

Interactive comment on “Trend of atmospheric mercury concentrations at Cape Point for 1995–2004 and since 2007” by Lynwill G. Martin et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 18 November 2016

This paper analyzed the long-term trends of gaseous elemental mercury (GEM) concentrations at Cape Point between September 1995 - December 2005 and since March 2007 until June 2015. The paper focuses on the changing trend sign between 2004 and 2007. The authors concluded that the trend at Cape Point is qualitatively consistent with the trend changes in other observation sites and suggests a change in worldwide mercury emissions. Overall, the analysis is very straightforward and the paper is clearly written. However, I found the analysis might be a bit overly simplified and too qualitative. Some specific comments are given below.

First, I can see that the measurement data at Cape Point is part of the GMOS and is an important dataset. But it is hard for me to see what the novelty of this paper is because

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



the authors always stated that the results of this study are consistent with previous studies.

Secondly, the comparison with emission inventory is quite weak. The authors tried to link the increase trend of GEM levels measured at Cape Point during 2007-2015 with the study of Zhang et al (2016), which indicated that the global mercury emissions had increased very slightly during 2000-2010, that is, by +5%. This is farfetched because the emissions given by Zhang et al. and the measurements are different years.

Third, Line 30-33: The trend change is qualitatively consistent with the trend changes in GEM concentrations observed at Mace Head, Ireland, and in mercury wet deposition over North America suggesting a change in worldwide mercury emissions. This is a very important selling point for this paper. However, I wonder if this can be applied to Worldwide emission. And more importantly, this should be supported by the data of Hg emissions or at least the drivers for Hg emission change. However, there is almost no analysis or discussions on the changes of Hg emissions in the paper.

Seasonal changes of biomass burning shall be discussed in more details and a more quantitative way if possible.

Line 259-262: This statement needs support of detail analyses.

Finally, the authors repeated some sentences in a few places of the paper. For example, Line 83-85 "According to Zhang et al. (2016) the worldwide anthropogenic emissions 83 decreased from 2890 Mg yr⁻¹ in 1990 to 2160 Mg yr⁻¹ in 2000 and increased slightly 84 to 2280 Mg yr⁻¹ in 2010 " was repeated in Line 250-252, and stated again in the conclusions. The downward trend during 1995-2004 was repeated for many times. The conclusions repeated the statements in results and discussions. And there are many sentences in the abstract same as that in conclusions. Therefore, the authors shall short the paper by deleting the repetitive sentences.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., doi:10.5194/acp-2016-882, 2016.