

Future mercury levels in fish: model vs. observational predictions under different policy scenarios

Henna Gull¹, Ju Hyeon Lee², Hoin Lee¹, H el ene Angot³, Sae Yun Kwon¹

¹Division of Environmental Science and Engineering, Pohang University of Science and Technology, 77 Cheongam-Ro, Nam-Gu, Pohang 37673, South Korea

²Harvard John A. Paulson School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138, United States

³Univ. of Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, INRAE, IRD, Grenoble INP, IGE, 38400 Grenoble, France

Correspondence to: Sae Yun Kwon (saeyunk@postech.ac.kr)

10 **Table S1.** Anthropogenic and natural mercury emission inventories applied in atmospheric Models.

References (models)	Anthropogenic	Natural
 Scenarios		
(Corbitt et al. 2011) (Geos-Chem) A1B, A2, B1, and B2	(Pacyna et al. 2010) – base year emissions (Streets et al. 2009) – future emission scenarios	GEOS-Chem parameterization – geogenic/ legacy emissions
(Lei et al. 2014) (CAM-Chem/Hg) A1B, B1, and A1F1	(Pacyna et al. 2006) – base year emissions (Streets et al. 2009) – future emission scenarios	(Lei et al. 2013) – natural/legacy emissions (Witt et al. 2008; Aiuppa et al. 2007) – volcanic emissions (IPCC 2001) – forest & grassland burning (Smith-Downey et al. 2010) – terrestrial Hg storage
(Vijayaraghavan et al. 2014) (CTM) A2 and B2	(EPRI 2006) – base year emissions (Streets et al. 2009) – future emission scenarios	(Seigneur et al. 2004) – natural/legacy re-emissions
(Giang and Selin 2016) (Geos-Chem) No policy and Minamata	(Pacyna et al. 2006) – base year emissions (Streets et al. 2009) – future emissions	GEOS-Chem parameterization
(Pacyna et al. 2016) (GLEMOS and ECHMERIT) CPS, NPS, and MFR	(AMAP/UNEP, 2013) – baseline emissions (Streets et al. 2009; 2011; 2017) – historical and future scenario emissions (Pacyna et al. 2006; 2010) – earlier global anthropogenic inventories	(Pirrone et al. 2010) – volcanic / geogenic emissions (Smith-Downey et al. 2010) – terrestrial storage and natural re-emissions
(Angot et al. 2018) (Geos-Chem) NPS and MFR	(AMAP/UNEP, 2013) – base year emissions	(Pirrone et al. 2010; Bagnato et al. 2011) – geogenic emissions

	(Streets et al. 2011) – historical emissions (2000 BCE–2008 CE) (Pacyna et al. 2016) – future scenarios	
(Perlinger et al. 2018) (Geos-Chem) Minimal regulation, Policy-in-action, and aspirational scenario	(AMAP/UNEP, 2013) – baseline emissions (Streets et al. 2009; 2011; 2017) – historical and future scenario emissions	(Pirrone et al. 2010; Bagnato et al. 2011) – geogenic GEOS-Chem parameterization – natural/legacy emissions
(Chen et al. 2018) (Geos-Chem) A1B, constant emissions, Hg control, and zero emissions	(Streets et al. 2011) – emissions (2000 BCE–2008 CE) (Horowitz et al. 2014) – commercial-product emissions (1850–2008) AMAP/UNEP (2018) – baseline emissions (Streets et al. 2011) – emissions (1850–1970) by region (Streets et al. 2009; Amos et al. 2013) – future scenario emissions	(Pirrone et al. 2010; Bagnato et al. 2011) – geogenic emissions
(Y. Zhang et al. 2021) (Geos-Chem) A1B, NPS-delayed, and MFR	AMAP/UNEP (2013) – base year emissions (Streets et al. 2009; Pacyna et al. 2016) – future scenario emissions	Default GEOS-Chem datasets
(H. Zhang et al. 2021) (Geos-Chem) A1B, B1	(Pacyna et al. 2010; Zhang et al. 2012) – base year emissions (Streets et al. 2009; Corbitt et al. 2011) – future scenario emissions	(Mason 2009; Bagnato et al. 2011) – geogenic emissions (Holmes et al. 2010) – biomass burning and soil evasion (Selin et al. 2008) – prompt terrestrial re-emission (Holmes et al. 2010; Zhang et al. 2016) – ocean evasion

Table S2. Acronyms and descriptions for climate-oriented and hybrid mercury emission scenarios.

Scenarios	Descriptions
BAS (Baseline)	Assumes continuation of air-quality and climate policies in force up to 2012, without introducing additional mercury or emission-control measures beyond 2030.
CLIM (Climate Mitigation)	Incorporates a 2 °C global climate policy, achieving substantial reductions in fossil-fuel use and associated mercury emissions by 2050.
CLIM+MFR	Climate mitigation scenario with maximum feasible mercury reduction measures, representing the lowest achievable global Hg emissions.
Net-Zero	Net-zero energy pathway (< 1.5 °C by 2100) combined with current-legislation Hg and air-quality policies.
Net-Zero + Hg MFR	Combines net-zero climate policy with maximum Hg-specific controls, yielding the lowest feasible Hg emissions by 2050.

SSP1-2.6	A lower-bound emissions scenario reflecting strong emphasis on sustainability and intensive control of climate-forcing agents.
SSP2-4.5	A middle-of-the-road scenario reflecting moderate socioeconomic development and continuation of current trends without strong climate mitigation.
SSP5-3.4	An overshoot scenario characterized by short-term growth in fossil fuel use and minimal consideration of climate control measures until 2040 followed by aggressive mitigation after mid-century.
SSP5-8.5	An upper-bound emissions scenario in which fossil-fuel use continues with little consideration of climate mitigation or transition to clean technologies.

Table S3. Full forms of abbreviations used for meteorological datasets and drivers in atmospheric Hg models.

Acronym / Model	Descriptions
GEOS	Goddard Earth Observing System
ECHAM5	The fifth-generation atmospheric general circulation model developed at the Max Planck Institute for Meteorology in Hamburg, based on the operational forecast model framework from ECMWF.
WRF	Weather Research and Forecasting
ECMWF	European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts
NCEP	National Centers for Environmental Prediction
NCAR	National Center for Atmospheric Research
ECCC	Environment and Climate Change Canada's
GEM	Global Environmental Multiscale
GCM	General circulation model
CCSM	Community Climate System Model
NCAR-MM	National Center for Atmospheric Research - Mesoscale Model
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NCDC	National Climatic Data Center
MERRA-2	Modern-Era Retrospective analysis for Research and Applications, Version 2 by NASA's Global Modeling and Assimilation Office (GMAO)
GISS-GCM	Goddard Institute for Space Studies - general circulation model

15

Table S4. Summary of variables used in PCA and MLRM analyses.

Scenarios	Change in fish MeHg (% yr⁻¹)	Change of Hg deposition (% yr⁻¹)	Watershed (km²)	Lake Area (km²)	Wetland (%)	Average depth (m)	Waterbodies
SRES A2	0.114	0.264	17.040	1.070	4.030	6.400	Mendums Pond, NH

SRES B2	-0.318	-0.346	17.040	1.070	4.030	6.400	Mendums Pond, NH
NPS	-0.275	-0.383	183.100	7.148	14.285	5.570	Lakes in Maine, ME
MFR	-0.550	-0.645	183.100	7.148	14.285	5.570	Lakes in Maine, ME
Policy-in-action	-0.250	-0.341	190.000	9.700	14.210	15.000	Lakes in Michigan's UP, MI
Aspirational	-1.477	-1.477	190.000	9.700	14.210	15.000	Lakes in Michigan's UP, MI
Policy-in-action	0.438	0.277	190.000	9.700	14.210	15.000	Michigan's UP with Adirondack's deposition
Policy-in-action	-0.857	0.277	190.000	9.700	8.800	15.000	Adirondack area, NY
Reduction in deposition, 50 %	-0.633	-1.020	4.200	0.200	1.000	2.000	Eagle Butte Lake, SD
Reduction in deposition, 50 %	-1.041	-1.020	0.810	0.120	-	4.800	Lake Barco, FL
Reduction in deposition, 50 %	-1.163	-1.020	50.000	3.600	4.000	5.000	Pawtuckaway Lake, NH
Reduction in deposition, 50 %	-1.571	-1.020	220.000	35.000	25.000	2.300	Lake Waccamaw, NC
Reduction in deposition, 50 %	-1.510	-1.020	2190.000	9.900	8.000	0.250	Brier Creek, GA

Note: For NPS and MFR, “Lakes in Maine” reflect the averaged characteristics of 20 modeled lakes.

Table S5. MLRM results testing whether lake characteristics alone predict changes in fish MeHg by 2050 in the model world.

	Coef	std err	t	P> t 	[0.025	0.975]
const	-0.6521	0.432	-1.509	0.175	-1.674	0.370
Watershed	-0.0003	0.000	-0.924	0.386	-0.001	0.000
LakeArea	-0.0687	0.045	-1.526	0.171	-0.175	0.038
Wetland	0.0582	0.061	0.947	0.375	-0.087	0.203
AverageDepth	0.0072	0.039	0.187	0.857	-0.084	0.099

Table S6. MLRM results testing lake characteristics together with scenario-specific Hg deposition as predictors of changes in fish MeHg by 2050 in the model world.

	Coef	std err	t	P> t 	[0.025	0.975]
const	-0.1249	0.275	-0.454	0.666	-0.799	0.549
Watershed	-0.0002	0.000	-1.219	0.269	-0.001	0.000
LakeArea	-0.0656	0.025	-2.599	0.041	-0.127	-0.004
Wetland	0.0685	0.035	1.982	0.095	-0.016	0.153
AverageDepth	-0.0264	0.023	-1.136	0.299	-0.083	0.030
Deposition	0.7864	0.195	4.032	0.007	0.309	1.264

Code, data, or code and data availability

25 Custom scripts used for statistical analyses are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request. All data analysed in this study are available from the cited publications. Any compiled datasets are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Supplement link

The link to the supplement will be included by Copernicus.

Author contributions

30 Henna Gull compiled and curated the data, conducted the analyses, and led the writing of the manuscript. Hoin Lee cross-checked and validated the compiled data. Ju Hyeon Lee provided critical feedback and contributed to manuscript revision. H el ene Angot provided scientific feedback and suggestions that helped improve the manuscript. Sae Yun Kwon supervised the study and contributed to conceptualization and manuscript revision. All authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript.

35 Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements

Henna Gull gratefully acknowledges financial support from the Government of Korea Scholarship (GKS). The authors thank POSTECH and the Department of Environmental Science and Engineering (DESE) for institutional support, and the
40 Environmental & Health Assessment Laboratory for providing the research infrastructure and facilities used in this study.

Financial support

No external funding was received for this work.

Review statement

The review statement will be added by Copernicus Publications listing the handling editor as well as all contributing referees
45 according to their status anonymous or identified.

References

- AMAP/UNEP, 2013. Technical Background Report for the Global Mercury Assessment 2013. Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme, Oslo, Norway/UNEP Chemicals Branch, Geneva, Switzerland. vi + 263 pp
- AMAP/UN Environment, 2019. Technical Background Report for the Global Mercury Assessment 2018. Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme, Oslo, Norway/UN Environment Programme, Chemicals and Health Branch, Geneva, Switzerland. viii + 426 pp including E-Annexes
- 50 Aiuppa, A., E. Bagnato, M. L. I. Witt, et al. 2007. “Real-Time Simultaneous Detection of Volcanic Hg and SO₂ at La Fossa Crater, Vulcano (Aeolian Islands, Sicily).” *Geophysical Research Letters* 34 (21). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007GL030762>.
- Amos, Helen M., Daniel J. Jacob, David G. Streets, and Elsie M. Sunderland. 2013. “Legacy Impacts of All-Time
55 Anthropogenic Emissions on the Global Mercury Cycle.” *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 27 (2): 410–21. <https://doi.org/10.1002/gbc.20040>.
- Angot, H el ene, Nicholas Hoffman, Amanda Giang, et al. 2018. “Global and Local Impacts of Delayed Mercury Mitigation Efforts.” *Environmental Science & Technology* 52 (22): 12968–77. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b04542>.
- Bagnato, E., A. Aiuppa, F. Parello, et al. 2011. “New Clues on the Contribution of Earth’s Volcanism to the Global Mercury
60 Cycle.” *Bulletin of Volcanology* 73 (5): 497–510. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00445-010-0419-y>.
- Chen, Long, Wei Zhang, Yanxu Zhang, et al. 2018. “Historical and Future Trends in Global Source-Receptor Relationships of Mercury.” *Science of The Total Environment* 610–611 (January): 24–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.07.182>.
- Cooper, Richard N., J. T. Houghton, James J. McCarthy, and Bert Metz. 2002. “Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis.” *Foreign Affairs* 81 (1): 208. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20033020>.

- 65 Corbitt, Elizabeth S., Daniel J. Jacob, Christopher D. Holmes, David G. Streets, and Elsie M. Sunderland. 2011. "Global Source-Receptor Relationships for Mercury Deposition Under Present-Day and 2050 Emissions Scenarios." *Environmental Science & Technology* 45 (24): 10477–84. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es202496y>.
- Giang, Amanda, and Noelle E. Selin. 2016. "Benefits of Mercury Controls for the United States." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 113 (2): 286–91. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1514395113>.
- 70 Holmes, C. D., D. J. Jacob, E. S. Corbitt, et al. 2010. "Global Atmospheric Model for Mercury Including Oxidation by Bromine Atoms." *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* 10 (24): 12037–57. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-10-12037-2010>.
- Horowitz, Hannah M., Daniel J. Jacob, Helen M. Amos, David G. Streets, and Elsie M. Sunderland. 2014. "Historical Mercury Releases from Commercial Products: Global Environmental Implications." *Environmental Science & Technology* 48 (17): 10242–50. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es501337j>.
- 75 Lei, H., X.-Z. Liang, D. J. Wuebbles, and Z. Tao. 2013. "Model Analyses of Atmospheric Mercury: Present Air Quality and Effects of Transpacific Transport on the United States." *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* 13 (21): 10807–25. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-13-10807-2013>.
- Lei, H., D. J. Wuebbles, X.-Z. Liang, et al. 2014. "Projections of Atmospheric Mercury Levels and Their Effect on Air Quality in the United States." *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* 14 (2): 783–95. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-14-783-2014>.
- 80 Mason, Robert P. 2009. "Mercury Emissions from Natural Processes and Their Importance in the Global Mercury Cycle." In *Mercury Fate and Transport in the Global Atmosphere: Emissions, Measurements and Models*, edited by Robert Mason and Nicola Pirrone. Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-93958-2_7.
- Pacyna, E.G., J.M. Pacyna, K. Sundseth, et al. 2010. "Global Emission of Mercury to the Atmosphere from Anthropogenic Sources in 2005 and Projections to 2020." *Atmospheric Environment* 44 (20): 2487–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2009.06.009>.
- 85 Pacyna, Elisabeth G., Jozef M. Pacyna, Frits Steenhuisen, and Simon Wilson. 2006. "Global Anthropogenic Mercury Emission Inventory for 2000." *Atmospheric Environment* 40 (22): 4048–63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2006.03.041>.
- Pacyna, Jozef M., Oleg Travnikov, Francesco De Simone, et al. 2016. "Current and Future Levels of Mercury Atmospheric Pollution on a Global Scale." *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* 16 (19): 12495–511. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-16-12495-2016>.
- 90 Perlinger, J. A., N. R. Urban, A. Giang, et al. 2018. "Responses of Deposition and Bioaccumulation in the Great Lakes Region to Policy and Other Large-Scale Drivers of Mercury Emissions." *Environmental Science: Processes & Impacts* 20 (1): 195–209. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C7EM00547D>.
- Pirrone, N., S. Cinnirella, X. Feng, et al. 2010. "Global Mercury Emissions to the Atmosphere from Anthropogenic and Natural Sources." *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* 10 (13): 5951–64. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-10-5951-2010>.
- 95 Seigneur, Christian, Krish Vijayaraghavan, Kristen Lohman, Prakash Karamchandani, and Courtney Scott. 2004. "Global Source Attribution for Mercury Deposition in the United States." *Environmental Science & Technology* 38 (2): 555–69. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es034109t>.

- Selin, Noelle E., Daniel J. Jacob, Robert M. Yantosca, Sarah Strode, Lyatt Jaeglé, and Elsie M. Sunderland. 2008. “Global 3-D Land-ocean-atmosphere Model for Mercury: Present-day versus Preindustrial Cycles and Anthropogenic Enrichment Factors for Deposition.” *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 22 (2): 2007GB003040. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007GB003040>.
- Smith-Downey, Nicole V, Elsie M. Sunderland, and Daniel J. Jacob. 2010. “Anthropogenic Impacts on Global Storage and Emissions of Mercury from Terrestrial Soils: Insights from a New Global Model.” *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences* 115 (G3): 2009JG001124. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JG001124>.
- Streets, David G., Molly K. Devane, Zifeng Lu, Tami C. Bond, Elsie M. Sunderland, and Daniel J. Jacob. 2011. “All-Time Releases of Mercury to the Atmosphere from Human Activities.” *Environmental Science & Technology* 45 (24): 10485–91. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es202765m>.
- Streets, David G, Hannah M Horowitz, Daniel J Jacob, Zifeng Lu, and Leonard Levin. 2017. “Total Mercury Released to the Environment by Human Activities.” *Environ. Sci. Technol.*
- Streets, David G., Qiang Zhang, and Ye Wu. 2009. “Projections of Global Mercury Emissions in 2050.” *Environmental Science & Technology* 43 (8): 2983–88. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es802474j>.
- “Technical Background Report for the Global Mercury Assessment 2013 | AMAP.” n.d.-a. Accessed November 7, 2023. <https://www.amap.no/documents/doc/technical-background-report-for-the-global-mercury-assessment-2013/848>.
- “Technical Background Report for the Global Mercury Assessment 2013 | AMAP.” n.d.-b. Accessed January 29, 2026. <https://www.amap.no/documents/doc/technical-background-report-for-the-global-mercury-assessment-2013/848>.
- Vijayaraghavan, Krish, Leonard Levin, Lynsey Parker, Greg Yarwood, and David Streets. 2014. “Response of Fish Tissue Mercury in a Freshwater Lake to Local, Regional, and Global Changes in Mercury Emissions.” *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry* 33 (6): 1238–47. <https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.2584>.
- Witt, M. L. I., T. A. Mather, D. M. Pyle, A. Aiuppa, E. Bagnato, and V. I. Tsanev. 2008. “Mercury and Halogen Emissions from Masaya and Telica Volcanoes, Nicaragua.” *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth* 113 (B6): 2007JB005401. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007JB005401>.
- Zhang, H., C.D. Holmes, and S. Wu. 2016. “Impacts of Changes in Climate, Land Use and Land Cover on Atmospheric Mercury.” *Atmospheric Environment* 141 (September): 230–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2016.06.056>.
- Zhang, Huanxin, Shiliang Wu, and Eric M. Leibensperger. 2021. “Source-Receptor Relationships for Atmospheric Mercury Deposition in the Context of Global Change.” *Atmospheric Environment* 254 (June): 118349. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2021.118349>.
- Zhang, Y., L. Jaeglé, A. Van Donkelaar, et al. 2012. “Nested-Grid Simulation of Mercury over North America.” *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* 12 (14): 6095–111. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-12-6095-2012>.
- Zhang, Yanxu, Zhengcheng Song, Shaojian Huang, et al. 2021. “Global Health Effects of Future Atmospheric Mercury Emissions.” *Nature Communications* 12 (1): 3035. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-23391-7>.
- Electric Power Research Institute. 2006. Modeling deposition of atmospheric mercury: Case studies. Palo Alto, CA, USA.