

Dear editor,

We would like to once again thank you for your time and helpful suggestions to make the manuscript more accessible and accurate.

We took in to account all your comments and provided our corrections point by point.

All corrections and changes what we did in the manuscript are in **yellow**.

Best regards,

Levan Tielidze on behalf of all co-authors

Title: Adding the range of date of the study period would be useful to readers.

Done, we added the study periods in the title and now it stands as:

Supraglacial debris-cover changes in the Greater Caucasus from 1986 to 2014

Please see P1 L1

2.21. “nominal” is RGI jargon, but could you clarify this concept in full words for all readers.

Done, we clarified it accordingly:

“Scherler et al. (2018) used the glacier outlines from the Randolph Glacier Inventory (RGI) v6 database (RGI consortium, 2017) with some geolocation errors and nominal glaciers, representing glacier area by an ellipse and included in RGI to achieve global coverage in case no other information were available (Pfeffer et al., 2014).”

Please see P2 L18-21

2.23. “lower” than what?

We clarified this sentence as follows:

“However, earlier studies indicated lower relative supraglacial debris-cover than our study in the Greater Caucasus but are restricted to smaller regions (Stokes et al., 2007) or individual glaciers (Lambrecht et al., 2011; Popovnin et al., 2015).”

Please see P2 L16-18

2.30. Would be good to state what percentage of the overall Caucasus glaciers (in area) are found in the Greater Caucasus. To illustrate that you map debris for a large fraction of the Caucasus.

Done, we added an appropriate sentence accordingly:

“The Greater Caucasus is one of the world’s highest mountain systems, and the major mountain unit of the Caucasus region containing about 96% of contemporary glacier area of the Caucasus and Middle East glacier region according to RGI (Pfeffer et al., 2014).”

Please see P2 L28-30

2.34. Why stating “At the same time, the terms northern and southern Greater Caucasus are commonly used.”? It complicates the picture and confused me a bit.

We clarified this sentence as follows:

“Moreover, the Greater Caucasus can also be subdivided the northern and southern part according to the location relative to the main crest of the range (Fig. 1).”

Please see P2 L33-34

2.38. In the end we do not know in which of the three parts of Caucasus, Elbrus is located. Is Elbrus part of Greater Caucasus. Why is it treated separately?

We clarified this sentence as follows:

“Contemporary glaciers are concentrated mostly along the main mountain range, as well as in the sub-ranges of the Greater Caucasus and separate massifs such as Elbrus and Kazbegi-Jimara (Fig. 1). Elbrus is a separate dormant volcanic mountain on the border between western and central Greater Caucasus about 10 km north from the main watershed divide. It is the highest summit of the region with two peaks - western (5642 m) and eastern (5621 m).”

Please see P2 L37-41

2.40. (Tielidze and Wheate, 2018) should be moved just after “recent inventory”

Done.

“According to the recent inventory (Tielidze and Wheate, 2018), this mountain range contains over 2000 glaciers with a total area of about 1200 km².”

Please see P2 L42

3.9. Values of the temperature lapse rate should be negative. (temperature decrease while z increase)

Done.

“The average regional lapse rate is minimum in winter (-2.3°C per 1000 m) and maximum (-5.2°C per 1000 m) in summer (Kozachek et al., 2016).”

Please see P3 L17-18

3.11. Do they bring water to the back sea? Or do you want to say that evaporation from the back sea re-inforce the depression systems? Unclear.

We improved this paragraph and changed accordingly:

“Annual precipitation varies between 2000-2500 mm in the west and declines to 800-1150 mm in the east on the northern slope. The central section of the southern slope receives over 2000 mm of precipitation while in the east, the annual total is 1000 mm. The south-western section of the region is humid with annual precipitation about 3200 mm (Volodicheva, 2002; Mikhaleiko et al., 2015). The south-western slopes of the Greater Caucasus experience heavy snowfall and snow avalanches (from November to April). Snow cover may reach 5-7 meters in several regions of the western part of the Greater Caucasus, such as the Upper Svaneti and northern Abkhazeti regions in Georgia (Sylvén et al., 2008).”

Please see P3 L19-25

3.21. Need to tell for what year.

We clarified year in brackets:

“We selected 659 glaciers with a total area of 590.0±25.8 km² (based on the “Greater Caucasus Glacier Inventory” and representing the year 2014 (Tielidze and Wheate, 2018))”

Please see P4 L3-4

3.27. I must say I am surprised that you need to quote a paper for the area of polygon. Not needed probably. Or if there is some understatement/complication hidden by this, make it clear.

We removed an extra citation and changed sentence accordingly.

“The size of the selected glaciers varied between 37.5 km² and 0.01 km².”

Please see P4 L8-9

Figure 1a. “percentage increase”. I think this is not the increase but just the percentage of debris cover. Double check.

Done. We corrected accordingly.

Please see new Figure 1.

P3 L5

6.5 Update the Mölg et al. Reference. Now publish. One of the co-author should be aware of that...

We cited correctly Mölg et al. (2018) here that was published in 2018 (<https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-10-1807-2018>, 2018).

6.33. suggested change to “The number of debris-covered glaciers, i.e. with an areal percentage of debris larger than 10%,”

Accepted. We changed this sentence as it was suggested:

“The number of debris-covered glaciers (i.e. with an areal percentage of debris larger than 10% - see methods) also increased from 122 in 1986, to 143 in 2000, and to 172 in 2014.”

Please see P6 L22-24

8.16. This is a bit confusing because the role of aspect as already been discussed. Make one paragraph to compare the different part of Greater Caucasus (east to west) and one paragraph for north/south differences.

Accepted. We improved these paragraphs accordingly:

“For all regions investigated in the Greater Caucasus the rate of increase in supraglacial debris-cover varied between northern and southern slopes, and between the western, central and eastern sections of the mountain range (Table 2; Fig. 3, 4). The western Greater Caucasus experienced a supraglacial debris-cover area increase from $4.1\pm 6.8\%$ in 1986, to $22.4\pm 6.4\%$ in 2014, while the increase was significantly lower in the central Greater Caucasus over the last 30 years - from $7.4\pm 6.3\%$ to $10.1\pm 6.2\%$ (Table 2). The eastern Greater Caucasus with fewer glaciers almost doubled in supraglacial debris cover over the last 30 years from $27.9\pm 6.2\%$ to $49.2\pm 5.7\%$.

Supraglacial debris-covered area increased from $13.5\pm 6.3\%$ to $29.3\pm 6.0\%$ for all three sections (western, central and eastern) on the northern slope (not including Elbrus), and from $4.0\pm 6.8\%$ to $9.2\pm 6.9\%$ on the southern slope of the Greater Caucasus between 1986 and 2014.”

Please see P6 L25-33

8.23 “in the 3000-3500 m zone”

Done.

Please see P6 L40

Figure 4. Clarify what are panels a, b and c. I suggest adding directly the time span on each panel to make the reading easier.

Accepted. Time spans have been added on each panel. We also clarified all three panels (a, b, c) in the legend.

Please see P9 L4-7

Figure 5. The figure gives hard work to the readers in part because the legend is not detailed enough. Is it only for Elbrus for all panels? (probably not but this is confusing). Are not % of SDC sufficient for panels b and C. The figure need to be re-thought.

We provided new figures for all three panels (a, b, c) in the Figure 5 along with the more appropriate legend.

At the panel “a” it is shown just percentage of supraglacial debris-cover for the Elbrus slopes in 1986 and 2014. Panel “b” and “c” shows total glacier area (km^2) and supraglacial debris cover area (km^2) changes between 1986 and 2014 for the Elbrus slopes.

Please see P10 L1-3

Figure 6. Again a lot of information in this figure so that the reader feels a bit lost. Cannot you find a way to simplify it to really make your point?

We slightly modified the Figure 6, but overall we think that basic changes are not necessary.

Please see new Figure 6. P10 L6-10

11.3. superscript should be -1 not +1 here. Can the authors quote their result for this particular glacier (even if the period is slightly different)? Otherwise the reader cannot judge whether the two studies agree. And this is true for all comparisons to previous studies (by Popovnin, Lambrecht). Overall, the manuscript needs to be improved on this aspect.

Accepted, we corrected all superscripts in the manuscript.

We also made additional comparison for some individual glaciers (e.g. Shkhelda, Djankuat) in order to better compare with previous studies. Overall, the new sentences stands as the:

“On individual glaciers, supraglacial debris-cover increased by 25%-30% (e.g. Shkhelda) in the same period. We found an increase of supraglacial debris-cover from $21.3 \pm 6.0\%$ to $30 \pm 5.8\%$ ($\sim 0.65\% \text{ yr}^{-1}$) for Shkhelda Glacier between 1986 and 2000.”

Please see P8 L22-24

“Popovnin et al. (2015), reported a supraglacial debris-cover increase from 2% to 13% ($\sim 0.23\% \text{ yr}^{-1}$) between 1968-2010, based on direct field monitoring for the Djankuat Glacier (northern slope of the central Greater Caucasus). This compares with our result of an area increase of supraglacial debris-cover for Djankuat Glacier from $2.6 \pm 6.9\%$ to $9.8 \pm 6.1\%$ ($\sim 0.25\% \text{ yr}^{-1}$) between 1986 and 2014. This difference can be explained in that the detailed field measurement would have picked out smaller spots of debris-cover which were beyond the resolution of the satellite imagery.”

Please see P8 L25-30

11.17. For the glacier with outlines in RGI v6 (i.e. not nominal glaciers), it would be nice to have a 1 to 1 comparison of the % of debris cover from this study and Scherler et al. Do Scherler et al. overestimate the % of debris cover for all glaciers? What is the mean overestimation?, its standard deviation, etc...? A more thorough comparison with quantitative statistics would be welcome.

We provided new text here, in order to better understand the clear differences for exactly the same glaciers (not nominal glaciers):

“We found that a large portion of these glaciers in the Greater Caucasus are covered by supraglacial debris-cover. While for two regions the results match within the uncertainty (western Greater Caucasus: $22.4 \pm 6.4\%$ vs. 23.7% and Elbrus $4.6 \pm 6.6\%$ vs. 7.7%), our values are lower than the results of Scherler, et al. (2018) for the other two regions ($10.1 \pm 6.2\%$ vs. 30.8% for central, $49.2 \pm 5.7\%$ vs. 84.9% for eastern) (Fig. S3).”

Please see P10 L13-16 and P 11 L1

In addition, there are Figure S3 and Figure S4a in the supplement, nicely showing these differences.

11.29. Can the authors quantify the mean up-glacier migration of the upper limit of the debris cover? It should be straightforward and it would be a useful numbers that future studies could quote and compare to.

Special thanks for this comment.

We calculated the mean up-glacier migration of the upper limit of the debris cover for all selected regions and provided new text, figure and table.

Please see the text: P8 L12-16

“The mean upper limit of the supraglacial debris-cover migrated from ~ 3015 m to ~ 3130 m between 1986 and 2014 for all selected glaciers of the Greater Caucasus. The highest mean upper limit lies on the northern slopes of eastern Greater Caucasus (~ 3626 m), while the lowest limit is on the southern slopes of western Greater Caucasus

(~2850 m). On the Elbrus Massif the mean upper limit of the supraglacial debris-cover migrated from ~3345 m to ~3520 m between 1986 and 2014 (Fig. 7, Table S1)”

Please see the new figure (Figure 7). P11 L11-13

And new Table in the supplement (Table S1).

11.33. Change “decreased by” to “changed by”. If you keep “decreased” then change sign from “-” to “+”

We changed this sentence as follows:

“The results presented in this study indicate that the clean-ice area for all selected glaciers decreased from about 93% to 87% between 1986 and 2014 (Table 2)”

Please see P11 L22-23

11.35-38. The Popovnin results were already compare to. They agree but do not “support” the interpretation. No need to repeat the agreement here.

We shortened this sentence as follows:

“This finding is also consistent with field measurements on Djankuat Glacier (Popovnin et al., 2015).”

Please see P11 L24-25

12.1-4. Please be more specific in the text. Was there some rock avalanches on Suatisi and Devdoraki glaciers? Figure S5 indeed suggest so but it would be good to state it directly in the text with the date (or possible range of dates) of the rock avalanches.

Accepted, we changed this sentence as follows:

“Rock avalanches after 2000 on some glaciers in the Greater Caucasus (particularly in the eastern section) might be one of the reasons why the increase rate was higher during our second time period (2000-2014). For example, a rock–ice avalanche onto the Devdoraki Glacier on 17 May 2014 (Tielidze et al., 2019) caused an area increase of supraglacial debris-cover from $5.9\pm 6.0\%$ to $19.1\pm 5.6\%$ or about $0.95\% \text{ yr}^{-1}$ and a landslide after 2000 onto the Suatisi Glacier produced supraglacial debris-cover area increase from $2.1\pm 6.1\%$ to $17.6\pm 5.7\%$ or about $1.10\% \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (Fig. S6).”

Please see P11 L27-32

13.13. “although smaller glaciers exist as well in high cirques”. Is it in the North? A bit ambiguous.

We clarified this sentence as follows:

“Our investigation shows also that the supraglacial debris-cover increases more quickly on the northern slopes of the Greater Caucasus than on the southern, where higher solar radiation input commonly results in smaller glaciers than on the northern slopes. Furthermore, smaller glaciers on the southern slope exist in high cirques with much steeper surface.”

Please see P12 L5-8

13.16. The sentence “But there are some exceptions, where the northern-facing glaciers are shorter and steeper, and here, the glaciers of the southern slope are characterized with relatively more supraglacial debris cover” is confusing again. I do not follow the reasoning.

We improved this sentence as follows:

“Glaciers on the northern slopes are on average less steep than on the south mainly because most valley glacier tongues in the north are longer and reach lower altitudes than the south-facing glaciers. This conclusion is supported by Lambrecht et al. (2011) who observed a more rapid increase of supraglacial debris-cover on the northern slopes than the southern.”

Please see P12 L8-11

13.9. The discussion is about increase in debris cover and here “rock glaciers” are mentioned. Again I do not follow the reasoning.

We deleted this sentence since it was not relevant here.

13.14. Because the lithology of the eastern and central Caucasus are described it should also be the case for the western Caucasus (and how it influences rock avalanches), otherwise the demonstration is not finished.

Accepted. We provided an appropriate text here partly explaining possible reasons (including lithology) for increasing supraglacial debris-cover:

“This section is characterised by the highest glacier retreat after the eastern Greater Caucasus. It is therefore possible that glaciers are also rapidly thinning favouring debris-covered over the ablation area (Benn et al., 2012; Pratap et al., 2015). The dome of the anticlinorium of the western Greater Caucasus (crest of the main water divide) is built on Proterozoic and Paleozoic plagiogneisses, granites, amphibolites, and crystalline slates. This provides the framework for overall denudation of the high mountainous relief (over 3000 m) (Gobejishvili et al., 2019). Furthermore, this area is characterized by active tectonic and ongoing mountain building (uplifting) processes (Tsereteli et al., 2016), which might be a further reason for increasing supraglacial debris-cover. We note that all these reasons need confirmation by detailed field measurements and could be part of a separate investigation since there is no accurate geographical pattern which otherwise explains the clear differences of the increase in supraglacial debris cover.”

Please see P13 L3-12

13.37. The end of the sentence “as debris-covered glaciers may not be as sensitive to climate change as debris-free glaciers” is a general statement that has not much to do here and is vaguely connected to the rest of the sentence.

We corrected this sentence and now stands as a:

“Direct field measurements show that thermal resistance of the < 20 cm supraglacial debris-cover for some glaciers (e.g. Djankuat and Zpkhito) in the Greater Caucasus is relatively higher (0.07-0.15°C and 0.05-0.08°C m²/W) than in other glacierised regions of the world (e.g. Baltoro, Karakoram 0.02-0.07°C and Maliy Aktru, Altay 0.02-0.09°C m²/W) (Lambrecht et al., 2011), preventing a more rapid retreat.”

Please see P14 L15-21

Figure 8. I must say that I find the figure quite confusing. Showing SDC only for the two dates would be best. I do not understand why the authors show clean ice if they do not really discuss it in the text.

Showing the clean ice area, helps reader to recognise full margins of the glaciers.

e.g. There was no SDC in 1986 in this area (which could be a red color) (on the image below), but the blue color help us to recognise how did the full glacier margin look like in 1986.



We also discuss about the clean ice area decrease in the text: “The results presented in this study indicate that the clean-ice area for all selected glaciers decreased from about 93% to 87% between 1986 and 2014 (Table 2). This reduction was caused by both glacier retreat and an increase in total supraglacial debris-cover” Please see P11 L22-24

We also agree that it is sometimes a bit confusing to show several layers in one image. That's why we created "gif animation", which is more clearly showing the basic principle of this image.

Accordingly, we decided to leave the Figure 8 without any changes.

Nicely written conclusion. However, I would not provide the name of specific instrument here (Kipp & Zonen or pulseEKKO). I do not think this is the right place.

Done, suggested sentence has been changed accordingly:

"Future work should focus on using high resolution aerial/satellite imagery and more detailed field measurements, e.g. glaciological mass balance measurements, characteristics of debris and debris thickness measurement by Ground-Penetrating Radar, or incoming and reflected solar radiation, long-wave terrestrial and returned radiation. This will reduce uncertainties connected with supraglacial debris-cover assessment and glacier mapping accuracy in this region."

Please see P15 L3-7

15.13. "Supraglacial debris-cover changes in the Greater Caucasus" should be replaced by "the supplement"

Done, suggested sentence has been changed accordingly

Please see P15 L16

Additional comments

Rates presented as $-XY\% \text{ yr}^{-1}$, as well as $+XY\% \text{ yr}^{+1}$ (see for example P1, L31). It appears to me that the main author confuses the unit and uses % yr each time when there is an increase. This is also seen in Figure 4. I also think the wording is often somewhat weird, but this is not too big an issue."

Done, we corrected all rates and superscripts through the manuscript.

I will ask you to check very carefully the units throughout the manuscript. It is of course of paramount importance to have correct units.

Accepted, all units have been checked and corrected.

Supraglacial debris-cover changes in the Greater Caucasus from 1986 to 2014

Levan G. Tielidze^{1,6,7}, Tobias Bolch², Roger D. Wheate³, Stanislav S. Kutuzov⁴, Ivan I. Lavrentiev⁴, Michael Zemp⁵

¹Department of Geomorphology, Vakhushti Bagrationi Institute of Geography, Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, 6 Tamarashvili st., 0177, Tbilisi, Georgia

²School of Geography and Sustainable Development, University of St Andrews, North Street, Irvine Building, St Andrews, KY16 9AL, Scotland, UK

³Natural Resources and Environmental Studies, University of Northern British Columbia, 3333 University Way, Prince George, V2N 4Z9, BC, Canada

⁴Department of Glaciology, Institute of Geography of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 29 Staromonetnyi Pereulok, 119017, Moscow, Russia

⁵Department of Geography, University of Zurich, 190 Winterthurerstrasse, CH-8057, Zurich Switzerland

⁶Antarctic Research Centre, Victoria University of Wellington, PO Box 600, 6140, Wellington, New Zealand

⁷School of Geography Environment and Earth Sciences, Victoria University of Wellington, PO Box 600, 6140, Wellington, New Zealand

Correspondence to: Levan G. Tielidze (levan.tielidze@tsu.ge)

Abstract

Knowledge of supraglacial debris-cover and its changes remain incomplete in the Greater Caucasus, in spite of recent glacier studies. Here we present data of supraglacial debris-cover for 659 glaciers across the Greater Caucasus based on Landsat and SPOT images from the years 1986, 2000, and 2014. We combined semi-automated methods for mapping the clean-ice with manual digitization of debris-covered glacier parts and calculated supraglacial debris-cover area as the residual between these two maps. The accuracy of the results were assessed by using high resolution Google Earth imagery and GPS data for selected glaciers. From 1986 to 2014, the total glacier area decreased from $691.5 \pm 29.0 \text{ km}^2$ to $590.0 \pm 25.8 \text{ km}^2$ ($15.8 \pm 4.1\%$ or $\sim 0.52\% \text{ yr}^{-1}$) while the clean-ice area reduced from $643.2 \pm 25.9 \text{ km}^2$ to $511.0 \pm 20.9 \text{ km}^2$ ($20.1 \pm 4.0\%$ or $\sim 0.73\% \text{ yr}^{-1}$). In contrast supraglacial debris-cover increased from $7.0 \pm 6.4\%$ or $48.3 \pm 3.1 \text{ km}^2$ in 1986 to $13.4 \pm 6.2\%$ ($\sim 0.22\% \text{ yr}^{-1}$) or $79.0 \pm 4.9 \text{ km}^2$ in 2014. Debris-free glaciers exhibited higher area and length reductions than debris-covered glaciers. The distribution of the supraglacial debris-cover differs between northern and southern and between western, central and eastern Greater Caucasus. The observed increase of supraglacial debris-cover is significantly stronger in the northern slopes. Overall, we have observed up-glacier average migration of supraglacial debris-cover from about 3015 m to 3130 m above sea level (asl) during the investigated period.

1 Introduction

Supraglacial debris-cover affects surface melt with increasing ablation in cases of thin debris-cover (< a few cm), or decreasing ablation under continuous thick debris-cover (Östrem, 1959; Nicholson et al., 2018). Obtaining information about debris-cover is relevant not only with respect to its impact on glacier ablation but also because it is an important part of the sediment transport system (supraglacial, englacial, and subglacial) in cold and high mountains (Kellerer-Pirklbauer, 2008), which ultimately affect the overall dynamics, and mass balance of the glaciers. Several studies show an increase in debris-covered area with overall glacier shrinkage and mass loss (Deline, 2005; Stokes et al., 2007; Kirkbride and Deline, 2013; Glasser et al., 2016).

1 For regions where the local population is dependent on glacial meltwater supply, detailed knowledge of glacial
2 hydrology is important to ensure the sustainable use of water resources (Baraer et al., 2012). One difficulty of such
3 investigations is associated with limited knowledge of the large-scale extent, thickness, and properties of the
4 supraglacial debris-cover. Field measurements of debris layers have practical difficulties on a large scale, and methods
5 for estimating supraglacial debris thickness using remote sensing and modelling remain in development (Zhang et
6 al., 2016; Rounce et al., 2018). Several studies have also reported the role of debris-cover in promoting the formation
7 of supraglacial lakes (Thompson et al., 2016; Jiang et al., 2018), which are directly related to glacial hazards (Benn
8 et al., 2012). Therefore, it is necessary to take supraglacial debris-cover into account when assessing temporal change
9 of mountain glaciers.

10 Ice and snow melt in the Greater Caucasus are major sources of runoff for populated places in many parts of the
11 Caucasus region (Tielidze, 2017). Previous studies have also shown that in this region, supraglacial-debris cover is
12 an important control for ice ablation (Lambrecht et al., 2011), and a component in glacier mass balance (Popovnin
13 and Rozova, 2002). Thus, correct delineation of supraglacial debris-cover in the Greater Caucasus is vital to correctly
14 model future glacier development. A recent global study (Scherler et al., 2018) concluded that supraglacial debris-
15 cover is abundant in the Caucasus and Middle East (more than 25% of glacier area) and that this region shows the
16 highest percent of supraglacial debris-cover worldwide. However, earlier studies indicated lower relative supraglacial
17 debris-cover than our study in the Greater Caucasus but are restricted to smaller regions (Stokes et al., 2007) or
18 individual glaciers (Lambrecht et al., 2011; Popovnin et al., 2015). Scherler et al. (2018) used the glacier outlines
19 from the Randolph Glacier Inventory (RGI) v6 database (RGI consortium, 2017) with some geolocation errors and
20 nominal glaciers, representing glacier area by an ellipse and included in RGI to achieve global coverage in case no
21 other information were available (Pfeffer et al., 2014). Hence, there is a clear need to provide an improved estimate
22 of supraglacial debris-cover and its changes for this region.


23 Based on a recently published glacier inventory (Tielidze and Wheate, 2018), we present the first regional
24 assessment of the spatial distribution of supraglacial debris-cover and related glacier changes between 1986, 2000
25 and 2014 for the Greater Caucasus.

27 **2 Study area**

28 The Greater Caucasus is one of the world's highest mountain systems, and the major mountain unit of the Caucasus
29 region containing about 96% of contemporary glacier area of the Caucasus and Middle East glacier region according
30 to RGI (Pfeffer et al., 2014). The range stretches for about 1300 km from west-northwest to east-southeast, between
31 the Taman Peninsula of the Black Sea and the Absheron Peninsula of the Caspian Sea. Using morphological and
32 morphometric characteristics, the Greater Caucasus can be divided into three parts - western, central and eastern.
33 Moreover, the Greater Caucasus can also be subdivided the northern and southern part according to the location
34 relative to the main crest of the range (Fig. 1). The central Greater Caucasus is the highest part of the main range
35 represented by the following summits exceeding 5000 m asl: Dykh-Tau - 5205 m, Shkhara - 5203 m, Jangha - 5058
36 m, and Pushkin Peak - 5034 m. The western and eastern sections are relatively lower with highest summits of Mt.
37 Dombai-ulgen (4046 m) and Mt. Bazardüzü (4466 m) respectively. Contemporary glaciers are concentrated mostly
38 along the main mountain range, as well as in the sub-ranges of the Greater Caucasus and separate massifs such as
39 Elbrus and Kazbegi-Jimara (Fig. 1). Elbrus is a separate dormant volcanic mountain on the border between western
40 and central Greater Caucasus about 10 km north from the main watershed divide. It is the highest summit of the
41 region with two peaks - western (5642 m) and eastern (5621 m).

42 According to the recent inventory (Tielidze and Wheate, 2018), this mountain range contains over 2000 glaciers
43 with a total area of about 1200 km². The northern slopes of the Greater Caucasus contain more glaciers than the
44 southern slopes. The altitude of the glacier equilibrium line (ELA), increases from 2500–2700 m in the west to 3700-
45 3950 m in the eastern sector of the northern slope of the Greater Caucasus (Mikhalenko et al., 2015). The ELA was

1 determined to range from ~3030 m in the west to ~3480 m in the eastern section of the southern slope of the Greater
 2 Caucasus (Tielidze, 2016). The ELA is ~1000 m higher on the northern slopes of the Elbrus than the southern slopes
 3 of the central Greater Caucasus (Mikhalenko et al., 2015).
 4



5 **Figure 1.** a – Investigated area and selected glaciers by regions. b – Three Landsat 5 TM satellite scenes 1985-1986. c – Three
 6 Landsat 7 ETM+ satellite scenes from 2000. d – Three Landsat 8 OLI satellite scenes from 2013-2014 and one (smaller) SPOT
 7 satellite scene from 2016.
 8

9
 10 We used the Glacier Classification Guidance from the Global Land Ice Measurements from Space (GLIMS)
 11 initiative for remote sensing observations (Rau et al., 2005) to define debris-free and debris-covered glaciers.
 12 According to this guideline we consider all glaciers with a debris-coverage of more than 10% as debris-covered and
 13 otherwise as debris-free glaciers.

14 As the Greater Caucasus range forms the boundary between temperate and subtropical climatic zones, the
 15 orientation and height of the range determines the contrasts between the northern and southern slopes. The mean
 16 annual temperatures at the northern slopes are usually 1-2°C cooler than those in the south (Tielidze and Wheate,
 17 2018). The average regional lapse rate is minimum in winter (-2.3°C per 1000 m) and maximum (-5.2°C per 1000 m)
 18 in summer (Kozachek et al., 2016).

19 Annual precipitation varies between 2000-2500 mm in the west and declines to 800-1150 mm in the east on the
 20 northern slope. The central section of the southern slope receives over 2000 mm of precipitation while in the east, the
 21 annual total is 1000 mm. The south-western section of the region is humid with annual precipitation about 3200 mm
 22 (Volodicheva, 2002; Mikhalenko et al., 2015). The south-western slopes of the Greater Caucasus experience heavy
 23 snowfall and snow avalanches (from November to April). Snow cover may reach 5-7 meters in several regions of the
 24 western part of the Greater Caucasus, such as the Upper Svaneti and northern Abkhazeti regions in Georgia (Sylvén
 25 et al., 2008).
 26
 27

3 Data and methods

3.1 Datasets

We selected 659 glaciers with a total area of $590.0 \pm 25.8 \text{ km}^2$ (based on the “Greater Caucasus Glacier Inventory” and representing the year 2014 (Tielidze and Wheate, 2018)): 223 glaciers in the western Greater Caucasus (145 - northern slope, 78 - southern slope); 285 in the central Greater Caucasus (173/112); and 130 in the eastern Greater Caucasus (130/0). In addition, all 21 glaciers on Elbrus (5 - northern slope, 8 - southern slope, 5 - western slope, 3 - eastern slope) - the largest glacierised massif in the whole region - were selected (Fig. 1a). Overall, this equals 49.5% and 32.6% of the Greater Caucasus total glacier area and number respectively. The size of the selected glaciers varied between 37.5 km^2 and 0.01 km^2 .

A total of nine Landsat images were used in this study (Fig. 1 b-d; Table 1), downloaded from the Earthexplorer website (<http://earthexplorer.usgs.gov/>). We also used an orthorectified high resolution (spatial resolution 1.5 m) SPOT-7 satellite image from 2016, and the Shuttle Radar Topography Mission Digital Elevation Model (SRTM DEM 30 m) (Table 1). The Landsat scenes served as a basis for supraglacial debris-cover assessment while the SPOT image was used for corrections of supraglacial debris-cover areas of Elbrus. All imagery was captured between 28th July and 12th September, when glacier tongues were mostly free of seasonal snow under cloud-free conditions.


The Advanced Spaceborne Thermal Emission and Reflection Radiometer (ASTER) Global Digital Elevation Model (GDEM, 30 m), version 2 (<http://asterweb.jpl.nasa.gov/gdem.asp>) was used to measure mean upper limit of the supraglacial debris-cover, and to calculate supraglacial debris-cover by 500 m elevation bands. We used these elevation bands to intersect our digitized debris-covered areas for 1985/86 to 2013/14, with the total area per elevation band. Further datasets used in this study include high resolution images from Google Earth, and GPS measurements.

Table 1. Satellite images and digital elevation models used in this study.

Date	UTM zone	Sensor	Region/Section	Resolution	Scene ID
10/08/1985	37N	Landsat 5 TM	Western Greater Caucasus	30 m	LT51720301985222XXX04
06/08/1986	38N	Landsat 5 TM	Central Greater Caucasus	30 m	LT51710301986218XXX02
31/08/1986	38N	Landsat 5 TM	Eastern Greater Caucasus	30 m	LT51700301986243XXX03
12/09/2000	37N	Landsat 7 ETM+	Western Greater Caucasus	15/30 m	LE71720302000256SGS00
05/09/2000	38N	Landsat 7 ETM+	Central Greater Caucasus	15/30 m	LE71710302000249SGS00
28/07/2000	38N	Landsat 7 ETM+	Eastern Greater Caucasus	15/30 m	LE17003020000728SGS00
23/08/2013	37N	Landsat 8 OLI	Western Greater Caucasus	15/30 m	LC81720302013235LGN00
03/08/2014	38N	Landsat 8 OLI	Central Greater Caucasus	15/30 m	LC81710302014215LGN00
28/08/2014	38N	Landsat 8 OLI	Eastern Greater Caucasus	15/30 m	LC81700302014240LGN00
20/08/2016	37N	SPOT-7	Elbrus	1.5 m	DS_SPOT7201608200751063
17/11/2011	37N	ASTER GDEM	Western Greater Caucasus	30 m	ASTGTM2_N43E041/E040_DEM
17/11/2011	38N	ASTER GDEM	Central Greater Caucasus	30 m	ASTGTM2_N43E042/E043_DEM
17/11/2011	38N	ASTER GDEM	Eastern Greater Caucasus	30 m	ASTGTM2_N42E045/E046_DEM
23/09/2014	37N	SRTM DEM	Elbrus	30 m	SRTM1N43E042V3_DEM

3.2 Methods

The widely used band ratio segmentation method (RED/SWIR with a threshold of ≥ 2.0) was used as the first step in delineating clean-ice outlines for 2014 (Bolch et al., 2010; Paul et al., 2013) followed by intensive manual improvements (removing misclassified areas, e.g. due to snow and shadows). In the next step supraglacial debris-cover was classified as the residual between these semi-automatically derived clean-ice outlines and the existing manually mapped outlines which include the debris-covered parts (cf. Tielidze and Wheate, 2018) (Fig. 2a). To assess temporal change, we calculated the area of supraglacial debris-cover for individual glaciers in a similar way for the earlier years 1986 and 2000.



1
2 **Figure 2.** Mapping examples: a – supraglacial debris-cover (D) assessment with comparison of different methods: fully manual
3 mapping (M) and semi-automated mapping (S) (ratio TM 3/5 threshold ≥ 2.0 followed by manual improvement). The Landsat
4 image from 06/08/1986 is shown in the background. Examples of glacier outline accuracy assessment by GPS measurements: b
5 – Adishi Glacier; c – Kirtisho Glacier. A Google Earth image from 19/09/2011 is shown in the background.

6
7 The buffer method (Granshaw and Fountain, 2006; Bolch et al., 2010) was used for uncertainty estimation for
8 both clean-ice and debris-covered glacier parts. For clean-ice we used a 15 m (1/2 pixel) buffer (Bolch et al., 2010)
9 and for debris-covered parts 60 m (two pixels) (Frey et al., 2012). We used the standard deviation of the uncertainty
10 distribution for the estimate following Mölg et al. (2018) as a normal distribution can be assumed for this type of
11 mapping error. This method is applied to glacier complexes excluding overlapping areas, as well as the boundary
12 between clean- and debris-covered ice of the same glacier. The calculated uncertainty for the clean-ice/debris-covered
13 parts was on average 4.0%/6.4% for 1986, 4.1%/6.3% for 2000, and 4.1%/6.2% for 2014. The uncertainty estimates
14 for all Caucasus glaciers are described in previous studies (Tielidze, 2016; Tielidze and Wheate, 2018).

1 As an independent assessment of these uncertainty estimates, three randomly selected glacier outlines from
2 Landsat 8 (03/08/14) (including clean-ice and debris-covered parts) were imported into Google Earth and manually
3 adjusted using the available high-resolution Quickbird images (19/09/11) superimposed upon the SRTM3 topography
4 (Raup, et al., 2014). These glacier outlines were then compared with original outlines from Landsat 8 image
5 (03/08/14). The area differences between the two resulting sets of outlines were $\pm 5.2\%$ for supraglacial debris-cover
6 and $\pm 3.4\%$ for clean-ice which confirms our uncertainty estimate based on the buffer method. For Elbrus the high-
7 resolution SPOT-7 imagery was used to estimate an extra uncertainty of the clean-ice and debris-covered area. The
8 area difference between SPOT-7 and Landsat 8 outlines was $\pm 7.4\%$ for supraglacial debris-cover and $\pm 4.1\%$ for clean-
9 ice.

10 An additional uncertainty assessment was performed using GPS (Garmin 62stc) measurements of glacier margins
11 (>1200 points) obtained during field investigations in 2014. In total seven glaciers (Ushba, Chalaati, Lekhziri, Adishi,
12 Shkhara, Zopkhito, Kirtisho) were surveyed. The horizontal accuracy of these measurements varied from ± 4 to ± 10
13 m. Fig. 2b-c shows the results of comparison between GPS measurements and Landsat based supraglacial debris-
14 cover/clean-ice outlines. The average accuracy based on all seven glacier measurements was ± 30 m for supraglacial
15 debris cover and ± 15 m for clean-ice, hence again confirming the suitability of the selected buffer method.

16 17 **4 Results**

18 We found an absolute increase of supraglacial debris-cover for all investigated glaciers from 48.3 ± 3.1 km² in 1986,
19 to 54.6 ± 3.4 km² in 2000 and 79.0 ± 4.9 km² in 2014, in contrast to a reduction of the total glacier area. This equates
20 to a total increase in the proportion of supraglacial debris-cover surface area from $7.0 \pm 6.4\%$ in 1986, to $9.1 \pm 6.3\%$ in
21 2000, and to $13.4 \pm 6.2\%$ in 2014 (Table 2; Fig. 3). Supraglacial debris-cover was highest in the glacier area classes
22 1.0 - 5.0 km² and 5.0 - 10.0 km² for both northern and southern slopes (Fig. S1). The number of debris-covered glaciers
23 (i.e. with an areal percentage of debris larger than 10% - see methods) also increased from 122 in 1986, to 143 in
24 2000, and to 172 in 2014.

25 For all regions investigated in the Greater Caucasus the rate of increase in supraglacial debris-cover varied between
26 northern and southern slopes, and between the western, central and eastern sections of the mountain range (Table 2;
27 Fig. 3, 4). The western Greater Caucasus experienced a supraglacial debris-cover area increase from $4.1 \pm 6.8\%$ in
28 1986, to $22.4 \pm 6.4\%$ in 2014, while the increase was significantly lower in the central Greater Caucasus over the last
29 30 years - from $7.4 \pm 6.3\%$ to $10.1 \pm 6.2\%$ (Table 2). The eastern Greater Caucasus with fewer glaciers almost doubled
30 in supraglacial debris cover over the last 30 years from $27.9 \pm 6.2\%$ to $49.2 \pm 5.7\%$.

31 Supraglacial debris-covered area increased from $13.5 \pm 6.3\%$ to $29.3 \pm 6.0\%$ for all three sections (western, central
32 and eastern) on the northern slope (not including Elbrus), and from $4.0 \pm 6.8\%$ to $9.2 \pm 6.9\%$ on the southern slope of
33 the Greater Caucasus between 1986 and 2014.

34 The Elbrus Massif contained the least percentage of supraglacial debris-cover in all our study regions, but it more
35 than doubled between 1986 and 2014 (from $1.8 \pm 6.9\%$ to $4.6 \pm 6.6\%$). Supraglacial debris-cover percentage increase
36 and total glacier area decrease were both highest on the eastern slope of the Elbrus between 1986 and 2014, and
37 lowest on the western slope (Fig. 5a-c).

38 Hypsometric profiles show that supraglacial debris-cover is most commonly found in the 2500-3000 m zone for
39 Elbrus and the 1900-2500 m zone for the other regions (Fig. 6). The supraglacial debris-cover doubled from 6.4% to
40 12.2% (0.21% yr⁻¹) in the 3000-3500 m zone for all selected glaciers in 1986-2014 (Fig. 6d) and increased in the
41 3500-4000 m zone for all regions and selected glaciers during the investigated period.

1 **Table 2.** Supraglacial debris-cover and clean-ice in the Greater Caucasus for 1985/86, 2000 and 2013/14 by regions and slopes. The error values are derived by a
 2 buffer approach.

Section and river basin	Selected glacier number	Landsat 5 TM, 1985/86					Landsat 7 ETM+, 2000					Landsat 8 OLI, 2013/14. SPOT-7, 2016				
		Total glacier area km ²	Clean-ice area km ²	Debris-covered area			Total glacier area km ²	Clean-ice area km ²	Debris-covered area			Total glacier area km ²	Clean-ice area km ²	Debris-covered area		
				Glacier number	Area km ²	%*			Glacier number	Area km ²	%*			Glacier number	Area km ²	%*
Western Caucasus																
Northern slope (Kuban)	145	91.7±3.4	87.1±3.1	15	4.6±0.31	5.0±6.7	87.2±3.4	80.8±3.0	21	6.2±0.41	7.1±6.6	78.3±3.4	57.9±2.1	33	20.4±1.3	26.1±6.4
Southern slope (Kodori)	78	35.5±1.7	34.8±1.6	1	0.7±0.05	2.0±7.1	32.8±1.6	31.7±1.5	1	1.1±0.078	3.5±7.1	26.1±1.3	23.1±1.1	3	3.0±0.21	11.5±7.1
Sum	223	127.2±5.1	121.9±4.7	16	5.3±0.36	4.1±6.8	119.8±5.0	112.5±4.5	22	7.3±0.48	6.1±6.6	104.4±4.4	81.0±3.2	36	23.4±1.5	22.4±6.4
Central Caucasus																
Northern slope (Baksan, Chegem, Cherek)	173	211.0±8.6	194.7±7.6	28	16.3±1.0	7.7±6.1	203.2±8.6	184.5±7.5	37	18.7±1.1	9.2±6.1	185.3±8.3	161.9±6.9	42	23.4±1.4	12.6±6.0
Southern slope (Enguri)	112	178.8±7.4	168.1±6.7	15	10.7±0.69	6.0±6.5	171.3±7.3	160.5±6.6	15	10.8±0.69	6.3±6.4	149.8±6.6	139.4±5.9	17	10.4±0.70	6.9±6.7
Sum	285	389.8±15.0	362.8±14.4	43	27.0±1.7	7.4±6.3	374.5±15.9	345.0±14.1	52	29.5±1.8	7.9±6.2	335.1±14.9	301.3±12.8	59	33.8±2.1	10.1±6.2
Eastern Caucasus																
Northern slope (Tergi headwaters, Sunja Right tributaries, Sulak)	130	49.1±2.5	35.4±1.7	54	13.7±0.84	27.9±6.2	41.3±2.5	27.2±1.6	56	14.1±0.86	34.1±6.1	32.1±2.0	16.3±1.1	59	15.8±0.90	49.2±5.7
Elbrus Massif	21	125.4±5.3	123.1±5.1	9	2.3±0.16	1.8±6.9	120.9±4.6	117.2±4.3	13	3.7±0.25	3.1±6.8	118.4±4.2	112.4±3.8	18	6.0±0.4	4.6±6.6
All selected glaciers	659	691.5±29.0	643.2±25.9	122	48.3±3.1	7.0±6.4	656.5±27.9	601.9±24.5	143	54.6±3.4	9.1±6.3	590.0±25.8	511.0±20.9	172	79.0±4.9	13.4±6.2

3 * % of the total glacier area




Figure 3. Percentage of supraglacial debris cover in the Greater Caucasus for 1986, 2000 and 2014 by regions (glaciers are non-existent on southern slopes of the eastern Greater Caucasus).

Supraglacial debris cover area for (the largest) Bezingi Glacier in the Greater Caucasus increased from $4.4 \pm 0.3 \text{ km}^2$ or $11.0 \pm 5.9\%$ to $7.5 \pm 0.4 \text{ km}^2$ or $20.0 \pm 6.0\%$ ($\sim 0.32\% \text{ yr}^{-1}$) between 1986 and 2014 in contrast with a reduction of the total glacier area from $40.0 \pm 0.9 \text{ km}^2$ to $37.5 \pm 0.9 \text{ km}^2$ ($6.3 \pm 2.2\%$ or $\sim 0.22\% \text{ yr}^{-1}$) during the same period with a terminus retreat of $\sim 374 \text{ m}$. Comparison with the debris-free Karaugom Glacier (third largest glacier of the Greater Caucasus), located in the same region (northern slope of central Greater Caucasus), shows that the percentage area reduction was almost three times greater than for the debris-covered Bezingi Glacier: from $29.2 \pm 0.6 \text{ km}^2$ to $24.0 \pm 0.4 \text{ km}^2$ ($17.8 \pm 2.1\%$ or $\sim 0.63 \text{ yr}^{-1}$) with a terminus retreat of $\sim 1366 \text{ m}$ (Fig. S2).


The mean upper limit of the supraglacial debris-cover migrated from $\sim 3015 \text{ m}$ to $\sim 3130 \text{ m}$ between 1986 and 2014 for all selected glaciers of the Greater Caucasus. The highest mean upper limit lies on the northern slopes of eastern Greater Caucasus ($\sim 3626 \text{ m}$), while the lowest limit is on the southern slopes of western Greater Caucasus ($\sim 2850 \text{ m}$). On the Elbrus Massif the mean upper limit of the supraglacial debris-cover migrated from $\sim 3345 \text{ m}$ to $\sim 3520 \text{ m}$ between 1986 and 2014 (Fig. 7, Table S1).

5 Discussion


5.1 Comparison with previous investigations

Our results are in agreement with studies assessing changes in supraglacial debris-cover for smaller areas in the Greater Caucasus. For example, Stokes et al. (2007) calculated that supraglacial debris-cover increased by 3%-6% ($\sim 0.20\% \text{ yr}^{-1}$) between 1985 and 2000 on several glaciers in the central Greater Caucasus. On individual glaciers, supraglacial debris-cover increased by 25%-30% (e.g. Shkhelda) in the same period. We found an increase of supraglacial debris-cover from $21.3 \pm 6.0\%$ to $30 \pm 5.8\%$ ($\sim 0.65\% \text{ yr}^{-1}$) for Shkhelda Glacier between 1986 and 2000. Popovnin et al. (2015), reported a supraglacial debris-cover increase from 2% to 13% ($\sim 0.23\% \text{ yr}^{-1}$) between 1968-2010, based on direct field monitoring for the Djankuat Glacier (northern slope of the central Greater Caucasus). This compares with our result of an area increase of supraglacial debris-cover for Djankuat Glacier from $2.6 \pm 6.9\%$ to $9.8 \pm 6.1\%$ ($\sim 0.25\% \text{ yr}^{-1}$) between 1986 and 2014. This difference can be explained in that the detailed field measurement would have picked out smaller spots of debris-cover which were beyond the resolution of the satellite imagery. Lambrecht et al. (2011) estimated that the supraglacial debris-cover distribution remained nearly constant at $\sim 16\%$ between 1971 and 1991 in the Adyl-su River basin (northern slope of the central Greater Caucasus). Between 1991 and 2006, the supraglacial debris-cover started to increase noticeably reaching 23% ($\sim 0.46\% \text{ yr}^{-1}$) within 15 years. For the Zopkhito and Laboda glaciers (southern slope of the central Greater Caucasus), supraglacial debris-


1 cover increase was lower in the same period (from 6.2% to 8.1% or $\sim 0.12\% \text{ yr}^{-1}$). We measured the supraglacial
 2 debris-cover increase in the same glaciers from $4.9 \pm 6.5\%$ to $6.1 \pm 6.4\%$ or $\sim 0.08\% \text{ yr}^{-1}$ between 1986 and 2000.



6 **Figure 4.** Supraglacial debris-cover increase (yellow) and glacier area decrease (green) rates in the Greater Caucasus by slopes,
 7 sections and mountain massifs in 1986–2000 (a), 2000–2014 (b) and 1986–2014 (c).



1 **Figure 5.** Percentage of supraglacial debris-cover (SDC) for the Elbrus slopes in 1986 and 2014 (a). Total glacier area (km²) and
 2 supraglacial debris-cover area changes (km²) in 1986 (b) and 2014 (c) for the Elbrus slopes.
 3
 4
 5



6 **Figure 6.** Hypsometry of supraglacial debris-cover, clean ice and total glacier area, of the four study regions in 1986 and 2014.
 7 a – Elbrus, b – Northern Slope of the Greater Caucasus, c – Southern Slope, d – All selected glaciers. Supraglacial debris-cover
 8 percentage is given according to the different elevation zones in 1986 (brown digits) and 2014 (black digits).
 9
 10
 11

12 We extracted both supraglacial debris-cover and clean-ice outlines from Scherler et al. (2018) for our glacier
 13 sample from 2014 to compare these results of our regional study with those from the global study. We found that a
 14 large portion of these glaciers in the Greater Caucasus are covered by supraglacial debris-cover. While for two regions
 15 the results match within the uncertainty (western Greater Caucasus: 22.4±6.4% vs. 23.7% and Elbrus 4.6±6.6% vs.
 16 7.7%), our values are lower than the results of Scherler, et al. (2018) for the other two regions (10.1±6.2% vs. 30.8%

for central, $49.2 \pm 5.7\%$ vs. 84.9% for eastern) (Fig. S3). These differences can mostly be explained by i) the RGI v6 used by Scherler, et al. (2018), is characterized by some inconsistent co-registration for the Greater Caucasus region which stems from the use of inadequately orthorectified satellite imagery to generate the inventory in contrast to the improved orthorectification of the Landsat L1T data (Fig. S4a); and ii) the RGI v6 contains nominal glaciers (i.e. ellipses around glacier label points) for the Greater Caucasus region which originate from the use of the world glacier inventory (WGI, Haeberli et al., 1989) to fill gaps with no data for earlier versions of the RGI (Pfeffer et al., 2014). According to Scherler et al. (2018), all nominal glaciers were classified as debris-covered (Fig. S4b). We note that the scope of the study by Scherler et al. (2018) was an automatized global assessment of supraglacial debris-cover from optical satellite data, without correcting any outlines in the RGI.





Figure 7. Mean upper limit (m asl) of the supraglacial debris-cover for 1986 and 2014 by different regions (glaciers are non-existent on southern slopes of the eastern Greater Caucasus).

5.2 Possible reasons for supraglacial debris-cover changes

We observed a clear increase in supraglacial debris-cover in all investigated regions, which became more pronounced after 2000. Based on our investigation, the upper limit of supraglacial debris-cover migrated up-glacier (Fig. 7, 8; Table S2) as a response to glacier retreat thinning and reduced mass flux, as described by Stokes et al. (2007) and defined as 'backwasting' by Benn and Evans (1998). A similar pattern of up-glacier migration has also been described on Tasman Glacier, New Zealand (Kirkbride and Warren, 1999), and on Zmuttgletscher Glacier, Swiss Alps (Mölg et al., 2019).

The results presented in this study indicate that the clean-ice area for all selected glaciers decreased from about 93% to 87% between 1986 and 2014 (Table 2). This reduction was caused by both glacier retreat and an increase in total supraglacial debris-cover (Table 2, Fig. 3-6, S5). This finding is also consistent with field measurements on Djankuat Glacier (Popovnin et al., 2015).

Glacier thinning and a warming atmosphere can lead to permafrost thawing and slope instability at higher altitudes (Deline et al., 2015). Rock avalanches after 2000 on some glaciers in the Greater Caucasus (particularly in the eastern section) might be one of the reasons why the increase rate was higher during our second time period (2000-2014). For example, a rock-ice avalanche onto the Devdoraki Glacier on 17 May 2014 (Tielidze et al., 2019) caused an area increase of supraglacial debris-cover from $5.9 \pm 6.0\%$ to $19.1 \pm 5.6\%$ or about $0.95\% \text{ yr}^{-1}$ and a landslide after 2000 onto the Suatysi Glacier produced supraglacial debris-cover area increase from $2.1 \pm 6.1\%$ to $17.6 \pm 5.7\%$ or about $1.10\% \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (Fig. S6).




1
2 **Figure 8.** An example of the supraglacial debris cover up-glacier migration onto the Shkhara Glacier: a – 1986, b – 2014 and
3 Khalde Glacier: c – 1986, d – 2014.

4
5 Our investigation shows also that the supraglacial debris cover increases more quickly on the northern slopes of
6 the Greater Caucasus than on the southern, where higher solar radiation input commonly results in smaller glaciers
7 than on the northern slopes. Furthermore, smaller glaciers on the southern slope exist in high cirques with much
8 steeper surface. Glaciers on the northern slopes are on average less steep than on the south mainly because most
9 valley glacier tongues in the north are longer and reach lower altitudes than the south-facing glaciers. This conclusion
10 is supported by Lambrecht et al. (2011) who observed a more rapid increase of supraglacial debris cover on the
11 northern slopes than the southern.

12 The highest mean upper limit of the supraglacial debris cover in the eastern Greater Caucasus can mostly be found
13 at small cirque and simply-valley type glaciers preserved at high altitudes and surrounded by rock walls.

14 The variation of supraglacial debris cover area in the eastern, central and western Greater Caucasus could be
15 mostly caused by climate, lithology and morphological peculiarities of the relief. Some river basins in the eastern
16 Greater Caucasus are built on Jurassic sedimentary rocks, which are characterized by relatively high denudation rates
17 (Gobejishvili et al., 2011; Bochud, 2011) supporting supraglacial debris cover formation. The relief of the central
18 Greater Caucasus is mainly constructed from Proterozoic and Lower Paleozoic plagiogranites, plagiogneisses, quartz
19 diorites and crystalline slates, which are more resistant and are less prone to the formation of rock avalanches. In

1 addition, the central Greater Caucasus is the highest section of the main range and glacier tongues are relatively
2 steeper and hence, less favourable for debris-cover accumulation. The western Greater Caucasus is hypsometrically
3 lower with less steep glaciers. This section is characterised by the highest glacier retreat after the eastern Greater
4 Caucasus. It is therefore possible that glaciers are also rapidly thinning favouring debris-covered over the ablation
5 area (Benn et al., 2012; Pratap et al., 2015). The dome of the anticlinorium of the western Greater Caucasus (crest of
6 the main water divide) is built on Proterozoic and Paleozoic plagiogneisses, granites, amphibolites, and crystalline
7 slates. This provides the framework for overall denudation of the high mountainous relief (over 3000 m) (Gobejishvili
8 et al., 2019). Furthermore, this area is characterized by active tectonic and ongoing mountain building (uplifting)
9 processes (Tsereteli et al., 2016), which might be a further reason for increasing supraglacial debris-cover. We note
10 that all these reasons need confirmation by detailed field measurements and could be part of a separate investigation
11 since there is no accurate geographical pattern which otherwise explains the clear differences of the increase in
12 supraglacial debris cover.
13



14
15 **Figure 9.** Supraglacial debris-cover (SDC) increase on the Elbrus Massif from 1986 to 2014. SPOT-7 image 20/08/2016 is used
16 as the background. Blue color shows retreat of clean-ice parts. Clean-ice in 1986 consists of the clean-ice 2014 (light blue,
17 transparent) plus clean-ice area that retreated between 1986 and 2014 (dark blue).
18

1 Our results indicate more than doubling of supraglacial debris-cover area for Elbrus glaciers from 1986 to 2014
2 with the highest increase rate between 2000 and 2014 (Fig. 4, 9), although the total estimated uncertainty is
3 comparable to the obtained relative changes. Glaciers in the western slope of Elbrus are affected by avalanches and
4 thus are partially debris-covered (Kutuzov et al., 2019). Glaciers on the eastern slope are characterized by high rates
5 of retreat and great expansion in proglacial lake number and area (Petraikov et al., 2007). The most significant increase
6 of supraglacial debris-cover occurred on the eastern oriented glaciers of Elbrus, where glaciers are characterized by
7 the highest thinning rates in recent years (Kutuzov et al., 2019). Detailed Ground-Penetrating Radar (GPR) survey
8 helps to more accurately identify supraglacial debris-cover extent in this area (e.g. GPR measurements by Kutuzov
9 et al. (2019) showed that ~30 m of ice may be present under the previously considered ice-free area on the eastern
10 slope of Elbrus).

11 The glaciers in the Greater Caucasus have retreated continuously since 1960 (Tielidze and Wheate, 2018),
12 suggesting that the shielding effect of increased supraglacial debris-cover at the glacier surface may only partly offset
13 the retreat trend. This is in line with detailed observations of the evolution of Zmuttgletscher, in the Swiss Alps (Mölg
14 et al., 2019) and that mass changes of debris-covered and debris-free glaciers in the Himalaya are similar (e.g. Berthier
15 et al., 2007; King et al., 2019). Direct field measurements show that thermal resistance of the < 20 cm supraglacial
16 debris-cover for some glaciers (e.g. Djankuat and Zpkhito) in the Greater Caucasus is relatively higher (0.07-0.15°C
17 and 0.05-0.08°C m²/W) than in other glacierised regions of the world (e.g. Baltoro, Karakoram 0.02-0.07°C and Maliy
18 Aktru, Altay 0.02-0.09°C m²/W) (Lambrecht et al., 2011), preventing a more rapid retreat. This process is consistent
19 with our observations of the largest debris-covered (Bezingi) and debris-free (Karaugom) glaciers of the Greater
20 Caucasus, where the latter is characterized with higher area shrinkage and terminus retreat. Numerous authors have
21 found similar model results in the Himalaya (e.g. Scherler et al., 2011; Rowan et al., 2015; Jiang et al., 2018).

22 23 **6 Conclusions**

24 We have presented supraglacial debris-cover change over the last 30 years in the Greater Caucasus region. Manual
25 and semi-automated digitization from satellite imagery (Landsat, SPOT, Google Earth) were used to distinguish the
26 supraglacial debris-cover area in 1986, 2000 and 2014. We expect that this study will significantly improve existing
27 knowledge for this region.

28 The main conclusions of this research are summarized as follows:

29 i) An overall glacier shrinkage by 15.8±4.1% in the Greater Caucasus was accompanied by an increase of
30 supraglacial debris-cover from 7.0±6.4% to 13.4±6.2% between 1986 and 2014. Clean-ice area reduced by
31 20.1±4.0% during the same time.

32 ii) Supraglacial debris-cover increase rate was relatively lower between 1986 and 2000 (~0.15% yr⁻¹), while it
33 doubled in the second investigated period (~0.30% yr⁻¹) partly explained by rock avalanches after 2000 on some
34 glaciers (particularly in the eastern section).

35 iii) The number of debris-covered glaciers (debris larger than 10%) increased from 122 in 1986, to 143 in 2000,
36 and to 172 in 2014.

37 iv) Increase of supraglacial debris-cover was observed more rapidly on the northern slopes than on the southern
38 ones during the investigated periods.

39 v) The eastern Greater Caucasus represented the largest percentage of supraglacial debris-cover (49.2±5.7%) for
40 2014, while the Elbrus Massif contained the lowest percentage of supraglacial debris-cover (4.6±6.6%) in all our
41 study regions.

42 Given the increasing degree of supraglacial debris-cover in the Greater Caucasus region, by monitoring should be
43 continued, as it constitutes an important control on glacier response to climate change. The recent significant increase
44 of the supraglacial debris-cover area in this region may alter the glacier mass balance in different ways depending on

1 debris thickness and properties. Such feedbacks can affect future glacier evolution and should be considered in glacier
2 modeling.

3 Future work should focus on using high resolution aerial/satellite imagery and more detailed field measurements,
4 e.g. glaciological mass balance measurements, characteristics of debris and debris thickness measurement by Ground-
5 Penetrating Radar, or incoming and reflected solar radiation, long-wave terrestrial and returned radiation. This will
6 reduce uncertainties connected with supraglacial debris-cover assessment and glacier mapping accuracy in this
7 region.

9 **Acknowledgements:**

10 This work was supported by Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation of Georgia (SRNSFG) [YS17_12]. We
11 gratefully acknowledge the support of the editor, Etienne Berthier, and two reviewers, Dirk Scherler and Sam Herreid,
12 for useful suggestions and detailed comments which clearly enhanced the quality of the paper. We thank Shaun Eaves
13 for cooperation during the preparation of the paper.

15 **Information about the Supplement**

16 The supplement includes glacier size classes with debris-covered and debris-free glaciers distributions for northern
17 and southern slopes (Fig. 1); Comparison of Debris-covered (Bezingi) and Debris-free (Karaugom) glaciers retreat
18 between 1986 and 2014 (Fig. 2); Mean up-glacier migration of the upper limit of the supraglacial debris-cover for
19 1986 and 2014 by regions (Table 1); Relative supraglacial debris-cover for the western, central, and eastern Greater
20 Caucasus as well as for Elbrus based on the current study and in comparison to Scherler et al. (2018) (Figs. 3-4);
21 Increased supraglacial debris-cover area for Devdoraki and Suatysi glaciers before and after rock-ice avalanches (Fig.
22 5); A comparison of supraglacial debris-cover and clean-ice area distribution in 1986 and 2014 for south and north
23 facing glaciers (Fig. 6). Total glacier area and supraglacial debris-cover change on the Elbrus Massif from 1986 to
24 2014 (animation map).

26 **Data availability**

27 The new supraglacial debris-cover database created during the investigated period has been submitted to GLIMS, and
28 can be used as a basis dataset for future studies.

30 *Supplement.* The supplement related to this article is available online at: <https://doi.org/.....>

32 *Competing interests.* The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

34 **References**

- 35 Baraer, M., Mark, B. G., McKenzie, J. M., Condom, T., Bury, J., Huh, K. I., Portocarrero, C., Gomez, J., and Rathay,
36 S.: Glacier recession and water resources in Peru's Cordillera Blanca. *Journal of Glaciology*, 58, 134-150, 2012.
- 37 Benn, D. I., and Evans, D. J. A.: *Glaciers and Glaciation*, Arnold, London, 1998.
- 38 Benn, D., Bolch, T., Hands, K., Gulley, J., Luckman, A., Nicholson, L., Quincey, D., Thompson, S., Toumi, R., and
39 Wiseman, S.: Response of debris-covered glaciers in the Mount Everest region to recent warming, and
40 implications for outburst flood hazards. *Earth-Science Reviews*, 114, 156-174, 2012.
- 41 Berthier, E., Arnaud, Y., Kumar, R., Ahmad, S., Wagnon, P., Chevallier, P.: Remote sensing estimates of glacier
42 mass balances in the Himachal Pradesh (Western Himalaya, India). *Remote Sens. Environ.* 108 (3), 327–338.
43 [10.1016/j.rse.2006.11.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2006.11.017). 2007.
- 44 Bochud, M.: *Tectonics of the Eastern Greater Caucasus in Azerbaijan*. PhD Thesis, Faculty of Sciences of the
45 University of Fribourg (Switzerland), 2011.

- 1 Bolch, T., Menounos, B., and Wheate, R.: Landsat-based inventory of glaciers in western Canada, 1985–2005,
2 Remote Sens. Environ., 114, 127–137, doi:10.1016/j.rse.2009.08.015, 2010.
- 3 Deline, P.: Change in surface debris cover on Mont Blanc massif glaciers after the ‘Little Ice Age’ termination. The
4 Holocene, 15(2), 302–309. <https://doi.org/10.1191/0959683605hl809rr>, 2005.
- 5 Deline, P., Gruber, S., Delaloye, R., Fischer, L., Geertsema, M., Giardino, M., Hasler, A., Kirkbride, M., Krautblatter,
6 M., Magnin, F., McColl, S., Ravel, L., and Schoeneich, P.: Chapter 15 - Ice Loss and Slope Stability in High-
7 Mountain Regions. In W. Haeberli, Colin Whiteman, John, F. Shroder (Eds.): Snow and Ice-Related Hazards,
8 Risks and Disasters. Boston: Academic Press, pp. 521–561, <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-394849-6.00015-9>, 2015.
- 9
- 10 Frey, H., Paul, F., and Strozzi, T.: Compilation of a glacier inventory for the western Himalayas from satellite data:
11 methods, challenges, and results, Remote Sens. Environ., 124, 832–843, 2012.
- 12 Gobejishvili, R., Lomidze, N., and Tielidze, L.: Late Pleistocene (Wurmian) glaciations of the Caucasus, in:
13 Quaternary Glaciations: Extent and Chronology, edited by: Ehlers, J., Gibbard, P. L., and Hughes, P. D., Elsevier,
14 Amsterdam, 141–147, doi:10.1016/B978-0-444-53447-7.00012-X, 2011.
- 15 Gobejishvili R., Tielidze L., Astakhov N.: Western Greater Caucasus. In: Tielidze L. (eds) Geomorphology of
16 Georgia. Geography of the Physical Environment. Springer, Cham. doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77764-1_8, 2019.
- 17 Glasser, N., Holt, T. O., Evans, Z. D., Davies, B. J., Pelto, M., and Harrison, S.: Recent spatial and temporal variations
18 in debris cover on Patagonian glaciers. Geomorphology 273, 202–216. doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2016.07.036,
19 2016.
- 20 Granshaw, F., D. and Fountain, A. G.: Glacier change (1958–1998) in the North Cascades National Park Complex,
21 Washington, USA. J. Glaciol., 52(177), 251–256, doi: 10.3189/172756506781828782, 2006.
- 22 Haeberli, W., Böschi, H., Scherler, K., Østrem, G. and Wallén, C. C. (Eds.): World glacier inventory - status 1988.
23 IAHS(ICSU)/UNEP/UNESCO, Nairobi. 1989.
- 24 Jiang, S., Nie, Y., Liu, Q., Wang, J., Liu, L., Hassan, J., Liu, X., and Xu, X.: Glacier Change, Supraglacial Debris
25 Expansion and Glacial Lake Evolution in the Gyirong River Basin, Central Himalayas, between 1988 and 2015.
26 Remote Sens. 10, 986. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs10070986>. 2018.
- 27 Kellerer-Pirklbauer, A.: The Supraglacial Debris System at the Pasterze Glacier, Austria: Spatial Distribution,
28 Characteristics and Transport of Debris. Zeitschrift für Geomorphologie, Supplementary 52 (1), 3–25. doi:
29 10.1127/0372-8854/2008/0052S1-0003. 2008.
- 30 King, O., Bhattacharya, A., Bhambri, R., Bolch, T.: Glacial lakes exacerbate Himalayan glacier mass loss. Scientific
31 Reports 9 (1), 18145. 10.1038/s41598-019-53733-x. 2019.
- 32 Kirkbride, M. P. and C. R. Warren.: Tasman Glacier, New Zealand: 20th-century thinning and predicted calving
33 retreat. Global Planet. Change, 22 (1–4), 11–28, 1999.
- 34 Kirkbride, M. P., Deline, P.: The formation of supraglacial debris covers by primary dispersal from transverse
35 englacial debris bands. Earth Surf. Process. Landforms 38, 1779–1792. <https://doi.org/10.1002/esp.3416>. 2013.
- 36 Kozachek, A., Mikhalenko, V., Masson-Delmotte, V., Ekaykin, A., Ginot, P., Kutuzov, S., Legrand, M., Lipenkov,
37 V., and Preunkert, S.: Large-scale drivers of Caucasus climate variability in meteorological records and Mt
38 El'brus ice cores, Clim. Past, 13, 473–489, <https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-13-473-2017>, 2017.
- 39 Kutuzov S., Lavrentiev I., Smirnov A., Nosenko G. and Petrakov D.: Volume changes of Elbrus glaciers from 1997
40 to 2017, Front. Earth Sci. 7:153. doi:10.3389/feart.2019.00153.
- 41 Lambrecht, A., Mayer, C., Hagg, W., Popovnin, V., Rezepkin, A., Lomidze, N., and Svanadze, D.: A comparison of
42 glacier melt on debris-covered glaciers in the northern and southern Caucasus, The Cryosphere, 5, 525–538,
43 doi:10.5194/tc-5-525-2011, 2011.
- 44 Mikhalenko, V., Sokratov, S., Kutuzov, S., Ginot, P., Legrand, M., Preunkert, S., Lavrentiev, I., Kozachek, A.,
45 Ekaykin, A., Faïn, X., Lim, S., Schotterer, U., Lipenkov, V., and Toropov, P.: Investigation of a deep ice core

- 1 from the Elbrus western plateau, the Caucasus, Russia, *The Cryosphere*, 9, 2253-2270, doi:10.5194/tc-9-2253-
2 2015, 2015.
- 3 Mölg, N., Bolch, T., Rastner, P., Strozzi, T., and Paul, F.: A consistent glacier inventory for Karakoram and Pamir
4 derived from Landsat data: distribution of debris cover and mapping challenges, *Earth Syst. Sci. Data*, 10,
5 1807-1827, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-10-1807-2018>, 2018.
- 6 Mölg, N., Bolch, T., Walter, A., and Vieli, A.: Unravelling the evolution of Zmuttgletscher and its debris cover since
7 the end of the Little Ice Age, *The Cryosphere*, 13, 1889-1909, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-13-1889-2019>, 2019.
- 8 Nicholson, L. I., McCarthy, M., Pritchard, H. D., and Willis, I.: Supraglacial debris thickness variability: impact on
9 ablation and relation to terrain properties, *The Cryosphere*, 12, 3719-3734, [https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-12-3719-](https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-12-3719-2018)
10 2018, 2018.
- 11 Östrem, G.: Ice Melting under a Thin Layer of Moraine, and the Existence of Ice Cores in Moraine Ridges.
12 *Geografiska Annaler*, 41(4), 228-230, 1959.
- 13 Paul, F., Barrand, N., Baumann, S., Berthier, E., Bolch, T., Casey, K., Frey, H., Joshi, S., Konovalov, V., Le Bris, R.,
14 Mölg, N., Nosenko, G., Nuth, C., Pope, A., Racoviteanu, A., Rastner, P., Raup, B., Scharrer, K., Steffen, S., and
15 Winsvold, S.: On the accuracy of glacier outlines derived from remote-sensing data, *Ann. Glaciol.*, 54, 171–182,
16 doi:10.3189/2013AoG63A296, 2013.
- 17 Petrakov, D. A., Krylenko, I. V., Chernomorets, S. S., Tutubalina, O. V., Krylenko, I. N., and Shakhmina, M. S.:
18 Debris flow hazard of glacial lakes in the Central Caucasus. *Debris-Flow Hazards Mitigation: Mechanics,*
19 *Prediction, and Assessment*, Chen & Major, eds. Millpress, Netherlands, 2007.
- 20 Pfeiffer, W. T., Arendt, A. A., Bliss, A., Bolch, T., Cogley, J. G., Gardner, A. S., Hagen, J., Hock, R., Kaser, G.,
21 Kienholz, C., Miles, E. S., Moholdt, G., Mölg, N., Paul, F., Radic V., Rastner, P., Raup, B. H., Rich, J., Sharp,
22 M. J., and The Randolph Consortium: The Randolph Glacier Inventory: a globally complete inventory of glaciers,
23 *J. Glaciol.*, 60, 537–552, doi:10.3189/2014JoG13J176, 2014.
- 24 Popovnin, V. V., and Rozova, A.: Influence of sub-debris thawing on ablation and runoff of the Djankuat Glacier in
25 the Caucasus. *Nord. Hydrol.*, 33, 75–94., 2002.
- 26 Popovnin, V. V., Rezepkin, A. A., and Tielidze, L. G.: Superficial moraine expansion on the Djankuat Glacier snout
27 over the direct glaciological monitoring period, *Earth Cryosphere*, vol. XIX, No. 1, pp. 79–87, 2015.
- 28 Pratap, B., Dobhal, D., Mehta, M., and Bhambri, R.: Influence of debris cover and altitude on glacier surface melting:
29 A case study on Dokriani Glacier, central Himalaya, India. *Annals of Glaciology*, 56(70), 9-16.
30 doi:10.3189/2015AoG70A971, 2015.
- 31 Rau, F., Mauz, F., Vogt, S., Singh Khalsa, S. J., and Raup, B.: Illustrated GLIMS Glacier Classification Manual,
32 Glacier Classification Guidance for the GLIMS Glacier Inventory. 2005. www.glims.org
- 33 Raup, B. H., Khalsa, S. J. S., Armstrong, R. L., Sneed, W. A., Hamilton, G. S., Paul, F., Cawkwell, F., Beedle, M. J.,
34 Menounos, B. P., Wheate, R. D., Rott, H., Shiyin, L., Xin, Li., Donghui, S., Guodong, C., Kargel, J. S., Larsen,
35 C. F., Molnia, B. F., Kincaid, J. L., Klein, A., and Konovalov, V.: Quality in the GLIMS glacier database, in:
36 *Global Land Ice Measurements from Space*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 163–182, doi:10.1007/978-3-54079818-
37 7_7, 2014.
- 38 RGI Consortium.: Randolph Glacier Inventory (RGI) – A dataset of global glacier outlines: version 6.0, Technical
39 Report. Global Land Ice Measurements from Space, Boulder, Colorado, USA. 2017.
- 40 Rounce, D. R., King, O., McCarthy, M., Shean, D. E., Salerno, F.: Quantifying Debris Thickness of Debris-Covered
41 Glaciers in the Everest Region of Nepal Through Inversion of a Subdebris Melt Model. *J. Geophys. Res.* 123 (5),
42 1094–1115. Doi: 10.1029/2017JF004395. 2018.
- 43 Rowan, A. V., Quincey, D. J., Egholm, D. L., and Glasser, N. F.: Modelling the feedbacks between mass balance,
44 ice flow and debris transport to predict the response to climate change of debris-covered glaciers in the
45 Himalaya. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* 430, 427–438. doi/10.1016/j.epsl.2015.09.00, 2015.


- 1 Scherler, D., Bookhagen, B., and Strecker, M. R.: Spatially variable response of Himalayan glaciers to climate change
2 affected by debris cover. *Nature Geoscience* vol. 4, pp. 156-159. <https://doi.org/10.1038/NGEO1068>, 2011.
- 3 Scherler, D., Wulf, H. and Gorelick, N.: Global assessment of supraglacial debris-cover extents. *Geophysical*
4 *Research Letters*, 45. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL080158>, 2018.
- 5 Stokes, C. R., Popovnin, V. V., Aleynikov, A., and Shahgedanova, M.: Recent glacier retreat in the Caucasus
6 Mountains, Russia, and associated changes in supraglacial debris cover and supra/proglacial lake development,
7 *Ann. Glaciol.*, 46, 196–203, 2007.
- 8 Sylvén, M., Reinvang, R., and Andersone-Lilley, Ž.: **Climate Change in Southern Caucasus: Impacts on nature,**
9 **people and society (WWF overview report). WWF Norway WWF Caucasus Programme, 2008.**
- 10 Thompson, S., Benn, D., Mertes, J. And Luckman A.: Stagnation and mass loss on a Himalayan debris-covered
11 glacier: processes, patterns and rates. *Journal of Glaciology*. Vol. 62, Issue 233. pp. 467-485,
12 doi.org/10.1017/jog.2016.37, 2016.
- 13 Tielidze, L. G.: Glacier change over the last century, Caucasus Mountains, Georgia, observed from old topographical
14 maps, Landsat and ASTER satellite imagery, *The Cryosphere*, 10, 713-725, doi.org/10.5194/tc-10-713-2016,
15 2016.
- 16 Tielidze L.: Introduction. In: *Glaciers of Georgia. Geography of the Physical Environment*. Springer, Cham,
17 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-50571-8_1, 2017.
- 18 Tielidze, L. G. and Wheate, R. D.: The Greater Caucasus Glacier Inventory (Russia, Georgia and Azerbaijan), *The*
19 *Cryosphere*, 12, 81-94, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-12-81-2018>, 2018.
- 20 Tielidze, L. G., Kumladze, R. M., Wheate, R. D., and Gamkrelidze, M.: The Devdoraki Glacier Catastrophes,
21 Georgian Caucasus. *Hungarian Geographical Bulletin*, 68(1), 21-35. <https://doi.org/10.15201/hungeobull.68.1.2>,
22 2019a.
- 23 Tielidze L., Gobejishvili R., Javakhishvili A.: Eastern Greater Caucasus. In: Tielidze L. (eds) *Geomorphology of*
24 *Georgia. Geography of the Physical Environment*. Springer, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77764-](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77764-1_10)
25 [1_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77764-1_10), 2019b.
- 26 Tsereteli, N., Tibaldi, A., Alania, V., Gventsadse, A., Enukidze, O., Varazanashvili, O., and Müller, B. I. R.: **Active**
27 **tectonics of central-western Caucasus, Georgia. *Tectonophysics*, 691, 328-344.**
28 doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2016.10.025, 2016.
- 29 Volodicheva, N.: The Caucasus, in: *The Physical Geography of Northern Eurasia*, edited by: Shahgedanova, M., 350–
30 376, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002.
- 31 Zhang Y., Hirabayashi, Y., Fujita, K., Liu, S., and Liu, Q.: Heterogeneity in supraglacial debris thickness and its role
32 in glacier mass changes of the Mount Gongga, *Science China Earth Sciences* 59, 170, [doi:10.1007/s11430-015-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11430-015-5118-2)
33 [5118-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11430-015-5118-2), 2016.

1 *Supplement of*

2 **Supraglacial debris-cover changes in the Greater Caucasus from 1986 to 2014**

3
4
5 Levan G. Tielidze et al.

6
7
8 *Correspondence to:* Levan G. Tielidze (levan.tielidze@tsu.ge)



12 **Figure S1.** The Greater Caucasus glacier size classes with debris-covered and debris-free glaciers distributions for
13 northern and southern slopes.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31





Figure S2. Debris-covered Bezingi Glacier retreat between 1986 (a) and 2014 (b); Debris-free Karaugom Glacier retreat between 1986 (c) and 2014 (d).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11


1 **Table S1.** Mean upper limit (m asl) of the supraglacial debris-cover for 1986 and 2014 by regions (glaciers are non-
 2 existent on southern slopes of the eastern Greater Caucasus).

Name	Elevation, (m asl) 1986	Elevation, (m asl) 2014
N slope of Western Caucasus	2809	2894
S slope of Western Caucasus	2723	2848
Both slopes of Western Caucasus	2766	2871
N slope of Central Caucasus	3108	3179
S slope of Central Caucasus	2839	3013
Both slopes of Central Caucasus	2974	3096
N slope of Eastern Caucasus	3538	3626
Elbrus	3343	3521
Total	3015	3130


3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12




13 **Figure S3.** Relative supraglacial debris-cover for the western, central, and eastern Greater Caucasus as well as for
 14 Elbrus based on the current study, and in comparison to Scherler et al. (2018).
 15
 16
 17



1
2 **Figure S4.** a - Comparison of supraglacial debris cover (SDC) assessment by Scherler, et al. (2018) (based on the
3 RGI v6) and current study. b - An example of the RGI v6 nominal glaciers (circles). According to Scherler, et al.
4 (2018), all nominal glaciers were classified as debris-covered. Landsat 8 (panchromatic band 8), 03/08/14 is shown
5 in the background.



9
10 **Figure S5.** Supraglacial debris cover (SDC) and clean-ice area change in 1986-2014 for the southern (a – Lekhziri)
11 and northern-facing (b – Kashkatash, c – Bashkara and d – Djankuat) glaciers. Landsat 8 (panchromatic band 8),
12 03/08/14 is shown in the background. Clean-ice in 1986 consists of the clean ice 2014 (light blue, transparent) plus
13 clean-ice area that retreated between 1986 and 2014 (dark blue).



1
 2 **Figure S6.** a – Devdoraki Glacier in 2000 (Landsat 7, 28/07/00); b – Devdoraki Glacier after rock-ice avalanche in
 3 2014 (Landsat 8, 28/08/14). c – Suatisi Glacier in 2000 (Landsat 7, 28/07/00); d – Suatisi Glacier in 2014 (Landsat 8,
 4 03/08/14). Yellow arrow shows increased supraglacial debris cover area. e – Devdoraki Glacier oblique image
 5 showing increased supraglacial debris cover area after rock-ice avalanche (18/04/14).
 6
 7