

Interactive comment on “Mercury fluxes, budgets and pools in forest ecosystems of China: A critical review” by Jun Zhou et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 16 May 2018

This manuscript reviewed the mercury fluxes, budgets and pools in forest ecosystems in China, however, the authors did not do a good systemic summary for all the current research. For example, the underground flow was not considered into the budget; There are numerous typographical errors and poor sentence structure throughout the paper. Tieshanping showed a high Hg pool, why? , due to its location or being influenced by human activities. Line 29, Chinses?? Line 43, change are to is Line 50, change sinks to sink Line 120, change plays to play Line 136, change resulted to result; which is closed to the large Hg mine of Wanshan, I think your mean is that the litterfall Hg concentration at Leigong is closed to the Hg concentration of litterfall in Wanshan?? If like this, please reorganize this sentence. Line 152, change we to it Line 154, change was to were Line 157, change ranging to range Line 209, change has to have Line 214,

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



change depends to depend Line 223, only one sites?? Line 239, change were to was
Line 247, change showed to show Line 277, humidity?? Line 287, change were to was
Line 306, add were after forests Line 439, change was to were

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2017-794>,
2018.

ACPD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

