

I appreciate the authors for considering my original comments and explaining proposed revisions. The proposed revisions for the Swarm data interpretation, data availability, and the minor comments seem appropriate. However, I'm not convinced by the responses about the comments on the prior work and the field-aligned structures. My follow-up comments are described below:

(1)

*> all events discussed by Partamies et al. (2025) are dayside cases observed at Svalbard*

This is not entirely true because their event in Figure 14c is on the nightside (19 MLT). Figure 14c shows picket fence-like emissions.

I'm not sure why Svalbard vs. Scandinavia can claim the uniqueness of the paper. Both papers show observations near the poleward edge of the auroral oval, providing a similar geophysical context. The latitude is different, but the oval location changes with magnetic activity.

Considering these, I still urge that the observations by Partamies et al. (2025) should be introduced and acknowledged. Although the point of your paper is the nightside observations, the common nature of the emissions near the poleward edge of the oval should be stated clearly.

(2)

*> In contrast, for Event 1, we consider that the structures are essentially field-aligned. We did not extract only those FAEs that happened to align within randomly extended structures; rather, the sequence shows orientations parallel to the local field in general... As you noted, some FAEs in individual snapshots do not appear perfectly parallel to the model field lines. However, when following the sequence, as the FAEs propagate from west to east, their orientation tracks the change in the model field-line inclination across the FoV*

I don't think that revised Figure 5 demonstrates this point. I have copied my markups to revised Figure 5 (see the PDF version of the comment). My previous comment pointed out that a significant part of the picket fence is not field aligned, and this version of the figure still shows the same issue. Although I agree that the orientation tracks the changes of field line orientation overall, the misalignment of a significant part of the picket fence does not support the conclusion that the picket fence for Event 1 is field-aligned.

