

Interactive comment on “Overview of mercury measurements in the Antarctic troposphere” by A. Dommergue et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 7 January 2010

Review comments After going through the paper, following are the review comments for “Overview of mercury measurements in the Antarctic troposphere” by Dommergue et al. submitted for publication in Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Journal. In summary, the overview of discussion presented in the paper is interesting. Minor revision is suggested before potential publication.

Comments: Some terms have been abbreviated several times (eg. “GEM” in Page 26674, 26675, 26677, Line 4), these are to be avoided.

Page 26674, Line 20: “The following article is a current state of Hg measurements in the Antarctic troposphere.” Which article?? Make it clear.

Page 26674, Line 17: “Elemental gaseous mercury (GEM)”. Is not the gaseous ele-

C9386

mental mercury (GEM) the proper representation?

Page 26676, Line 10: To be corrected as “The role of the Antarctic continent and its influence on the global geochemical cycle of mercury is unclear today, and is certainly evaluated by current models (Selin et al., 2007).”

Page 26677: Should “2.1 Methods be present here under “Results and discussion” or in the “Methodology” section separately?

Page 26677, Line 6: Use of verb is confusing, please make it clear “GEM is maybe the only gaseous Hg component. ...”

Page 26684: The title “Tropospheric reactivity in the Antarctic vs. the Arctic” be better “Tropospheric reactivity of mercury in the Antarctic vs. the Arctic”

Table 1: “BDL: concentrations below detection limit” is not sufficient, provide the detection limit value. “Please update, if possible.”??

I suggest authors to provide additional information on the areas needing further research.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 9, 26673, 2009.

C9387