the center of the current sheet.

Event	$\delta/l$	Reconnection Rate	$L_z/L_x$	Upstream Interval for $L_z/L_x$
11 July 2017	$0.210\pm0.041$	$0.180 \pm 0.035^{a}$	$0.146 \pm 0.039$	22:31-22:31:50
10 August 2017	$0.202\pm0.054$	$0.190 \pm 0.040^{b}$	$0.151 \pm 0.019$	12:19:17-12:19:19
17 June 2017	$0.119 \pm 0.077$	$0.077 \pm 0.050^{c}$	$0.145 \pm 0.010$	20:24:45-20:25

<sup>a</sup>(Genestreti et al., 2018) <sup>b</sup>(Li et al., 2019) <sup>c</sup>(Farrugia et al., 2021)

205

#### 3.1 EDR Aspect Ratio with Data from MMS

Next we apply the techniques described in section 2.2 to MMS observations for three symmetric magnetotail reconnection events: the previously discussed 11 July 2017 event, 10 August 2017 (Zhou et al., 2019), and 17 June 2017 (Farrugia et al., 2021). The trajectories of MMS through each of the three EDRs differed (see Figure 2), but all three passed through regions where the PIC simulation analysis predicts the aspect ratio can be determined within 20% uncertainty.

During the 11 July 2017 EDR encounter, MMS crossed the EDR along the mag-212 netotail current sheet, moving predominantly in the L-direction, and the small  $B_L$  in-213 dicates it spent a significant of time in the current sheet (Figure 3a) where the current 214 density is largest (Figure 3b). This is consistent with the spatial region where the sim-215 ulation tells us the uncertainty in  $\delta/l$  is smallest (Figure 1). For this event, we find that 216 the EDR aspect ratio calculated by R. Nakamura et al. (2019) and normalized recon-217 nection rate from Genestreti et al. (2018) are both within the error bars of  $\delta/l$  (Figure 218 3c). The 19% uncertainty in  $\delta/l$  is comparable to the 20% upper-bound uncertainty es-219 timated from the PIC simulation results in section 3. While the reconnection rate un-220 certainty of 0.035 found by Genestreti et al. (2018) is smaller than the  $\delta/l$  upper-bound 221 uncertainty, the 11 July EDR is an ideal case which permitted errors being character-222 ized and minimized with a detailed study. Additionally, the reconnection rate error cal-223 culated by Genestreti et al. (2018) does not account for uncertainties in the upstream 224 conditions used for normalization. 225



Figure 3. Summary of the 11 July 2017, 10 August 2017, and 17 June 2017 EDR encounters. Panels (a), (d), and (g) show the 4-point average magnetic field in *LMN* coordinates  $B_{LMN}$ . Panels (b), (e), and (h) show the current density in *LMN* coordinates  $J_{LMN}$ . Panels (c), (f), and (i) show the aspect ratio determined using the Fixed LMN, the MDD-B LMN, and the MDD-B Eigenvalue methods (see Table 1). Purple shading indicates the uncertainty in  $\delta/l$  over an 0.1 second interval around maximum  $J_M$ .

On 10 August MMS crossed the EDR obliquely (Zhou et al., 2019), and the mag-226 nitude of the aspect ratio determined using the Fixed LMN and MDD-B Eigenvalue Ra-227 tio methods are close at the center of the current sheet, while the MDD-B LMN derived 228 aspect ratio is larger (Figure 3f).  $\delta/l$  is within the error bars of the normalized recon-229 nection rate determined by Li et al. (2019) for 10 August (Table 1). The trajectory for 230 the 17 June encounter was different from the 11 July and 10 August central EDR en-231 counters, in that on 17 June MMS crossed the outer EDR (Farrugia et al., 2021). Ad-232 ditionally, Figure 3h shows the EDR had a double-peaked current structure labeled "Lo-233 cal Max  $J_M$  1 and 2." The aspect ratio  $\delta/l$  at the first peak is within the error bars of 234 the normalized reconnection calculated by Farrugia et al. (2021) for the 17 June EDR. 235

Next we compare the  $\delta/l$  with the predicted EDR aspect ratio by calculating  $\beta_{e\infty}$ 236 for each event and evaluating Eq.(2). The upstream intervals and  $L_z/L_x$  for each event 237 are summarized in Table 1. The nominal normalized reconnection rate from Genestreti 238 et al. (2018) for 11 July is within the error bars of  $L_z/L_x$ , but not the aspect ratio  $0.240\pm$ 239 0.071 from R. Nakamura et al. (2019). For 10 August,  $L_z/L_x$  is outside of the error bars 240 for both  $\delta/l$  and the normalized reconnection rate from Li et al. (2019). The 17 June event, 241 where MMS did not encounter the central EDR, was the only event where  $L_z/L_x$  is larger 242 than the reconnection rate and  $\delta/l$ , but still outside the error bars. 243

#### 4 Summary and Conclusions

We have introduced a new technique for calculating the aspect ratio of the EDR 245 using the magnetic field gradient, with the effect of MMS-like errors in the magnetic field 246 quantified using a PIC simulation. The aspect ratio of the EDR calculated with the mag-247 netic field gradient has an error below 20% within the central EDR even for the upper-248 bound MMS magnetic field errors. We used MMS data to calculate the aspect ratio  $\delta/l$ 249 for three magnetotail EDR encounters and showed that it is within error bars of the mea-250 sured normalized reconnection rate for all three events. All values of  $\delta/l$  calculated us-251 ing the methods introduced in this paper are within the range 0.1-0.2, which is expected 252 from past studies of fast reconnection (Liu et al., 2017; Liu et al., 2022). 253

During the first event studied, 11 July 2017, MMS passed through the EDR lat-254 erally, spending an extended period of time along the current sheet. As predicted by the 255 PIC simulation in section 2, we find  $\delta/l$  measured at the center of the current sheet is 256 within 20% of the EDR aspect ratio and normalized reconnection rate. During the sec-257 ond event studied, 10 August 2017, MMS cut through the central EDR along the sep-258 aratrices. While MMS spent less time in the current sheet during the 10 August EDR 259 encounter compared to 11 July,  $\delta/l$  is within 20% of the normalized reconnection rate 260 localized in the center of the current sheet. During the third event studied, 17 June 2017, 261 MMS did not encounter the central EDR, but crossed the extended electron outflow jets 262 downstream, with a bifurcated structure in the out-of-plane current density. Despite not 263 traversing the central EDR, the normalized reconnection rate was within the uncertainty 264 in  $\delta/l$  at the first current peak. This is consistent with the PIC simulation error anal-265 vsis that suggested the aspect ratio measured in the outer EDR corresponds to the as-266 pect ratio of the central EDR, which is a result meriting further investigation. The ac-267 curacy of the Fixed LMN, MDD-B LMN, and MDD-B Eigenvalue Ratio techniques may 268 depend on the background plasma conditions where reconnection occurs (e.g. guide field 269 strength, which modifies the electron meandering motions and the Hall current system). 270 A more detailed parameter analysis (beyond the single simulation analyzed in section 271 3) is required to determine the relative accuracy of each technique in a meaningful way. 272

The aspect ratio  $L_z/L_x$  determined using Eq.(2) and the asymptotic upstream electron  $\beta_{e\infty}$  is found to be consistently below the normalized reconnection rate and  $\delta/l$ . Equation (2) was determined for anti-parallel reconnection, and all three events had a small guide field. Another potential explanation is difference in EDR definition. The dimensions  $L_z$  and  $L_x$  are determined as boundaries of the region with non-gyrotropic electrons, and the outer EDR has been observed to exhibit some electron non-gyrotropy. Since the aspect ratio is inversely proportional to  $L_x$ , an elongated EDR would decrease the aspect ratio. While the magnitude of  $L_z/L_x$  is less than  $\delta/l$ , we are unable to determine whether they scale the same with available data, but the relative scaling of  $\delta/l$  and  $L_z/L_x$ may be tested using any future magnetotail encounters with higher or lower values of  $\beta_{e\infty}$ .

Established methods for estimating the normalized reconnection rate in situ require 284 normalization by upstream quantities with large uncertainties, and place constraints on 285 spacecraft trajectory. We have shown that the EDR aspect ratio can be used as a mea-286 sure of reconnection rate for symmetric 2-dimensional laminar reconnection in the mag-287 netotail. Since the technique presented in this paper for determining the EDR aspect 288 ratio using  $\nabla B$  and Eq.(1) is a normalized quantity that can be measured anywhere within 289 the central EDR, it can be used to estimate the normalized reconnection rate indepen-290 dent of spacecraft trajectory through the EDR and with fewer sources of error than es-291 tablished methods. 292

Further work is necessary determine the accuracy of Eq.(1) when one or more of the assumptions are violated, such as during asymmetric or guide field reconnection. The multi-spacecraft  $\nabla \vec{B}$  reconstruction technique used in this study assumed that the current density within the MMS tetrahedron was spatially uniform. While this assumption was shown to be valid for the three EDRs studied in this paper, a higher-order gradient reconstruction method (Torbert et al., 2020; Denton et al., 2020) may be necessary for EDRs with smaller characteristic length scales, such as at the magnetopause.

#### 300 Appendix A PIC Simulation Setup

In this paper, we analyzed a 2.5-dimensional simulation of the 11 July 2017 MMS 301 event performed by T. Nakamura et al. (2018) using the fully kinetic particle-in-cell code 302 VPIC (Bowers et al., 2008, 2009). The simulation initial conditions were based on MMS 303 observations of the plasma sheet and lobes (see T. Nakamura et al. (2018) for full de-304 scription of simulation parameters). The system size was  $120d_{i0} \times 40d_{i0}$ , where  $d_{i0}$  is 305 the ion inertial length in the initial current sheet, with a total of  $1.4 \times 10^{11}$  super par-306 ticles and an ion-to-electron mass ratio of 400. The initial current sheet was symmet-307 ric with a guide field of 0.03. At the time shown in Figure 1 (50 ion cyclotron periods 308 after simulation start), the reconnection rate had developed to a steady state. The ir-309 regular cut shown in Figure 1 through the simulated EDR was selected to match the MMS 310 trajectory by a best fit of  $B_L$ . 311

#### 312 Data Availability Statement

The MMS FIELDS and FPI data used in this study are publicly available from the Science Data Center (SDC) at https://lasp.colorado.edu/mms/sdc/public/about/browse.

- Routines from the pySPEDAS and pyTplot libraries used to process the MMS data an-
- alyzed in this paper (Grimes et al., 2019) are freely available at https://github.com/spedas/pyspedas.

#### 317 Acknowledgments

318 S.V.H., K.J.G., and R.B.T. were supported by NASA's MMS FIELDS Grant NNG04EB99C.

T.K.M.N. was supported by the Austrian Research Fund (FWF): P32175-N27. For the

simulation analyzed in this paper, we acknowledge PRACE for awarding us access to MareNos-

trum at Barcelona Supercomputing Center (BSC), Spain.

322	References
303	Birn J. Drake J. F. Shav M. A. Rogers B. N. Denton, R. E. Hesse, M.
324	Pritchett P L (2001) Geospace environmental modeling (gem) magnetic
224	reconnection challenge Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics
325	106(A3) 3715-3719 doi: https://doi.org/10.1029/1999JA900449
320	Birn I & Priest F B (2007) Reconnection of magnetic fields : magnetohudrodu-
328	namics and collisionless theory and observations
320	Biskamp D & Schindler K (1971) Instability of two-dimensional collisionless
330	plasmas with neutral points <i>Plasma Physics</i> 13 1013-2026
331	Bowers K J Albright B J Vin L Bergen B & Kwan T J T (2008)
332	May). Ultrahigh performance three-dimensional electromagnetic relativis-
333	tic kinetic plasma simulationa). <i>Physics of Plasmas</i> , 15(5), 055703. doi:
334	10.1063/1.2840133
335	Bowers, K. J., Albright, B. J., Yin, L., Daughton, W., Rovtershtevn, V., Bergen, B.,
336	& Kwan, T. J. T. (2009, July). Advances in petascale kinetic plasma sim-
337	ulation with VPIC and Roadrunner. In Journal of physics conference series
338	(Vol. 180, p. 012055). doi: 10.1088/1742-6596/180/1/012055
339	Burch, J. L., Moore, T. E., Torbert, R. B., & Giles, B. L. (2016, March). Magne-
340	tospheric Multiscale Overview and Science Objectives. Space Science Reviews,
341	199(1-4), 5-21. doi: 10.1007/s11214-015-0164-9
342	Burch, J. L., Torbert, R. B., Phan, T. D., Chen, LJ., Moore, T. E., Ergun, R. E.,
343	Chandler, M. (2016). Electron-scale measurements of magnetic reconnec-
344	tion in space. Science, $352(6290)$ , aaf2939. doi: $10.1126$ /science.aaf2939
345	Cassak, P. A., Liu, YH., & Shay, M. A. (2017). A review of the 0.1 reconnection
346	rate problem. Journal of Plasma Physics, 83(5), 715830501. doi: 10.1017/
347	S0022377817000666
348	Chanteur, G. (1998). Spatial interpolation for four spacecraft: Theory. In
349	G. Paschmann & P. Daly (Eds.), Analysis Methods for Multi-Spacecraft Data.
350	The International Space Science Institute, Bern, Switzerland.
351	Daugnton, W., Scudder, J., & Karimabadi, H. (2006). Fully kinetic simulations
352	of undriven magnetic reconnection with open boundary conditions. <i>Physics of</i> $D_{1,2}$
353	Pussmas, 13(1), 0.12101. doi: 10.1005/1.2210017
354	Ctrongerway, P. L. Vines, S. K. (2018, March) Determining I. M.N.Cur
355	ront Shoot Coordinates at the Magnetopause From Magnetospheric Multiscale
350	Data Iournal of Geonbusical Research (Snace Physics) 199(3) 2274-2205
357	doi: 10 1002/2017 IA 024619
350	Denton R E Torbert R B Hasegawa H Dors I Genestreti K I Argall
360	M B Fischer D (2020) Polynomial reconstruction of the recon-
361	nection magnetic field observed by multiple spacecraft. Journal of Geo-
362	physical Research: Space Physics, 125(2), e2019JA027481. (e2019JA027481
363	10.1029/2019JA027481) doi: https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JA027481
364	Divin, A., Semenov, V., Zaitsev, I., Korovinskiv, D., Deca, J., Lapenta, G.,
365	Markidis, S. (2019, October). Inner and outer electron diffusion region of
366	antiparallel collisionless reconnection: Density dependence. Physics of Plas-
367	mas, 26(10), 102305. doi: 10.1063/1.5109368
368	Farrugia, C. J., Rogers, A. J., Torbert, R. B., Genestreti, K. J., Nakamura,
369	T. K. M., Lavraud, B., Dors, I. (2021, March). An Encounter With the
370	Ion and Electron Diffusion Regions at a Flapping and Twisted Tail Current
371	Sheet. Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics), 126(3), e28903. doi:
372	10.1029/2020JA028903
373	Fuselier, S. A., & Lewis, W. S. (2011). Properties of near-earth magnetic recon-
374	nection from in-situ observations. Space Science Reviews, $160(1)$ , 95. Re-
375	trieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-011-9820-x doi: 10.1007/
376	s11214-011-9820-x

377	Genestreti, K. J., Nakamura, T., Nakamura, R., Denton, R. E., Torbert, R. B.,
378	Burch, J. L., Russell, C. T. (2018). How accurately can we measure
379	the reconnection rate em for the mms diffusion region event of 11 july 2017?
380	Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics, 123(11), 9130-9149. doi:
381	https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JA025711
382	Grimes, E. W., Hatzigeorgiu, N., Lewis, J. W., Russell, C., McTiernan, J. M., Droz-
383	dov, A., & Angelopoulos, V. (2019, December). pySPEDAS: Space Physics
384	Environment Data Analysis Software in Python. In Agu fall meeting abstracts
385	(Vol. 2019, p. SH41C-3313).
386	Hesse, M., Schindler, K., Birn, J., & Kuznetsova, M. (1999). The diffusion region in
387	collisionless magnetic reconnection. <i>Physics of Plasmas</i> , $6(5)$ , 1781-1795. doi:
388	10.1063/1.873436
389	Hwang, K. J., Sibeck, D. G., Choi, E., Chen, L. J., Ergun, R. E., Khotvaintsev, Y.,
390	Torbert, R. B. (2017, March). Magnetospheric Multiscale mission obser-
391	vations of the outer electron diffusion region. <i>Geophysical Research Letters</i> ,
392	44(5), 2049-2059. doi: 10.1002/2017GL072830
393	Karimabadi, H., Daughton, W., & Scudder, J. (2007, July). Multi-scale structure
394	of the electron diffusion region. <i>Geophysical Research Letters</i> , 34(13), L13104.
395	doi: 10.1029/2007GL030306
396	Kuznetsova, M. M., Hesse, M., & Winske, D. (2000). Toward a transport
397	model of collisionless magnetic reconnection. Journal of Geophysical Re-
398	search: Space Physics, 105(A4), 7601-7616. Retrieved from https://
399	agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/1999JA900396 doi:
400	https://doi.org/10.1029/1999JA900396
401	Le, A., Egedal, J., Ohia, O., Daughton, W., Karimabadi, H., & Lukin, V. S. (2013,
402	March). Regimes of the Electron Diffusion Region in Magnetic Reconnection.
403	Phys. Rev. Lett., 110(13), 135004. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.135004
404	Li, X., Wang, R., Lu, Q., Hwang, KJ., Zong, Q., Russell, C. T., & Wang,
405	S. (2019). Observation of nongyrotropic electron distribution across
406	the electron diffusion region in the magnetotail reconnection. Geophys-
407	ical Research Letters, 46(24), 14263-14273. Retrieved from https://
408	agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2019GL085014 doi:
409	https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL085014
410	Liu, YH., Cassak, P., Li, X., Hesse, M., Lin, SC., & Genestreti, K. (2022, Decem-
411	ber). First-principles theory of the rate of magnetic reconnection in magneto-
412	spheric and solar plasmas. Communications Physics, 5(1), 97. doi: 10.1038/
413	s42005-022-00854-x
414	Liu, YH., Hesse, M., Guo, F., Daughton, W., Li, H., Cassak, P. A., & Shay,
415	M. A. (2017, Feb). Why does steady-state magnetic reconnection have a
416	maximum local rate of order 0.1? Phys. Rev. Lett., 118, 085101. Retrieved
417	from https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.118.085101 doi:
418	10.1103/PhysRevLett.118.085101
419	Nakamura, R., Genestreti, K. J., Nakamura, T., Baumjohann, W., Varsani, A., Na-
420	gai, T., Torbert, R. B. (2019). Structure of the current sheet in the 11 july
421	2017 electron diffusion region event. Journal of Geophysical Research: Space
422	<i>Physics</i> , 124(2), 1173-1186. doi: https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JA026028
423	Nakamura, T., Genestreti, K. J., Liu, YH., Nakamura, R., Teh, WL., Hasegawa,
424	H., Giles, B. L. (2018). Measurement of the magnetic reconnection rate
425	in the earth's magnetotail. Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics,
426	123(11), 9150-9168. doi: https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JA025713
427	Nakamura, T., Hasegawa, H., Genestreti, K. J., Denton, R. E., Phan, T. D.,
428	Stawarz, J. E., Nystrom, W. D. (2021). Fast cross-scale energy transfer
429	during turbulent magnetic reconnection. Geophysical Research Letters, $48(13)$ ,
430	e2021GL093524. Retrieved from https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley
431	. com/doi/abs/10.1029/2021GL093524 (e2021GL093524 2021GL093524) doi:

432	https://doi.org/10.1029/2021GL093524
433	Nakamura, T., Nakamura, R., & Haseagwa, H. (2016). Spatial dimensions of the
434	electron diffusion region in anti-parallel magnetic reconnection. Annales Geo-
435	physicae, 34(3), 357-367. doi: 10.5194/angeo-34-357-2016
436	Parker, E. N. (1957, December). Sweet's Mechanism for Merging Magnetic Fields in
437	Conducting Fluids. Journal of Geophysical Research, 62(4), 509-520. doi: 10
438	.1029/JZ062i004p00509
439	Phan, T. D., Drake, J. F., Shav, M. A., Mozer, F. S., & Eastwood, J. P. (2007, De-
440	cember). Evidence for an Elongated (; 60 Ion Skin Depths) Electron Diffusion
441	Region during Fast Magnetic Reconnection. Phys. Rev. Lett., 99(25), 255002.
442	doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.99.255002
443	Pollock, C., Moore, T., Jacques, A., Burch, J., Gliese, U., Saito, Y., Zeuch, M.
444	(2016, March). Fast Plasma Investigation for Magnetospheric Multiscale. Space
445	Science Reviews, 199(1-4), 331-406. doi: 10.1007/s11214-016-0245-4
446	Russell, C. T., Anderson, B. J., Baumiohann, W., Bromund, K. R., Dearborn,
447	D., Fischer, D., Richter, I. (2016, March). The Magnetospheric Mul-
448	tiscale Magnetometers. Space Science Reviews, 199(1-4), 189-256. doi:
449	10.1007/s11214-014-0057-3
450	Scudder, J., & Daughton, W. (2008, June). "Illuminating" electron diffusion
451	regions of collisionless magnetic reconnection using electron agvrotropy.
452	Journal of Geophysical Research (Space Physics), 113(A6), A06222. doi:
453	10.1029/2008JA013035
454	Shay, M. A., Drake, J. F., Denton, R. E., & Biskamp, D. (1998). Structure of the
455	dissipation region during collisionless magnetic reconnection. Journal of Geo-
456	physical Research: Space Physics, 103(A5), 9165-9176. doi: https://doi.org/10
457	.1029/97JA03528
458	Shi, Q. Q., Shen, C., Pu, Z. Y., Dunlop, M. W., Zong, Q. G., Zhang, H., Balogh,
459	A. (2005, June). Dimensional analysis of observed structures using multipoint
460	magnetic field measurements: Application to Cluster. Geophysical Research
461	Letters, 32(12), L12105. doi: 10.1029/2005GL022454
462	Sonnerup, B., & Scheible, M. (2000). Minimum and maximum variance analysis. In
463	G. Paschmann & P. Daly (Eds.), Analysis Methods for Multi-spacecraft Data
464	(p. 183-22). The International Space Science Institute, Bern, Switzerland.
465	Torbert, R. B., Burch, J. L., Phan, T. D., Hesse, M., Argall, M. R., Shuster, J.,
466	Saito, Y. (2018). Electron-scale dynamics of the diffusion region during sym-
467	metric magnetic reconnection in space. Science, 362(6421), 1391-1395. doi:
468	10.1126/science.aat2998
469	Torbert, R. B., Dors, I., Argall, M. R., Genestreti, K. J., Burch, J. L., Farrugia,
470	C. J., Strangeway, R. J. (2020). A new method of 3-d magnetic field recon-
471	struction. Geophysical Research Letters, 47(3), e2019GL085542. Retrieved
472	<pre>from https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/</pre>
473	2019GL085542 (e2019GL085542 2019GL085542) doi: https://doi.org/10.1029/
474	2019 GL085542
475	Torbert, R. B., Russell, C. T., Magnes, W., Ergun, R. E., Lindqvist, P. A., Le Con-
476	tel, O., Lappalainen, K. (2016, March). The FIELDS Instrument Suite on
477	MMS: Scientific Objectives, Measurements, and Data Products. Space Science
478	Reviews, 199(1-4), 105-135. doi: $10.1007/s11214-014-0109-8$
479	Vasyliunas, V. M. (1975, February). Theoretical models of magnetic field line merg-
480	ing, 1. Reviews of Geophysics and Space Physics, 13, 303-336. doi: 10.1029/
481	RG013i001p00303
482	Yamada, M., Kulsrud, R., & Ji, H. (2010, Mar). Magnetic reconnection. Rev. Mod.
483	<i>Phys.</i> , $82$ , $603-664$ . doi: 10.1103/RevModPhys.82.603
484	Zenitani, S., Hesse, M., Klimas, A., & Kuznetsova, M. (2011, May). New measure of
485	the dissipation region in collisionless magnetic reconnection. Phys. Rev. Lett.,
486	106, 195003.

- <sup>487</sup> Zhou, M., Deng, X. H., Zhong, Z. H., Pang, Y., Tang, R. X., El-Alaoui, M., ...
- Lindqvist, P.-A. (2019, jan). Observations of an electron diffusion region in symmetric reconnection with weak guide field. *The Astrophysical Journal*,
- 489 symmetric reconnection with weak guide fiel 490 870(1), 34. doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/aaf16f

Figure 1.

Aspect Ratio Uncertainity



Cut of Aspect Ratio Along MMS Trajectory



Figure 2.



Figure 3.



