

Interactive comment on “How relevant is the deposition of mercury onto snowpacks? – Part 2: A modeling study” by D. Durnford et al.

D. Durnford et al.

dorothy.durnford@ec.gc.ca

Received and published: 28 September 2012

Re: acp-2011-996

How relevant is the deposition of mercury onto snowpacks? – Part 2: A modeling study by D. Durnford et al.

Response to Reviewer 2

Comments/suggested edits:

P 2648 line 20: define GEM before using the term

Done: Abstract, lines 48-49.

p 2650 lines 16-19: This sentence would be less awkward if ‘whether in association C7568

with AMDEs or not’ was moved to after ‘partially revolatilized’

The sentence was reworked: Introduction, lines 97-105 in the paragraph beginning “To date”.

p 2651-2653. I find the descriptions of previous modeling disrupted by the description of this “three-part study” which is made up of one prior publication and then this and a sister publication (Part 1). The statements about how prior models were ‘simplistic’ (p2651 line 8), or not ‘anywhere near its full complexity’ (p2651 line 22) seem to beg for the explanation of what is complex about mercury processes in snowpack, which to a certain extent is a part of a prior body of knowledge, whether or not that was the first part of a longer study (Durnford and Dastoor, 2011). This section would be more straightforward if the Durnford and Dastoor 2011 publication were treated as part of the literature review. Then the authors can introduce the companion paper to this one (Part 1) without talking about a three part study with one published work and two companion papers and the language of “We” (p2651 line 23) and “They” (p2651 line 26) which seems unnecessarily complicated.

The Introduction was reworked following these suggestions.

P 2675 lines 12-16. In your description of ‘yearly accumulation’ could you explain some processes that would be included in this calculation that are not included in net deposition? An example or two would help distinguish between accumulation and deposition

New text was added in Sect. 3.3.2, lines 831-835.

Figures: Figure 3: This figure seems difficult to read except in pdf. I would suggest moving ‘as observed (red)’ to directly before the descriptors of the simulations.

The caption for Fig. 3 has been reworked.

Figure 4. I don’t understand what the individual columns are. Are they individual years? You don’t use the a) b) c) labels in the caption and that will be helpful in identifying the

multiple graphs.

The caption for Fig. 4 has been reworked.

Figure 6. Include the descriptors a) b) c). . . in your caption for clarity.

Done.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 12, 2647, 2012.

C7570