Dynamics of gaseous oxidized mercury at Villum Research Station during the High Arctic summer
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Abstract. While much research has been devoted to the subject of gaseous elemental mercury (GEM) and gaseous oxidized mercury (GOM) in the Arctic spring, during atmospheric mercury depletion events, few studies have examined the behavior of GOM in the High Arctic summer. GOM, once introduced into the ecosystem, can pose a threat to human and wildlife health, though there remain large uncertainties regarding the transformation, deposition, and assimilation of mercury into the ecosystem. Therefore, to further our understanding of the dynamics of gaseous oxidized mercury in the High Arctic during the late summer, we performed measurements of GEM and GOM along with meteorological parameters, atmospheric constituents, and air mass history during two summer campaigns in 2019 and 2020 at Villum Research Station (Villum) in Northeastern Greenland. Five events of enhanced GOM concentrations were identified and investigated in greater detail. The origin of these events was identified, through analysis of air mass back-trajectories, associated meteorological data, and other atmospheric constituents, to be the cold, dry free troposphere. These events were associated with low RH, limited precipitation, cold temperatures, and intense sunlight along the trajectory path. Events were positively correlated with ozone, aerosol particle number, and black carbon mass concentration, which were interpreted as an indication of tropospheric air masses. This work aims to provide a better understanding of the dynamics of GOM during the High Arctic summer.

1 Introduction

Gaseous elemental mercury (Hg⁰ or GEM) is a ubiquitous pollutant in the atmosphere due to its long relaxation time (6 to 12 months), thus being subject to long-range transport from source regions to remote environments through deposition and reemission cycling (Pirrone et al., 2010; Skov et al., 2020). The sources of mercury include anthropogenic emissions, e.g., fossil fuel combustion and small artisan gold mines, in addition to natural emissions such as volcanoes, biomass burning, ocean and soil evasion, and reemission of previously deposited mercury (AMAP, 2011). In the atmosphere, GEM is oxidized to its divalent form (Hg⁺), commonly known as gaseous oxidized mercury (GOM). GOM has a much shorter residence time than GEM in the atmosphere owing to its higher solubility, lower vapor pressure, and faster deposition velocity (Skov et al., 2006). Mercury can also be present in aerosol particles, referred to as particulate bound mercury (PHg), either through GOM condensation or through heterogeneous reactions of GEM on aerosol surfaces (Durnford and Dastoor, 2011). In the polar
regions, GEM typically dominates the atmospheric distribution throughout the year, with smaller contributions from GOM and PHg. However, during depletion events in the spring, GOM and PHg can constitute large fractions of total gaseous mercury. In contrast, in the mid-latitudes and especially in locations close to anthropogenic emission point sources, GOM and PHg can represent larger fractions of the atmospheric mercury burden (Muntean et al., 2018).

In locations with elevated halogen concentrations (e.g., polar environments, coastal regions, volcanic plumes, and salt lakes), GEM is quickly transformed into GOM (Angot et al., 2016). In the Arctic, this process manifests as atmospheric mercury depletion events (AMDEs), which occur in spring following polar sunrise, and result in the rapid depletion (on the order of hours) of GEM and conversion to GOM (Schroeder et al., 1998; Lindberg et al., 2002; Berg et al., 2003; Skov et al., 2004). In the early spring, this GOM is converted to PHg (through condensational processes due to the cold temperatures and high aerosol surface area) while in the late spring oxidized mercury is mainly present as GOM (due to reduced surface area and increased temperatures) (Steffen et al., 2014). Late spring is also the peak of Hg in snow, indicating that GOM is the main deposition pathway (Lu et al., 2001; Steffen et al., 2014). GEM oxidization has been demonstrated to be initiated via photochemical reactions with the Br radical (R1-R2) through modeling studies (Holmes et al., 2006, 2010), kinetic studies (Donohoue et al., 2006), theoretical studies (Goodsite et al., 2004, 2012), and observations (Skov et al., 2004; Stephens et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2019).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Br} + \text{Hg}^0 & \leftrightarrow \text{HgBr} \\
\text{HgBr} + Y & \rightarrow \text{HgBrY}
\end{align*}
\]

Where Y could be OH, O₃, NO₂, NO, HO₂, Br, Cl, BrO, ClO, I, IO, of which Br, I, and OH have been postulated to be the main species for Y, both globally and in the Arctic (Goodsite et al., 2004, 2012). Sources of these reactive halogen species include emissions from sea ice, snowpack, frost flowers, refreezing leads, sea-salt aerosol, and liable halogen reservoir species (i.e., halocarbons and inorganic bromine) (Brooks et al., 2006; Kaleschke et al., 2004; Peterson et al., 2018, 2019; Simpson et al., 2015). The exact chemical formulas for GOM and PHg are currently unknown so both species are operationally defined by their detection methods (Landis et al., 2002; Angot et al., 2016). Once formed, GOM can either bind to aerosol particles, becoming PHg, or deposit onto the snowpack through dry and wet deposition. Recently, isotope analysis has revealed GEM uptake by vegetation and soils to be the main source of mercury input to the terrestrial environment in Alaska (Obrist et al., 2010; Douglas and Blum, 2019; Jiskra et al., 2019), although this process has yet to be confirmed in the High Arctic. The majority of this deposited mercury is photo-reduced and emitted back into the atmosphere (Brooks et al., 2006; Dastoor et al., 2008; Kamp et al., 2018). The snowpack will retain a fraction of this mercury and release it with the ionic pulse during the melt season, introducing mercury into the ecosystem (Ariya et al., 2004; Durnford and Dastoor, 2011).

After deposition onto the Earth’s surface, GEM, GOM, and PHg can be methylated through biotic and abiotic processes to organic mercury (methyl- and dimethylmercury) (Macdonald and Loseto, 2010; Møller et al., 2011). Organic mercury is an extremely powerful neurotoxin that bio-accumulates in upper trophic levels thus posing harmful effects to...
ecosystems and human health (especially in indigenous peoples in high latitudes and societies that rely heavily on a seafood diet) (Park and Zheng, 2012). Therefore, it is pertinent to understand mercury oxidation in response to a changing climate, especially in high latitude regions (Durnford and Dastoor, 2011; Stern et al., 2012).

While the majority of GOM formation and deposition occurs in the Arctic during spring, little attention has been given to the behavior of GOM outside of AMDEs. Steen et al. (2011) reported high amounts of GOM (max > 120 pg m\(^{-3}\), mean 8 ± 13 pg m\(^{-3}\)) during the summers of 2007 and 2008 at Zeppelin Mountain (79.93° N 11.50° E, 474 m above sea level). This study revealed a pattern of GOM previously unknown to the Arctic, with elevated GOM concentrations during the summer, which postulates GOM deposition occurs also outside of AMDEs. They concluded the presence of GOM was of local/regional origin, as transport of direct emissions from anthropogenic sources were unlikely. During a research expedition in the Arctic Ocean in June–August 2004, Aspmo et al. (2006) measured GEM, GOM, and PHg, and found increases in GEM over areas with > 70 % sea ice concentrations, which were attributed to an enhanced reduction potential and increased evasion of supersaturated dissolved mercury from the ocean through open leads. They also found low levels of GOM (< 20 pg m\(^{-3}\)) and PHg (< 10 pg m\(^{-3}\)). Levels of Hg in snow and melt ponds were low (< 10 ng L\(^{-1}\)) suggesting little accumulation throughout the summer of deposited mercury from AMDEs in the spring. Concentrations of GEM, GOM, PHg, CO, and ozone were also reported on a research cruise throughout the Arctic basin from July–September 2005 (Sommar et al., 2010). They found low levels of GOM (3.2 ± 1.7 pg m\(^{-3}\)) and PHg (1.0 ± 0.7 pg m\(^{-3}\)), which were not correlated with GEM, sunlight, nor ozone. Steffen et al. (2014) analyzed GOM and PHg at Alert, CA from 2002–2011, they reported low median values during July–September of 5.3–7.36 pg m\(^{-3}\) and 1.01–14.78 pg m\(^{-3}\) for PHg and GOM, respectively. The source of GOM during this study was unclear. These studies show that mercury oxidation and deposition can occur outside of the springtime AMDEs, therefore warranting further study.

The variability of GOM reported during the Arctic summer (Aspmo et al., 2006; Sommar et al., 2010) as well as the previously unknown yearly cycle and lack of formation mechanism (Steen et al., 2011; Steffen et al., 2014) emphasize the need for further examination of the dynamics of GOM in the High Arctic summer. Resolving the sources and dynamics of mercury species in the High Arctic summer will help to infer the response of mercury in the context of a changing climate. It is also important to understand the dynamics of mercury to assess the effects of abatement strategies on atmospheric concentrations in the framework of the Minamata Convention (UNEP, 2013). This will aid in understanding what will be the effects of decreasing anthropogenic mercury emissions and global climate change on the recycling of mercury between different environmental matrices and how it is ultimately sequestered.

Here we report measurements of GEM and GOM, outside of AMDEs, during the late summer of 2019 and GEM and GOM as well as PHg in the late summer of 2020 at Villum Research Station (Villum). We investigate the levels of GOM in connection with meteorological parameters, ozone, aerosol particle physical properties, and air mass history and examine existing interconnections and dependencies. In the following section, we describe the measurement site, analytical instrumentation, and analysis methods. We will then examine the behavior of GOM in relation to meteorological parameters and atmospheric constituents as well as air mass history. We compare our measurements to previous studies of GOM from the
mid-latitudes and hypothesize on possible halogen sources. We conclude with a summary and consider the implications for mercury oxidation in a future climate.

2 Methods and instrumentation

2.1 Measurement sites

Measurements were performed at Flyger’s hut (N 81° 36’, W 16° 40’), which is part of Villum (81.6° N 16.67° W, 24 m above sea level) located on the Danish military base Station Nord in Northeastern Greenland. Villum and Flyger’s hut are both located approx. 2 kilometers to the south of Station Nord, they are separated by approx. 200 meters distance and they are both upwind > 95% of the time from local pollution sources at the military base. All times are reported as UTC.

2.2 Atmospheric mercury measurements

In 2019, atmospheric measurements of GEM and GOM at Flyger’s hut started on August 16 and ended on September 1. In 2020, measurements of GEM, GOM, and PHg started on July 17 and ended on August 4. GEM was analyzed on a 5-minute time resolution by a Tekran 2537A vapor phase analyzer at a flow rate of 1 L min⁻¹. This technique is based on the pre-concentration of GEM on dual gold cartridges followed by thermal desorption in a stream of argon gas and detection by cold vapor atomic fluorescence spectroscopy (CVAFS) at a wavelength of 253.7 nm. Skov et al. (2004) determined a detection limit of 0.1 ng m⁻³ and a reproducibility of 20 %, at a 95% confidence interval (CI) and above 0.5 ng m⁻³. The instrument was manually calibrated with injections of a known amount of mercury before and after the campaigns and auto-calibrated in the field every 25th hour by an internal permeation source.

GOM and PHg were collected using a Tekran 1130 and 1135 speciation unit, respectively, upstream of the GEM analyzer, at a flow rate of 10 L min⁻¹. GOM was sampled onto potassium chloride (KCl) coated denuders. After sample collection, the denuders were flushed in a stream of zero air supplied from the 1130 pump module, then heated to 500°C during which GOM was thermally decomposed to GEM and detected by the Tekran 2537A analyzer. Denuders were exchanged weekly. PHg was sampled onto quartz filters, thermally released in a stream of zero air at 800 °C, and pyrolyzed on quartz chips also at 800 °C (for details about denuder and quartz filter performance and coating procedure, see Landis et al. (2002)). The cutoff size for PHg was < 2.5 µm. For the 2019 campaign, the sampling time was 80 minutes, while for the 2020 campaign the sampling time was 60 minutes. Due to technical issues during the 2019 campaign, measurements of PHg were not available. The limit of detection (LOD) for both GOM and PHg was calculated as three times the standard deviation (s.d.) of blanks values for the flush cycles, excluding the first measurement in a flush cycle as the heated sampling line still contains ambient air. The LODs for the 2019 and 2020 campaigns were 0.18 and 0.684 pg m⁻³, respectively.
2.3 Ancillary measurements

Meteorological parameters including wind speed, wind direction, air temperature, relative humidity, radiation, and snow depth were measured at Villum on a time resolution of 5 minutes. Ozone (O$_3$) was measured at Villum using a photometric O$_3$ analyzer (API M400) at 1 Hz, averaged to 30-minute means. The detection limit was 1 parts per billion by volume (ppbv), with an uncertainty of 3% for measured concentrations above 10 ppbv and 6% below, respectively, on a 95% CI (Nguyen et al., 2016). All measurements used in this study were averaged (median) to correspond temporally to GOM and PHg sampling intervals.

2.4 Particle number size distribution and black carbon

Particle number size distributions (PNSD) from 0.3 to 10 µm were measured using an optical particle sizer (OPS, TSI 3330) on a 10-minute time resolution. This size range is representative of coarse mode particles and a fraction of accumulation mode particles. The entire particle size spectrum was integrated to give the coarse mode particle number concentration ($N_{\text{coarse}}$). The OPS was located at Villum and the data were vigorously quality controlled for abnormal instrument diagnostic parameters (RH and temperature) and the influence of local pollution (i.e., vehicles and activities from Station Nord).

Black carbon (BC) concentrations were measured using a MAGEE AE33 aethalometer (Drinovec et al., 2015) at a 1-minute time resolution. The instrument is an absorption photometer that continuously collects aerosol particles onto a filter and measures light absorption from the resulting filter spot containing the aerosol. The AE33 automatically corrects for filter-loading effects by measuring absorption on a reference filter and operates at seven wavelengths: $\lambda = 370$, 470, 520, 590, 660, 880, and 950 nm. By using a standard BC mass absorption cross-section (MAC) of 7.77 m$^2$ g$^{-1}$ at 880 nm, these absorption coefficients are converted to equivalent black carbon (eBC) mass concentrations. It has been found that the aethalometer overestimates BC concentrations at Arctic sites compared to co-located absorption photometers (Backman et al., 2017). To account for this, an Arctic harmonization factor was used, adapted from Backman et al. (2017) to suit the newer aethalometer model. This has been widely used for Arctic datasets (Schmeisser et al., 2018; Zanatta et al., 2018; Schacht et al., 2019). Substantial uncertainties may arise from cross-sensitivity to scattering in the instrument, especially for Arctic aerosols, which are typically highly scattering. This uncertainty is estimated to be around 15% at Villum, using typical values of single scattering albedo (SSA) and previously determined uncertainty studies (Weingartner et al., 2003; Drinovec et al., 2015).

2.5 Air mass history analysis

Air mass history was interrogated by use of the HYSPLIT trajectory model (Draxler and Hess, 1998; Rolph et al., 2017). Air mass back-trajectories of 120-hour length were calculated arriving at 50 m above ground level for every hour during the two campaigns. The trajectory starting height of 50 m was selected as a compromise between capturing air masses that are representative of our sampling site and avoiding trajectories intercepting the surface, which can produce unrepresentative trajectories (Stohl, 1998); trajectories were also initialized at 20 m, which produced similar trajectory paths but often
intercepted the surface. The trajectory length of 120 hours was selected to produce accurate trajectories but also capture the lifetime of GOM in the atmosphere. Global Data Assimilation System (GDAS) meteorological data on a 1° spatial resolution, employing modeled vertical velocity, were used as input for the model. The HYSPLIT model output included meteorological variables along the trajectory path including relative humidity, precipitation, mixed layer height, and H2O mixing ratio. These parameters along with sea ice concentrations and active fire data were utilized to inspect the geo-physical history of air masses arriving at Villum during the campaign periods (Greene et al., 2017; Greene, 2020). Daily polar gridded sea ice concentrations for the measurement period were obtained through the Nimbus-7 SMMR and DMSP SSM/I-SSMIS Passive Microwave Data from the National Snow and Ice Data Center (NSIDC) (Cavalieri et al., 1996). Fire data were provided by NASA's Fire Information for Resource Management System (FIRMS), active fire data from NASA’s Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS), and NASA's Visible Infrared Imaging Radiometer Suite (VIIRS) (Schroeder et al., 2014).

3 Results & Discussion

3.1 Atmospheric mercury and ground-level meteorological parameters

From the two campaigns, five events of enhanced GOM concentrations were observed: two during the 2019 campaign and three during the 2020 campaign. These events were identified by enhancements of GOM over background levels. Results from the 2019 campaign, describing the time series of meteorological parameters and atmospheric mercury concentrations, are presented in Fig. 1. Wind direction, wind speed, and snow depth are displayed in Fig. S1. From Fig. 1, there are two distinct GOM enhancement events during the 2019 campaign: Event 1 from August 20 at 17:45 to August 27 at 00:10, and Event 2 from August 29 at 20:10 to September 1 at 18:20.

During the first days of Event 1 (August 21 and 22), GEM increased slightly from ~1.6 to ~1.7 ng m⁻³. On the night of August 22, GEM suddenly dropped followed by a slow decrease until the afternoon of August 24 when it precipitously decreased, reaching a minimum of 1.1 ng m⁻³ on the morning of August 25. GEM then quickly increased back to consistent levels of ~1.5 ng m⁻³ for the remainder of the measurement campaign including Event 2. For Event 1, GOM gradually increased from zero on the afternoon of August 20 to the night of August 24, with the highest value (9.8 pg m⁻³) on August 25. On the night of August 25 and into the morning of August 26, GOM quickly decreased from ~8 pg m⁻³ to zero, corresponding to a concurrent increase in RH. As RH then decreased throughout the day of August 26, GOM once again increased to levels similar to those observed on the previous day. A back-trajectory analysis revealed that air masses arriving on August 26 had significant surface contact (Fig. S2). From August 27 to the evening of August 29, GOM is undetectable, before averaging (median ± m.a.d.) 2.8 ± 1.3 pg m⁻³ for Event 2, which started on August 29 and ended on September 1. Concerning the meteorological parameters for Events 1 and 2, the wind direction was mainly from the southwest, with low but variable wind speed (4.9 ± 2.9 m s⁻¹). The relative humidity was low (< 90 % RH), averaging 63 ± 5 % RH for the two event periods. The temperature was routinely above freezing (2.1 ± 0.8 °C). The skies were clear with peak solar radiation above 200 W m⁻². Between the enhancement event periods and non-event periods of the 2019 campaign, temperature, relative humidity, wind direction, solar
radiation, GEM, and GOM were significantly different (Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test, 95 % CI); however, there was no significant difference for wind speed.

Figure 1. Overview of mercury and meteorological parameter measured during the 2019 campaign including (a) temperature (°C) in green on the left axis and relative humidity (%) in blue on the right axis, (b) radiation (W m^{-2}), and (c) GEM (ng m^{-3}) in black on the left axis and GOM (pg m^{-3}) in red on the right axis. The areas shaded in blue indicate Events 1 and 2.

Results from the 2020 campaign, describing the time series of atmospheric mercury species and meteorological parameters, are presented in Fig. 2. Wind direction, wind speed, and snow depth are displayed in Fig. S3. From Fig. 2, three distinct GOM enhancement events are observed: Event 3 from July 22 at 16:35 to July 23 at 13:15, Event 4 from July 24 at 11:55 to July 26 at 13:15, and Event 5 from July 30 at 17:00 to August 4 at 09:40. The 2020 campaign experienced higher GEM concentrations compared to the 2019 campaign. For example, GEM increased from ~1.7 ng m^{-3} on July 17 to ~2.8 ng m^{-3} on July 19, only to dip to ~1.7 ng m^{-3} on July 21 before increasing to ~2.4 ng m^{-3}. These elevated concentrations could be the result of oceanic evasion through open leads and fissures in the consolidated pack ice (Aspmo et al., 2006; DiMento et al., 2019), as air masses experienced extensive surface contact with sea ice on July 19–21 (Fig. S4a–c). For Event 3, GEM and GOM averaged 1.7 ± 0.1 ng m^{-3} and 35.1 ± 13.9 pg m^{-3}, respectively. At the beginning of Event 3, GEM dropped from 2.1 to 1.5 ng m^{-3}, while GOM increased from 6.2 to 61.8 pg m^{-3}. For Event 4, GEM and GOM averaged 1.8 ± 0.1 ng m^{-3} and 8.7 ± 2.4 pg m^{-3}, respectively. During Event 4, GOM peaked at ~14 pg m^{-3} on July 24 at 13:55 and July 25 at 18:35, while GEM decreased from ~1.9 ng m^{-3} to ~1.4 ng m^{-3} before returning to levels of ~1.9 ng m^{-3} by the end of Event 4. For Event 5, GEM and GOM averaged 1.5 ± 0.03 ng m^{-3} and 9.8 ± 2.7 pg m^{-3}, respectively. At the beginning of Event 5, GEM was elevated at
\~1.8 \text{ng m}^{-3} \text{ although quickly decreased to } \~1.4 \text{ng m}^{-3} \text{ while GOM increased from near-zero values to enhanced concentrations of } 20 \text{pg m}^{-3} \text{ for the remainder of Event 5. For Events 3, 4, and 5, } \text{PHg} \text{ displayed no visible pattern and was constantly near or below LOD.}

Meteorological parameters during the 2020 campaign are displayed in Fig. 2. Event 3 experienced decreasing temperatures (5 to 1 °C) and increasing RH (77 to 92 %) while Event 4 displayed an opposite pattern of increasing temperatures (5 to 7, maximum 12 °C) and decreasing RH (77 to 79, minimum 52 %). For Events 3 and 4, the wind direction was mainly from the east with low and stable wind speeds (Fig. S2). For Event 5, the temperature exhibited a diurnal pattern (10.6 ± 1.2 °C) with low (< 70 %) and decreasing RH (minimum 30 %), the wind direction was consistently from the southwest with high wind speeds (median 8.8 m s\(^{-1}\), max 12 m s\(^{-1}\)). During all three events, snow cover was near zero (Fig. S2) and global radiation was high during all three events (except during the beginning of Event 3, Fig 2). Between the enhancement event periods and non-event periods of the 2020 campaign, temperature, relative humidity, wind speed, wind direction, solar radiation, GEM, and GOM were significantly different (Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test, 95% CI).

**Figure. 2.** Overview of mercury and meteorological parameters during the 2020 campaign including (a) temperature (°C) in green on the left axis and relative humidity (%) in blue on the right axis, (b) radiation (W m\(^{-2}\)) shaded in yellow, and (c) GEM (ng m\(^{-3}\)) in black on the left axis, GOM (pg m\(^{-3}\)) in red on the right axis, and PHg (pg m\(^{-3}\)) in blue on the right axis. The area shaded in blue indicates Events 3, 4, and 5, respectively.

For Events 1, 2, 4, and 5, the ground level meteorological parameters mainly associated with GOM enhancement are high levels of radiation and low RH. Interestingly, these events were not linked to cold temperatures, which has been previously
demonstrated to be associated with mercury oxidation (Ariya et al., 2015; Steffen et al., 2015). The stability of the Hg-Br intermediate is highly temperature-dependent (Goodsite et al., 2004, 2012). The temperature at Villum ranged from -3.1 to 5.6 °C and from 0.0 to 15.1 °C during the 2019 and 2020 campaign, respectively. Therefore, the ground-level temperatures are likely too high for local in situ production of GOM in the boundary layer to occur. This observation prompted the analysis of air mass back-trajectories with arriving at Villum, and their meteorological data, to investigate the dynamics of GOM during these enhancement events.

3.2 Air mass history

Analysis of air mass history including both the trajectories and the associated meteorology along the paths can provide useful information regarding the source regions and favorable conditions for GOM formation and removal. Contour plots for different meteorological parameters (temperature, relative humidity, solar radiation) and altitude for each trajectory along with GOM concentrations for the 2019 and 2020 campaigns are displayed in Fig. 3 and 4, respectively. Other meteorological parameters (H₂O mixing ratio and precipitation) for the 2019 and 2020 campaigns are shown in Fig. S5a–b and Fig. S5c–d, respectively.

Figure 3. Contour plots of trajectory derived meteorological parameters (a) temperature, (b) relative humidity, (c) solar radiation, and (d) altitude, along each trajectory for the 2019 campaign. Event periods are outlined in red. The x-axis displays arrival time at Villum, the y-axis displays hours backward in time for each trajectory, and the color bar represents the meteorological parameter. Trajectories were producing via the HYSPLIT model.
In 2019, air masses arriving during Events 1 and 2 were, on average, colder (temperature: -2.8 ± 3.2 °C), dryer (RH: 80 ± 15 %, accumulated precipitation: 3.8 ± 2.5 mm, and H2O mixing ratio: 2.6 ± 0.7 g / kg\textsubscript{dry air}), and exposed to more intense solar radiation (110 ± 73 W m\textsuperscript{-2}) when compared to non-event periods (temperature -1.1 ± 1.5 °C, RH: 90 ± 7 %, accumulated precipitation: 5.1 ± 3.0 mm, H2O mixing ratio: 3.2 ± 0.4 g / kg\textsubscript{dry air}, solar radiation: 100 ± 54 W m\textsuperscript{-2}). Trajectory temperature, RH, precipitation, H2O mixing ratio, solar radiation, and altitude were significantly different (Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test, 95% CI) between GOM enhancement event periods and non-event periods during the 2019 campaign. For the 2020 campaign, a similar pattern is observed for Events 3, 4, and 5 with air masses being, on average, colder (temperature: 0.4 ± 4.1 °C), drier (RH: 74 ± 17 %, accumulated precipitation: 1.9 ± 1.6 mm, and H2O mixing ratio: 3.1 ± 0.7 g / kg\textsubscript{dry air}) and exposed to more intense solar radiation (214 ± 104 W m\textsuperscript{-2}) when compared to non-event periods (temperature 1.3 ± 2 °C, RH: 91 ± 8 %, accumulated precipitation: 7.0 ± 3.6 mm, H2O mixing ratio: 3.9 ± 0.6 g / kg\textsubscript{dry air}, and solar radiation: 167 ± 85 W m\textsuperscript{-2}). During the 2020 campaign, trajectory temperature, RH, H2O mixing ratio, solar radiation, and altitude were significantly different (Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test, 95% CI) between GOM enhancement event periods and non-event periods. Higher levels of solar radiation enable the photolysis of reactive halogen species and lower relative humidity inhibits the partitioning of GOM into the liquid phase (Laurier, 2003; Soerensen et al., 2010; Brooks et al., 2011; Steen et al., 2011). Lower temperatures aid in the formation of GOM from HgBr; Skov et al. (2004) and Christensen et al. (2004) modeled a surface temperature below -4 °C for mercury depletion to occur in the Arctic, while Brooks et al. (2011) observed a temperature threshold of -15 °C for mercury oxidation to occur. Therefore, it appears that while ground-level measurements showed no robust connection to cold temperatures, meteorological conditions along the trajectory path showed a relationship between GOM and subfreezing temperatures as well as dry, sunlit conditions.
The differences between ground-level and trajectory-derived meteorological parameters during enhancement events and non-events imply that these air masses are likely decoupled from the boundary layer. To examine the vertical origin of these air masses, an analysis of the altitude of trajectories arriving at Villum was performed. Figures 3d and 4d display a contour plot of the altitude for each hourly back-trajectory for the 2019 and 2020 campaign, respectively. From these figures, it is evident that during GOM enhancement events air masses spent considerable time aloft before arrival at Villum. For the 2019 campaign, median back-trajectory altitudes during event periods were $754 \pm 467$ m, compared to $371 \pm 351$ m during non-event periods. For the 2020 campaign, median altitudes during event periods were $1075 \pm 578$ m, compared to $425 \pm 352$ m during non-event periods. Indeed, air masses that arrived during event periods were above the mixed layer height $90$ and $99$ % of the time in the 2019 and 2020 campaigns, respectively. Air masses that arrived during non-event periods were above the mixed layer height only $64$ and $82$ % of the time in the 2019 and 2020 campaigns, respectively. Together, the analysis of air mass history demonstrates that the origin of the GOM enhancement events is the free troposphere under favorable meteorological conditions (cold and dry with intense solar radiation along the trajectory path).

Interestingly, during event periods, air masses experienced these favorable conditions at different times during transport; temperatures were colder further back along the trajectory path while RH was lower closer to the measurement site.
During the 2019 campaign, minimum temperatures were observed, on average (median), 48 hours before arrival, while minimum RH was observed 23 hours before arrival. These times correspond to average altitudes of 1538 m and 427 m, for minimum temperature and RH, respectively. During the 2020 campaign, temperatures were, on average, at a minimum 76 hours before arrival, while RH was at a minimum 16 hours before arrival. These times correspond to average altitudes of 1795 m and 542 m, for minimum temperature and RH, respectively. These findings highlight the complex relationship between GOM formation, removal, and meteorological parameters during transport. Colder temperatures in the free troposphere are likely facilitating the formation of GOM, by increasing the stability of the HgI intermediate at colder temperatures, while low RHs closer to the surface are limiting uptake of GOM into the aqueous phase. Additionally, given the low surface resistance of GOM over snowpack (Skov et al., 2006), dry (and possibly wet) deposition will increase occur when air masses come in close contact with the surface, resulting in decreased concentrations. Thus, it appears the formation of GOM is facilitated in the free troposphere and the survival is governed closer to the surface.

**Figure. 5.** Map of air mass back-trajectories during Events 1–5 in (a) through (e). Individual hourly trajectories are in black, active fires during each event are in red, active fires intersecting trajectories within 1° latitude/longitude and within 1 hour are in yellow (active fires from the previous 5 days before the start of an event were included to reflect the trajectory length), and sea ice concentration is given by the color bar. The position of Villum is marked by the blue star. Trajectories were producing via the HYSPLIT model. Sea ice concentration was taken from NSIDC. Fire data were obtained from the FIRMS database.
Geospatially, the GOM enhancement events show different source regions. Figure 5a–e shows hourly air mass back-trajectories, combined with sea ice concentrations and active fire data, for each event. To capture the presence of fires in relation to the length of each trajectory, active fires from the previous 5 days before the start of each event and up to the end of each event were included. For Event 1, air masses showed two main source regions: the first is the Arctic with air masses originating from either the central Arctic Ocean or the northern part of the Canadian archipelago and passing over Northern Greenland, and the other is the Northern Atlantic. Event 2 showed a major contribution of air masses from the Canadian archipelago with smaller contributions from the Northern Atlantic just south of Svalbard. Events 3 and 4 showed air masses originating from the Arctic Ocean with little spatial extent. Event 5 showed the largest spatial extent, with air masses arriving from mainly over the Greenlandic Ice Sheet, although contributions were also found from the Northern Atlantic and parts of Northern Scandinavia. Other than Events 3 and 4, the geospatial origins of air masses during GOM enhancement events were quite diverse. Events 3 and 4 were only separated by a couple of hours and therefore similar air mass origin is expected for the two events. Figure 5a–e shows that the air mass origins during GOM enhancement events are heterogeneously distributed throughout the Arctic as well as the Canadian Archipelago and Scandinavia.

3.3 Comparison with mid-latitude studies

Previous studies have demonstrated the influence of the troposphere on mercury concentrations. In the mid-latitudes of the northern hemisphere, the free troposphere has been established as a source of GOM through modeling studies (Gratz et al., 2015; Shah and Jaeglé, 2017) and observations from both aircraft campaigns (Talbot et al., 2007; Gratz et al., 2015) and high altitude sites (Swartzendruber et al., 2006; Faïn et al., 2009; Fu et al., 2016). Depletions of GEM were observed onboard research flights in the upper troposphere (8–12 km) during the INTEX-B campaign in 2006 over the North Pacific (Talbot et al., 2007). GEM was rarely detected when ozone was greater than 300 ppb; the authors ascribed this relationship as an indicator of time spent in the stratosphere. They hypothesized that the near-ppm levels of ozone in the stratosphere were the cause of the depleted GEM. Faïn et al. (2009) reported similar observations of the free troposphere acting as a source of oxidized mercury at a high elevation site (3220 m above sea level) in the Rocky Mountains, USA. They also observed that the presence of GOM was dependent on RH. They hypothesized that the build-up of GOM in the free troposphere was governed exclusively by the existence of low RH, possibly due to the lack of scavenging by particles at low RH levels. Modeling studies have also shown the troposphere to be a source of GOM. Using the GEOS-Chem global chemical transport model, Holmes et al. (2006) and Holmes et al. (2010) identified Br to be the dominant oxidant of GEM globally, with most of the oxidation occurring in the middle and upper troposphere. Shah and Jaeglé (2017) arrived at a similar conclusion using GEOS-Chem that much of the mercury oxidation by Br occurs in the middle and upper troposphere. These studies show the free troposphere to be a source of GOM in the mid-latitudes, however, there are a limited number of field studies on GOM in the High Arctic summer and none, to the authors' knowledge, on the influence of the free troposphere on GOM levels. Similar chemistry is likely the cause of the observations in this study; however, the Arctic atmosphere is largely separated from the mid-latitudes during summer.
on account of contraction of the polar dome, so there may be differences in the dynamics, albeit unlikely (Holmes et al., 2010). This study provides field validation of these previous modeling studies from the mid-latitudes by identifying the free troposphere as a source of GOM in the High Arctic summer.

### 3.4 Ozone

Given the source of the enhanced GOM concentrations was identified to be the cold, dry free troposphere, our analysis now turns to other atmospheric constituents, particularly ozone. An analysis of ground-level ozone measurements can help to provide insight into the dynamics of GOM as mercury depletion events and ozone depletion events often occur concurrently through reactions with halogen species.

GEM and GOM concentrations along with ozone mixing ratios for the 2019 and 2020 campaigns are displayed in Fig. 6a and Fig. 6d, respectively. During non-event periods in the 2019 campaign, ozone is either low or decreasing. During Event 1, ozone increases concurrently with GOM, when they both peak on August 25 at 45.5 ppb and 9.8 pg m$^{-3}$ for ozone and GOM, respectively, while GEM exhibits a minimum on August 25 at 1.1 ng m$^{-3}$ (Fig. 6a). For Event 1, ozone averaged 36.9 ± 4.7 ppb. The peak ozone level is abnormally high for the late summer (median ± m.a.d. ozone mixing ratio for August 2010–2018 is 24.6 ± 3.1 ppb). Ozone then decreases during the second non-event period and only increases again during Event 2 to an average of 31.9 ± 2.6 ppb.

For the 2020 campaign, a similar relationship between ozone and GOM is observed (Fig. 6d). During Event 3, ozone is increasing simultaneously with GOM while GEM is decreasing; for this event, ozone averaged 26.7 ± 0.8 ppb. For Event 4, ozone averaged 25.3 ± 1.6 ppb and is at background levels for much of the event. On July 25, ozone peaked at 34 ppb before returning to background levels. For the non-event period from July 26 to 30, ozone is significantly elevated over background levels, although there is an absence of enhanced GOM concentrations. This discrepancy can again be accounted for by the meteorological conditions along the trajectory path (Fig. 4 and S3); elevated temperature, RH, precipitation, and H$_2$O mixing ratios lead to the removal of GOM, while ozone is only slightly water-soluble leading to less efficient wet removal (Sander, 2015). For Event 5, ozone follows a similar pattern as GOM, increasing at the beginning of the event and remaining elevated for the duration. Event 5 experienced the highest average trajectory altitudes (1530 ± 813 m) as well as highest average ozone mixing ratios (30.7 ± 1.7 ppb), which were elevated over normal levels during July (median ± m.a.d. ozone mixing ratio for August 2010–2018 is 23.6 ± 2.8 ppb).

For the GOM enhancement events in 2019, there is a moderate negative correlation between GEM and ozone (Spearman’s rank coefficient -0.62, Fig. 6b), as well as a moderate positive correlation between GOM and ozone (Spearman’s rank coefficient 0.71, Fig. 6c). For the 2020 campaign, this moderate negative relationship between GEM and ozone is retained (Spearman’s rank coefficient -0.72, Fig. 6e), although for GOM and ozone the correlation is moderate to weak (Spearman’s rank coefficient 0.45, Fig. 6c). This is likely due to the high concentrations observed during Event 3, when removing this event from the correlation analysis for the 2020 campaign, the Spearman’s rank coefficient increases to 0.62. These relationships cast doubt on the boundary layer production of GOM, analogous to the mechanisms of AMDEs. During AMDEs, ozone and
GEM are positively correlated due to mutual reaction with halogen species and are both extremely depleted due to strong halogen explosion events (Schroeder et al., 1998; Lindberg et al., 2002; Berg et al., 2003; Skov et al., 2004; Brooks et al., 2006; Simpson et al., 2015). While ozone mixing ratios were high during GOM enhancement events, they are an order of magnitude below levels reported in the upper troposphere/lower stratosphere (Talbot et al., 2007), and given the slow rate reaction coefficient (Pal and Ariya, 2004), ozone is an improbable oxidant of mercury during these campaigns. Any depletions of ozone during GEM oxidation is likely masked by the elevated levels of ozone in the free troposphere.

**Figure. 6.** Time series of GOM concentrations (pg m$^{-3}$) in black on the left axis, ozone mixing ratios (ppbv) in red on the first right axis, and GEM concentrations (ng m$^{-3}$) in blue on the second right axis for (a) the 2019 and (d) the 2020 campaign. Correlation between GEM and ozone for (b) the 2019 and (e) the 2020 campaign. Correlation between GOM and ozone for (c) the 2019 campaign and (f) the 2020 campaign. The areas shaded in blue indicate events periods. Correlations were calculated using the event periods. The slopes for (b), (c), (e), and (f) are significantly different from zero at the 95 % CI.
The relationship between GOM and ozone suggests a common source or source regions for these two species. Sources of ozone in the High Arctic include transport from mid-latitudes, local production from NOx present in the snowpack, peroxycetyl nitrate (PAN) photolysis, and intrusion from the free troposphere/stratosphere (Dibb et al., 2002; Walker et al., 2012; Law et al., 2014). During the winter and spring, transport from the mid-latitudes (Hirdman et al., 2009) and the free troposphere/stratosphere (Semane et al., 2007; Arnold et al., 2015) are dominant ozone sources. During the summer and autumn, contraction of the polar dome decreases transport of ozone and its precursors (e.g., CO, PAN, NOx) from the mid-latitudes, making intrusion from the free troposphere/stratosphere a more dominant source of ozone. Elevated ozone mixing ratios have been observed with increasing altitude in the Arctic during the ARCTAS aircraft campaigns (Jacob et al., 2010; Monks et al., 2015). Conversely, increased photochemical activity and deposition are important sinks for ozone at the ground level during the summer (Helmig et al., 2007; Arnold et al., 2015). Enhancements of GOM, which exhibited a positive correlation with ozone, have also been observed during subsidence events on Antarctica (Brooks et al., 2008; Pfaffhuber et al., 2012). Therefore, the elevated ozone levels during GOM enhancement events and positive correlation between these two species are an indicator of influence from air masses in the free troposphere, strengthening our hypothesis of the free troposphere as the source of GOM during summer (Sect. 2.2).

3.5 Particle number and black carbon

Our attention now turns to other atmospheric constituents, namely aerosol particles and black carbon content. The free troposphere has been shown to be a source of aerosol particles to the boundary layer in the Arctic (Igel et al., 2017) and contains elevated concentrations of BC over the surface level (Schulz et al., 2019). The presence of coarse mode aerosol particles has also been shown to be a necessary condition for observing BrO (a tracer for halogen activation) in the Arctic (Bognar et al., 2020). A common source of aerosol particles, black carbon, and mercury species is biomass burning (Friedli et al., 2009; Soerensen et al., 2010; Winiger et al., 2019). Therefore, we analyzed these constituents to examine their interaction with GOM with respect to the different sources.

During the non-event periods of the 2019 campaign, the coarse mode particle number concentration ($N_{Coarse}$) and black carbon (BC) are both low, $0.5 \pm 0.3$ cm$^{-3}$ and $1.2 \pm 1.1$ ng m$^{-3}$, respectively. For Event 1, $N_{Coarse}$ and BC are both elevated ($4.2 \pm 3.1$ cm$^{-3}$ and $8.6 \pm 6.0$ ng m$^{-3}$, respectively) and increase concurrently with GOM, reaching a maximum concentration of $\sim 11$ cm$^{-3}$ and $\sim 26$ ng m$^{-3}$, respectively, on August 25 (Fig. 7a). For Event 2, $N_{Coarse}$ and BC returned to low values, although at a higher level compared to non-event periods, $2 \pm 0.1$ cm$^{-3}$ and $3.8 \pm 0.6$ ng m$^{-3}$, respectively. This pattern is comparable to the behavior of ozone (Sect. 2.3, Fig. 6a). For the enhancement events during the 2019 campaign, there is a positive correlation for event periods between GOM and $N_{Coarse}$ (Spearman’s rank coefficient 0.71), as well as between GOM and BC (Spearman’s rank coefficient 0.62). For the 2020 campaign, a different scenario is observed between $N_{Coarse}$, BC, and GOM (Fig. 7b). For Events 3 and 4, there is a slight enhancement of $N_{Coarse}$ and BC levels when compared to the preceding non-event periods (Fig. 7b). For Event 5, both $N_{Coarse}$ and BC are decreasing and low, $0.6 \pm 0.1$ cm$^{-3}$ and $2.8 \pm 1.1$ ng m$^{-3}$, respectively. For enhancement events during the 2020 campaign, GOM is not correlated with $N_{Coarse}$ and BC (Spearman’s rank coefficient -0.02 and -0.07,
respectively). Given the high concentrations during Event 3, these measurements may be skewing the results of the correlation analysis, however, if they are removed, the Spearman’s rank coefficient between GOM and both $N_{\text{Coarse}}$ and BC becomes moderately negative (Spearman’s rank -0.25 and -0.33, respectively). This moderate negative correlation is due to decreasing concentrations during Event 5. Air masses during this event arrived from high altitudes from over the Greenlandic ice sheet (Sect. 2.2), therefore the low concentrations of $N_{\text{Coarse}}$ and BC are likely a representation of upper tropospheric air masses above the polar dome, which are extremely pristine (Schulz et al., 2019).

**Figure. 7.** Gaseous oxidized mercury (pg m$^{-3}$) in black on the left axis, coarse mode particle number concentration (cm$^{-3}$) in blue on the first right axis, and black carbon (ng m$^{-3}$) in red on the second right axis for (a) the 2019 and (b) the 2020 campaign. The areas shaded in blue indicate event periods.

Given the correlation between GOM, BC, and $N_{\text{Coarse}}$ during enhancement events, biomass burning could be a potential source. To investigate the influence of biomass burning emission on GOM concentrations and the two episodes of high $N_{\text{Coarse}}$ and BC concentrations during the 2020 campaign, active fire data from the FIRMS database were utilized in connection with air mass back-trajectory analysis for each event (active fires from the previous 5 days before the start of an event were included to reflect the trajectory length). As seen in Fig. 5a–e in Sect. 3.2, the geospatial origins of air masses during GOM enhancement events are heterogeneously distributed. During the enhancement events, there are few intersections between air mass back-trajectories and active fires during Events 2 and 5 and none for Events 1, 3, and 4. GOM levels during Events 2 and 5 were low compared to other events (Fig. 1 and 2) and there is minimal intersection of back-trajectories and fires. Therefore, it appears that biomass burning and/or combustion related emissions have little to no influence on GOM levels observed at Villum.

During the 2020 campaign, there are two episodes, the first from July 26 at 15:15 to July 27 at 11:35 and the second from July 27 at 19:05 to July 28 at 09:05, where $N_{\text{Coarse}}$ and BC are significantly elevated, reaching up to 33 cm$^{-3}$ and 100 ng m$^{-3}$, respectively, compared to the rest of the campaign (Fig. 7b). These two episodes are observed during non-event periods (Fig. 7b). These episodes are likely long-range transported, as they are too gradual and long to be identified as local pollution from activities at Station Nord. Figure 8a and b show air mass back-trajectories for the first and second episodes, respectively,
combined with active fire data from the previous 5 days to the end of the episode. These episodes, which originate mainly from Fennoscandia with smaller contributions from the Arctic Ocean and the Barents Sea, are influenced by biomass burning emissions from active fires around the Bay of Bothnia (Fig. 8). GOM during these episodes is low, 2.6 ± 1.1 pg m⁻³ for the first episode and 1.8 ± 0.9 pg m⁻³ for the second episode. This shows that while biomass burning emissions can influence the Arctic atmospheric composition, they do not impact GOM concentrations.

Figure 8. Map of air mass back-trajectories during a) the first episode and b) the second episode of elevated N_{Coarse} and BC concentrations. Individual hourly trajectories are in black, active fires during each event are in red, active fires intersecting trajectories within 1° latitude/longitude and within 1 hour are in yellow (active fires from the previous 5 days before the start of an episode were included to reflect the trajectory length), and sea ice concentration is given by the color bar. The position of Villum is marked by the blue star. Trajectories were producing via the HYSPLIT model. Sea ice concentration was taken from NSIDC. Fire data were obtained from the FIRMS database.

While these positive correlations between GOM and both N_{Coarse} and BC appear not to be indicative of a common source, they do suggest a common sink. A dominant sink for aerosol particles is scavenging by cloud droplets and removal via wet deposition (Browse et al., 2012). Tunved et al. (2013) observed a decrease in particle mass and diameter with increased accumulated precipitation at Ny Ålesund for the period 2000–2010, while Croft et al. (2016) used the GEOS-Chem-TOMAS model to simulate the Arctic aerosol annual cycle and found coagulation scavenging of interstitial aerosols to be a strong control on accumulation mode particles. Presuming that an RH greater than 95 % signifies air masses were within a cloud (Freud et al., 2017), the time spent in-cloud could be calculated for each event. Air masses during Events 1 and 2 spent 23 and 12 % of the time in-cloud, respectively, and 20 % combined. For Events 3, 4, and 5, air masses spent 50 %, 8 %, and 16 % of the time in-cloud, and 15 % combined. Interestingly, Event 3 exhibited both the highest GOM concentrations and the most...
time in-cloud, an observation for which we do not have an explanation thus far. While Event 3 followed the general pattern displayed by the other events (cold, dry air from the free troposphere under sunlit conditions), there appears other factors influencing the high concentrations of GOM during this event that we are unable to detect at this time. Overall, we hypothesize that the lack of sinks in the free troposphere for accumulation mode particles and BC due to the absence of wet removal processes and diminished water content is likely the reason for the observed increase in NCoarse and BC during the enhancement events. Furthermore, we did not find evidence of biomass burning emissions influencing GOM levels at Villum.

3.6 Possible halogen sources

With the source region of the observed GOM identified as the cold, dry free troposphere, what are the possible sources of halogen species? Sources of these reactive halogen species include snowpack, sea ice, frost flowers, refreezing leads, sea-salt aerosol, and liable halogen reservoir species (i.e., halocarbons and inorganic bromine) (Kaleschke et al., 2004; Brooks et al., 2006; Simpson et al., 2015; Peterson et al., 2018). As demonstrated by Halfacre et al. (2019) and Burd et al. (2017), a frozen heterogeneous surface is required for the propagation of halogen explosions. However, with the altitude and meteorological conditions of back-trajectories indicating free tropospheric air masses (Sect. 3.2), as well as ground-level temperatures regularly above 0 °C and little snow cover during both campaigns, emissions from snowpack, sea ice, and frost flowers appear to be unlikely sources in this study.

Coarse mode particles and aerosol optical depth have been shown to be connected with BrO enhancement events (Peterson et al., 2017; Bognar et al., 2020), through the recycling of halogens on sea salt aerosol surfaces in the troposphere. Indeed, previous studies have found depletions of bromine in coarse mode particles in the polar regions (Giordano et al., 2018; Hara et al., 2018; Frey et al., 2020). The positive correlation between GOM and NCoarse observed during our study (Fig. 7), could consequently be due to halogens being activated and recycled on coarse mode aerosol particle surfaces. As stated in Sect. 3.5, we hypothesize instead that the positive correlation between GOM and NCoarse is due to decreased sinks in the free troposphere, although the contribution from halogen activation and recycling cannot be ruled out without high time resolution measurements of aerosol chemical composition. While NCoarse is low throughout both campaigns, coarse mode particles are likely one of the few heterogeneous surfaces in the free troposphere, therefore, they could have a large impact on halogen recycling.

One biogenic source of halogen species is the emission of halocarbons from marine emissions by micro-organisms, e.g., macroalgae, ice algae, and phytoplankton (Sturges et al., 1992; Quack and Wallace, 2003). Thin, porous sea ice has been shown to readily emit halocarbons during the Arctic summer (Atkinson et al., 2014), and our studies were conducted in July–September when sea ice is at a minimum (Comiso, 2012). Once emitted from the ocean, these halocarbons are photolyzed in the troposphere to produce reactive halogen species (Yang et al., 2005). In our study, the vertical extent of air mass back-trajectories during enhancement events was consistently from aloft, under cold, dry, and sunlit conditions. The spatial extent showed no consistent source regions, indicating that GEM oxidation is ubiquitous in the free troposphere of the High Arctic.
emissions of coarse mode aerosol particles from open waters and marginal ice zones would therefore represent a widespread source throughout the Arctic.

Therefore, we hypothesize that the oxidants responsible for the mercury oxidation result from the photolysis of short-lived halocarbons emitted from marine biological activity and were possibly sustained via recycling on aerosol surfaces. However, this is a working hypothesis and further research is needed to confirm this theory, specifically column and in situ measurements of reactive halogen species, their precursors, aerosol chemical composition, and mercury species.

4 Summary and conclusion

While the behavior of GEM and GOM during the spring in the High Arctic has received much attention, the dynamics of GOM in the late summer/autumn have seldom been investigated. Therefore, we conducted measurements of GEM, GOM, PHg (only 2020), meteorological parameters, ozone, and aerosol particle physical properties at Villum Research Station in Northeastern Greenland during the High Arctic summer in 2019 and 2020. By probing the air mass history during five GOM enhancement events, we show that enhancements of GOM are largely controlled by temperature, RH, and solar radiation. Analysis of air mass history provides direct evidence of influence from the free troposphere, while measurements of ozone, BC, and coarse mode particle number concentration support this conclusion. Biomass burning was not found to contribute to GOM enhancement events, although it affects N_{Coarse} and BC concentrations through long-range transport. These measurements and analyses provide insight into the behavior of GOM during summer in the High Arctic and provide validation for previous studies from the mid-latitudes, where the free troposphere has been identified to be a source of GOM. The behavior of mercury in a changing Arctic climate is still an area with many knowledge gaps, and this work seeks to bridge those gaps, although further research (especially long-term, mercury speciation measurements) is needed.

With changing conditions in the Arctic (i.e., rising temperatures, melting sea ice, longer melt seasons), there is large uncertainty regarding the oxidation and deposition of mercury in response to these changes (Stern et al., 2012). For example, with the Arctic becoming warmer (Jiang et al., 2020) and therefore wetter, the feedback mechanisms on mercury oxidation remain an important scientific question. Warming temperatures will decrease the stability of the HgI intermediate and possibly increase biogenic production of halocarbons as well as increasing atmospheric water vapor, which will favor increased uptake of oxidized mercury into the particulate phase and its removal by wet deposition. The magnitude of these contrasting effects and their consequences for GOM levels in the High Arctic is still an open question. Given the positive correlation between GOM and aerosol particles, and their role in halogen activation, changes in the size distribution and chemical composition of aerosol particles could have implications for mercury oxidation. Recent trends in declining sea ice (Stroeve et al., 2012) could increase the sea salt aerosol burden, thus potentially increasing mercury oxidation and deposition via increased halogen recycling and particulate mercury deposition. Declining sea ice could also increase GEM evasion from the Arctic Ocean, shifting the Arctic Ocean from a sink to a source (Ariya et al., 2004; Dastoor and Durnford, 2014). Future studies addressing the contribution of the free troposphere to boundary layer GOM concentrations along with flux measurements of dry and wet...
deposition of GOM in the summer will help answer these questions. The presented work aims to bridge some of the knowledge gaps in mercury processing although further research is needed to better understand how the behavior of atmospheric mercury will respond in a changing climate.
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