Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 9, C8270–C8271, 2009
www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/9/C8270/2009/

Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions

Interactive comment on "Source apportionment of mercury in dust fallout at urban residential area of Central India" *by* S. Pervez et al.

A. Urba (Referee)

urba@ktl.mii.lt

Received and published: 12 December 2009

It appears that an important and comprehensive investigation has been done, in particular heaving in mind the revealed alarmingly high dust and Hg deposition rates.

However, description of this investigation still lacks some clarity and accuracy in many instances. The English lacks accuracy even more. For example, the word "regression" is occasionally spelled as "regession" and even as "regration" (in the titles of the figures) and there is a lot of other small language errors.

The employment of non-system measurement units and their unusual abbreviations is a bit confusing too. For example, "m" stands for "month" and not for "metre" in this paper. Why not to use the SI system?

The provided site maps (Figure 1 and 2) are of rather poor quality and seem to lack some important information to enable to read them. For example, looking at the map on Figure 2, "Wind channels over the Raipur", I failed to link the wind map to the map of source and receptor sites (Figure 1). Map scales have not been provided either.

Moreover, the "map of source and receptor sites" has clearly labeled only three sites (S-1, S-2 and R-1), while the paper has mentioned site codes from S-1 to S-6 and from R-1 to R-3, nine sites in total. The map only provides some additional geographical names. The "Table 1" is given for the detailed site descriptions, but the table does not link the site codes to their geographical names. The manuscript text occasionally mentions the site codes and occasionally mentions their geographical names. May be it could be clear for a local citizen, but for a foreigner it could be extremely difficult to get familiar to the local geography and location of the sites. Moreover, none of the important suspected pollution sources has been identified on the maps.

I recommend therefore that better quality maps and more detailed description and analysis of the local geography could be provided.

After improving the description and language as mentioned above, I suggest that the paper can be accepted.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 9, 21915, 2009.