

Interactive comment on “Chemical cycling and deposition of atmospheric mercury in Polar Regions: review of recent measurements and comparison with models” by H el ene Angot et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 25 July 2016

A few minor suggestions:

line 568: interesting that the models underestimate RGM since the KCl denuder collection method is thought to collect RGM with <100% efficiency. I did not immediately see that a reason for the discrepancy was given. Similar to results shown in Weiss-Penzias et al ACP 2015, Figure 5, where the GEOS-Chem model underpredicted a high RGM event at Desert Research Institute site in Nevada USA.

line 938: passive samplers are mentioned in too casual a way as a possible solution to obtaining year round RGM data. Have they been adequately tested to know their collection efficiencies and potential biases? This is mentioned in point number 2. Maybe combine points 1 and 2?

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



line 949: from how many sites in polar regions would snow samples need to be taken in order to have a better understanding of Hg wet and dry deposition?

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., doi:10.5194/acp-2016-509, 2016.

ACPD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

