

Interactive comment on “Worldwide atmospheric mercury measurements: a review and synthesis of spatial and temporal trends” by F. Sprovieri et al.

F. Sprovieri et al.

f.sprovieri@cs.iaa.cnr.it

Received and published: 13 May 2010

Anonymous Referee # 1: I find this review of atmospheric mercury data to be useful. With the inclusion of data in references suggested by Dr. Feng, worldwide spatial trends will have been well covered. Please add concentrations to Sections 2.3.5 and 2.3.6 to promote consistency throughout the paper. However, it seems to me that temporal trends should be discussed more. I also think that a broad overview of the spatial and temporal trends should be provided in the conclusion to pull together all the information from the individual sectors. The English is understandable, but could be much improved. Simply cutting many of the sentences in half would be a great improvement.

Response to Anonymous Referee # 1: Referee # 1: I find this review of atmospheric C2617

mercury data to be useful. With the inclusion of data in references suggested by Dr. Feng, worldwide spatial trends will have been well covered.

Response: The section 2.7 has been revised including the recent Hg measurements carried out in China following the suggestions provided by Dr. Feng. Please, see revised Section 2.7.

Referee # 1: Please add concentrations to Sections 2.3.5 and 2.3.6 to promote consistency throughout the paper.

Response: Both the Sections (2.3.5 and 2.3.6) have been integrated with Hg concentrations observed by the cited authors. Please, see the sections 2.3.5 (North Sea) and 2.3.6 (Baltic Sea). Referee # 1: However, it seems to me that temporal trends should be discussed more. I also think that a broad overview of the spatial and temporal trends should be provided in the conclusion to pull together all the information from the individual sectors.

Response: The Section 3 (Conclusions and research needs) has been revised and integrated following the reviewer's suggestions. Please, see the section 3 “Conclusions and research needs”.

Referee # 1: The English is understandable, but could be much improved. Simply cutting many of the sentences in half would be a great improvement.

Response: The English has been improved extensively.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:
<http://www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/10/C2617/2010/acpd-10-C2617-2010-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 10, 1261, 2010.