



Supplement of

Glacier damage evolution over ice flow timescales

Meghana Ranganathan et al.

Correspondence to: Meghana Ranganathan (miranganathan@uchicago.edu)

The copyright of individual parts of the supplement might differ from the article licence.

S1 Coupled Flowline/Damage Model

S1.1 Flowline Model and Numerical Implementation

In Section 2 of the main text, we implement a flowline model initially posed in Schoof (2007) and used in previous studies, including Robel et al. (2014) and Christian et al. (2022). These studies have described this model in significant detail and thus can be used to supplement any detail not outlined here.

This model implements a one-dimensional form of the momentum and mass balance equations:

$$\rho_i g h \frac{\partial s}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[2hA^{-1/n} \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right|^{\frac{1}{n}-1} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right] - C|u|^{m-1}u \quad (\text{S1})$$

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial t} = \dot{a} - \frac{\partial(uh)}{\partial x} \quad (\text{S2})$$

in which u, h, s are ice velocity, thickness, and surface elevation, respectively. The parameters are: ρ_i is the density of ice, g is the gravitational constant, A is the flow-rate parameter, n is the stress exponent is Glen's flow law, C is the sliding coefficient, m is the sliding exponent, \dot{a} is the surface accumulation rate.

The glacier terminates at the grounding line, with no ice shelf, and therefore the thickness boundary condition at the end of the domain is

$$h_L = -\frac{\rho_w}{\rho_i} b(x_g) \quad (\text{S3})$$

where L is the length of the glacier, ρ_w is the density of water, b is the bed elevation measured from sea level, and x_g is the grounding line position. At the terminus, the velocity is found by

$$\rho_i g h_L \left(1 - \frac{\rho_i}{\rho_w}\right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[2hA^{-1/n} \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right|^{\frac{1}{n}-1} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right] \quad (\text{S4})$$

To solve for velocity and thickness, we follow the implementation outlined in Schoof (2007). As the grounding line advances and retreats, the grid in the x -direction is allowed to stretch and contract. To allow for this, we rescale the x -coordinates to define a new coordinate variable γ , where $\gamma = 0$ describes the inflow boundary and $\gamma = 1$ describes the terminus. Note that in previous work, this parameter was denoted as σ , but to avoid confusion with stress in this work, we denote this γ .

We solve Equations 1, 2 using an implicit finite difference scheme, in which the derivatives in the x -direction are approximated by an upwind scheme. There are two differences between the implementation here and the one outlined in Schoof (2007). First, as in Christian et al. (2022), we force the model with frontal melt forcing such that the thickness approximation at the terminus becomes

$$0 = \frac{h_i^k - h_i^{k-1}}{\Delta t} - \frac{\gamma}{x_g} \frac{(x_{g_i}^k - x_{g_i}^{k-1})(h_i^k - h_{i-1}^k)}{\Delta t \Delta \gamma} + \frac{(h_i^k(u_i^k + m \frac{h_f}{h_i^k} + u_{i-1}^k) - h_{i-1}^k(u_{i-1}^k + u_{i-2}^k))}{2x_{g_i}^k \Delta \gamma} - \dot{a} \quad (\text{S5})$$

in which there is an extra term in the $\frac{\partial(uh)}{\partial x}$ approximation to account for frontal melt forcing at the terminus. Second, in order for viscosity to vary with damage, we let viscosity vary spatially over the grid. We do this through the parameter ϵ defined in Schoof (2007) to represent ice viscosity. We scale this such that $\tilde{\epsilon} = \epsilon(1 - D)^{-1/n}$, where ϵ is as defined in Schoof (2007) and $\tilde{\epsilon}$ is used in its stead in this work.

S1.2 Transient Damage Model and Numerical Implementation

In Section 2.2, we implement a transient damage model based on Pralong and Funk (2005) to compare against our diagnostic damage model:

$$\frac{\partial D^*}{\partial t^*} + u^* \frac{\partial D^*}{\partial x^*} = \delta(\tilde{\sigma}_x^* - \sigma_t^*)^r (1 - D)^{-k} \quad (\text{S6})$$




Figure S1. Recalculation of Fig. 2 in the main text but with $\sigma_t = 0.05$ MPa. In this case, each run is for 1000 years and the grounding line position is calculated for both the transient and diagnostic damage models.

35 where all parameters here are nondimensionalized as described in Section 2.1 of the main text. Here, D is damage, u is ice velocity, δ is the nondimensional parameter describing the ratio of advective to fracture timescales, $\tilde{\sigma}_x^*$ is the effective maximum principal stress, σ_t^* is the nondimensional stress threshold, r, k are material parameters.

To find the source term f in the one-dimensional flowline model, we first determine σ_x as

$$\sigma_x = \frac{3}{2}\tau_x - \frac{1}{2}\rho_i g(h - z) \quad (\text{S7})$$

$$40 \quad \tau_x = 2\eta \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \quad (\text{S8})$$

$$\eta = A \left[\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right)^2} \right]^{\frac{1-n}{n}} \quad (\text{S9})$$

where τ_x describes the longitudinal deviatoric stress, z is the vertical coordinate, and η is the dynamic viscosity. We then convert the x -coordinates to γ as described above.

We solve the damage equation using an upwind scheme to approximate the x - derivatives as follows:

$$45 \quad \frac{\partial(uD)}{\partial \gamma} \approx \frac{D_i^k(u_i^k + u_{i-1}^k) - D_{i-1}^k(u_{i-1}^k + u_{i-2}^k)}{2\Delta \gamma} \quad (\text{S10})$$

The ice enters the inflow boundary undamaged and is allowed to advect out of the outflow boundary.

S2 δ Parameter Space: Other σ_t Value

Here, we recalculate Figure 2 in the main text, which shows the parameter space of δ and its effect on the validity of the diagnostic damage model, for a higher stress threshold value ($\sigma_t = 0.05$ MPa) to demonstrate that the results are largely
50 insensitive to the value of the stress threshold.




Figure S2. Similar to Fig. 3 in the main text. We run three different model simulations using no damage coupling, the full transient damage model of Pralong and Funk (2005), and the diagnostic damage model. We present the melt forcing (column 1), grounding line position (column 2), the absolute error in grounding line position between the diagnostic damage model and the transient damage model, and the error in grounding line position as a percent of the amount of grounding line retreat by the transient model: (top row) annual frontal melt variability with a lower fraction of variability, (middle row) interannual frontal melt forcing, (bottom row) Constant frontal melt forcing with a higher rate of melt.

S3 Diagnostic Damage Model: Other Melt Scenarios

In the main text, we test the diagnostic damage model against different climate forcing scenarios that may affect the flow timescale of the model. Here, we show other scenarios not presented in the main text (Figure S2). We first test annual melt forcing with a smaller degree of variability than shown in the main text, in which the error in grounding line position is lesser than the annual forcing example presented in the main text. We also present an interannual variability example, in which frontal melt forcing oscillates in a 7-year cycle. This produces a similar degree of error in the grounding line position as annual melt forcing. Finally, we test a constant frontal melt forcing of $\mu_m = 100 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$, a much higher rate of melt than presented in the main text. Even with a significant increase in the melt rate, the diagnostic damage solver reproduces the grounding line change of the transient model with a smaller error ($< 5\%$ by 1000 years).

Given these results, we would expect that for a large frontal melt forcing and a large degree of variability on short timescales, the diagnostic damage solver would produce a larger error than with smaller melt forcing or degree of variability. However,

the results here suggest that, for physical scenarios, the diagnostic damage solver should produce reasonable damage estimates and, thus, similar ice sheet response as the full transient damage models.

S4 Converting Deviatoric to Cauchy Stresses

65 We calculate damage in 3D in order to capture the effect of overburden pressure counteracting the opening of cracks. However, the ice flow model icepack operates using the shallow-stream approximation, which captures ice flow in two dimensions and assumes that velocity is constant with depth. Therefore, to calculate 3D damage, we compute deviatoric stresses from the flow model and convert the deviatoric stresses to Cauchy stresses, following the previous work of Keller and Hutter (2014); Huth et al. (2021) as

$$70 \quad \sigma_{ij} = \tau_{ij} - p\delta_{ij} \quad (\text{S11})$$

where σ_{ij} is the Cauchy stress tensor, τ_{ij} is the deviatoric stress tensor, p is pressure, and δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta.

The choice of pressure p affects where we allow damage to accumulate. In this study, we set $p = p_i$, ice overburden pressure, which is

$$p_i = \rho_i g(h - z) - \tau_{xx} - \tau_{yy} \quad (\text{S12})$$

75 where ρ_i is ice density, g is the gravitational constant, h is ice thickness, z is the vertical coordinate, and τ_{xx}, τ_{yy} are the in-plane deviatoric normal stresses. The pressure is therefore monotonically increasing with depth, producing damage that accumulates primarily at the surface. However, in regions of the glacier in which the base of the ice is in contact with water, such as on ice shelves or in grounded ice that flows over subglacial channels, water pressure can counteract the ice overburden pressure, allowing for damage accumulation at the base of ice shelves and glaciers. As outlined in Keller and Hutter (2014); Huth et al. 80 (2021), this can be modeled through the use of an effective pressure in Equation 11, in which

$$p_{\text{eff}} = \begin{cases} 0 & z \geq z_{\text{sl}} \\ \rho_w g(z_{\text{sl}} - z) & z < z_{\text{sl}} \end{cases} \quad (\text{S13})$$

where z_{sl} is the height of sea level and is set to $z_{\text{sl}} = 0$ as in Huth et al. (2021), and ρ_w is the density of seawater. In the next section, we describe how including this effective pressure would increase the magnitude of damage estimated at each timestep and therefore enhance the overall effect of damage on flow.

85 S5 Basal crevassing

In Figure S3, we evaluate the effects of including basal crevassing on our results. We calculate damage using the diagnostic model at steady-state in the MISMP+ configuration, calculating Cauchy stresses using just ice overburden pressure (Figure S3a) and using effective pressure (Figure S3b). For each case, we show vertical slices through the glacier of the Hayhurst stress (Figure S3i,iii) and the damage field (Figure S3ii,iv), in which the slices are taken through the margin (Figure S3i,ii) and 90 through the centerline (Figure S3iii,iv). We set the stress threshold to be $\sigma_t = 0.2$ MPa.

If using ice pressure (Figure S3a), the Hayhurst stress is largest at the surface and smaller at depth, due to depth varying compressive (negative) ice pressure. The stress also is larger downstream of the glacier than upstream, with the smallest stress being upstream near the bed. In the margin slice, there is a minimum in stress through the ice column right at the grounding line. Damage is set to $D = 1$ where the Hayhurst stress exceeds the stress threshold $\sigma_t = 0.2$ MPa. There are small amounts 95 of damage concentrated at the surface in both the margin and the centerline, with damage extending deeper through the ice column in the margin slice.

When using effective pressure (Figure S3b), the Hayhurst stress is larger on the ice shelf at depth than in the ice pressure case, due to the effects of water pressure in basal crevasses. The difference in the margin is more minor, since damage in the margins is concentrated into two lobes at the grounding line. However, the stress in that lobe is high enough to produce damage




Figure S3. Including basal crevassing: Calculations of Hayhurst stress and damage using (a) ice pressure and (b) effective pressure to calculate Cauchy stresses from deviatoric stresses. For each case, we show the 2D damage field calculated using the diagnostic model from the steady-state MISMP+ configuration. We also show vertical slices through the margin of (i) Hayhurst stress and (ii) damage and vertical slices through the centerline of (iii) Hayhurst stress and (iv) damage. Contours on the Hayhurst stress fields show where the stress is 0.2 MPa, the stress threshold.

through the full ice thickness, so $\bar{D} = 1$ in the margin. In the centerline on the ice shelf, the Hayhurst stress is higher at depth than in the ice pressure case. Along the bulk of the ice shelf centerline, there are regions of $\sigma \geq \sigma_t$ (Figure S3b,iii), producing a region of damage at the base of the ice shelf along with a region of damage at the surface (Figure S3b,iv).

As a result, the depth-averaged damage using effective pressure (Figure S3b) is much higher than the depth-averaged damage using ice pressure (Figure S3a). Therefore, using effective pressure in the results here would likely further enhance the effects of damage on flow.

S6 Timestep and Mesh Size Dependence of Diagnostic Damage Model

Here we show the sensitivity to mesh size and timestep of the diagnostic damage model. We initialize these simulations with a steady-state MISMP+ configuration with no damage, and we run the simulations with no external forcing in order to identify the mesh size and timestep dependence of only the damage model. Because there is no external (basal melt) forcing, damage causes ice volume to increase slightly over the simulation period, as the steady state with damage has a slightly larger mass than the steady state without damage.

To evaluate the effect of mesh size (Figure S4a), we create a mesh with triangular elements of the same area across the domain and vary the element sizes from 3–15 km². In general, as mesh size increases, the change in ice volume also increases, because as mesh size increases, damage is applied over a larger area of the glacier. However, as the mesh size decreases, the effect of mesh size also decreases; the difference between 3 and 5 km² is very small after 100 years. While here, we test mesh sizes




Figure S4. Evaluating the (a) mesh size and (b) timestep dependence of the diagnostic damage model, in the MISMP+ geometry, initialized with no damage and run with no basal melting.

that are applied uniformly across the domain, in the basal melt simulations we use a mesh that is refined near the grounding line, where the melt is being applied. The mesh size begins at 8 km² away from the grounding line and reduces to 1 km² at the grounding line quadratically with proximity to the grounding line.

To evaluate the effect of timestep (Figure S4b), we run simulations for 10 model-years with varying timesteps from 0.01 year to 1 year. The effect of timestep within these bounds is very small. In the main text, we use a timestep of $\Delta t = 0.25$ year.

S7 Effect of D_{\max}

In the study, we take the value of $D_{\max} = 0.79$ for numerical convergence reasons. Larger values of D_{\max} produce viscosity values close to zero and, thus, cause difficulties with convergence of the flow solver. When we compare stress criteria, we use $D_{\max} = 0.5$ for a similar reason. As described in the main text, we argue that this is an acceptable approximation to $D_{\max} \rightarrow 1$, as it still produces viscosities significantly close to 0 so as to mimic the behavior of a material that has lost its load-bearing capacity.

Here we show that the estimates of ice volume loss presented in the study are largely insensitive to the specific value of D_{\max} as long as it is sufficiently large enough. Figure S5 shows results of comparing ice volume loss with and without damage evolution for varying D_{\max} . The percent enhancement of ice volume loss is similar for all values of D_{\max} , with minor differences. Between $\sim 60 - 80$ years, lower values of D_{\max} produce slightly lower estimates of ice volume loss enhancement, though on the century-scale, the resulting enhancement of ice volume loss is the same for all values of D_{\max} .

S8 MISMP+ Experiment Ice1ra

Here we run the MISMP+ Experiment Ice1ra, in which we simulate grounding line retreat in response to basal melt forcing for 100 years and then turn off basal melt forcing and let the grounding line advance for another 900 years. We do this for two cases: one in which we compare damage initiation and evolution to no damage modeling at all (Figure S6), and one in which we compare damage initiation and evolution to damage initiation but no evolution (Figure S7).

The first simulation initiates with no damage, and after one model timestep of $dt = 0.25$ years, there are two lobes of damage that initiate near the grounding line in the margins. After 100 years of basal melting, damage accumulates to maximum across




Figure S5. Estimates of ice volume loss enhancement for the case in which we compare a model run with damage initialization but no evolution with a model run with damage initialization and evolution by the diagnostic damage solver, for varying D_{\max} values.

the ice shelf, with the two initial lobes connecting. In reality, this would initiate a calving event. However, given that this model does not simulate calving currently, once basal melt forcing was turned off, that damage field advects away and, given that there is no longer climate forcing, much less damage accumulates in its place. Therefore, by 1000 years, the damage field remains again concentrated in the margins, with low damage in the center of the ice shelf.

However, the ice shelf does not completely recover to its previous undamaged state. This is reflected in the change in ice volume and grounded area. While the simulation with no damage largely recovers to the grounded area and ice volume of the initial steady state (in fact, with the glacier growing in volume slightly as compared to the initial state; Figure S6b), if we include damage initiation and evolution, the glacier no longer reaches its initial grounded area (Figure S6c). This suggests that damage affects the ability of the glacier to recover from grounding line retreat.

Next, we consider the effect of initializing a model with damage but not evolving damage (Figure S7). Initially, there is elevated damage in the margins. In response to basal melting for 100 years, damage accumulates in the margins and along the grounded ice. Once basal melting turns off, the damage field largely reverts back to its steady-state, with a few regions of elevated damage along the margins of the grounded ice (Figure S7a). Unlike the previous simulation, initializing the model with damage produces a similar behavior in grounding line advance and ice volume recovery. Both simulations do not fully recover in ice volume to the initial steady-state or the initial grounded area (Figure S7b-c).

S9 MISMP+ Experiment: Run to 500 years

In the main text, we show ice sheet response to basal melt forcing over 100 years. Here, we show how these results change if we were to run the experiments for 500 years. In Figure S8, we are comparing two simulations: one in which we initialize and evolve damage (“With Damage”), and one in which we only initialize but do not evolve damage (“Without Damage”).

There is significant damage evolution in the margins, near the terminus, and in the center of the ice shelf (Figure S8a). Over 500 years, the effect of damage continues to enhance ice volume and grounded area loss, with the enhancement of ice volume loss $\sim 17.5\%$ by 500 years (Figure S8b-c).




Figure S6. Results from a 1000-year simulation of the MISMIP+ model configuration for two simulations, one with damage initiation and evolution and one without, for Ice1ra experiment. (a) Damage fields at $t = 0.25, 100, 1000$ years with damage initiation and evolution, (b) Change in total ice volume over the 1000 year simulation, (c) Change in grounded area of the glacier over the 1000 year simulation.

S10 Effect of Basal Melting Rate

The idealized glaciers in these simulations are responding to basal melt forcing as described by the chosen melt parameterization. The magnitude of basal melting is controlled by the parameter Ω , which is set to $\Omega = 0.2 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ for the MISMIP+ experiments. Here, we evaluate how changing the basal melt forcing affects the significance of damage to ice flow (Figure S9). As Ω , and thus the basal melt rate, increases, the enhancement of ice volume loss due to damage increases, with $\Omega = 0.2$ producing 12% enhancement and $\Omega = 0.01 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ producing 3% enhancement. This suggests the existence of a feedback between basal melting and damage evolution, in which increased basal melting causes local thinning on the ice shelf, enhancing the damage locally. This damage affects flow over the ice shelf as the damage advects downstream. This may suggest that regions that experience strong climate forcing may be most vulnerable to damage-induced flow enhancement and thus incorporating damage models into simulations of those regions is necessary to capture the full effect of ocean-induced melt forcing.




Figure S7. Results from a 100-year simulation of the MISMIP+ model configuration for two simulations, one with damage initiation but no evolution and one with both damage initiation and evolution, for Ice1ra experiment. (a) Damage fields at $t = 0, 100, 1000$ years with damage initiation and evolution, (b) Change in total ice volume over the 1000 year simulation, (c) Change in grounded area of the glacier over the 1000 year simulation.




Figure S8. Results from a 500-year simulation of the MISMIP+ model configuration for two simulations, one with damage initiation but no evolution and one with both damage initiation and evolution. (a) Damage field at the beginning of the simulation (top row), after 500 years (middle row), and the difference between the two (bottom row). The bottom row also shows grounding line positions initially (black line), and after 500 years for the case without damage evolution (green line) and with damage evolution (red line). (b) Change in grounded ice area over the 500 year simulation, (c) Change in total ice volume of the glacier over the 500 year simulation.




Figure S9. Effect of damage on ice volume loss for varying basal melt rate: Results from a 100-year simulation for $\Omega = 0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 0.15, 0.2 \text{ yr}^{-1}$. We show the percent enhancement of ice volume loss (difference in ice volume loss between a simulation with damage evolution and a simulation with damage initialization but no evolution as a percentage of total ice volume loss in the damage initialization simulation) and the damage fields (initial and final damage, and total damage change) for $\Omega = 0.01, 0.2 \text{ yr}^{-1}$.

References

- Christian, J. E., Robel, A. A., and Catania, G.: A probabilistic framework for quantifying the role of anthropogenic climate change in marine-terminating glacier retreats, *The Cryosphere*, 16, 2725–2743, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-2021-394>, 2022.
- 175 Huth, A., Duddu, R., and Smith, B.: A Generalized Interpolation Material Point Method for Shallow Ice Shelves. 2: Anisotropic Nonlocal Damage Mechanics and Rift Propagation, *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 13, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020MS002292>, 2021.
- Keller, A. and Hutter, K.: Conceptual thoughts on continuum damage mechanics for shallow ice shelves, *Journal of Glaciology*, 60, 685–693, <https://doi.org/10.3189/2014JoG14J010>, 2014.
- 180 Pralong, A. and Funk, M.: Dynamic damage model of crevasse opening and application to glacier calving, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 110, B01 309, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2004JB003104>, 2005.
- Robel, A. A., Schoof, C., and Tziperman, E.: Rapid grounding line migration induced by internal ice stream variability, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, 119, 2430–2447, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JF003251>, 2014.
- Schoof, C.: Ice sheet grounding line dynamics: Steady states, stability, and hysteresis, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 112, F03S28, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006JF000664>, 2007.