Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.,
doi:10.5194/acp-2016-528-RC2, 2016

Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions

Interactive comment on "Development and Testing of a Passive Sampler for Measurement of Gaseous Mercury" *by* Ingvar Wängberg et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 12 July 2016

The manuscript sounds as in interesting study about the potentials of a kind of passive sampler used to adsorb elemental mercury from the atmosphere. Unfortunately the lack of data about the structure of the passive sampler, any description about the strategy of exposure, any time-relationship with Hg absorption, make the study unclear and unattractive from a scientific point of view, unless of providing more details.

a) Each detailed information reported in Introduction (p1, r20-r33, p2. R1-3) should be linked to proper literature reference. The cited link (p.2, r3 http://www.amap.no/) refers to a generic webpage.

b) Citations McLagan et al. 1016 should be properly changed.

c) A better description of the Hg passive sampler should be provided (r13-r14) together with the Figure 1 and the Figure caption, that are both very sparing of details.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

d) Additional information should be provided about the Hg sampling (exposure), the shape and volume of the container.

e) (P5. R1-2). "The reproducibility of the mercury analysis was tested by performing double analysis which yielded an average reproducibility of 2 %". About such a sentence, would the authors better clarify what they mean when they talk about the reproducibility (of 2%) of the mercury analysis?

f) Final results should be more clearly described (p.5 r12-13). Authors never dealt with the relationship between the Hg adsorption and the time of exposure. Could they provide any information about this parameter?

g) What about the passive sampler saturation?

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., doi:10.5194/acp-2016-528, 2016.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper