

Interactive comment on “Sensitivity model study of regional mercury dispersion in the atmosphere”
by Christian N. Gencarelli et al.
Anonymous Referee #1
Received and published: 7 September 2016

The manuscript reports the model results of a number of carefully crafted sensitivity simulations under different scenarios of mercury emission inventory (AMAP and EDGAR) and chemical oxidation (O₃, OH and Br) of elemental mercury in air, using WRF/Chem-Hg and CMAQ-Hg. The model results and data interpretation are presented in a organized fashion; and the conclusions are useful for better understanding of the chemical transport of mercury at regional scale. There are a few minor points that can be explained in more detail. I recommend the manuscript be accepted for publication after clarifying the points or providing the discussion of the following:

P4L27. The authors claim that the deposition parametrisation does not have an effect on the ratio of simulate dry to wet deposition. This is somewhat surprising and should be clarified.

We think the referee may have misread the sentence, “The differences in deposition parametrisations does have an effect on the ratio of dry to wet Hg deposition however.” We purposefully used “does have” rather than “has” in order to emphasize the fact that the dry to wet deposition ratio changes, as is clearly stated in the sentence that follows, “While dry and wet deposition are almost equal in the WRF simulations (wet 49%, dry 51%), the dry deposition in CMAQ is more than twice the wet (69% dry and 31% wet), see Table 3, Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 for details.”

We have therefore left the text unchanged.

Figure 5. The authors rank the ratios from high to low. Discussion should be provided regarding what causes the spatial difference should be provided.

This is an interesting suggestion. Unfortunately it was not possible to identify obvious spatial patterns, although in the stations located around the Baltic Sea a general overestimation of WD measurements by the model is noted.

Generally for GEM atmospheric concentrations there is a general underestimation in the WRF model simulations and an overestimation in CMAQ model simulations. For wet deposition values the CMAQ model tends overestimate the observations, especially in Scandinavia, England and at Longobucco. On the other hand the WRF model has different characteristics: in Scandinavia the observations are always overestimated when compared to the rest of the domain, in the BASE2 experiment the greatest overestimation occurs while in the ANTSPEC experiment there is a general underestimation almost everywhere (given the lack of RGM emissions it is not surprising that the deposition is lower in this experiment).

These comments were added to section 3.1. according

It appears that (1) the variability of simulated concentration does not match the variability of observed concentration, and (2) the simulated wet deposition grossly underestimate the observed values. (Figures 6 and 7). Discussion regarding the reasons should be provided.

(1) It is normal that the ratio is not equal between measurements and model values, otherwise the ratio should always be 1 (perfect agreement). But a fairly accurate agreement consists in having

the ratio within the range of uncertainty in the literature (dashed lines in figure 5: 30% for the GEM air concentrations, figure 5a, and factor 5 for wet deposition, figure 5b)

(2) Regarding the wet deposition in the estimation of these fluxes many more factors are involved (e.g. estimation of rainfall, coalescence efficiency), which increase the inaccuracies between observed and modeled values. In fact the literature range of the uncertainty is much larger.

With these suggestions the comments to Figure 5 have been expanded

It is somewhat disappointing that the authors paid little attention to the simulated concentration of gaseous oxidized mercury, considering the experiment on the oxidation mechanism of gaseous elemental mercury. Discussion around this topic is of scientific interest and should be provided.

We initially planned to only discuss the model results which in part can be compared with the observations. Considering that we do not have enough RGM measures to harmonize the discussion, we avoided including these results. However these results have been added in section 3.3 and the maps in figure 10 now show the average concentrations of modelled RGM for the main experiments (BASE, ANTSPEC and BASEc) and the ratio with respect to the sensitivity runs.

After such an expansive modelling assessment, the authors may want to provide a synthesized conclusion regarding regional model configuration (chemistry, emission, etc.) for atmospheric modelling.

A more extensive description of the models and the differences between them was added in Section 2.1, as suggested also by Referee #2.

Interactive comment on “Sensitivity model study of regional mercury dispersion in the atmosphere”
by Christian N. Gencarelli et al.
Anonymous Referee #2
Received and published: 8 September 2016

This paper presents the results of model sensitivity studies of anthropogenic emissions and oxidation chemistry on atmospheric concentrations and deposition of mercury over Europe. The model results of each study are evaluated against observations.

General comments:

- I recommend the paper for publication after the revisions suggested here, which are largely about adding more explanation of the sensitivity studies and results, including more connection of the results to the current state of knowledge in the field, and highlighting implications of the results.

- In general, the discussion can be hard to follow at times since only some of the results are presented in the figures but results from all sensitivity studies are discussed.

In the different sections only the figures regarding the sensitivity tests that were useful to compare with observations are shown. Otherwise the article would have been overly long.

- Every option for emissions inventories, chemistry schemes, etc. are presented as equally valid but it would be helpful to know what discussion has already been performed of these inventories/chemical mechanisms etc. to indicate the strengths and weaknesses of each and how this paper's results fit in. I think it is misleading to present Br and OH/O₃ oxidation mechanisms on equal footing, for example, but then the paper shows that Br oxidation alone best represents TGM results which adds further support to what previous studies have suggested.

Text added: “A summary of the simulations performed is shown in Table 1. Some of these tests have been studied for other regions (e.g. Travnikov et al. (2016) and Bieser et al. (2016)) while many other studies have investigated Hg oxidation by Ozone or Br (Hynes et al., 2009; Subir et al., 2011, 2012; Weiss-Penzias et al., 2014).”

So in this paper we are not trying to make a direct comparison between the two mechanisms, but simply an analysis of how much the atmospheric Hg cycle may change considering a single Hg oxidant. The above text was added in section 2.3.

- I think the paper would benefit from more clearly outlining the purpose of each of the sensitivity studies. It would also be beneficial to have the explanation of most sensitivity studies be more centralized – since some of the sensitivity studies are untrue hypotheticals (e.g., NOCHEM and NOANT) while others are testing different hypothesized physical processes (e.g., BRCHEM1 vs. BRCHEM2), but both types are valuable. There is some of this scattered throughout the results section, but I think it can be more explicit; e.g., ‘the ANTSPEC experiment, which assumes all anthropogenic emissions are as GEM, would represent a lower bound on deposition from local anthropogenic sources and an upper bound on long-range transport of anthropogenic emissions because GEM has a much longer lifetime against deposition than RGM/PBM’ or something to that effect.

Very useful suggestions. Section 2.3 was expanded adding this information (bullets of different experiments).

- Some background information is missing – e.g., the lifetime of GEM vs. RGM/PBM is not explained in the paper, or the sinks of GEM vs. RGM/PBM (dry deposition vs. wet deposition

affinities), making the results from the ANTSPEC simulations and others less easily understood. Some aspects of atmospheric mercury are missing from the discussion (e.g., reduction of Hg(II), uncertainty in present oxidized Hg measurement capabilities that would be relevant for the 2nd to last sentence of the paper).

This information has been added in the Introduction

Specific comments:

Section 2.1: There are a lot of details given here about the models but it is not clear how the model representations of Hg are different or how their differences would affect Hg results. It would be helpful to rewrite this a bit and make it more explicit whether/how the differences would affect Hg (e.g., if CMAQ is offline while WRF is online meteorology, the transport of Hg will be different to some degree between the models.)

A more extensive models description was added in Section 2.1

Page 4 line 2: it would be helpful to explain briefly here whether there are multiple heights in the EDGAR inventory, as it is written it is unclear what the difference is and this comes up later in the results section.

Text added: "They also have different emission height distributions: AMAP uses three height classes (0-50, 50-150 and above 150\,m) whereas EDGAR ranges into six classes (distributed between 0 and 800 metres, listed according with SNAP (Selected Nomenclature for Air Pollution) categories as used in De Simone et al. (2016)). The differences in the geographical distributions are shown in Fig. 2." The EDGAR anthropogenic ranges in six classes, distributed between 0 and 800 m, listed according with SNAP categories.

This was added in Section 2.2.

Section 2.3: It is unclear from the way the paper is written what the base model oxidation chemistry schemes include –is it OH, O₃ and Br oxidation at the same time in both CMAQ and WRF-Chem Hg? This should be made clear.

The sentence was modified to explain this point: "The BASE experiment refers to the model in the standard configuration, with AMAP anthropogenic emissions distributed according with the inventory guidelines." has been changed to "The BASE experiment refers to the model in the standard configuration, with AMAP anthropogenic emissions and Hg oxidation driven only by O₃ and OH for WRF/Chem-Hg and by O₃, OH, H₂O₂ and Cl₂ for CMAQ-Hg, as described in section 2.1".

Page 4 Lines 23-25: some of this would be helpful to mention in the model description section 2.1.

Sections 2.1 and 3 were modified following this suggestion.

Table 3: add a total deposition column, just makes it easier to follow

Table 3 was modified following this suggestion.

Figure 3: It is hard to compare the results between CMAQ and WRF-Chem Hg because the same model set ups do not line up. I think it is worth reordering the individual panels to lining up the ANTSPEC and ANTSPEC_C vertically, or NOCHEM with NOCHEM_C below it, etc. to make more obvious the comparisons made in Section 3 of the paper.

We are not sure that it is convenient to change the order of the figures. The maps should be read horizontally, with the first column (BASE, ANTSPE and BASEc) as a reference for the other maps.

Figure 4: This is total dry deposition of Hg(II)+Hg(0), correct? Just making sure since wet deposition is of course just Hg(II). I think this is worth mentioning as it also helps explain the changes in dry vs. wet deposition seen in the sensitivity studies.

No, it is just wet deposition flux, not the sum. Only the total dry (figure 3) and total wet (figure 4) deposition contributions are reported in the figures, to underline the results of tests. Total dry and total wet deposition are obtained as the sum of gaseous species and particulate deposition.

Figure 5a: there are two legend labels with “BASE”. I assume the green square is BASE2? Also, I would explain that the order of the sites is by the magnitude of the mod/obs ratio of the BASE simulation as it is not immediately obvious.

The legend of figure 5 was modified following this suggestion.

Page 5 Lines 20-23. It is counterintuitive to me how an overestimate relative to observations for the ANTSPEC sensitivity study where all anthropogenic emissions of RGM & PBM are as GEM means long-range transport is less important than regional emissions. I think more explanation would be helpful – so when PBM and RGM are emitted normally as in the BASE simulation, the model is no longer overestimating the observations because the Hg(II) is deposited fast enough before it reaches the CZ03 site? I suppose part of this is defining what is local vs. “regional” vs. long-range more clearly.

First, the definition of Local and Long-Range follows that of Gencarelli et al., 2015: Local are the sources of Hg inside the domain (anthropogenic emissions and evasion from the sea surface), Long-Range sources of Hg come from the boundary condition (external to domain). About the overestimate relative to observations for the ANTSPEC experiment, it concerns also the GEM air concentrations (I was wrong not to specify this), in fact the depositions in CZ03 station are lower in the ANTSPEC than the BASE experiment. Section 3.1 was modified following this suggestion.

Page 5 last paragraph (beginning line 29): do you have any hypotheses why TGM at ES08 is so low relative to the models?

From the modelling point of view of this study no clues have emerged to explain these low concentrations. The causes are probably attributable to the measurement technique or some unusual combination of local phenomena.

Page 6 Lines 1-2: The discussion of OHCHEM and NOANT experiments comes as a surprise as it is not in Figures 5, 6, or 7; more connection to the rest of the section is needed.

In order to include OHCHEM and NOANT to the rest of the discussion, the results of these experiments are reported in figure 5. It is not surprising that this sensitivity test yields very low concentrations in comparison with total deposition and overestimation with air concentrations.

Page 7 Lines 15-16: it is also not immediately obvious why dry deposition decreases so much more than wet deposition, since GEM is not wet deposited. Is it because even though there is higher GEM_{air} in the ANTSPEC experiment, it is dry deposited so much more slowly than the RGM/PBM species, or is it something about how RGM and PBM contribute different amounts to wet vs. dry dep of the oxidized species? Setting up the background on this in the intro or methods would be helpful.

This explanation has been added to section 3.2:

In the ANTSPEC experiment the deposition decreases in comparison to BASE, in particular the dry decreases more than the wet. % RGM and PBM deposit more rapidly than GEM and so deposit in proximity to their emission sources where the air concentrations are higher. Clearly dry deposition can occur at any time while wet deposition requires precipitation. With all Hg emissions releases treated as GEM in ANTSPEC the dry deposition decreases most as a result of the lack of direct emissions of RGM and PBM.

Page 7 lines 21-23: given that a no anthropogenic emissions scenario is currently untrue, I think something more insightful can be said about the results – e.g., something about how anthro. emissions contribute to 2/3 of total deposition (not counting the fact that “natural” emissions from soil/ocean as they are tuned in models also implicitly are impacted by legacy anthropogenic sources), or how a hypothetical policy scenario of shutting off emissions could have huge local benefits?

The final part of section 3.2 was modified according to this suggestion and the results of Pacyna et al., 2016, that describes the results of modelling studies using GMOS project scenarios to assess Hg concentration and deposition fields, for present (2013) and future anthropogenic (2035) Hg emissions.

Section 3.3 paragraph 2 (pg 7 lines 30-32): I would emphasize that this shows a significant proportion (exact percent varying on the model) of total Hg deposition to ecosystems is coming from the oxidation of GEM which can be transported from far distances as opposed to the Hg(II) locally emitted. This is an interesting result with policy implications and could be highlighted more.

Section 3.3 and the conclusion have been modified according with this very useful suggestion.

Page 8 lines 3-4: “A number of studies have shown the importance of O₃, and the OH radical, and also reactive halogen compounds. . .”: I understand that there have been review papers discussing the intricacies of this and you don’t want to repeat that here, but it is overly simple to group all three oxidants together and not mention that studies have found that the homogeneous gas-phase oxidation of Hg(0) by O₃ and OH are thermodynamically and/or kinetically impossible (e.g., Hynes et al. (2009), Goodsite et al. (2004), Calvert and Lindberg, 2005). I think it is still interesting to compare the results from the three species, but it needs to be introduced with a bit more nuance. Moreover, as Theodore Dibble posted in his comment, there are additional HgBr+X second-step oxidation reactions that can greatly increase the total Hg(II) production and deposition through the Br-initiated pathway. Somewhere in the paper there should be a discussion of how this would affect the results presented – e.g., Hg deposition in the BRCHEM1 and 2 sensitivity simulations would be increased and TGM would be decreased.

The section 3.3 was modified according with this suggestion.

Page 9 Lines 1-8: it is hard to understand the differences in the two Br concentration fields from the description given – would it be possible to show (perhaps in the supplemental) a difference plot of the Br concentrations over the Europe domain? (e.g., zonal mean latitude on x-axis vs. altitude on y-axis or something like that). Most GEM oxidation is not occurring in the PBL but in the free and upper troposphere (because of Br distribution and the temperature dependence of the oxidation reactions), so it is not surprising that the huge differences in Br in the PBL between the two Br fields doesn’t impact on Hg(II) deposition; I am more interested in the differences at higher altitudes.

To supplement the information about Bromine concentrations the vertical longitudinal profiles of the annual mean concentrations were added in section 3.3. The main differences between the two inputs are in the first 3 km and in the range 12-15 km, as shown in the new version of section 3.3.

Page 9 Lines 13-16: I think it is essential to connect this to available observations of Br. The Shah et al. study tripled bromine concentrations of the GEOS-Chem Parrella et al. 2012 model which was consistent with observations of BrO during the NOMADSS field campaign (Gratz et al., 2015). Parrella et al. (2012) showed previously that BrO was underestimated in GEOS-Chem by 30% in the global mean against satellite observations. So it is not just a model exercise but shows that higher Br in GEOS-Chem (closer to reality but not quite there) is also closer to reality for Hg model results. But in addition – since anthropogenic Hg(II) emissions have been turned to GEM in reality there would be more deposition with just Hg+Br oxidation and anthropogenic emissions of RGM/PBM turned on. This makes me curious about the Hg(II) reduction mechanisms in CMAQ vs. WRF-Chem Hg – if this was included, was it treated the same in all sensitivity simulations? I think reduction needs to be discussed somewhere in the paper.

The last part of section 3.3 was modified in accordance with this useful suggestion.

additional references cited here:

Calvert, J. G., and S. E. Lindberg (2005), Mechanisms of mercury removal by O₃ and OH in the atmosphere, *Atmospheric Environment*, 39(18), 3355-3367, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2005.01.055.

Goodsite, M., J. Plane, and H. Skov (2004), A theoretical study of the oxidation of Hg⁰ to HgBr₂ in the troposphere, *Environmental Science & Technology*, 38(6), 1772-1776, doi:10.1021/es034680s.

Gratz, L. E., Ambrose, J. L., Jaffe, D. A., Shah, V., Jaeglé, L., Stutz, J., Festa, J., Spolaor, M., Tsai, C., Selin, N. E., Song, S., Zhou, X., Weinheimer, A. J., Knapp, D. J., Montzka, D. D., Flocke, F. M., Campos, T. L., Apel, E., Hornbrook, R., Blake, N. J., Hall, S., Tyndall, G. S., Reeves, M., Stechman, D., and Stell, M.: Oxidation of mercury by bromine in the subtropical Pacific free troposphere, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 42, 10494–10502, doi:10.1002/2015GL066645, 2015a.

Hynes, A. J., D. L. Donohoue, M. E. Goodsite, and I. M. Hedgecock (2009), Our Current Understanding of Major Chemical and Physical Processes Affecting Mercury Dynamics in the Atmosphere and At the Air-Water/Terrestrial Interfaces, in *Mercury Fate and Transport in the Global Atmosphere*, edited by N. Pirrone and R. Mason, pp. 427-457, Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, doi:10.1007/978-0-387-93958-2_14.

Sensitivity model study of regional mercury dispersion in the atmosphere

Christian N. Gencarelli¹, Johannes Bieser^{2,3}, Francesco Carbone¹, Francesco De Simone¹, Ian M. Hedgecock¹, Volker Matthias², Oleg Travnikov⁴, Xin Yang⁵, and Nicola Pirrone⁶

¹CNR-Institute of Atmospheric Pollution Research, Division of Rende, Rende, Italy

²Institute of Coastal Research, Helmholtz-Zentrum Geesthacht, Geesthacht, Germany

³National Aeronautics and Space Center (DLR), Oberpfaffenhofen, Weßling, Germany

⁴Meteorological Synthesizing Centre, East of EMEP, 2nd Roshchinsky proezd, 8/5, 115419 Moscow, Russia

⁵British Antarctic Survey, Cambridge, United Kingdom

⁶CNR-Institute of Atmospheric Pollution Research, Monterotondo, Rome, Italy

Correspondence to: C. N. Gencarelli (christian.gencarelli@iia.cnr.it)

Abstract. Atmospheric deposition is the most important pathway by which Hg reaches marine ecosystems, where it can be methylated and enter the base of food chain. The deposition, the transport and chemical interactions of atmospheric Hg has been simulated over Europe for the year 2013 in the framework of the Global Mercury Observation System (GMOS) project, performing 14 different model sensitivity tests using two high resolution three-dimensional Chemical Transport Models (CTMs), varying the anthropogenic emissions data sets, atmospheric Br input fields, the Hg oxidation schemes and the modelling domain boundary condition input. Sensitivity simulation results were compared with observations from 28 monitoring sites in Europe, to assess model performance and particularly to analyse the influence of anthropogenic emission speciation and the Hg_(g)⁰ atmospheric oxidation mechanism. The contribution of anthropogenic Hg emissions, their speciation and vertical distribution is crucial to the simulated concentration and deposition fields, as is also the choice of Hg_(g)⁰ oxidation pathway. The areas most sensitive to changes in Hg emission speciation and the emission vertical distribution are those near major sources, but also the Aegean and the Black Seas, the English Channel, the Skagerrak Strait and the North German coast. Considerable influence was found also evident over the Mediterranean, the North and Baltic Sea, some influence is seen over continental Europe, while this difference is least over the north-western part of the modelling domain, which includes the Norwegian Sea and Iceland. The Br oxidation pathway produces more Hg_(g)^{II} in the lower model levels, but overall wet deposition is lower in comparison to the simulations which employ an O₃/OH oxidation mechanism. The necessity to perform continuous measurements of speciated Hg, to investigate the local impacts of Hg emissions and deposition, as well as interactions dependent on land use and vegetation, forests, peat bogs etc. is highlighted in this study.

1 Introduction

Mercury (Hg) is a toxic element, present on Earth in different environmental compartments. Due to its chemical and physical properties Hg is a global pollutant, and in its monomethyl form hazardous to human and wildlife health. The main human methylmercury exposure pathway is through piscivorous fish consumption. Soluble inorganic Hg^{II} compounds can be methy-

lated in the marine environment and enter the base of the food chain (Chen et al., 2016; Žagar et al., 2013; Oken et al., 2012; Storelli et al., 2010). Hg exists in atmosphere as Gaseous Elemental Mercury (GEM, Hg^0), Reactive Gaseous Mercury (RGM, $\text{Hg}_{(\text{g})}^{\text{II}}$) and Particulate Bound Mercury (PBM, $\text{Hg}^{(\text{p})}$). The term RGM describe all forms of Hg sampled using a KCl-coated denuder and analysed by CVAAFS (Landis et al., 2002; Gustin et al., 2015), the exact chemical nature of these
5 compounds is still not known. There is also still some debate also over the oxidation and reduction mechanisms that occur in the atmosphere (Subir et al., 2011; Gustin et al., 2015). RGM is much less volatile and more water soluble than GEM, and thus is readily transferred to aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems by dry and wet deposition processes. Moreover, GEM concentrations in some regions are linked to large scale climatological phenomena (Carbone et al., 2016).

Since European Hg riverine discharges have been reduced greatly since the '70s, atmospheric deposition has become the
10 most important source of Hg in the marine ecosystems.

In order to support the recent Minamata convention (<http://www.mercuryconvention.org/>), the GMOS (Global Mercury Observation System, <http://www.gmos.eu/>) project has set up a global Hg observation network, with the aim to work alongside existing networks for Europe, USA and Asia. The data obtained by GMOS has made it possible to fill in some of the gaps left by regional networks, by performing measurements in places which have until now not been studied, especially in the South-
15 ern hemisphere. In Europe the GMOS network has complemented the EMEP regional network with special measurements, such as the Med-Oceanor oceanographic campaigns in the Mediterranean Marine Boundary Layer (MBL, Gencarelli et al. (2014b); Sprovieri et al. (2010)) the ETMEP (European Tropospheric Mercury Experiment) series of Tropospheric measurements (Weigelt et al., 2016) and the fixed station at Longobucco, in the South of Italy (Sprovieri et al., 2016b). This station is currently the southernmost in Europe, and is in the centre of the Mediterranean Sea region. Compared to the north of Europe
20 however southern and eastern Europe still have a lack of monitoring stations. Within GMOS global CTMs have been used to evaluate the intercontinental transport of anthropogenic Hg (De Simone et al., 2016), analysed different future Hg emission scenarios (Pacyna et al., 2016), source-receptor relationships (Travnikov et al., 2010) and Hg cycle in the Polar regions (Angot et al., 2016). Regional scale models have been used for a closer study of the processes that occur in specific areas at much higher spatial resolution than the global CTMs (Gencarelli et al., 2015; Bieser et al., 2014). In a recent review Ariya et al.
25 (2015) gives a exhaustive summary of modelling progress and of the uncertainties still present concerning the atmospheric Hg cycle. To date only a limited number of model to model intercomparisons have been carried out (for the U.S. (Bullock et al., 2008, 2009; Zhang et al., 2012), for Europe (Ryaboshapko et al., 2007a, b), and for global models (Travnikov et al., 2010, 2016; AMAP/UNEP, 2013b)), where it was found that are often significant differences in Hg concentrations and deposition estimated by different models. Previous European studies (Ryaboshapko et al., 2007a, b) performed a model intercomparison
30 for the year 1999, using 8 different models and data from 11 measurement stations with the aim to characterise the ability of CTMs to predict atmospheric Hg concentration and deposition fields.

The aim of this work is to analyse the influence of different processes affecting atmospheric Hg and quantify some of the uncertainties present in the regional Hg cycle (highlighted in the aforementioned model comparisons), in particular anthropogenic emissions speciation and the $\text{Hg}_{(\text{g})}^0$ atmospheric oxidation mechanism. The atmospheric Hg cycle has been simulated
35 over Europe for the year 2013, performing 14 different model sensitivity tests using the WRF/Chem-Hg model for the most

part. A number of further investigations were also performed using the CMAQ-Hg model, to gain an insight into model-to-model variation. The model sensitivity tests were conducted using different anthropogenic emission datasets, Br concentration input fields, Hg oxidation schemes and global CTMs to provide boundary condition input. The [..¹]experimental results were compared with observations from 28 monitoring sites in Europe (23 from the EMEP network, 4 from the EMEP/GMOS network including the Longobucco station of the GMOS network), in order to validate model performance and investigate the influences of anthropogenic emission speciation and the Hg_(g)⁰ atmospheric oxidation mechanism. A more detailed screening for some selected stations was performed, in order to investigate some anomalies in the sensitivity model results. The work presented here was performed in the framework of the GMOS Mercury Modelling Task Force (MMTF, Travnikov et al. (2016)).

10 2 Methods

2.1 Models description and setup

The models used in this analysis both use a Lambert Conformal model domain covering Europe and the Mediterranean Sea, including part of the western North Atlantic Ocean, North Africa and the Middle East (see Fig. 1) with a horizontal resolution of 24 × 24 km, and 30 vertical levels. The online WRF/Chem-Hg model (Gencarelli et al., 2014a) is a modified version of the WRF/Chem model (version 3.4 [..²] [..³] Grell et al. (2005)) which includes emissions, transport, atmospheric chemistry and deposition of Hg.

The Hg emissions in the model include online GEM evasion from the sea surface (based on the parametrisation of Wanninkhof (1992) and the methodology of Gårdfeldt et al. (2003), with Dissolved Gaseous Mercury concentrations of 150 fmol l⁻¹) and anthropogenic emissions from the AMAP (AMAP/UNEP, 2013a) and EDGAR (Muntean et al., 2014) inventories (see section 2.2). The gas phase chemistry of Hg and a parametrised representation of atmospheric Hg aqueous chemistry have been added to the RADM2 chemical mechanism using KPP (Sandu and Sander, 2006) and the WKC coupler (Salzmann and Lawrence, 2006), [..⁴] while the atmospheric physics and transport are solved by the WRF model core using the parametrisations described in Gencarelli et al. (2014a). Hg [..⁵] dry deposition is treated according to the approach developed by Wesely (1989) and calculated as described in Lin et al. (2006). Wet deposition (in-cloud and below-cloud scavenging) of Hg species has been implemented by adapting an already available module in WRF/Chem, based on the approach described by Neu and Prather (2012). Chemical Initial and Boundary Conditions (IC/BC) were taken from the ECHMERIT model [..⁶] Jung et al. (2009); De Simone et al. (2014, 2015, 2016) for Hg species, while boundary conditions for other chemical species were taken from MOZART-4 (Emmons et al., 2010).

¹removed: experiemntal

²removed: (Grell et al., 2005) which includes

³removed: emissions(anthropogenic and natural)

⁴removed: see Gencarelli et al. (2014a)for further details regarding

⁵removed: parametrisations and the physics options employed.

⁶removed: (Jung et al., 2009; De Simone et al., 2014)

The second model used is CMAQ-Hg (version 5.0.1), based on CMAQ (Byun et al., 1999) and modified by Bullock and Brehme (2002) and Gbor et al. (2006) to include chemistry, transport and deposition of GEM, GOM and PBM. This model was compiled with the multi-pollutant version of the CBM5 photochemical mechanism [..⁷](Sarwar et al., 2008) (which includes Hg gaseous reactions with O₃, OH, H₂O₂ and Cl₂ as described by Lin and Tao (2003)) with the Euler Backward
5 Iterative solver and the AERO4 aerosol mechanism (Binkowski and Roselle, 2003). [..⁸]The CMAQ-Hg model uses offline meteorological fields provided by the COSMO-CLM model (Rockel et al., 2008)[..⁹], processed by the Meteorology-Chemistry Interface Processor (MCIP v3.6). The same MCIP to calculate the dry deposition velocities of GEM and GOM. During the offline simulations cloud processes, including cloud attenuation of photolysis rates, convective and non-convective mixing and scavenging by clouds, aqueous-phase chemistry, and wet deposition were calculated as described
10 in Liu and Zhang (2013). The chemical IC/BC were taken from [..¹⁰]the GLEMOS model (Travnikov et al., 2009). For further details on the models see Gencarelli et al. (2014a, 2015) for WRF/Chem-Hg and Bieser et al. (2014); Zhu et al. (2015) for CMAQ-Hg.

The main difference between the two models is in the feedback between chemical and meteorological dynamics: while in CMAQ the meteorological fields are provided as input (offline model), in WRF they are solved simultaneously with
15 the chemistry, in the same time step (online model). Other major differences concern the parametrisations of some of the processes, for instance, GEM dry deposition, convective precipitation and GEM evasion from the sea surface (see Gencarelli et al. (2015) and Bieser et al. (2014) for details). Other differences result from the use of different BC sets and meteorological input.

Oxidation of Hg by bromine was implemented in some of the WRF experiments, using the off-line [..¹¹]Br fields obtained
20 from the p-TOMCAT (Yang et al., 2005, 2010) and GEOSCHEM (Parrella et al., 2012) models.

2.2 Modelled emissions

In order to analyse the effects of anthropogenic emissions speciation, amount and vertical distribution, the input from the two recent global anthropogenic Hg emission inventories were interpolated over the model grids and used in the sensitivity simulations.

25 The AMAP/UNEP 2010 (hereafter AMAP) inventory is available at a spatial resolution of 0.5° by 0.5° (AMAP/UNEP, 2013b), while the EDGARv4.tox1 2008 (hereafter EDGAR) has a spatial resolution of 0.1° by 0.1° (Muntean et al., 2014). Over the modelling domain the inventories differ in both emission totals and speciation ratio GEM[..¹²][..¹³]:RGM:PBM as:

– 136.2 Mg y⁻¹ with GEM:RGM:PBM ratio 65:28:7 for AMAP, and

⁷removed: with updated chlorine and toluene chemistry (cb05tump) with on-line photolysis and the aero6 aerosol module. (see (Bieser et al., 2014; Zhu et al., 2015) for further details)

⁸removed: CMAQ model is an off-line model, with meteorology fields obtained from

⁹removed: . The chemical initial and boundary conditions

¹⁰removed: base

¹¹removed: Br

¹²removed: (Gaseous Elemental Mercury), RGM(Reactive Gaseous Mercury,

¹³removed:), PBM (Particulate Bound Mercury)

- 123.8 Mg y⁻¹ with 60:32:8 for EDGAR.

They also have different emission height distributions: AMAP uses three height classes (0-50, 50-150 and above 150 m) whereas EDGAR [..¹⁴] ranges into six classes (distributed between 0 and 800 metres, listed according with SNAP (Selected Nomenclature for Air Pollution) categories as used in De Simone et al. (2016)). The differences in the geographical distributions are shown in Fig. 2.

2.3 Simulations performed

Simulations were performed varying the emissions speciation, the atmospheric Hg oxidation mechanism, the bromine concentration field and the atmospheric process parametrisation. A total of 14 (9 with WRF and 5 with CMAQ) 12-month model simulations were conducted, as reported in Table 1, where experiments conducted using CMAQ are indicated by a *C* subscript.

10 The [..¹⁵] specific scopes of every particular experiment as:

- BASE – base case test, used as reference experiment. It refers to the model in the standard configuration, with AMAP anthropogenic emissions [..¹⁶] and Hg oxidation driven only by O₃ and OH for WRF/Chem-Hg and by O₃, OH, H₂O₂ and Cl₂ for CMAQ-Hg, as described in section 2.1.
- BASE2 – similar to BASE experiment, with the [..¹⁷] only change of Hg anthropogenic emission used. In fact in this case EDGAR Hg emissions are used.
- NOANT – hypothetical scenario, where all anthropogenic emissions are turned off, in order to [..¹⁸] [..¹⁹] [..²⁰] highlight the influence of long-range transport on European areas. The same chemical mechanism of BASE experiment is used.
- NOCHEM - hypothetical scenario, where the chemical [..²¹] [..²²] [..²³] reactions of Hg are turned off. In this way there are not conversion of GEM in RGM, that imply a different distribution of Hg deposition respect the BASE experiment.
- ANTSPEC – hypothetical experiment where all Hg emissions are treated as GEM. With this experiment RGM and PBM emission are turned off, and considering the different chemical and physical properties respect the GEM the

¹⁴removed: lists

¹⁵removed: BASE experiment

¹⁶removed: distributed according with the inventory guidelines. In the ANTSPEC experiment the RGM and PBM emissions are treated as GEM

¹⁷removed: aim to keep the total emissions constant and analyse the effects of emission speciation. In the NOANT experiment anthropogenic emissions were not included

¹⁸removed: estimate their effects, while to analyse the effects of oxidation mechanisms the atmospheric

¹⁹removed: chemical reactions were excluded in the NOCHEM simulation. Simulations based on ANTSPEC were performed with a single

²⁰removed: chemical reaction in the

²¹removed: mechanism, to assess the effects and feasibility of

²²removed: reactions with

²³removed: ,

deposition can occur in far place respect the emission points. It would represent a lower bound on deposition from local anthropogenic sources and an upper bound on long-range transport of anthropogenic emissions because GEM has a much longer lifetime against deposition than RGM and PBM.

- 5 – O3CHEM/OHCHEM/BRCHEM1/BRCHEM2 - hypothetical experiments where only a singular reaction of Hg atmospheric was activated (only O₃, OH and Br [..²⁴] respectively). The HgBr + OH rate constant is taken from the assumptions made in Holmes et al. (2010) (Global atmospheric model for mercury including oxidation by bromine atoms, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 10, 12037–12057). These sensitivity tests are not a direct comparison between the chemical mechanisms, but are an analysis of how much the atmospheric system change considering an singular Hg oxidant. The difference between BRCHEM1 and BRCHEM2 regard only the answer of the system at the change
10 of amount of Br in the atmosphere.

A summary of the simulations performed is shown in Table 1. Some of these tests have been studied for other regions (e.g. Travnikov et al. (2016) and Bieser et al. (2016)) while many other studies have investigated Hg oxidation by Ozone or Br (Hynes et al., 2009; Subir et al., 2011, 2012; Weiss-Penzias et al., 2014).

2.4 Measurement networks

- 15 Model results have been compared with observations of Total Gaseous Mercury (TGM, Hg_(g)⁰ + Hg_(g)^{II}) and Hg wet deposition from 28 EMEP and GMOS measurement sites as shown in Table 2. Of these, 13 measured both TGM air concentrations and Hg in precipitation, 4 measured only TGM and 11 only Hg in precipitation (Fig. 1). Comparison was made between monthly averaged values of TGM observations and monthly Hg in precipitation (Aas and Bohlin-Nizzetto, 2015; D'Amore et al., 2015). Monthly averages were used because the measurement frequency was not the same at all the sites.

20 3 Results

- The principal differences between the models used concern the parametrisations of some of the processes, for instance, GEM dry deposition, convective precipitation and GEM evasion from the sea surface (see Gencarelli et al. (2015) and Bieser et al. (2014) for details). Other differences result from the use of different BC sets and meteorological input. Despite these differences, the base cases (BASE and BASE_C) give similar Hg deposition totals of 219 Mg y⁻¹ in the WRF BASE and 208 Mg y⁻¹
25 in the CMAQ BASE_C experiments ([..²⁵]table 3). The differences in deposition parametrisations does have an effect on the ratio of dry to wet Hg deposition however. While dry and wet deposition are almost equal in the WRF simulations (wet 49%, dry 51%), the dry deposition in CMAQ is more than twice the wet (69% dry and 31% wet), see [..²⁶]table 3 and figures 3 and [..²⁷]4 for details. There are major differences in the spatial distribution of the Hg deposition, wet deposition in WRF is greater

²⁴removed: . The BASE2 experiment used the EDGAR emission inventory to assess the impact of the inventory choice on a regional scale.

²⁵removed: Table

²⁶removed: Table 3 , Fig.

²⁷removed: Fig.

over continental Europe, the North Sea and around Iceland, while in CMAQ deposition is highest over the Alps and along the Balkan coast. Although both models simulate higher dry deposition over land than the sea the distribution in CMAQ is more even than that simulated by WRF, which has quite distinct regions and hot spots of high deposition (Fig. 3).

5 3.1 Modelled and Observed Hg species comparison

The skill of the WRF/Chem-Hg and CMAQ-Hg model in reproducing the modelled Hg concentrations, deposition fluxes and precipitation fields has been described in previous studies (see Gencarelli et al. (2015), Bieser et al. (2014) and references therein). Thus, the principal aim of this study is to analyse the performance of models in terms of validation of the sensitivity tests, also comparing the results of all the simulations performed with the available observations reported in Sect. 2.4.

10 Generally for GEM atmospheric concentrations there is a general underestimation in the WRF model simulations and an overestimation in CMAQ model simulations. For wet deposition values the CMAQ model tends overestimate the observations, especially in Scandinavia, England and at Longobucco. On the other hand the WRF model has different characteristics: in Scandinavia the observations are always overestimated when compared to the rest of the domain, in the BASE2 experiment the greatest overestimation occurs while in the ANTSPEC experiment there is a general under-
15 estimation almost everywhere (given the lack of RGM emissions it is not surprising that the deposition is lower in this experiment).

Overall the agreement of the comparison between base model (BASE, ANTSPEC, BASE_C, ANTSPEC_C and BASE2) results and observations obtained (both for TGM concentrations and Hg in wet deposition) at all stations are broadly in agreement with previous studies (e.g., Ryaboshapko et al. (2007b)). Comparing modelled and observed values of TGM concentrations the
20 ratio of annual pairs Model-Observation is within 30% in almost all stations for the BASE, ANTSPEC, BASE_C, ANTSPEC_C, and BASE2 experiments, while an obvious underestimation occurs in NOANT experiment (Fig. 5a). It is however interesting to look at cases where the model to observation ratio is different in order to highlight the differences which are found in the sensitivity tests and in different locations. In the central, DE03 (Schauinsland) and southern, DE08 (Schmücke), German stations, the BASE and BASE2 experiments underestimate the observed annual average TGM concentration by 1.75 and
25 1.65 ng m⁻³ respectively, while the ANTSPEC experiment shows better agreement. Contrarily the relatively nearby station at Kosetice (CZ03, a rural location in the Czech Republic) the TGM concentrations are overestimated in the ANTSPEC experiment, while the BASE and BASE2 simulations show good agreement. In this station an annual average of 1.24 ng m⁻³ was observed.

The DE03, DE08 and CZ03 sites are the most central European continental sites with available observations, and are
30 characterised by an elevated contribution from [..²⁸] local Hg emissions with respect to the contribution from long-range transport (Gencarelli et al., 2015). [..²⁹] In Gencarelli et al. (2015) local sources are those within the domain, including anthropogenic emissions and evasion from the sea surface, while long-range sources are those from the boundary

²⁸removed: regional

²⁹removed: The strongest regional influence

conditions obtained from the global model. The strongest influence of local emissions was found at the CZ03 station, as suggested by the large overestimation of GEM concentrations in the ANTSPEC experiment ($\simeq 37\%$, which instead was not the case in the BASE experiment).

This is due to the emissions from Chlor-alkali plants, which are still important sources in some parts of central Europe (Wang et al., 2012), while the different behavior seen at DE03 and DE08 is most likely due to a local emission process or processes, possibly of non-anthropogenic origin as argued in Siudek et al. (2016) for a study of forested Polish sites. The German sites used in this study are in mountainous and hilly forested regions (DE03 in the Black Forest - 1205 m asl - and DE08 in the Thuringian Forest, 937 m asl) are the two sites where the model underestimation is greatest.

At the GB48 station (Auchencorth Moss) and the coastal site of Niembo, ES08, the models fail to reproduce the low annual average TGM concentrations of 0.89 and 0.46 ng m^{-3} respectively. At the GB48 site the disagreement between the models and observations can be attributed to local effects, as suggested by Drewer et al. (2010) in their study of greenhouse gas fluxes at the site. In fact this site is located in a peat bog, and the observed TGM values are very different from sites at similar latitudes such as DK01, Færøerne and IE31, Mace Head where the annual average TGM concentrations were 1.56 and 1.49 ng m^{-3} respectively, and where the models are able to reproduce the observations.

Overall the overestimation of GEM concentrations using WRF/Chem-Hg is greater in the OHChem experiment due to a lower rate of $\text{Hg}_{(\text{g})}^0$ oxidation and lower in NOANT because there are no anthropogenic emissions.

The monthly comparison between the observed and modelled concentrations are shown in Fig. 6a and Fig. 7a (only the principal experiments are shown). There is a clear overestimation of monthly concentrations by CMAQ, particularly during summer. Only small differences occur changing the anthropogenic emissions inventory (BASE2), while the differences when the speciation (ANTSPEC) and the chemical mechanism (BRCHEM1) are changed and are much more evident. Decreasing the uncertainty in flue gas speciation would be a great advantage in modelling the atmospheric Hg cycle.

Comparing modelled and observed values of wet deposition fluxes gives a ratio of annual pairs Model-Observation within a factor of 2 in most stations (15 of the 24 stations), while in 23 of the 24 stations it is within a factor of 5 (see Fig. 5b). The outlier is the Valentia Observatory (IE01) in South-West Ireland: the annually averaged observed Hg deposition is $1.70\mu\text{g m}^{-2}\text{ month}^{-1}$, which is high with respect to the median of $0.31\mu\text{g m}^{-2}\text{ month}^{-1}$ and the average of $0.46\mu\text{g m}^{-2}\text{ month}^{-1}$ in all stations, ($1.70\mu\text{g m}^{-2}\text{ month}^{-1}$ is approximately the 97th percentile). Moreover, the underestimation is more notable in WRF (ratio $\simeq 0.10$) than CMAQ ($\simeq 0.40$).

Overall in the BASE and ANTSPEC experiment slight overestimates were found, while the results from CMAQ experiments show higher Hg wet deposition fluxes than in the WRF/Chem-Hg experiments. In Sprovieri et al. (2016a) high values of wet deposition in Råö (SE14) and Pallas (FI36) stations were found, compared to the other European stations in the GMOS network. The model results reflect this result, with high deposition fluxes in the North of Europe. In these stations, as in all of Scandinavia, the oxidation mechanism makes a great difference, see the BRCHEM1 and BRCHEM2 experiments.

3.2 Emissions speciation

Recently, in order to study the impact of Hg anthropogenic emission speciation on Hg deposition and its global cycle, some modelling studies have made use of modified anthropogenic emission inventories, either in terms of emission totals or in terms of the emission speciation (Selin et al., 2008; Amos et al., 2012; Horowitz et al., 2014)). For example Bieser et al. (2014) (for Germany) and Kos et al. (2013) (for the U.S.) obtain the best agreements between observations and model results when respectively assuming no RGM emissions, and using a modified emission speciation ratio, 90:8:2 instead of 50:40:10 (GEM:RGM:PBM, see Sect. 2.2). Gencarelli et al. (2015) compared the Hg deposition over Europe using the two most recent AMAP/UNEP inventories, showing that the lower emissions in 2010 resulted in lower simulated deposition fluxes, but that the deposition reduction was proportionally less than the emission reduction within the domain. With the experiments performed it was possible to estimate the impact of Hg anthropogenic emission speciation on Hg deposition. Specifically the results of the BASE, BASE2, ANTSPEC, NOANT, BASE_C and ANTSPEC_C simulations in Table 1 were compared (Fig. 8 and Fig. 10). The BASE simulation used the AMAP Hg emissions (136.2 Mg y⁻¹, GEM:RGM:PBM 65:28:7) while the BASE2 simulation used the EDGAR emissions (123.8 Mg y⁻¹, ratio 60:32:8). The difference in emitted Hg over the modelling domain makes little difference in terms of the TGM concentrations and the wet deposition fluxes at the monitoring stations, see Fig. 5. However, over the whole domain the total Hg deposition is \simeq 20% less using the EDGAR inventory, as shown in Table 3. The deposition pattern changes, often in areas characterised by elevated Hg emissions were decreased deposition in BASE2 was found with respect to the BASE experiment (where the ratio BASE/BASE2 is <1 in Fig. 8). This difference is very marked over the North and Baltic Seas, while it is almost negligible over the Mediterranean and Northern Atlantic. This effect is prevalently due to the difference in the vertical distribution of the emissions in the two experiments, because the total Hg emitted is very similar, there is only a 9% difference, contrarily to Gencarelli et al. (2015) where the same vertical distribution but different emissions totals resulted only in a small change in deposition. The change in emission vertical distribution prevalently affects dry deposition processes, decreasing by 28% between the BASE - BASE2 simulations, against a 13% decrease in wet deposition (Fig. 3 and Fig. 4). In the BASE2 simulation deposition is noticeably lower over the Balkans, Carpathians and the lowlands of northern Germany, while Hg deposition is higher over the Skagerrak strait (which links the North and Baltic Seas). The ANTSPEC and ANTSPEC_C simulations isolate the role of Hg emission speciation. In these simulations all emissions were considered to be Hg_(g)⁰. Overall the simulations show an increase in the GEM concentration fields and a decrease in wet deposition, leading to improved agreement with the GEM/TGM observations in the ANTSPEC simulation (however this is less evident in ANTSPEC_C). In ANTSPEC_C improved agreement was obtained for wet deposition fluxes in some central (CZ03 and SI08) and northern (GB48, SE11 and SE14) monitoring sites. Total Hg deposition over the modelling domain decreased by 20% in WRF/Chem-Hg and by 22% in CMAQ. Dry deposition is particularly affected, see Table 3; with 28 and 26% decreases in dry deposition (WRF and CMAQ respectively) compared to a 13 and 14% decrease in wet deposition.

In the ANTSPEC experiment the deposition decreases in comparison to BASE, in particular the dry decreases more than the wet. RGM and PBM deposit more rapidly than GEM and so deposit in proximity to their emission sources where the air concentrations are higher. Clearly dry deposition can occur at any time while wet deposition requires precipitation. With

all Hg emissions releases treated as GEM in ANTSPEC the dry deposition decreases most as a result of the lack of direct emissions of RGM and PBM. The areas most affected by changing the emission speciation are obviously near major sources, but also over the Aegean and the Black Seas, the English Channel and the North German coast. Considerable influences were found also over the Mediterranean, the North and Baltic Sea and the rest of Europe, while very little difference is seen over the Norwegian Sea and around Iceland, only minor differences were registered in DK01 station.

5 However the contribution of anthropogenic emissions is crucial. In fact, the complete exclusion of anthropogenic emissions (the NOANT experiment) cannot reproduce the TGM concentrations and wet deposition fluxes, they are clearly underestimated, and total Hg deposition is only one third of that when anthropogenic emissions are included. The NOANT experiment is a hypothetical scenario, but it allows the contribution of anthropogenic emissions to total deposition, which is roughly 2/3,

10 not counting the fact that natural emissions from the oceans are in part previously deposited Hg from anthropogenic sources. A number of policy scenarios were used during the GMOS project to estimate future trends in the anthropogenic emission of Hg (Pacyna et al., 2016). Pacyna et al. (2016) describes the results of modelling studies using these scenarios to assess Hg concentration and deposition fields, for present (2013) and future anthropogenic (2035) Hg emissions.

3.3 Mercury oxidation

15 In order to highlight the differences due to the gas phase Hg oxidation mechanism employed various simulations were performed isolating a single oxidant in the model chemical mechanism.

The importance of the chemical reactions has been emphasised by considering the variations between BASE and NOCHEM experiments (and BASE_C and NOCHEM_C), where no chemical interactions in the atmosphere were considered. In this experiment the RGM and PBM fields in the model domain are due prevalently to anthropogenic emissions, the influence BC on RGM and PBM is relatively minor over the model domain. Only very small changes in TGM air concentrations were found (there is slight increase $\simeq 1\%$ in WRF, $\simeq 3\%$ in CMAQ), while RGM and Hg deposition decrease appreciably (by 83% RGM, 25% wet and 73% dry in WRF, and 42%, 32% and 46% in CMAQ).

20

This result shows the net reduction in deposition when setting the Hg anthropogenic emissions to zero, and provides a limit to the deposition due to natural emissions. With the exception of stations CZ03 and LV01 deposition is underestimated everywhere (especially in northern Europe, and at FI36 and GB13 above all). Agreement within a factor of 2 was found only in some stations in Central Europe (e.g., CZ03, DE02, DE09, LV01), demonstrating the importance of anthropogenic emissions speciation in these particular areas, with respect to BC and atmospheric oxidation.

25

A number of studies have shown the importance of O₃, and the OH radical, and also reactive halogen compounds in the atmospheric oxidation of Hg to form more readily deposited Hg^{II} compounds (see Ariya et al. (2015) and references therein).

30 Despite the theoretical doubts of significance of GEM oxidation under atmospheric conditions by O₃ and OH radical, that atomic Br is of great relevance to the atmospheric oxidation of GEM is certain (Hynes et al., 2009; Subir et al., 2011, 2012; Weiss-Penzias et al., 2014). In particular, for the HgBr* intermediate, Dibble et al. (2012) has shown the potential importance of reactions with NO₂, HOO, ClO, and BrO.

While Subir et al. (2011) summarises the experimental and theoretical uncertainties in the calculation of the rate constants of these reactions (and also discusses the implications for CTMs), this study demonstrates the effect of individual oxidants on tropospheric Hg concentrations and deposition, isolating the individual contributions and comparing them with the monthly wet deposition observed at the measuring stations. Based on the ANTSPEC experiment the three main GEM oxidants have
5 been studied individually in the experiments O3CHEM, OHCHEM and BRCHEM1 (and BRCHEM2). Compared to the BASE case the emission scenario is different, all anthropogenic emissions were considered to be GEM, thus the RGM involved in the deposition process is solely the result of atmospheric oxidation processes.

In this way it is possible to estimate the extent of individual reactions on Hg oxidation and its deposition. The simulations are unrealistic because these reactions most likely occur simultaneously in the atmosphere (as in BASE and ANTSPEC cases), but
10 these experiments are a potentially useful way to provide information on the principal oxidant pathways. The O3CHEM and OHCHEM experiment (executed BC from ECHMERIT) yield quite different results, both experiments are very different than observations. The OHCHEM experiment leads to the production of only small amounts of RGM $\simeq 40\%$ less than ANTSPEC over the whole domain and reduced deposition $\simeq 19\%$ less than ANTSPEC. Consequently GEM concentrations are higher $\simeq 35\%$. As described in Subir et al. (2011) the mechanism of this reaction is unclear, and there are a number of different
15 rate constants reported. In this study the Sommar et al. (2001a) rate constant was used, however, alone this oxidation pathway cannot explain the observed deposition, wet deposition fluxes are underestimated at all measuring stations. The underestimation is lowest in the southernmost stations, PT06 and LONG. In the O3CHEM experiment only GEM oxidation by O_3 is considered (Hall, 1995). The results of this experiment show very high GEM concentrations (the ratio of GEM concentrations in O3CHEM and in BASE is $\simeq 1.33$) but low RGM concentrations (ratio $\simeq 0.25$) at ground level. Also the total depositions is underestimated
20 (ratio $\simeq 0.24$). As above, this reaction alone is not sufficient to represent oxidation and the deposition of Hg over Europe. Individually, oxidation by O_3 and OH do not give concentrations and fluxes comparable with the BASE case.

Using fixed BC (as in OHCHEM_C and O3CHEM_C) the two simulations give very similar deposition (Fig. 8, Table 3). A decrease compared to the BASE_C case was found, but the effect of BC is dominant and the differences in the oxidation mechanisms are not appreciable.

25 The BRCHEM experiments provide more interesting results, more RGM is formed at ground level, the BRCHEM1/BASE ratio is $\simeq 1.63$, BRCHEM2/BASE $\simeq 1.70$, but the overall Hg wet deposition is lower than the base simulation (ratio $\simeq 0.44$ and $\simeq 0.43$ respectively). The comparison of model TGM to observations is within a factor of 2 in 16 of the 24 stations, which is the best result for the set of the oxidation mechanism experiments (O3CHEM, OHCHEM, BRCHEM). A slight overestimation was found in the stations bordering the Baltic Sea and Mediterranean Sea. In fact the atmospheric Br concentrations in the
30 upper troposphere and the MBL are the subject of much scientific interest (e.g., Subir et al. (2011); Hedgecock and Pirrone (2004); Saiz-Lopez and von Glasow (2012); Glasow et al. (2004)). In order to analyse the effect of different Br input (total amount and spatial distribution), the Br concentration fields from the off-line three-dimensional models p-TOMCAT (Yang et al., 2005) and GEOSCHEM (Parrella et al., 2012) were interpolated on to the WRF domain. For every month a daily mean profile of [30 Br] was obtained and used for BRCHEM1 (p-TOMCAT) and BRCHEM2 (GEOSCHEM), where a two-step

³⁰removed: Br

GEM oxidation process which proceeds firstly by reaction with Br to form unstable diatomic HgBr^* was implemented (see Gencarelli et al. (2015) and references therein for details). ^[.31]Notable differences in the ^[.32]two Br input fields exist in the Planetary Boundary Layer (PBL) and indeed in the whole atmospheric column exist^[.33]. In fact, in the ^[.34]PBL, the amount of Br in the BRCHEM2 experiment is $\simeq 4.5$ times greater than that in BRCHEM1, with differences ranging from a factor of 6 (in the cold months) to roughly 4 (in the summer months) over the modelling domain. These differences are also visible observing the vertical longitudinal profiles of annual mean concentrations of Br in Fig. 9, where Br in BRCHEM2 is greater than Br in BRCHEM1 in the first 3 km. The Br in BRCHEM1 is greater than BRCHEM1 in the range between 12 and 15 km, while at other elevations there are not such large differences.

Despite this large discrepancy in Br input the Hg deposition flux is largely unaffected. Total Hg deposition in BRCHEM1 is 3% greater than BRCHEM2 (2 % wet and 3.7 % dry), due to greater concentrations of Br in areas with high rainfall in BRCHEM1. The spatial distribution of the deposition is different in the two experiments, especially over North Africa, the English Channel and the Western Mediterranean. The RGM concentrations in the PBL are also slightly different (RGM in BRCHEM1 about is 4% lower than BRCHEM2, as shown in Fig. 8 and Table 3). Model to observation comparison for TGM does not change between BRCHEM1 and BRCHEM2, and the model underestimates wet deposition in both cases. In BRCHEM1 the underestimation is evident (ratio BRCHEM1/Observations $\simeq 0.77$) while in BRCHEM2 the model results and observations are closer (ratio $\simeq 0.90$). ^[.35]Thus, increasing the Br concentration gives model results closer to observations, as shown also in Shah et al. (2015), who ^[.36]tripled the Br and BrO concentrations ^[.37]in GEOS-CHEM model (with respect to Parrella et al. (2012), where an underestimation of 30% was found for BrO concentrations compared to the global mean obtained by satellite observations) to model the NOMADSS field campaign (Gratz et al., 2015). Differently to the Shah et al. (2015) study, RGM reduction is not implemented here, for the purposes of this paper it was necessary to standardise the experiments as far as possible. Only an aqueous phase reduction was implemented in CMAQ following Si and Ariya (2008).

A comparison of the annual mean RGM concentration in the first model level simulated in the various sensitivity runs is shown in figure 10. While the BASE and BASE_C show a similar pattern, the ANTSPEC simulation (figure 10 first row) gives lower concentrations with no areas of elevated RGM concentrations. The ratio of the RGM concentration in the BASE2 and BASE simulations is strongly dependent on the distribution of the anthropogenic emissions, while the mean RGM concentrations in the BASE simulation are always greater than in NOANT, especially in central Europe. The opposite occurs when comparing BASE and NOCHEM, where the ratio is ~ 1 central Europe and < 1 over the Mediterranean and the northern part of the domain. In the O3CHEM simulation the RGM concentrations are greater than those in ANTSPEC over the whole modelling domain, while in the OHCHEM and BRCHEM the ratio changes over the domain: in OHCHEM

³¹removed: Greater

³²removed: PBL and

³³removed: in the two Br input fields

³⁴removed: Planetary Boundary Layer (PBL), the annual amount of Br

³⁵removed: This result is in agreement with

³⁶removed: found that tripling

³⁷removed: improved the model agreement with the observations.

RGM is relatively higher over land and the Mediterranean Sea, while in BRCHEM1 RGM is lower over Mediterranean region and the Black Sea, but higher over the eastern and northern parts of the domain. In the BRCHEM2 the relative decrease in RGM is found to be mostly over the eastern part of the domain and Scandinavia. Using fixed BC (the third column of figure 10) the simulations show decreased RGM concentrations with respect $BASE_C$, especially in the areas characterised by significant anthropogenic emissions.

4 Conclusions

This work was performed to analyse the influence of several processes which determine the atmospheric Hg cycle and quantify some of the uncertainties present over a European modelling domain. The output of 14 model sensitivity tests were compared between themselves and with available measurements from 28 monitoring sites. The base experiments (BASE and $BASE_C$) furnish model results roughly in accord with measurements of TGM concentrations and wet deposition fluxes, and agree with the results of observations reported in (Sprovieri et al., 2016a), with higher Hg deposition fluxes in the North of Europe.

In the model results the quantity, speciation and vertical profile of anthropogenic Hg emissions is crucial: over the whole model domain the vertical distribution of Hg emissions has a large influence on the Hg deposition fields. In addition to the areas near the principal anthropogenic emission sources, the areas of Aegean and the Black Seas, the English Channel, the Skagerrak strait and the North Germany coast are largely influenced by the characteristics of European Hg emissions speciation more than they are by the total amount.

Using a reaction mechanism with GEM oxidation by only O_3 or OH greatly underestimate the observed deposition in precipitation. Whereas using a mechanism with Br as the GEM oxidant produces more RGM at ground level, but the overall Hg wet deposition are lower than the BASE simulation, which employs both O_3 and OH in the oxidation mechanism. Nonetheless good agreement between the model and observations was found, especially in the stations bordering the Baltic and Mediterranean Seas. The Hg deposition was only slightly affected by the choice of Br input fields, quadrupling the Br air concentrations in the PBL resulted in a change of only of 3% in total deposition in accord with the results of Shah et al. (2015) for the U.S.

The necessity to perform continuous measurements of speciated Hg in order to refine model oxidation mechanisms is clear. Moreover, the necessity to investigate more thoroughly local influences on Hg emissions and deposition, as well as interactions dependent on land use and vegetation, forests, peat bogs etc. should be investigated in future studies.

5 Tables and figures

Table 1. Simulations performed

exp	CTM	BC	Ant. Emiss	Description
BASE	WRF/Chem-Hg	ECHMERIT	AMAP	Base experiment, performed as in Gencarelli et al. (2015)
ANTSPEC	WRF/Chem-Hg	ECHMERIT	AMAP	RGM and PBM emissions as GEM
NOANT	WRF/Chem-Hg	ECHMERIT	AMAP	No Hg anthropogenic emissions
NOCHEM	WRF/Chem-Hg	ECHMERIT	AMAP	No Hg chemical reactions
O3CHEM	WRF/Chem-Hg	ECHMERIT	AMAP	As ANTSPEC, but with only O ₃ GEM oxidation (Hall, 1995)
OHCHEM	WRF/Chem-Hg	ECHMERIT	AMAP	As ANTSPEC, but with only OH GEM oxidation (Sommar et al., 2001b)
BASE2	WRF/Chem-Hg	ECHMERIT	EDGAR	As BASE, but with anthropogenic emissions from EDGAR inventory
BRCHEM1	WRF/Chem-Hg	ECHMERIT	AMAP	As ANTSPEC, but with only Br two step GEM oxidation, [³⁸]Br from p-TOMCAT
BRCHEM2	WRF/Chem-Hg	ECHMERIT	AMAP	As BRCHEM1, but with [³⁹]Br input from GEOS-Chem model
BASE _C	CMAQ-Hg	GLEMOS	AMAP	Base CMAQ experiment
ANTSPEC _C	CMAQ-Hg	GLEMOS	AMAP	RGM and PBM emissions as GEM
NOCHEM _C	CMAQ-Hg	GLEMOS	AMAP	No Hg chemical reactions
O3CHEM _C	CMAQ-Hg	GLEMOS	AMAP	As ANTSPEC _C , but with only O ₃ GEM oxidation
OHCHEM _C	CMAQ-Hg	GLEMOS	AMAP	As ANTSPEC _C , but with only OH GEM oxidation

Acknowledgements. We are grateful to the WRF/Chem [⁴⁰]developers and to the NCAR ESL Atmospheric Chemistry Division for making the WRF/Chem and the WRF/Chem preprocessor codes freely available. We gratefully acknowledge EMEP for maintaining and making available the database of monitoring station data. We thank Noelle Eckley Selin and Shaojie Song at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, for completion of GEOSCHEM [⁴¹]Br input, used in the BRCHEM2 [⁴²]experiment. The research was performed in the framework of the EU project GMOS (FP7 - 265113), the National Reference Centre for Mercury (CNRM, Italy) and the STM program of the Italian CNR.

⁴⁰removed: developer

⁴¹removed: Br

⁴²removed: experimen

Table 2. List of observation points

CODE	Name	Network	TGM	WD
BE14	Koksijde	EMEP		•
CZ03	Kosetice	EMEP	•	•
DE02	Waldhof	EMEP	•	•
DE03	Schauinsland	EMEP	•	•
DE08	Schmücke	EMEP	•	•
DE09	Zingst	EMEP	•	•
DK01	Færøerne	EMEP	•	
ES08	Niembro	EMEP	•	•
FI36	Pallas	EMEP/GMOS	•	•
GB13	Yarner Wood	EMEP		•
GB17	Heigham Holmes	EMEP		•
GB36	Harwell	EMEP		•
GB48	Auchencorth Moss	EMEP	•	•
GB91	Banchory	EMEP		•
IE01	Valentia Obs.	EMEP		•
IE31	Mace Head	EMEP/GMOS	•	
LV01	Rucava	EMEP		•
NL91	De Zilk	EMEP		•
NO01	Birkenes	EMEP	•	•
NO90	Andoya	EMEP	•	
PL05	Diabla Gora	EMEP	•	
PT04	Monte Velho	EMEP		•
PT06	Alfragide	EMEP		•
SE05	Bredkalen	EMEP	•	•
SI08	Iskrba	EMEP/GMOS		•
SE11	Vavihill	EMEP	•	•
SE14	Råö	EMEP/GMOS	•	•
LONG	Longobucco	GMOS	•	•

experiment	Wet	Dry	Total
BASE	108.0	111.0	219.0
ANTSPEC	88.0	32.0	120.0
NOANT	52.1	19.2	71.3
NOCHEM	26.5	81.4	107.9
O3CHEM	38.5	13.9	52.4
OHCHEM	27.8	14.3	42.1
BASE2	94.4	79.9	174.3
BRCHEM1	63.2	33.2	96.4
BRCHEM2	60.2	32.0	92.2
BASE _c	65.5	142.7	208.2
ANTSPEC _c	56.5	105.7	162.2
O3CHEM _c	52.2	99.1	151.3
OHCHEM _c	50.5	98.9	98.9
NOCHEM _c	21.2	65.2	86.4

Table 3. Wet and dry annual deposition (Mg).




Figure 1. The model domain and location to the measurement stations (white points for wet deposition (WD) and black points for TGM air concentrations).




Figure 2. The anthropogenic Hg emissions used in the model experiments: AMAP (left panel) and EDGAR (right panel)




Figure 3. The total Hg dry deposition in the model experiments performed.




Figure 4. The total Hg wet deposition in the model experiments performed.




Figure 5. Ratio of the modelled and observed values at the measurement station points. Upper panel (a) for GEM concentrations and lower panel (b) for wet deposition fluxes. Horizontal lines represent perfect agreement (dashed line, ratio = 1) and good agreement intervals (dotted lines, $\pm 30\%$ for GEM, factor 5 for WD).




Figure 6. Monthly distribution of observed and modelled values for BASE, BASE2 and BASE_c experiments at measurement stations. Upper panel (a) for TGM concentrations and lower panel (b) for wet deposition fluxes.




Figure 7. Monthly distribution of observed and modelled values for BASE, ANTSPEC and BRCHEM1 experiments at measurement stations. Upper panel (a) for TGM concentrations and lower panel (b) for wet deposition fluxes.




Figure 8. The total Hg deposition and the ratio of deposition in the sensitivity runs compared to BASE, ANTSPEC and BASE_C. The Hg total deposition is shown in the first row for BASE, ANTSPEC and BASE_C experiments (upper color label), while the ratio (lower color label) of these with relative sensitivity runs is reported over the relative column: BASE2, NOANT and NOCHEM ratio (left column) are referred to BASE experiment, O3CHEM, OHCHEM, BRCHEM1 and BRCHEM2 (central column) ratio are referred to ANTSPEC experiment, ANTSPEC_C, O3CHEM_C, OHCHEM_C and NOCHEM_C (right row) ratio are referred to BASE_C experiment.




Figure 9. Vertical longitudinal profiles of Bromine annual mean concentrations (ppt) using p-TOMCAT concentrations (BRCHEM1 experiment, left panel) and GEOSCHEM concentrations (BRCHEM2 experiment, right panel).




Figure 10. The annual RGM mean concentrations at ground level and the ratio of RGM in the sensitivity runs compared to BASE, ANTSPEC and BASE_c. The mean RGM concentrations are shown in the first row for BASE, ANTSPEC and BASE_c experiments (upper colour label), while the ratio (lower colour label) of these with the sensitivity runs is reported in the relative column: BASE2, NOANT and NOCHEM ratio (left column) are referred to the BASE experiment, O3CHEM, OHCHEM, BRCHEM1 and BRCHEM2 (central column) ratios refer to the ANTSPEC experiment, ANTSPEC_c, O3CHEM_c, OHCHEM_c and NOCHEM_c (right column) ratios refer to the BASE_c experiment.

References

- Aas, W. and Bohlin-Nizzetto, P.: Heavy metals and POP measurements 2013, Norwegian Institute for Air Research. EMEP/CCC-Report, 3, 2015, 2015.
- AMAP/UNEP: Technical Background Report for the Global Mercury Assessment 2013, Tech. rep., Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme, Oslo, Norway / UNEP Chemicals Branch, Geneva, Switzerland, <http://www.unep.org/hazardoussubstances/Mercury/Informationmaterials/ReportsandPublications/tabid/3593/Default.aspx>, [⁴³]2013a.
- AMAP/UNEP: Technical Background Report for the Global Mercury Assessment 2013, Tech. rep., Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme, Oslo, Norway / UNEP Chemicals Branch, Geneva, Switzerland, <http://www.unep.org/hazardoussubstances/Mercury/Informationmaterials/ReportsandPublications/tabid/3593/Default.aspx>, 2013b.
- 10 Amos, H. M., Jacob, D. J., Holmes, C. D., Fisher, J. A., Wang, Q., Yantosca, R. M., Corbitt, E. S., Galarneau, E., Rutter, A. P., Gustin, M. S., Steffen, A., Schauer, J. J., Graydon, J. A., Louis, V. L. S., Talbot, R. W., Edgerton, E. S., Zhang, Y., and Sunderland, E. M.: Gas-particle partitioning of atmospheric Hg(II) and its effect on global mercury deposition, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 12, 591–603, doi:10.5194/acp-12-591-2012, <http://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/12/591/2012/>, 2012.
- 15 Angot, H., Dastoor, A., De Simone, F., Gardfeldt, K., Gencarelli, C. N., Hedgecock, I. M., Langer, S., Magand, O., Mastro Monaco, M. N., Nordstrom, C., Pfaffhuber, K. A., Pirrone, N., Ryjkov, A., Selin, N. E., Skov, H., Song, S., Sprovieri, F., Steffen, A., Toyota, K., Travnikov, O., Yang, X., and Dommergue, A.: Chemical cycling and deposition of atmospheric mercury in Polar Regions: review of recent measurements and comparison with models, *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, doi:10.5194/acp-2016-509, 2016.
- Ariya, P. A., Amyot, M., Dastoor, A., Deeds, D., Feinberg, A., Kos, G., Poulain, A., Ryjkov, A., Semeniuk, K., Subir, M., et al.: Mercury physicochemical and biogeochemical transformation in the atmosphere and at atmospheric interfaces: A review and future directions, *Chemical Reviews*, 115, 3760–3802, 2015.
- 20 Bieser, J., De Simone, F., Gencarelli, C. N., Geyer, B., Hedgecock, I. M., Matthias, V., Travnikov, O., and Weigelt, A.: A diagnostic evaluation of modeled mercury wet depositions in Europe using atmospheric speciated high-resolution observations, *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, pp. 1–18, 2014.
- Bieser, J., Slemr, F., Ambrose, J., Brenninkmeijer, C., Brooks, S., Dastoor, A., De Simone, F., Ebinghaus, R., Gencarelli, C., Geyer, B., 25 Gratz, L. E., Hedgecock, I. M., Jaffe, D., Kelley, P., Lin, C.-J., Matthias, V., Ryjkov, A., Selin, N., Song, S., Travnikov, O., Weigelt, A., Luke, W., Ren, X., Zahn, A., Yang, X., Zhu, Y., and Pirrone, N.: Multi-model study of mercury dispersion in the atmosphere: Vertical distribution of mercury species, *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 2016.
- Binkowski, F. S. and Roselle, S. J.: Models-3 Community Multiscale Air Quality (CMAQ) model aerosol component 1. Model description, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* (1984–2012), 108, 2003.
- 30 Bullock, O. R. and Brehme, K. A.: Atmospheric mercury simulation using the CMAQ model: formulation description and analysis of wet deposition results, *Atmospheric Environment*, 36, 2135–2146, 2002.
- Bullock, O. R., Atkinson, D., Braverman, T., Civerolo, K., Dastoor, A., Davignon, D., Ku, J.-Y., Lohman, K., Myers, T. C., Park, R. J., Seigneur, C., Selin, N. E., Sistla, G., and Vijayaraghavan, K.: The North American Mercury Model Intercomparison Study (NAM-MIS): Study description and model-to-model comparisons, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 113, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2008JD009803>, 2008.
- 35

⁴³removed: 2013.

- Bullock, O. R. J., Atkinson, D., Braverman, T., Civerolo, K., Dastoor, A., Davignon, D., Ku, J. Y., Lohman, K., Myers, T. C., Park, R. J., Seigneur, C., Selin, N. E., Sistla, G., and Vijayaraghavan, K.: An analysis of simulated wet deposition of mercury from the North American Mercury Model Intercomparison Study, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 114, D08 301–, 2009.
- Byun, D. W., Ching, J., et al.: Science algorithms of the EPA Models-3 community multiscale air quality (CMAQ) modeling system, US Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development Washington, DC, 1999.
- Carbone, F., Landis, M., Gencarelli, C., Naccarato, A., Sprovieri, F., De Simone, F., Hedgecock, I., and Pirrone, N.: Sea surface temperature variation linked to elemental mercury concentrations measured on Mauna Loa, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 43, 7751–7757, 2016.
- Chen, C. Y., Driscoll, C. T., Lambert, K. F., Mason, R. P., and Sunderland, E. M.: Connecting mercury science to policy: from sources to seafood, *Reviews on Environmental Health*, 31, 17–20, 2016.
- D'Amore, F., Bencardino, M., Cinnirella, S., Sprovieri, F., and Pirrone, N.: Data quality through a web-based QA/QC system: implementation for atmospheric mercury data from the global mercury observation system, *Environmental Science: Processes & Impacts*, 17, 1482–1491, 2015.
- De Simone, F., Gencarelli, C. N., Hedgecock, I. M., and Pirrone, N.: Global atmospheric cycle of mercury: a model study of the impact of oxidation mechanisms, *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 2014.
- De Simone, F., Cinnirella, S., Gencarelli, C. N., Yang, X., Hedgecock, I. M., and Pirrone, N.: Model study of global mercury deposition from biomass burning, *Environmental science & technology*, 49, 6712–6721, 2015.
- De Simone, F., Gencarelli, C. N., Hedgecock, I. M., and Pirrone, N.: A Modeling Comparison of Mercury Deposition from Current Anthropogenic Mercury Emission Inventories, *Environmental Science & Technology*, 2016.
- Dibble, T. S., Zelic, M. J. ., and Mao, H.: Thermodynamics of reactions of ClHg and BrHg radicals with atmospherically abundant free radicals, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 12.21, 10271–10279, 2012.
- Drewer, J., Lohila, A., Aurela, M., Laurila, T., Minkkinen, K., Penttilä, T., Dinsmore, K., McKenzie, R., Helfter, C., Flechard, C., et al.: Comparison of greenhouse gas fluxes and nitrogen budgets from an ombrotrophic bog in Scotland and a minerotrophic sedge fen in Finland, *European Journal of Soil Science*, 61, 640–650, 2010.
- Emmons, L. K., Walters, S., Hess, P. G., Lamarque, J.-F., Pfister, G. G., Fillmore, D., Granier, C., Guenther, A., Kinnison, D., Laepple, T., Orlando, J., Tie, X., Tyndall, G., Wiedinmyer, C., Baughcum, S. L., and Kloster, S.: Description and evaluation of the Model for Ozone and Related chemical Tracers, version 4 (MOZART-4), *Geoscientific Model Development*, 3, 43–67, 2010.
- Gårdfeldt, K., Sommar, J., Ferrara, R., Ceccarini, C., Lanzillotta, E., Munthe, J., Wängberg, I., Lindqvist, O., Pirrone, N., Sprovieri, F., Pesenti, E., and Strömberg, D.: Evasion of mercury from coastal and open waters of the Atlantic Ocean and the Mediterranean Sea, *Atmospheric Environment*, 37, 73 – 84, 2003.
- Gbor, P. K., Wen, D., Meng, F., Yang, F., Zhang, B., and Sloan, J. J.: Improved model for mercury emission, transport and deposition, *Atmospheric Environment*, 40, 973–983, 2006.
- Gencarelli, C. N., De Simone, F., Hedgecock, I. M., Sprovieri, F., and Pirrone, N.: Development and application of a regional scale atmospheric mercury model based on WRF/Chem: a Mediterranean area investigation, *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 2014a.
- Gencarelli, C. N., Hedgecock, I. M., Sprovieri, F., Schurmann, G. J., and Pirrone, N.: Importance of ship emissions to local summertime ozone production in the mediterranean marine boundary layer: a modeling study, *Atmosphere*, 5(4), 937–958, 2014b.
- Gencarelli, C. N., De Simone, F., Hedgecock, I. M., Sprovieri, F., Yang, X., and Pirrone, N.: European and Mediterranean mercury modelling: Local and long-range contributions to the deposition flux, *Atmospheric Environment*, 117, 162–168, 2015.

- Glasow, R. v., Kuhlmann, R. v., Lawrence, M., Platt, U., and Crutzen, P.: Impact of reactive bromine chemistry in the troposphere, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 4, 2481–2497, 2004.
- Gratz, L., Ambrose, J., Jaffe, D., Shah, V., Jaeglé, L., Stutz, J., Festa, J., Spolaor, M., Tsai, C., Selin, N., et al.: Oxidation of mercury by bromine in the subtropical Pacific free troposphere, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 42, 2015.
- 5 Grell, G. A., Peckham, S. E., Schmitz, R., McKeen, S. A., Frost, G., Skamarock, W. C., and Eder, B.: Fully coupled "online" chemistry within the WRF model, *Atmospheric Environment*, 39, 6957–6975, 2005.
- Gustin, M. S., Amos, H. M., Huang, J., Miller, M. B., and Heidecorn, K.: Measuring and modeling mercury in the atmosphere: a critical review, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 15, 5697–5713, 2015.
- Hall, B.: The gas phase oxidation of elemental mercury by ozone, *Water, Air, and Soil Pollution*, 80, 301–315, 1995.
- 10 Hedgecock, I. M. and Pirrone, N.: Chasing Quicksilver: Modeling the Atmospheric Lifetime of Hg⁰(g) in the Marine Boundary Layer at Various Latitudes, *Environmental Science & Technology*, 38, 69–76, 2004.
- Holmes, C. D., Jacob, D. J., Corbitt, E. S., Mao, J., Yang, X., Talbot, R., and Slemr, F.: Global atmospheric model for mercury including oxidation by bromine atoms, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 10, 12 037 – 12 057, 2010.
- Horowitz, H. M., Jacob, D. J., Amos, H. M., Streets, D. G., and Sunderland, E. M.: Historical mercury releases from commercial products: 15 Global environmental implications, *Environmental science and technology*, 48(17), 10 242–10 250, 2014.
- Hynes, A. J., Donohoue, D. L., Goodsite, M. E., and Hedgecock, I. M.: Our current understanding of major chemical and physical processes affecting mercury dynamics in the atmosphere and at the air-water/terrestrial interfaces, in: *Mercury Fate and Transport in the Global Atmosphere: Emissions, Measurements and Models*, edited by Pirrone, N. and Mason, R. P., chap. 14, pp. 427–457, Springer, 2009.
- 20 Jung, G., Hedgecock, I. M., and Pirrone, N.: ECHMERIT V1.0 – a new global fully coupled mercury-chemistry and transport model, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 2, 175–195, doi:10.5194/gmd-2-175-2009, 2009.
- Kos, G., Ryzhkov, A., Dastoor, A., Narayan, J., Steffen, A., Ariya, P. A., and Zhang, L.: Evaluation of discrepancy between measured and modelled oxidized mercury species, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 13(9), 4839–4863, 2013.
- Landis, M. S., Stevens, R. K., Schaedlich, F., and Prestbo, E. M.: Development and characterization of an annular denuder methodology 25 for the measurement of divalent inorganic reactive gaseous mercury in ambient air, *Environmental science & technology*, 36, 3000–3009, 2002.
- Lin, C.-J., Pongprueksa, P., Lindberg, S. E., Pehkonen, S. O., Byun, D., and Jang, C.: Scientific uncertainties in atmospheric mercury models I: Model science evaluation, *Atmospheric Environment*, 40, 2911 – 2928, 2006.
- Lin, X. and Tao, Y.: A numerical modelling study on regional mercury budget for eastern North America, *Atmospheric Chemistry and 30 Physics*, 3, 535–548, 2003.
- Liu, X.-H. and Zhang, Y.: Understanding of the formation mechanisms of ozone and particulate matter at a fine scale over the south-eastern US: Process analyses and responses to future-year emissions, *Atmospheric Environment*, 74, 259–276, 2013.
- Muntean, M., Janssens-Maenhout, G., Song, S., Selin, N. E., Olivier, J. G., Guizzardi, D., Maas, R., and Dentener, F.: Trend analysis from 1970 to 2008 and model evaluation of EDGARv4 global gridded anthropogenic mercury emissions, *Science of The Total Environment*, 35 494, 337–350, 2014.
- Neu, J. L. and Prather, M. J.: Toward a more physical representation of precipitation scavenging in global chemistry models: cloud overlap and ice physics and their impact on tropospheric ozone, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 12, 3289–3310, doi:10.5194/acp-12-3289-2012, 2012.

- Oken, E., Choi, A., Karagas, M., Mariën, K., Rheinberger, C., Schoeny, R., Sunderland, E., and Korrick, S.: Which fish should I eat? Perspectives influencing fish consumption choices., *Environ Health Perspect*, 120, 790–798, 2012.
- Pacyna, J. M., Travnikov, O., De Simone, F., Hedgecock, I. M., Sundseth, K., Pacyna, E. G., Steenhuisen, F., Pirrone, N., Munthe, J., and Kindbom, K.: Current and future levels of mercury atmospheric pollution on global scale^[.44], *Atmos. Chem. Phys*, 2016.
- 5 Parrella, J., Jacob, D. J., Liang, Q., Zhang, Y., Mickley, L. J., Miller, B., Evans, M., Yang, X., Pyle, J., Theys, N., et al.: Tropospheric bromine chemistry: implications for present and pre-industrial ozone and mercury, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 12, 6723–6740, 2012.
- Rockel, B., Will, A., and Hense, A.: The regional climate model COSMO-CLM (CCLM), *Meteorologische Zeitschrift*, 17, 347–348, 2008.
- Ryaboshapko, A., Bullock, O. R., Jr., Christensen, J., Cohen, M., Dastoor, A., Ilyin, I., Petersen, G., Syrakov, D., Travnikov, O., Artz, R. S., Davignon, D., Draxler, R. R., Munthe, J., and Pacyna, J.: Intercomparison study of atmospheric mercury models: 2. Modelling results vs. long-term observations and comparison of country deposition budgets, *Science of The Total Environment*, 377, 319 – 333, 2007a.
- 10 Ryaboshapko, A., Bullock Jr., R. O., Christensen, J., Cohen, M., Dastoor, A., Ilyin, I., Petersen, G., Syrakov, D., Travnikov, O., Artz, R. S., Davignon, D., Draxler, R. R., Munthe, J., and Pacyna, J.: Intercomparison study of atmospheric mercury models: 2. Modelling results vs. long-term observations and comparison of country deposition budgets, *Science of The Total Environment*, 377, 319 – 333, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2007.01.071, 2007b.
- 15 Saiz-Lopez, A. and von Glasow, R.: Reactive halogen chemistry in the troposphere, *Chemical Society Reviews*, 41, 6448–6472, 2012.
- Salzmann, M. and Lawrence, M. G.: Automatic coding of chemistry solvers in WRF-Chem using KPP, in: 7th WRF User’s Workshop, Boulder, Colorado, USA, 2006.
- Sandu, A. and Sander, R.: Technical note: Simulating chemical systems in Fortran90 and Matlab with the Kinetic PreProcessor KPP-2.1, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 6, 187–195, doi:10.5194/acp-6-187-2006, 2006.
- 20 Sarwar, G., Luecken, D., Yarwood, G., Whitten, G. Z., and Carter, W. P.: Impact of an updated carbon bond mechanism on predictions from the CMAQ modeling system: Preliminary assessment, *Journal of applied meteorology and climatology*, 47, 3–14, 2008.
- Selin, N. E., Jacob, D. J., Yantosca, R. M., Strode, S., Jaeglé, L., and Sunderland, E. M.: Global 3-D land-ocean-atmosphere model for mercury: Present-day versus preindustrial cycles and anthropogenic enrichment factors for deposition, *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, 22, GB2011, 2008.
- 25 Shah, V., Jaeglé, L., Gratz, L., Ambrose, J., Jaffe, D., Selin, N., Song, S., Campos, T., Flocke, F., Reeves, M., et al.: Origin of oxidized mercury in the summertime free troposphere over the southeastern US, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions*, 15, 26 839–26 893, 2015.
- Si, L. and Ariya, P. A.: Reduction of Oxidized Mercury Species by Dicarboxylic Acids (C2- C4): Kinetic and Product Studies, *Environmental science & technology*, 42, 5150–5155, 2008.
- Siudek, P., Frankowski, M., and Siepak, J.: Atmospheric particulate mercury at the urban and forest sites in central Poland, *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 23, 2341–2352, 2016.
- 30 Sommar, J., Gårdfeldt, K., Strömberg, D., and Feng, X.: A kinetic study of the gas-phase reaction between the hydroxyl radical and atomic mercury, *Atmospheric Environment*, 35, 3049 – 3054, doi:10.1016/S1352-2310(01)00108-X, 2001a.
- Sommar, J., Gårdfeldt, K., Strömberg, D., and Feng, X.: A kinetic study of the gas-phase reaction between the hydroxyl radical and atomic mercury, *Atmospheric Environment*, 35, 3049 – 3054, 2001b.
- 35 Sprovieri, F., Pirrone, N., Ebinghaus, R., Kock, H., and Dommergue, A.: A review of worldwide atmospheric mercury measurements, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 10, 8245–8265, 2010.

⁴⁴removed: .

- Sprovieri, F., Pirrone, N., Bencardino, M., D'Amore, F., Angot, H., Barbante, C., Brunke, E.-G., Arcega-Cabrera, F., Cairns, W., Comero, S., Diéguez, M. D. C., Dommergue, A., Ebinghaus, R., Feng, X. B., Fu, X., Garcia, P. E., Gawlik, B. M., Hagestrom, U., Hansson, K., Horvat, M., Kotnik, J., Labuschagne, C., Magand, O., Martin, L., Mashyanov, N., Mkololo, T., Munthe, J., Obolkin, V., Islas, M. R., Sena, F., Somerset, V., Spandow, P., Varde, M., Walters, C., Wängberg, I., Weigelt, A., Yang, X., , and Zhang, H.: Five-year records of Total Mercury Deposition flux at GMOS sites in the Northern and Southern Hemispheres, ACPD, Submitted to ACP Special Issue: Global Mercury Observation System – Atmosphere (GMOS-A), doi:10.5194/acp-2016-517, 2016a.
- Sprovieri, F., Pirrone, N., Bencardino, M., D'Amore, F., Carbone, F., Cinnirella, S., Mannarino, V., Landis, M., Ebinghaus, R., Weigelt, A., Brunke, E.-G., Labuschagne, C., Martin, L., Munthe, J., Wangberg, I., Artaxo, P., Morais, F., Cairns, W., Barbante, C., Dieguez, M. D. C., Garcia, P. E., Dommergue, A., Angot, H., Magand, O., Skov, H., Horvat, M., Kotnik, J., Read, K. A., Neves, L. M., Gawlik, B. M., Sena, F., Mashyanov, N., Obolkin, V. A., Wip, D., Feng, X. B., Zhang, H., Fu, X., Ramachandran, R., Cossa, D., Knoery, J., Maruszczak, N., Nerentorp, M., and Norstrom, C.: Atmospheric Mercury Concentrations observed at ground-based monitoring sites globally distributed in the framework of the GMOS network, ACPD, Under review to ACP Special Issue: Global Mercury Observation System – Atmosphere (GMOS-A), doi:10.5194/acp-2016-466, 2016b.
- Storelli, M. M., Barone, G., Cuttone, G., Giungato, D., and Garofalo, R.: Occurrence of toxic metals (Hg, Cd and Pb) in fresh and canned tuna: Public health implications, *Food and Chemical Toxicology*, 48, 3167 – 3170, doi:10.1016/j.fct.2010.08.013, 2010.
- Subir, M., Ariya, P. A., and Dastoor, A. P.: A review of uncertainties in atmospheric modeling of mercury chemistry I. Uncertainties in existing kinetic parameters—Fundamental limitations and the importance of heterogeneous chemistry., *Atmospheric Environment*, 45, 32, 5664–5676, 2011.
- Subir, M., Ariya, P. A., and Dastoor, A. P.: A review of the sources of uncertainties in atmospheric mercury modeling II. Mercury surface and heterogeneous chemistry – A missing link, *Atmospheric Environment*, 46, 1 – 10, 2012.
- Travnikov, O., Jonson, J., Andersen, A., Gauss, M., Gusev, A., Rozovskaya, O., Simpson, D., Sokovyh, V., Valiyaveetil, S., and Wind, P.: Development of the EMEP global modelling framework: Progress report. EMEP/MSC-E Technical Report 7/2009, Tech. rep., Meteorological Synthesizing Centre - East, Moscow, Russia, www.msceast.org/publications.html, 2009.
- Travnikov, O., C-J, L., Dastoor, A., Bullock, O., I.M., H., Holmes, C., Ilyin, I., Jaegle, L., Jung, G., Pan, L., Pongprueksa, P., Ryzhkov, A., Seigneur, C., and Skov, H.: Hemispheric Treansport of Air Pollution, Part B: Mercury, chap. Chapter 4 Global and regional modeling, pp. 97 – 144, United Nations, New York ; Geneva :, 2010.
- Travnikov, O., Angot, H., Artaxo, P., Bencardino, M., Bieser, J., [..⁴⁵]D'Amore, F., Dastoor, A., De Simone, F., Diéguez, M. D. C., Dommergue, A., Ebinghaus, R., Feng, X. B., Gencarelli, C. N., Hedgecock, I. M., Magand, O., Martin, L., Matthias, V., Mashyanov, N., Pirrone, N., Ramachandran, R., Read, K. A., Ryjkov, A., Selin, N. E., Sena, F., Song, S., [..⁴⁶]Sprovieri, F., Wip, D., Wängberg, I., and [..⁴⁷]Yang, X.: Multi-model study of mercury dispersion in the atmosphere: Atmospheric processes and model evaluation, [..⁴⁸]*Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 2016.
- Žagar, D., Simik, N., Četina, M., Horvat, M., Kotnik, J., Ogrinc, N., Hedgecock, I. M., Cinnirella, S., De Simone, F., Gencarelli, C. N., and Pirrone, N.: Mercury in the Mediterranean. Part 2: processes and mass balance, *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, pp. 1–14, 2013.

⁴⁵removed: Gencarelli, C

⁴⁶removed: Yang, X

⁴⁷removed: Pirrone, N

⁴⁸removed: ACP, in preparation

- Wang, J., Feng, X., Anderson, C. W., Xing, Y., and Shang, L.: Remediation of mercury contaminated sites—A review, *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 221, 1–18, 2012.
- Wanninkhof, R.: Relationship Between Wind Speed and Gas Exchange Over the Ocean, *Journal Of Geophysical Research - Atmospheres*, 97, –, 1992.
- 5 Weigelt, A., Ebinghaus, R., Pirrone, N., Bieser, J., Bödewadt, J., Esposito, G., Slemr, F., van Velthoven, P. F., Zahn, A., and Ziereis, H.: Tropospheric mercury vertical profiles between 500 and 10 000 m in central Europe, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 16, 4135–4146, 2016.
- Weiss-Penzias, P., Amos, H. M., Selin, N. E., Sexauer Gustin, M., Jaffe, D. A., Obrist, D. and Sheu, G. R., and Giang, A.: Use of a global model to understand speciated atmospheric mercury observations at five high-elevation sites, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions*, 14(16), 22 763–22 792, 2014.
- 10 Wesely, M.: Parameterization of surface resistances to gaseous dry deposition in regional-scale numerical models, *Atmospheric Environment*, 23, 1293 – 1304, doi:10.1016/0004-6981(89)90153-4, 1989.
- Yang, X., Cox, R. A., Warwick, N. J., Pyle, J. A., Carver, G. D., O'Connor, F. M., and Savage, N. H.: Yang, X., Cox, R. A., Warwick, N. J., Pyle, J. A., Carver, G. D., O'Connor, F. M., & Savage, N. H. (2005). Tropospheric bromine chemistry and its impacts on ozone: A model study, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 110, 1984–2012, 2005.
- 15 Yang, X., Pyle, J., Cox, R., Theys, N., and Roozendaal, M. V.: Snow-sourced bromine and its implications for polar tropospheric ozone, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 10, 7763–7773, 2010.
- Zhang, Y., Jaeglé, L., van Donkelaar, A., Martin, R. V., Holmes, C. D., Amos, H. M., Wang, Q., Talbot, R., Artz, R., Brooks, S., Luke, W., Holsen, T. M., Felton, D., Miller, E. K., Perry, K. D., Schmeltz, D., Steffen, A., Tordon, R., Weiss-Penzias, P., and Zsolway, R.: Nested-grid simulation of mercury over North America, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 12, 6095 – 6111, 2012.
- 20 Zhu, J., Wang, T., Bieser, J., and Matthias, V.: Source attribution and process analysis for atmospheric mercury in eastern China simulated by CMAQ-Hg, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 15, 8767–8779, 2015.