

Dear Editor,

We would like to thank you and the two anonymous reviewers for your comments on our manuscript. The primary concern of both reviewers was our under-estimation of observed crevasse depths due to our assumption that crevasse geometries are approximately V-shaped. In the attached revision, we have more explicitly acknowledged the limitations of this assumption and have emphasized that, despite the potential under-estimation of observed crevasse depths, the major results of our analysis hold true: current crevasse depth models that rely solely on local stresses cannot reliably simulate observed patterns in crevasse depth. While relaxation of the V-shaped crevasse assumption potentially deepens our observed crevasses towards the depths modeled using the Nye ‘zero-stress’ crevasse depth model, and tuning of the models can shallow the modeled depths towards the observed depths, the pattern of predicted crevasse depths is fundamentally at odds with the observed pattern of crevasse depths. We make this point more directly in our revision.

To further emphasize this point and provide a more compelling study, we have added a new analysis to complement the existing analysis of the Nye model for crevasse depths. In this new analysis, we apply the linear elastic fracture mechanics (LEFM) model to our study glaciers, and compare these modeled crevasse depths with our observed crevasse depths as well. The LEFM model out-performs the Nye model when informed by the crevasse depth observations, but both models have inconsistent accuracy across the broad range of conditions observed for Greenland’s fast-flowing glaciers. In response to your suggestions and those of our reviewers, we feel that the manuscript is greatly improved and look forward to receiving your decision.

Sincerely,
Ellyn Enderlin & Tim Bartholomaus

Reviewer comments in black, [responses in blue](#).

Reviewer 1

Summary of manuscript

This study infers crevasse depth from Operation IceBridge ATM data along swaths of 19 Greenland outlet glaciers over 6 spring campaigns, and compares these depths to the Nye formulation, a simple model for crevasse depth based on local stresses. The paper finds a systematic misfit between the “observed” and “modeled” crevasse depths: observations show consistently shallower crevasses than modeled. The authors speculate that the mismatch may originate from deformational history of the ice as well as non-uniform stress concentrations at crevasse tips. The authors conclude that the Nye formulation is inadequate for use in calving parameterizations.

Comments

The “observations” of crevasse depth presented here are flawed. The authors find a local elevation maximum, minimum, and maximum for each crevasse and calculate crevasse depth as the elevation difference – that is, they interpret the elevation minimum as the crevasse bottom. If the lidar were downward looking, this could be a reasonable approximation; however, the ATM looks outward at $\theta = 15^\circ$ angle, never straight down, in order to increase its effective swath width (see <https://nsidc.org/sites/nsidc.org/files/technical-references/OIB-ATMtransceivers.pdf>, where

Table 1 notes the full scan angle, which is 2θ , for off-nadir angle θ). This means that the ATM cannot see deeper than $W \tan \theta$; for a crevasse $W = 10$ to 20 meters wide, the ATM depth limitation is 40 – 70 meters, which is consistent with the results shown in Table 1. Crevasses may well be deeper than what the ATM instrument can constrain.

Although the above limitation is not mentioned in the manuscript, the authors do seem to account for the possibility that the ATM misses the crevasse bottom by introducing their V-shape correction. It is reasonable to expect that even a downward-pointing lidar might miss a crevasse bottom, since the beam footprint is ~ 1 meter, and crevasse width is much narrower than this at the tip, so the beam would see sidewalls as well as bottom and give a too-shallow average elevation. The authors thus infer a truer crevasse bottom by linearly extending the slopes of each wall to the point where they meet. While I appreciate this approach, it is still an underestimate of the crevasse depth. Although the large crevasses typically found on the outlet glaciers being studied here do appear, from the surface, to have wide V shapes, it is unlikely that the crevasses terminate at the tip of the apparent V. Stress concentration at that point are high, of course, which will drive the crevasse downward beyond the V tip. Crevasse shape below the V tip will be a narrow fissure, probably meandering irregularly downwards, as often seen on smaller crevasses upglacier or in alpine environments. This is not captured by the authors' V-shape model, yet that "extra" depth is accounted for in the Nye formulation (as I understand it). Importantly, this fissure below the V tip would easily facilitate calving, which is the broad and important application of this study.

Overall, the full meaning and limitations of the observational data, described above, are not presented in the manuscript. The authors misinterpret ATM observations as crevasse bottoms, or as data that can be used to infer crevasse depths, when in fact the ATM measurements can only underestimate crevasse depths. True crevasse depths will be deeper, and may in fact compare well with the Nye formulation. The data presented here cannot support evaluation of the Nye formulation. Thus, much of the manuscript, including its title, is substantially flawed. Most of the tuning analysis, for instance, is irrelevant, given the above.

The figures were somewhat difficult to interpret. An illustration of data from a single crevasse, or from a few crevasses across a reach of a kilometer or two, would have greatly helped me understand the picking, extrapolation, and manual/automated approach. I liked the organization of the panels for each glacier within a rough map/array of Greenland (Figures 2–3), but I missed helpful features like titles, y-axis labels, and consistent y-axis ranges among panels.

The reviewer is correct that our method is only capable of mapping the open portion of crevasses and we have made that more explicit in several locations throughout the text (lines 169, 235-239, 297-320, 328-329, and in the abstract and discussion). We also have added text starting at line 297 that explicitly states that the off-nadir viewing geometry may prevent the extraction of crevasse bottom elevations from narrow crevasses. However, we disagree with the reviewer that these limitations prevent the estimation of surface crevasse depth from the observations. As pointed out by reviewer 2, the most interesting part of this study is not that the Nye model apparently over-estimates crevasse depths but that it cannot reproduce patterns. Even though we likely under-estimate the true depth of fractures beneath crevasses, if the models are useful, the along-flow patterns in crevasse depths should be similar in our minimum depth estimates and the

true depths. In addition to our extensive revisions to acknowledge the methodological limitations of our study, we have reframed the text to focus more on the disagreement in crevasse depth patterns. We have also added modeled depths using the linear elastic fracture mechanics (LEFM) formulation for crevasse depths from van der Veen (1998) to emphasize that the disagreement between modeled and observed depths stems from the assumption that crevasse depths are governed by only the local stress state. The title of the manuscript has been changed to account for these revisions.

We refer the reviewer to Figure 1 for observations of crevasse depths over a relatively small subregion. The subplots for the observed and modeled crevasse depths in Figures 5 and S23 now have standardized y-axes, as recommended by the reviewer. We did not, however, standardize the y-axes in Figure 2 since this would obscure the along-flow patterns in crevasse concentration for the glaciers with relatively sparse crevassing. We have not added titles to the figures, in keeping with the formatting conventions of *The Cryosphere*.

Reviewer 2

In this paper the authors compile a new dataset of crevasse depths derived from lidar swaths made by IceBridge flights over 19 different glaciers in Greenland. They compare their very extensive observations with a commonly used crevasse depth model introduced by Nye and based on strain rates derived from satellite velocities. They conclude that the Nye model that has been used as a calving criterion is flawed as it appears to overestimate crevasse depths compared to observations in this study. This is a really interesting and well-written paper and I thoroughly enjoyed reading it. In many ways, the finding that the Nye model does not work very well is almost the least interesting outcome of this research, and in fact this is also one of the less novel findings, nonetheless the persistent use of the Nye model as a fracture criterion suggests that the ice modelling community has yet to absorb this message! I very much appreciated the results and discussion sections which raised many familiar points related to the difficulties in translating velocities to strain rates and stresses as well as attempting to refine the Nye Depth model. It's likely beyond the scope of this work but I look forward to future work examining the implications for a fracture mechanics approach to crevasses based on or related to the present study. The authors have done a huge amount of work and their crevasse depth dataset as well as the lidar techniques they have developed will surely be of great value for future research into the problems and processes of ice fracture on outlet glaciers. Given the hazards of measuring and observing crevasses in the field, the development of these kind of remote sensing techniques are crucial for advancing the field and many of their findings are replicating similar findings from field studies albeit on a smaller scale.

We thank the reviewer for her or his message, and appreciate that she or he has grasped the important implications of our study. We have sought, in the revision, to bring our these conclusions even further.

Some further specific comments:

1) Perhaps the main issue with the study is the assumption that the lidar technique actually reaches the bottom of the crevasses. As extensive discussion in Colgan et al (2016) and van der Veen (1999) (a missing reference that would perhaps help to interpret their results) also showed, defining the “bottom” of a crevasse is surprisingly difficult. The authors assume a v-shape is the

standard shape, but field studies indicate that the fracture often penetrates substantially further than is easy to measure with plumb lines or laser scanning techniques and the reported measured depths are usually best understood therefore as a minimum depth. A better model of crevasse shape may be an initial v-shape (partly also due to ablation processes) that narrows but extends with sides almost parallel to each other for some distance. Observations of fractures from within ice caves would also support this shape. There is no reason to believe that the lidar technique would not suffer from similar issues as manual measurements and while I think it would be unreasonable to redo all the calculations with a different profile since we don't have a clear idea what this might be, I think it would be helpful to discuss the implications if the v-shape model turns out to be an oversimplification. The authors to their credit do discuss this to some extent but their explanation on lines 110 to 124 is a little unclear and should be expanded further, also when considering the results.

We have added text in a number of locations (see the response to reviewer 1 above) to be more explicit in the limitations of the methodology used here. We agree with the reviewer that it does not make sense to introduce a more complex shape since that shape would be unconstrained by observations, and the 'V' shapes are consistent with observations. Instead we emphasize that our crevasse depth estimates should be treated as minimum estimates since they cannot account for micro fractures that may extend meters, or even tens of meters, below the open portion of each crevasse. In addition to more explicit acknowledgement of the potential under-estimation of observed crevasse depths, we have slightly reframed the manuscript to focus more on the disagreement in observed and modeled crevasse depth patterns rather than focusing on the magnitude differences.

2) Similarly the authors mention falsely identified crevasses (line 105) but it is not clear how this was done. Please expand on this and roughly how many were positive/negative.

The false positives and negatives were identified based on a comparison with the manually-delineated dataset. We have added the following to the text: "For these optimal window sizes, the median false negative rate was 1.2% and the median false positive rate was 38.5% across all glaciers. In other words, the automated algorithm missed ~1% of manually-identified crevasses and identified ~38% more crevasses than the manual interpreter." It is clear that the algorithm is somewhat more liberal in its definition of "crevasse" than the human analyst, however, in review, we have found these algorithmically identified, "extra" crevasses to also be consistent with our expectations for crevasse geometry.

3) In the crevasse depth comparison with modelled depths section (3.2) there are several statements that are a little confusing; on line 244, it is stated that the model failed to predict crevasses in compressional zones, but Nye's model explicitly only calculates crevasse depths where there is a positive (extensional strain) so this is not surprising – was there an extensional strain across glacier rather than down glacier in these zones that could be used? Other studies have also used the strain ellipse rather than simply the longitudinal strain rate.

We agree that this is not a surprising result given that the Nye and LEFM models assumed Mode I failure, but felt that it is worth emphasizing in this paper given the use of the crevasse penetration depth calving parameterizations in numerical models. The LEFM model inherently

accounts for the full stress tensor, as it is dependent in part on the effective stress, yet there are few places where the Nye model does not predict any crevassing but the LEFM model predicts that crevasses are present (see Figure S23). However, we note in the text that the consideration of the full stress tensor reduces modeled regions of no crevassing by the LEFM model relative to the Nye model. This inter-model comparison suggests that inclusion of cross-flow longitudinal extension in the Nye model may reduce the spatial extent of model-predicted crevasse-free zones but is unlikely to drastically improve the ability of the model to reproduce spatial patterns in crevasse depth.

4) The acceleration of an outlet glacier does not necessarily lead to enhanced longitudinal strain rates across the whole glacier, did the acceleration of Inngia Isbræ lead to a significant increase in strain rates (Line 254)?

As shown by the narrow bands of blue and orange shading for the temporal variations in the local strain rates and cumulative strain, respectively, Inngia Isbræ did not appear to undergo substantial temporal variations in strain rate over the observation period. We suspect that the dynamic thinning observed from 2012-2017 was initiated by a change in the glacier stress balance prior to 2012, which would not necessarily appear as a change in strain rate over the observation period.

Minor comments:

Line 17: Surely this should be “are both affected by and affect”

Changed

Line 60: Given that the crevasses were mostly around 6m in depth I don’t think a water depth of 1 to 10 m can be described as “small” – sorry a picky point...

Removed

Line 90-91: Sentences that use brackets to denote the reverse condition are really hard to read, it’s better to write this as two separate sentences (also required by e.g. AGU style guide).

Changed

Line 155: remove “a”

Changed

Local stress models do not predict observed crevasse patterns at Greenland's marine terminating glaciers

Ellyn M. Enderlin¹, Timothy C. Bartholomaus²

¹Department of Geosciences, Boise State University, Boise, Idaho, 83725, USA

²Department of Geological Sciences, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, 83844, USA

Correspondence to: Ellyn M. Enderlin (ellynenderlin@boisestate.edu)

Abstract. Crevasses are affected by and affect both stresses and surface mass balance of glaciers. These effects are brought on through potentially important controls on meltwater routing, glacier viscosity, and iceberg calving, yet there are few direct observations of crevasse sizes and locations to inform our understanding of these interactions. Here we extract crevasse depth estimates from high-resolution surface elevation observations for 52,644 crevasses from 19 Greenland glaciers. We then compare our observed depths with those calculated using two popular models that assume crevasse depths are functions of local stresses: the Nye and linear elastic fracture mechanics (LEFM) formulations. We find that along-flow patterns in crevasse depths are unrelated to along-flow patterns in strain rates (and therefore stresses), but that cumulative strain rate is more predictive of crevasse depths. Both the Nye and LEFM approaches can be tuned to reproduce observed, average crevasse depths, but along-flow variations in observed and modeled crevasse depths remain uncorrelated. This leads us to conclude that neither model adequately captures the physics controlling crevasse evolution at fast-flowing glaciers. Our finding motivates us to question glacier and ice sheet change projections that rely on Nye or LEFM-based calving.

1 Introduction

The geometry and concentration of crevasses are both affected by and affect the stress state and surface mass balance of glaciers, ice shelves, and ice sheets (Colgan et al., 2016). Changes in crevasse geometry and concentration can arise as the result of long-term or rapid changes in stress state, serving as a valuable tool to infer the onset of kinematic change (Colgan et al., 2011; Trantow and Herzfeld, 2018). These changes can also influence the stress state. For example, changes in crevassing within lateral shear margins of Antarctic ice streams have the potential to dramatically alter the ability of ice streams to buttress flow from the interior, in turn exerting an important control on ice sheet stability (Borstad et al., 2016; Reese et al., 2018). The impoundment of surface meltwater runoff in crevasses can promote crevasse penetration and assist in the penetration of meltwater to the glacier bed (van der Veen, 1998; Stevens et al., 2015; Poinar et al., 2017), influencing the englacial and basal stress states. Crevasses also increase surface roughness, altering the incidence angle of solar radiation and turbulent energy fluxes, which in turn influence surface melt production (Pfeffer and Bretherton, 1987; Andreas, 2002; Hock, 2005; Cathles et al., 2011; Colgan et al., 2016).

Deleted: Poor performance of a common crevasse model at marine-terminating glaciers

Deleted: -

Deleted: the

Deleted: that drive these interactions

Deleted: assess one of the most common models for crevasse formation, in which crevasse depths depend on the local stress state, through analysis of

Deleted: crevasse depth observations

Deleted: estimates to those calculated using

Deleted: for crevasse depths, which assume crevasse depths are functions of local stresses and therefore strain rates

Deleted: that modeled depths are uncorrelated with observed depths...

Deleted: In models where observeds are used to rheologically soften the ice...

Deleted: the

Deleted: using our crevasse depth observations

Deleted: , over the course of glacier lengths,

Deleted: patterns in

Deleted: result

Deleted: ice

Deleted: that

Deleted: the

Deleted: insertion and

Deleted: of crevasses

Deleted:

Deleted: This

Deleted: has important and immediate implications onfor

Deleted: numerical ice flow models

Deleted: of iceberg calving

Deleted: fracturing to control

Deleted: , as. Thus, numerical ice flow models drawing on these parameterizations they are likely to yield inaccurate projections of terminus position and subsequent dynamic glacier mass change

Deleted: and crevasse depth-driven terminus position changes

Deleted: 200 words

These interactions between crevasses, stresses, and surface mass balance make crevasses particularly important components of terrestrial ice, particularly near the termini of the marine-terminating glaciers and ice streams draining Greenland and Antarctica. In Antarctica, observations and models indicate that the ice shelves fringing the continent are highly vulnerable to widespread crevasse hydrofracture in a warming climate (Pollard et al., 2015; Rott et al., 1996; Scambos et al., 2000, 2009). The influence of crevasses, and changes in crevassing over time due to atmospheric warming, are less clear for Arctic marine-terminating glaciers. Despite the abundance of crevasses throughout the marginal zone of the Greenland ice sheet, there are few observations of crevasse depths at Greenland's glaciers. However, the coincident increase in surface meltwater runoff and widespread retreat of glacier termini across Greenland (Carr et al., 2017; Howat and Eddy, 2011; Moon and Joughin, 2008) suggests that hydrofracture may exert a first-order control on calving (Benn et al., 2007a; Cook et al., 2014).

Since calving involves the mechanical detachment of ice from a glacier terminus, it has been assumed that calving occurs when and where surface crevasses penetrate the full ice thickness (Benn et al., 2007a). The penetration depth of crevasses has been traditionally modeled using either the linear elastic fracture mechanics (LEFM) or Nye formulations, which assume that crevasse depth is dictated by local longitudinal stresses. For a single crevasse, the LEFM formulation estimates the stress concentration at the crevasse tip as

$$K_I = F(\lambda) R_{xx} \sqrt{\pi d_{modeled}} \quad (1)$$

where the modeled crevasse depth, $d_{modeled}$, is the maximum depth where the stress concentration is sufficient to overcome the fracture toughness of the ice (van der Veen, 1998). In Eqn. 1, R_{xx} is the full stress minus the lithostatic stress (estimated using strain rates) and $F(\lambda)$ is a geometric parameter that accounts for the non-linear increase in the stress intensity factor as a crevasse penetrates deeper into the glacier and the ratio of the crevasse depth to ice thickness, λ , increases (van der Veen, 1998). For closely-spaced crevasses, concentration of stresses at crevasse tips can be ignored and surface crevasse depths can be estimated using the Nye formulation (Nye, 1957), such that

$$d_{modeled} = \frac{2}{\rho_l g} \left(\frac{\epsilon_{xx} - \epsilon_{crit}}{A} \right)^{1/3} + \frac{\rho_w}{\rho_l} h_w, \quad (2)$$

where ρ_l and ρ_w are the densities of ice (917 kg m^{-3}) and water (1000 kg m^{-3}), g is gravitational acceleration (9.81 m s^{-2}), ϵ_{xx} is the longitudinal strain rate (yr^{-1}), ϵ_{crit} is the critical strain rate threshold for crevasse formation (yr^{-1}), A is the creep parameter describing ice viscosity ($\text{Pa}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$), and h_w is the depth of water in crevasses. Neither formulation has been rigorously validated using crevasse depth observations, but data from Breiðamerkurjökull, Iceland, suggest that the LEFM formulation is more accurate than the Nye formulation when a priori information on crevasse geometries are available to constrain $F(\lambda)$ (Mottram and Benn, 2009).

Despite its potential over-estimation of crevasse depths (Mottram and Benn, 2009), the Nye formulation has been implemented in a number of numerical ice flow models as the terminus boundary condition (Cook et al., 2014; Nick et al., 2013; Vieli and Nick, 2011). The Nye formulation has been used in lieu of the LEFM formation because observations of dense crevasse fields

Deleted: 1

Deleted: Using this formulation, crevasse deepening can be driven by either increased surface meltwater impoundment or enhanced longitudinal stretching.

Deleted: When

Deleted: , an open connection between the ocean and crevasses penetrating to sea level is assumed, which allows abundant water to drive full-thickness crevasse propagation, i.e., calving; the terminus is shifted accordingly (Benn et al., 2007b). This crevasse depth parameterization has been used to simulate terminus position change for several large glaciers around the Greenland periphery

Deleted: However, crevasse depth observations from Breiðamerkurjökull, Iceland, suggest that the Nye formulation may over-estimate crevasse depths by a factor of two (Mottram and Benn, 2009). Despite the over-estimation, it remains assumed that, at the least, crevasse depths are related to local stresses.

120 near glacier termini suggest considerable stress blunting occurs and the a priori information on crevasse geometries needed to
tune the LEFM formulation are lacking. Using Eq. 2, the ice viscosity or water depth in crevasses can conceivably be tuned to
drive changes in crevasse depth, so that the modeled terminus position change matches observations. The high sensitivity of
125 simulated terminus positions to changes in water depth (Cook et al., 2012, 2014; Otero et al., 2017), however, lead us to
question the appropriateness of this model. Furthermore, there is no assurance that the modeled crevasse depths reproduce
observations or that the crevasse depth parameterization accounts for the primary control(s) on terminus change. Because
model projections of dynamic mass loss may well be in error if driven by an inaccurate calving parameterization, increased
confidence in dynamic mass loss projections drawing on these calving parameterizations requires validation of modeled
125 crevasse depths.

Here we construct the first extensive record of crevasse depths for Greenland's fast-flowing outlet glaciers using airborne lidar
and high-resolution digital elevation models from 2011-2018. We compare these observed crevasse depths with modeled
crevasse depths derived from satellite-based velocity fields to assess the accuracy of modeled crevasse depths. Furthermore,
130 we examine the likelihood that spatio-temporal variations in crevasse depth can explain observed variations in terminus
position change and associated dynamic mass loss for Greenland's marine-terminating outlet glaciers. Although we focus on
Greenland, our assessment of 19 glaciers spanning a wide range of geometries, climate regimes, and dynamic histories (Fig.
1a) increases the likelihood that our results are broadly applicable to glaciers throughout the Arctic.

135 2 Methods

2.1 Observed Crevasse Depths

Surface crevasses exist as fractures in ice that extend from glacier surfaces, generally as some sort of visible opening within a
glacier, and continue down to the bottom of a fracture, to unbroken ice. While the full crevasse depth is unmeasurable from
glacier surfaces, we assume here that the depth of the visible, near-surface void space is positively correlated with the full
140 depth of the crevasse, which likely extends beyond the depth of the void space. We refer to the maximum, visibly open depth
below the surface as the observed crevasse depth.

We construct time series of crevasse depths from flow-following lidar swaths acquired by NASA Operation IceBridge (OIB)
and 2 m-resolution digital elevation models (DEMs) using a semi-automated approach that identifies crevasses from local
145 elevation minima (Figs. 1b-e). We use lidar observations from the OIB ATM (Advanced Topographic Mapper), which has a
vertical precision of better than 1cm and spatial sampling of one pulse every ~10 m² within its conical swath
(https://nsidc.org/data/ilatm1b). Repeat April/May flow-following observations are available for all our study sites during the
2013-2018 period. Elevations were also extracted from 2 m-resolution DEMs produced by the Polar Geospatial Center as part

Deleted: Failure of the Nye formulation, as well as more complex models for crevasse formation and propagation, are attributed to inaccuracies in other underlying assumptions and parameterizations of the models rather than the dependence on local stresses (Benn et al., 2007a; van der Veen, 1998). While

Deleted: in Eq. (1)

Moved down [2]: , there is no assurance that the model accounts for the primary control(s) on terminus change. Furthermore,

Deleted: t

Deleted: relatively small (~1-10 m)

Moved (insertion) [2]

Deleted:

Deleted: Furthermore,

Deleted: law

Deleted: law

Deleted: strain rates

Deleted:

165 of the ArcticDEM program. The WorldView DEMs are less precise (3m vertical uncertainty (Noh and Howat, 2015)) but
provided estimates of elevation throughout the 2011-2018 melt seasons. We used an average of ~4 lidar swaths and ~16 DEMs
per glacier for our analysis.

170 Lidar swaths were overlain on cloud-free summer Landsat 8 images and swath centerlines were manually traced to the inland
extents of visible crevassing. Using a moving window approach, shifted at ~1 m increments along the swath centerlines, we
linearly interpolated the nearest elevation data, then identified crevasses using a filtering process described below and
illustrated for Kong Oscar Gletsjer in Fig. 1. To identify crevasses, centerline elevations were first detrended over the ~500
m-wide moving window (Fig. 1b inset), then the local elevation minimum and maximum were extracted from each of three
smaller windows centered on the detrended profile (Fig. 1b, gray shading). The process was repeated over the full profile
175 length, resulting in the identification of local lows and highs for each elevation profile. The minimum elevation was identified
from each grouping of contiguous low points, a similar procedure was used to define high points, and the remaining points
were discarded (Fig. 1c). For each minimum, the closest neighboring down- and up-glacier maxima were used to define
longitudinal crevasse widths (Fig. 1d). Potential collapsed seracs at the bottom of crevasses and small surface irregularities
less than the vertical uncertainty of the DEMs were discarded.

180 The appropriate lengths for the detrending window and search windows to identify the local minima were determined through
a comparison of manual and automated crevasse depth distributions (i.e., depths and their locations) from the most complete
lidar profile for each glacier. Six detrending window sizes and two sets of search window sizes were tested, for a total of 12
test combinations, as outlined in Table S1. The range of possible detrending window sizes was constrained by the requirements
185 that the window (1) spanned the largest crevasses (~200 m in width at Helheim Glacier) and (2) did not exceed the maximum
half-wavelength of large-scale oscillations in surface elevation evident along the profiles (~800-1500m). For the search
windows, we tested sizes that minimally spanned the maximum observed half-width of crevasses, but fully spanned the
majority of crevasses: the median width ± 1.48 MAD (median of absolute deviation) of the 3264 manually-identified crevasses,
which is analogous to the mean \pm the standard deviation for normally-distributed data, was 19.2 ± 10.2 m and the maximum
190 width was 184 m. The optimal window combination used for automated crevasse identification was the window combination
that yielded the smallest number of falsely-identified crevasses (both false positives and false negatives) and the smallest depth
misfit relative to the manually-extracted dataset. Optimal window sizes were glacier-dependent. The optimal detrending
window sizes ranged from 350-800 m (9=350 m, 2=500 m, 3=550 m, 1=650 m, 4=800 m). The smaller search window sizes
were considered optimal for all study sites except Helheim Glacier, which had the widest crevasses. For these optimal window
195 sizes, the median false negative rate was 1.2% and the median false positive rate was 38.5% across all glaciers. In other words,
the automated algorithm missed ~1% of manually-identified crevasses and identified ~38% more crevasses than the manual
interpreter.

Deleted: The tested

Deleted: (

Deleted: median of the absolute value of deviation (

Deleted:)

Deleted: of the 3264 manually-identified crevasses

Deleted: m

Deleted: 6.9

Given the off-nadir scan angle of the OIB lidar and the stereo imagery used to construct the DEMs, it is highly unlikely that the elevation observations penetrate to the bottom of the open portion of all crevasses. Therefore, following the approach of Liu et al. (2014), who used ICESat data to estimate crevasse depths across the Amery Ice Shelf, we estimated the depths of open crevasses using a V-shaped cross-sectional geometry. Based on the commonality of V-shaped crevasses in our elevation transects, we assumed that crevasses initially form with V shapes and negligible fracture extent beyond the bottom of these 'V's. As stated above, further fracturing below the bottom of the V is possible, although we would then expect it to also open under the same extensional strain rates that open the V shapes above. Apparent deviations from an idealized V-shaped geometry are likely due to serac toppling, over-printing of new crevasses on previously damaged ice (Colgan et al., 2016), the presence of impounded meltwater, or occlusion of the lidar signal by the walls of the crevasse or ice debris in the crevasse. To estimate the true depth of the open portion of each crevasse, we linearly projected both crevasse walls to depth and identified their extrapolated point of intersection (Fig. 1e). For each elevation minimum and closest neighboring down- and up-glacier maxima, the crevasse walls were identified as contiguous regions with slopes within the typical range observed for manually-identified V-shaped crevasses in the window-calibration elevation profiles. Since there is no physical reason why the crevasse wall surface slopes should be normally distributed, we used the median \pm 1.48 MAD to characterize the typical range. For normally distributed data, this formulation would be analogous to the mean \pm standard deviation. For irregularly-shaped crevasses and for crevasses located where the rough glacier surface resulted in local elevation maxima several meters to tens of meters from the crevasse edge, this approach retracted the crevasse wall extents to correspond with slope breaks. If wall slopes were entirely outside of the typical range, there was no effect on the crevasse extents. We refer to the average elevation difference between the top and bottom of crevasses as the observed crevasse depths, and represent minimum estimates of the full penetration depth of ice fracture beneath crevasses.

We estimated uncertainties associated with (1) spatial resolution of the satellite-derived DEMs through comparison of same-day ATM profiles, (2) the automated approach for crevasse identification through comparisons with depths from manually-identified crevasses, and (3) crevasse depth extrapolation through comparisons between observed and extrapolated depths for V-shaped crevasses. All values presented are the median \pm 1.48 MAD unless otherwise stated.

Although the precision of the lidar elevations is better than 1 cm, the discrete sampling of the lidar may not be coincident with the location of the true crevasse bottom. Uncertainties associated with the lidar spatial sampling were quantified through a comparison of crevasse depths extracted from same-day up- and down-glacier swaths. The difference in crevasse depths between repeat swaths was -0.35 ± 2.5 m. We attribute the non-zero mean depth difference to slight differences in crevasse wall slopes between repeat observations. Uncertainties associated with the inclusion of the lower resolution WorldView DEM-derived depths were estimated through a comparison of same day lidar- and DEM-derived crevasse depths. We found that the DEM-derived depths were 1.0 m less than the lidar-derived depths, with a MAD of 2.5 m. A comparison of high-resolution and 2-m-resolution lidar-derived crevasse depths indicated the decrease in horizontal resolution of the DEMs accounted for

Deleted: Although V-shaped crevasses were common at all study sites, more complex geometries were also prevalent.

Deleted: or

Deleted: To better represent the depth of fractured ice, we

Deleted: Average crevasse wall surface slopes were used to project crevasses to depth.

Deleted: +/- the median of the absolute value of deviation from the median (i.e., MAD)

Deleted: 1.7

Deleted: potential mismatches in the depth comparison: depths for nearest neighboring crevasses were used in our calculation but advection between swaths introduces some ambiguity where speeds were fast and crevasses were densely packed

300 rates in the native (polar stereographic) coordinate system, which were then rotated into flow-following coordinates. The creep parameter (A) is dependent on a number of variables, including ice temperature, crystal fabric development, and damage, but is poorly constrained by observations. Here, we approximated temperature-dependent spatial variations in the creep parameter as a linear function of latitude (Nick et al., 2013). [Longitudinal strain rates were calculated over the full velocity domain then linearly interpolated to the swath centerlines.](#)

305 For our initial estimates [using the Nye model](#), what we term the ‘minimal’ model, we followed the approach of Mottram and Benn (2009) and assumed crevasses formed everywhere under tension (i.e., no critical strain rate threshold) and there was no water in crevasses (likely the case for spring OIB data). To improve model performance, we also tested several more complex versions of the model. We first estimated the critical strain rate for crevasse formation at each glacier as the maximum strain rate inland of the most up-glacier crevasse observation. [To explore the potential contribution of the ice viscosity parameterization to the observed-modeled depth discrepancy, we assumed that the observed crevasse depths are accurate and constructed profiles of the deformation enhancement factor needed to minimize the misfit between observed and modeled crevasse depths.](#) Similar to Borstad et al. (2016), we included a deformation enhancement factor, D , in these calculations as

$$d_{\text{observed}} = (1 - D) \left[\frac{2}{\rho_l g} \left(\frac{\epsilon_{xx}}{A} \right)^{1/3} \right]. \quad (3)$$

315 Substituting our initial modeled crevasse depths (i.e., Eq. (2) with $\epsilon_{\text{crit}} = 0$ and $h_w = 0$) in for the RHS term in brackets and rearranging to solve for the deformation enhancement factor, we obtained

$$D = \frac{d_{\text{modeled}} - d_{\text{observed}}}{d_{\text{modeled}}}. \quad (4)$$

Although similar to damage in Borstad et al. (2016), our deformation enhancement factor is a function of spatial variations in damage, ice temperature, and crystal fabric. A unique deformation factor can be identified at each crevasse location using Eq. (4). However, such detailed tuning is neither physically motivated nor practical for models, so we binned the data along-flow then parameterized deformation enhancement as a linear function of distance from the terminus using the binned data (Fig. S2). The deformation enhancement factors for the deepest crevasses [over each 300 m bin, spanning from the terminus to the inland-most crevasse observation](#), were used in our parameterizations. Finally, we also used the inland-most deformation enhancement value to solve for modeled crevasse depths under the assumption of spatially uniform ice viscosity, then estimated impounded water depths from the misfit between the observed and modeled crevasse depths. Again, we sought a simple parameterization appropriate for use in numerical ice flow models: assuming that water depth varies with meltwater generation, we parameterized impounded water depth as linear function of surface elevation for each glacier (Fig. S3). [For the damage and impounded water depth parameterizations, bin size did not influence along-flow patterns discussed below.](#)

330 [Although numerical ice flow models have relied on the Nye formulation to model crevasse depths, the previously-observed over-estimation of crevasse depths by the Nye formulation relative to both observations and the LEFM formulation \(Mottram](#)

Deleted: and linearly interpolated to the swath centerlines. Modeled crevasse depths were calculated from the longitudinal strain rate profiles using Eq. (1). ¶

Deleted: To quantify the effects of potential spatial variations in viscosity, we also used the crevasse observations to quantify a viscous deformation enhancement factor that effectively softens the ice and shallows predicted crevasses.

Deleted: 2

Deleted: 1

Deleted: 3

Deleted: 3

Deleted: in each 300 m bin

Moved down [1]: Bin size did not influence along-flow patterns discussed below.

Deleted: ¶

Moved (insertion) [1]

Deleted: B

and Benn, 2009) suggests there may be large differences in accuracy of the Nye and LEFM formulations. We solved for LEFM crevasse depths as the maximum depth where the stress intensity factor from Eq. (1) no longer exceeded the fracture toughness of ice, K_{IC} . In line with Mottram and Benn (2009), we used $K_{IC}=50\text{kPa m}^{1/2}$ as our best estimate and constrained uncertainty in this term using minimum and maximum values of $10\text{kPa m}^{1/2}$ and $100\text{kPa m}^{1/2}$, respectively. Longitudinal stress, σ_{xx} , was calculated from the measured strain rate tensors using

$$\sigma_{xx} = A^{-1/n} \varepsilon_e^{(1-n)/n} \varepsilon_{xx} \quad (5)$$

where ε_e and ε_{xx} are the second invariant of the strain rate tensor (i.e., effective strain rate, assuming negligible vertical shear) and the longitudinal strain rate in the direction of ice flow, respectively, and $n=3$. The lithostatic stress was subtracted from σ_{xx} to estimate the longitudinal resistive stress, R_{xx} . Longitudinal resistive stress was calculated over the full velocity domain, averaged in time, then linearly interpolated to the swath centerlines. At each observed crevasse location, λ was calculated using the observed crevasse depth to ice thickness ratio and the LEFM-modeled crevasse depth was calculated as the maximum depth where K_I from Eq. (1) was greater than or equal to K_{IC} .

3 Results

3.1 Observed Crevasse Depths

We identified a total of 52644 crevasses in 381 elevation profiles among the 19 study glaciers (Enderlin, 2019). Broadly, crevasse occurrence increased towards each glacier terminus. Crevasse depth distributions are shown in Fig. 2 and depth profiles are shown in Fig. S4. We present statistics pertaining to crevasse depth and concentration, i.e., number of crevasses per kilometer, within 5 km of glacier termini in Table 1. Of all observed crevasses, the median depth was 6.2 m and median concentration was 17.2 crevasses per kilometer (one crevasse every 58 m). The crevasse concentrations span a fairly narrow range of values, with ~75% of crevasse concentrations between 15.0-19.7 crevasses km^{-1} , despite a wide range of glacier thicknesses and strain rates. The two relatively uncrevassed glaciers (concentrations less than 10 km^{-1}) have floating tongues and occur in the coldest, high latitude regions. The maximum observed depth of 64.9 m occurred at steep, fast-flowing Helheim Gletsjer. Helheim also had the deepest median crevasse depth of 10.2 m. While some glaciers have more and deeper crevasses near the terminus than inland, this pattern is clearly not universal, and in many instances, crevasse depths decreased over the last several km of the terminus region (Figs. 2, S4).

Although the crevasse size distributions are dominated by a large number of relatively shallow (i.e., <10 m-deep) crevasses, we are primarily interested in the deepest crevasses, which are the most likely to penetrate the full glacier thickness and therefore play an important role in iceberg calving and meltwater routing to the glacier bed. To isolate the deepest crevasses from the observations, we identified the maximum crevasse depth at 150 m-increments along flow so that the along-flow variations in crevasse depth had the same spatial resolution as the velocity data used to compute strain rates. To determine

Deleted:

2.3 Crevasse Depth Comparison

To test the accuracy of modeled crevasse depths, we compared the maximum observed crevasse depths to median modeled crevasse depths computed using Equation 1. For this portion of the assessment, we use the simplest form of Equation 1, wherein there is no critical stress threshold for crevasse formation ($\varepsilon_{crit} = 0$) and no water in crevasses ($h_w = 0$). We refer to this version of the Nye formulation for crevasse depths as the minimal model hereafter. The comparison was performed over a wide range (50-2000 m) of spatial scales to account for variations in the spatial resolution of numerical models as well as potential variations in the distance over which stresses are transmitted.

395 whether along-flow variations in maximum crevasse depth can be explained by either local variations in local longitudinal strain rates or strain history (i.e., longitudinal strain rate integrated along flow), we normalized the crevasse depth, strain rate, and strain history data to facilitate direct comparison of their along-flow patterns. Data were linearly normalized such that the observed values span from zero to one. The normalized profiles in Fig. 3 suggest that along-flow variations in maximum crevasse depth cannot be simply explained as a function of variations in either local strain rate or strain history, although kilometer-scale variations in maximum crevasse depth at approximately half of the glaciers appear to follow patterns in strain history.
400

3.2 Crevasse Depth Comparison

At all spatial scales and over all time periods, the minimal model produced crevasse depths that were typically deeper than observed depths in extensional zones. [This](#) result could potentially arise from the fact that our observations are minimum estimates of crevasse depth. [however, the observed-modeled depth discrepancy](#) was not spatially consistent and the model failed to predict crevasses in compressional zones, as demonstrated for Inngia Isbræ in Fig. 4. Identical plots are shown for the other glaciers in the supplemental material (Figs. S5-S22). In Fig. 4 and Figs. S5-S22, where modeled and observed crevasses were in good agreement, the data fall along the 1:1 line separating the white and gray regions. Where crevasses were observed but strain rates were negative, i.e., crevasses were missed by the model, the data fall along the x-axis. Although the maximum misfit and occurrence of missed crevasses decreased at longer spatial scales, discrepancies between observed and modeled depths on the order of tens of meters were observed at all spatial scales.
410

The comparisons of observed and modeled crevasse depths in Fig. 4 and Figs. S5-S22 also suggest that crevasse depths remained relatively stable at all study glaciers over the 2011-2018 period. Inngia Isbræ exhibited the largest dynamic change among our study glaciers – the glacier retreated by ~4 km and thinned by ~100 m near the terminus (Fig. 4a) and flow accelerated by ~500 m/yr near the terminus (not shown) from 2012-2017 – yet crevasse depths do not significantly differ over time, and nearly all observed crevasse depths remain < 30 m throughout the observation record (Fig. 4b). The [stable and consistent](#) nature of the kilometers-scale oscillations in crevasse depth [are also](#) visible for each glacier [in Fig. S4](#). Uncertainties are not included in Fig. S4, but a large portion of the observed variations in crevasse depth are within the observational uncertainty of ~3 m for the observed depths.
420

We illustrate spatial variations in the discrepancy between modeled and observed crevasse depths at four study sites – Kong Oscar (northwest Greenland), Inngia (west), Daugaard-Jensen (east), and Heimdal (southeast) – in Fig. 5. For each panel, we represent temporal variability in modeled depths (driven by strain rate changes) in a minimal model (Fig. 5, orange shading, see Methods), but finding no clear pattern in the temporal variability, only identify modeled depths computed from the median
425

- Deleted: H
- Deleted: over-estimation of
- Deleted: crevasse depths
- Deleted: ¶

speed profile for the remainder of our analysis (Fig. 5, colored lines). The complete set of plots, arranged geographically, are included in the supplemental material (Fig. S23).

Modifications of the minimal Nye model, including model variations with a threshold strain rate, different viscosities, and impounded water depth parameters reduced the overall discrepancy between the observations and models. However, even these more complex, tuned models could not accurately reproduce spatial patterns in crevassing. For example, one parameter with a clear physical motivation is the critical strain rate: because ice has tensile strength, crevasses will not form where the strain rates (and therefore tensile stresses) do not exceed an appropriate tensile strength-dependent threshold. We found that the addition of an observation-based non-zero critical strain rate does not improve agreement between observed and modeled crevasse depths (Fig. 5; red lines). Instead, there is an increase in the extent of modeled no-crevasse regions without compensatory improvements in the accuracy of crevasse depths elsewhere.

Along-flow variations in ice viscosity associated with strain-induced variations in crystal fabric or temperature, cryohydrologic warming, or even the presence of crevasses themselves may also contribute to along-flow discrepancies between the modeled and observed crevasse depths. Inclusion of a deformation enhancement parameterization that varies linearly along flow (Fig. S2) results in improved model performance in extensional zones (Figs. 5, S23; green lines). However, despite the expected along-flow increase in the deformation enhancement factor, with damage, strain heating, etc., minimization of modeled/observed crevasse depth misfits (Eq. 4) reveals an along-flow decrease in deformation enhancement for approximately half of the glaciers (Fig. S2).

Increasing crevasse water depths, potentially associated with increasing melt at low elevations, represent another potentially important process, modifying the Nye minimal model, and adding another layer of complexity to the deformation enhancement approach. Using the inland-most deformation enhancement factor and tuning impounded water depths to minimize the observed-modeled depth misfit, we obtain first-order estimates of modeled crevasse water depths. Water depths necessary for this minimization vary from ≤ 3.2 m for Zachariae Isstrøm to ≤ 32.7 m for Kong Oscar Gletsjer (Table 1). Modeled crevasse depths obtained using parameterized water depths are shown in Figs. 5 and S21 (blue lines). Again, and as with the deformation enhancement factor, we find inconsistent, positive and negative trends in crevasse water depth with surface elevation. Approximately half of the glaciers displayed patterns of increasing water depth with decreasing surface elevation, as expected (Fig. S3). However, the remaining half of glaciers showed either decreasing or no change in estimated water depths at the low-elevation, near-terminus regions. Inclusion of a simple parameterization that scales crevasse water depth as a linear function of elevation improved the model's ability to capture kilometers-scale patterns in crevasse depth (Fig. S23) but could not explain the smaller-scale oscillations in crevasse depth that we observed. Inconsistent patterns of putative crevasse water depth lead us to suggest that this additional free model parameter is not reliably capturing the physics of the glacier crevassing.

Deleted: Additional model complexity, through tuning of the

Deleted: crevasse depths

Deleted: ϵ

Deleted: D

Deleted: s can also arise due to uncertainties in the parameterization of the viscosity of the ice.

Deleted: Profiles of a deformation enhancement factor that minimizes the misfit between observed and modeled crevasse depths, shown in Fig. S2, suggest that the ice is considerably more ductile than predicted using a latitudinally-varying, temperature-dependent creep parameter: D generally exceeds 0.5, equivalent to an order of magnitude increase in the creep parameter.

Deleted: down-flow increases in crystal fabric development, melt water, strain heating, and crevassing lead us to expect that

Deleted: , D, would increase

Deleted: towards the terminu

Deleted: s. iln contrast,

Deleted: ,

In contrast to the Nye model, the LEFM model predicts realistic crevasse depths without the addition of model complexity, although in many cases, the spatial pattern of LEFM crevasses suffers the same deficiencies as the minimal Nye model and its variants. Excluding regions of longitudinal compression, where both the LEFM and Nye formulations fail to predict crevassing, the median depth for the minimal, $e_{crit} > 0$, damaged, and water-filled versions of the Nye formulation are 29 m, 16 m, 0 m, and 2 m greater than the maximum observed crevasse depths on average. On average, maximum LEFM depths are ~1 m deeper than the maximum observed depths under extension. However, like the Nye formulation, LEFM modeled crevasse depths are uncorrelated with observed crevasse depths, and the LEFM model fails to reproduce realistic along-flow variations in crevasse depth for most glaciers. Figures 5 and S21 show the maximum LEFM crevasse depths averaged over 300 m bins (purple). Purple shading indicates the effects of variations in the fracture toughness are obscured by the profiles for the intermediate fracture toughness value ($K_{IC} = 50 \text{ kPa m}^{1/2}$).

4 Discussion and Conclusions

Using the first spatially and temporally extensive record of surface crevasse depths for Greenland's fast-flowing marine-terminating glaciers, we find that there are typically >10 crevasses per kilometer but that the majority of crevasses are <10 m in depth. Given the skewed distributions of crevasse depths in Fig. 2, the inclusion of crevasses smaller than our detection threshold of 3 m-depth would likely increase the concentration and decrease the median depths relative to those reported in Table 1. Crevasse depths are highly variable along flow, with pronounced changes in the shapes of the crevasse depth distributions and maximum crevasse depths evident at most glaciers (Figs. 2, 3). Although large-scale variations in maximum crevasse depth follow strain history at approximately half of our study sites (Fig. 3), small-scale patterns in crevasse depth cannot easily be explained by variations in local longitudinal strain rate, strain history, or stress.

The discrepancy between modeled and observed crevasse depths is problematic for numerical ice flow models that rely on spatio-temporal variations in crevasse depth to prescribe the terminus position. If calving is the result of crevasse penetration to the waterline, then the use of either the poorly-performing Nye or LEFM models in prognostic simulations is unlikely to reliably simulate glacier behavior. Furthermore, the predicted absence of crevasses in compressional zones could prevent modeled retreat, or lead to punctuated episodes of retreat and temporary stabilization, biasing projections of dynamic mass loss from marine-terminating glaciers.

Some of the physical processes present within the models tested here are undoubtedly important to true ice fracture, even if they are not predictive in the forms tested within this study. For example, ice is known to have tensile strength, and therefore there is likely some threshold strain rate or stress below which crevasses will not form (see van der Veen (1998)). Inclusion of a non-zero threshold strain rate for crevasse formation decreases the average misfit between the observed and Nye-modeled

Deleted:

Deleted: or

Deleted: The disconnect between crevasse depths and local strain rates is emphasized by the failure of the Nye formulation to model crevasse depths.

Deleted: because

Deleted: the

Deleted: calving parameterization uses the Nye formulation

Deleted: in numerical ice flow models

Deleted: s

Deleted: penetrating

Deleted:

Deleted: over-estimation of crevasse depths could result in erroneous terminus retreat. T

Deleted: also

Deleted:

Deleted: i

Deleted: oes not improve model performance

Formatted: Font: Italic

535 crevasse depths from ~29 m to ~16 m but the misfit reduction is accompanied by a decrease in crevasse occurrence, even in places where they are observed. Thus, in the form presented here, the inclusion of a non-zero threshold strain rate for crevasse formation does not improve model performance. More realistic performance is found with the LEFM model, which, similar to the Nye model with $\epsilon_{crit} > 0$, assumes that crevassing occurs only where the longitudinal stresses exceed a critical threshold for crevasse initiation (i.e., stress concentration $>$ fracture toughness). The LEFM-modeled depths are in much better agreement with observations in regions of longitudinal extension (~1 m misfit) and, since the LEFM model takes into account the full stress tensor (via the effective stress) rather than just the along-flow longitudinal stress, there are fewer crevassed regions where the LEFM model fails to predict crevassing.

Deleted: occurrence of s, even in places where they are found

Deleted: will not

Deleted: do not

Deleted: <

545 The modeled depths that incorporate deformation enhancement are generally in better agreement with observations than with the minimal model and typically have similar magnitudes and spatial variations in crevasse depth as the LEFM model. This is not surprising since the deformation enhancement factor is calculated using a priori crevasse depth information, similar to the LEFM model. However, there is no clear physical explanation for the contrasting along-flow patterns in inferred enhancement, which suggest some glaciers have more viscous ice towards the terminus and others have less viscous (more ductile) ice towards the terminus. Although the LEFM model performance is similar for the Nye model with hydrofracture, the inferred water depths are problematic. There are few observations of hydrofracture in Greenland to which we can compare our inferred water depths, but the spatial patterns are unrealistic – they can vary by tens of meters over hundreds of meters along flow and do not follow expected regional patterns in meltwater runoff. Furthermore, approximately 1/4 of our observations were acquired prior to the onset of widespread seasonal surface melting. Because crevasses are known to drain over the course of the melt season (Everett et al., 2015; Lampkin and VanderBerg, 2014), we expect no water impounded in crevasses during spring. Therefore, even though model accuracy is improved by tuning, the optimal deformation enhancement and water depth tuning parameters found here have no physical basis and should not be used to improve model agreement with observations.

Deleted: We find that t

Deleted: the misfit between the modeled and observed crevasse depths...

Deleted: The

Deleted: even more

Deleted: et al.

Deleted: 1; Everett et al., 2015

555 Based on the comparison of observed crevasse depths with local strain rates, strain history, and modeled crevasse depths, we hypothesize that our inability to reproduce small-scale (i.e., sub-kilometer) variations in observed crevasse depths using the Nye formulation stems from both its assumption of reduced stress concentration at crevasse tips in dense fields of crevasses and its ignorance of crevasse advection. As ice is advected into a stress field that favors crevasse formation, the depth to which a newly-formed crevasse penetrates depends on the instantaneous stress state as well as the micro- and macro-scale damage that the parcel of ice has inherited throughout its history (Bassis and Jacobs, 2013). If a crevasse penetrates deeper than its surrounding crevasses, then it will reduce the stresses on its neighbors, which will penetrate shallower than inherently assumed by the Nye formulation (van der Veen, 1998). Propagation is favored at the deepest crevasses as they advect through extensional flow regimes, as supported by the observed along-flow increase in maximum crevasse depths at over half of our glaciers. Focusing of stresses within individual, deep crevasses is also supported by the better performance of the LEFM formulation. The LEFM model uses the observed crevasse depth to ice thickness ratios to account for the depth-dependent

Deleted: and

Deleted: as well as the results of our tuning tests

Deleted: its ignorance of advection and

585 nature of stress concentration and crevasse propagation, with considerably improved performance relative to Nye model. When either model is informed by a priori knowledge of crevasse depths, many of the large-scale spatial patterns in crevasse depths can be reproduced, but the simplifying assumption that crevasse depth is a function of the local stress state still results in model failure in regions of longitudinal compression.

590 The inability of the existing, local stress-dependent formulations to simulate the complex patterns in observed crevasse depths for fast-flowing outlet glaciers is problematic for a number of reasons. Unrealistic spatial variations in modeled crevasse depths may result in undue emphasis on the role of surface crevassing as a control on recent and future changes in terminus position. However, our analysis of observed and modeled crevasse depths also suggests that advection of crevasses, and their associated mechanical and thermodynamic softening of ice, may exert an important control on the glacier stress balance. Confident projections of dynamic mass loss therefore require additional investigations on crevassing, including the impacts of spatio-temporal variations in crevassing on hydrologic routing, flow enhancement via damage and cryohydrologic warming, and iceberg calving. We anticipate that these findings will spur novel efforts to model crevasse evolution, as well as the parameterization of calving in numerical ice flow models.

595 **Data Availability**
The crevasse size distribution datasets constructed for this study are publicly archived at the Arctic Data Center (doi: 10.18739/A2WH2DF1F).

600 **Author Contributions**
EME formulated the study, developed the code for the analysis, performed the majority of the data extraction, compilation, and analysis, and wrote the initial draft of the manuscript. TCB provided guidance on methodology and revised the manuscript.

605 **Acknowledgements**
This project is funded by NSF Office of Polar Programs collaborative awards 1933105 and 1714639 to E.M. Enderlin and 1716865 to T.C. Bartholomaeus. We would like to thank Editor Stef Lhermitte and the two anonymous reviewers for their recommended improvements to the analysis and its presentation in the manuscript.

610 **Competing Interests**
The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

Andreas, E.: Parameterizing scalar transfer over snow and ice: A review, J. Hydrometeor., 3, 417–432, 2002.

Deleted: Although the Nye formulation may accurately model the depths of closely-spaced crevasses in an idealized setting,

Deleted: its

Moved (insertion) [3]

Deleted: s

Deleted: (1)

Deleted: complicated stress histories at fast-flowing outlet glaciers, and (2) stress concentration at crevasse tips can be ignored in closely-spaced crevasse fields, are invalid for the

Moved up [3]: complicated stress histories at fast-flowing outlet glaciers.

Deleted: Nye

Deleted: the over-prediction of

Deleted: formation that pursue approaches different than that of the Nye formulation

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Left

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 10 pt

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman, 10 pt

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman, Font color: Auto, English (UK)

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman, 10 pt

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

- Bassis, J. N. and Jacobs, S.: Diverse calving patterns linked to glacier geometry, *Nat. Geosci.*, 6, 833-836, doi:10.1038/ngeo1887, 2013.
- 630 Benn, D. I., Warren, C. R. and Mottram, R. H.: Calving processes and the dynamics of calving glaciers, *Earth-Sci. Rev.*, 82, 143-179, 2007a.
- Benn, D. I., Hulton, N. R. J. and Mottram, R. H.: 'Calving laws', 'sliding laws' and the stability of tidewater glaciers, *A. Glaciol.*, 46, 123-130, 2007b.
- Bjork, A. A., Kruse, L. M. and Michaelsen, P. B.: Brief Communication: Getting Greenland's glaciers right – a new dataset of all official Greenlandic glacier names, *The Cryo.*, 9, 2215-2218, doi:10.5194/tc-9-2215-2015, 2015.
- 635 Carr, J. R., Stokes, C. R. and Vieli, A.: Threefold increase in marine-terminating outlet glacier retreat rates across the Atlantic Arctic: 1992–2010, *A. Glaciol.*, 58(74), 72–91, doi:10.1017/aog.2017.3, 2017.
- Cathles, M., Abbot, D., Bassis, J. and MacAyeal, D.: Modeling surface-roughness/solar-ablation feedback: Application to small-scale surface channels and crevasses of the Greenland ice sheet, *A. Glaciol.*, 52, 99–108, 2011.
- 640 Colgan, W., Rajaram, H., Abdalati, W., McCutchan, C., Mottram, R., Moussavi, M. S. and Grigsby, S.: Glacier crevasses: Observations, models, and mass balance implications, *Rev.Geophys.*, 54, doi:10.1002/2015RG000504, 2016.
- Colgan, W., Steffen, K., McLamb, W., Abdalati, W., Rajaram, H., Motyka, R., Phillips, T. and Anderson, R.: An increase in crevasse extent, West Greenland: Hydrologic implications, *Geophy. Res. Lett.*, 38, L18502, doi:10.1029/2011GL048491, 2011.
- 645 Cook, S., Zwinger, T., Rutt, I. C., O'Neel, S. and Murray, T.: Testing the effect of water in crevasses on a physically based calving model, *A. Glaciol.*, 53, 90–96, 2012.
- Cook, S., Rutt, I. C., Murray, T., Luckman, A., Zwinger, T., Selmes, N., Goldsack, A. and James, T. D.: Modelling environmental influences on calving at Helheim Glacier in eastern Greenland, *The Cryo.*, 8, 827-841, doi: 10.5194/tc-8-827-2014, 2014.
- 650 [Enderlin, E.: Elevation profile-derived crevasse depths for select Greenland marine-terminating glaciers, 2011-2018, Arctic Data Center, doi:10.18739/A2WH2DF1F, 2019.](#)
- Everett, A., Murray, T., Selmes, N., Rutt, I. C., Luckman, A., James, T. D., Clason, C., O'Leary, M., Karunaratna, H., Moloney, V. and Reeve, D. E.: Annual down-glacier drainage of lakes and water-filled crevasses at Helheim Glacier, southeast Greenland, *J. Geophys. Res.: Earth Surface*, 121(10), 1819-1833, 2016.
- 655 Hock, R.: Glacier melt: A review of processes and their modelling, *Prog. Phys. Geog.*, 29, 362–391, 2005.
- Howat, I.M. and Eddy, A.: Multi-decadal retreat of Greenland's marine-terminating glaciers, *J. Glaciol.*, 57(203), 389-396, 2011.
- Lampkin, D. J., and VanderBerg, J.: Supraglacial melt channel networks in the Jakobshavn Isbræ region during the 2007 melt season, *Hydro. Proc.*, 28(25), 6038-6053, 2014.
- 660 Moon, T.K. and Joughin, I.: Retreat and advance of Greenland tidewater glaciers from 1992 to 2007, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, F02022, doi:10.1029/2007JF000927, 2008.

Deleted: 1

- Mottram R. H. and Benn, D. I.: Testing crevasse-depth models: a field study at Breiðamerkurjökull, Iceland, *J. Glaciol.*, 55(192), 746–752, 2009.
- 665 Nick, F. M., Vieli, A., Anderson, M. L., Joughin, I., Payne, A., Edwards, T. L., Pattyn, F. and van de Wal, R. S. W.: Future sea-level rise from Greenland's main outlet glaciers in a warming climate, *Nature*, 497, 235–238, doi:10.1038/nature12068, 2013.
- Noh, M. -J. and Howat, I. M.: Automated stereo-photogrammetric DEM generation at high latitudes: Surface Extraction with TIN-based Search-space Minimization (SETSM) validation and demonstration over glaciated regions, *GIS. Rem. Sens.*, doi:10.1080/15481603.2015.1008621, 2015.
- 670 Nye, J.F.: The distribution of stress and velocity in glaciers and ice sheets, *Proc. Roy. Soc. London. Series A*, 239, 113–133, 1957.
- Otero, J., Navarro, F. J., Lapazaran, J. L., Welty, E., Pucsko, D. and Finkelnburg, R.: Modeling the controls on the front position of a tidewater glacier in Svalbard, *Front. Earth Sci.*, 5, 29, doi:10.3389/feart.2017.00029, 2017.
- 675 Pfeffer, W. and Bretherton, C.: The effect of crevasses on the solar heating of a glacier surface, *Int. Assoc. Hydro. Sci. Pub.s: The Physical Basis of Ice Sheet Modelling* 170, 191–205, 1987.
- Pollard, D., DeConto, R. M. and Alley, R. B.: Potential Antarctic Ice Sheet retreat driven by hydrofracturing and ice cliff failure, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 412, 112–121, doi: 10.1016/j.epsl.2014.12.035, 2015.
- Poinar, K., Joughin, I., Lilien, D., Brucker, L., Kehrl, L. and Nowicki, S.: Drainage of Southeast Greenland firn aquifer water through crevasses to the bed, *Front. Earth Sci.*, 5, 5, doi:10.3389/feart.2017.00005, 2017.
- 680 Reese, R., Gudmundsson, G. H., Levermann, A. and Winkelmann, R.: The far reach of ice-shelf thinning in Antarctica, *Nature Clim. Change*, 8, 53–57, doi: 10.1038/s41558-017-0020-x, 2018.
- Rott, H., Skvarca, P. and Nagler, T.: Rapid collapse of northern Larsen Ice Shelf, *Ant. Sci.*, 271, 788–792, 1996.
- Scambos, T. A., Hulbe, C., Fahnestock, M. and Bohlander, J.: The link between climate warming and break-up of ice shelves in the Antarctic Peninsula, *J. Glaciol.*, 46, 516–530, doi:10.3189/172756500781833043, 2000.
- 685 Scambos, T. A., Fricker, H. A., Liu, C. -C., Bohlander, J., Fastook, J., Sargent, A., Massom, R. and Wu, A.-M.: Ice shelf disintegration by plate bending and hydro-fracture: Satellite observations and model results of the 2008 Wilkins ice shelf break- ups, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 280, 51–60, doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2008.12.027, 2009.
- Stevens, L. A., Behn, M. D., McGuire, J. J., Das, S. B., Joughin, I., Herring, T., Shean, D. E. and King, M. A.: Greenland supraglacial lake drainages triggered by hydrologically induced basal slip, *Nature*, 522, 73–76, 2015.
- 690 Trantow, T. and Herzfeld, U.C.: Crevasses as Indicators of Surge Dynamics in the Bering Bagley Glacier System, Alaska: Numerical Experiments and Comparison to Image Data Analysis, *J. Geophys. Res.: Earth Surf.*, 123(8), 1615–1637, doi:10.1029/2017JF004341, 2018.
- Van der Veen, C. J.: Fracture mechanics approach to penetration of surface crevasses on glaciers, *Cold Reg. Sci. Technol.*, 27(1), 31–47, 1998.

Vieli, A. and Nick, F. M.: Understanding and modeling rapid dynamic changes of tidewater outlet glaciers: Issues and implications, *Surv. Geophys.*, 32, 437–458, doi:10.1007/s10712-011-9132-4, 2011.





Figure 1: Map of glacier locations and example of the crevasse depth estimation approach applied to the elevation data for each glacier. a) Operation IceBridge transects (black squares) overlain on the Greenland Ice Mapping Project ice mask (light blue) and land mask (gray). Glacier names are from Björk et al. (2015). The red box highlights the location of the profile in panels b–e. **b)** Moving window approach to find local extrema. The nested search windows (gray shading) and local extrema (colored points) overlain on the de-trended portion of the profile. Local extrema were filtered to c) isolate crevasse bottoms (blue x's) and top edges (orange +'s), d) locate steeply-sloped crevasse walls (blue lines), and e) project wall slopes to depth.



710 Figure 2: Observed crevasse depth distributions for 1km-wide bins over the first 10km of each glacier. The distance from the
 terminus of each bin is distinguished by line color. Differences in area under the curves reflect variations in observed crevasse
 concentration between bins. Panels are geographically arranged so that western glaciers are on the left and eastern glaciers are on
 the right. Common names (Greenlandic names) are a) Ryder Gletsjer, b) Harald Moltke Bræ (Ullip Sermia), c) Kong Oscar Gletsjer
 (Nuussuup Sermia), d) Illiup Sermia, e) Upernavik North Isstrøm, f) Upernavik Isstrøm (Sermeq), g) Inngia Isbræ (Salliarutsip
 715 Sermia), h) Umiammakku Sermiat, i) Rink Isbræ (Kangilliup Sermia), j) Jakobshavn Isbræ (Sermeq Kujalleq), k) Heimdal Gletsjer,
 l) Koge Bugt Gletsjer, m) Helheim Gletsjer, n) Midgård Gletsjer, o) Kangerlussuaq Gletsjer, p) Dendrit Gletsjer, q) Magga Dan
 Gletsjer, r) Dugaard-Jensen Gletsjer, s) Zachariae Isstrøm.




Figure 3: Normalized profiles of maximum crevasse depth, local strain rate, and strain history. In each panel, the maximum crevasse depth in 150 m-wide bins is in black, the local strain rate is in blue, and the strain history is in orange. The median strain rate and strain history are shown as lines with shading indicating their temporal ranges. As in Fig. 2, the panels are geographically arranged.




Figure 4: Inngia Isbræ (Greenlandic Name: Salliarutsip Sermia) crevasse depth data. The legend indicates the observation year for all panels. a) Elevation profile time series extracted along the OIB swath. b-h) Scatterplots of observed crevasse depths plotted against modeled crevasse depths. Points that fall in the white (gray) region represent model over-estimates (under-estimates) of observed depths. All observations are shown in b whereas the maximum observed and median modeled depths within along-flow bins are shown in c-h. The bin sizes in c-h (50-2000 m) reflect the range of spatial resolutions for numerical ice flow models.




Figure 5: Profiles of all observed crevasse depths (black lines) and modeled crevasse depths (colored lines) computed from the median velocity profile for a) Kong Oscar Gletsjer, b) Inngia Isbræ, c) Dagaard-Jensen Gletsjer, and d) Heimdal Gletsjer. Orange colors show the median (line) and temporal range (shading) in modeled crevasse depths using the minimal Nye formation (i.e., no critical strain rate, uniform viscosity, no water). The red, green, and blue lines show the [Nye](#)-modeled crevasse depths with observation-based critical strain rates, flow enhancement, and flow enhancement with impounded water, respectively. [The purple lines show the LEFM-modeled crevasse depths with the geometry-dependent stress intensity scaling factor calculated from observations.](#)

Glacier Name	Latitude (°N)	Longitude (°E)	Max. Observed Depth (m)	Median Observed Depth (m)	Concentration (crevasses/km)	Max. Nye Depth (m)	Median Nye Depth (m)	Deformation Enhancement (unitless)	Max. Water Depth (m)	Max. LEFM Depth (m)	Median LEFM Depth (m)
Ryder	81.7802	-50.4556	10.9	4.8	1.0	29.4	15.2	0.64	6.1	5.1	5.1
Harald Moltke	76.5718	-67.5659	21.1	3.3	15.2	34.8	22.2	0.63	10.2	11.9	9.7
Kong Oscar	76.0267	-59.7052	47.0	5.0	9.6	69.7	46.6	0.79	32.7	28.7	23.1
Illullip	74.4026	-55.9341	46.6	6.3	16.9	90.8	62.9	0.77	25.0	43.4	31.9
Upernavik North	72.9511	-54.1183	59.9	8.6	17.8	118.5	52.2	0.70	30.7	56.3	40.4
Upernavik	72.8461	-54.1578	36.3	7.6	19.6	69.6	41.4	0.58	10.8	33.8	20.8
Inngia	72.1022	-52.5047	29.3	6.2	17.2	56.4	33.8	0.64	6.4	24.1	19.8
Umiammakku	71.7685	-52.3880	35.3	6.9	15.2	64.7	39.1	0.55	9.4	32.0	28.9
Rink	71.7381	-51.6096	31.6	5.9	21.9	72.3	49.7	0.62	13.1	34.3	23.5
Jakobshavn	69.1166	-49.4560	58.6	7.3	17.9	72.3	61.9	0.67	28.1	34.7	24.6
Heimdal	62.8969	-42.6730	24.0	5.4	18.5	33.8	28.2	0.58	12.7	18.8	14.9
Koge Bugt	65.2097	-41.2156	35.1	5.9	17.3	106.3	58.2	0.76	8.7	41.0	27.1
Helheim	66.3941	-38.3800	64.9	10.2	15.0	51.5	37.1	0.38	5.8	11.9	8.0
Midgård	66.5119	-36.7300	55.4	9.3	19.0	108.2	56.8	0.54	14.0	33.2	21.8
Kangerlussuaq	68.5864	-32.8397	50.0	4.5	17.8	80.8	45.9	0.70	27.9	40.4	18.6
Dendrit	69.3449	-25.1687	23.9	6.5	11.4	52.8	35.2	0.62	7.3	21.3	13.2
Magga Dan	69.9375	-27.1410	33.1	5.3	18.6	76.2	49.4	0.72	4.0	53.4	25.6
Daugaard-Jensen	71.8797	-28.6788	55.9	7.2	16.2	84.5	38.1	0.53	12.0	35.8	24.2
Zachariae	78.9161	-21.0828	19.1	5.3	6.8	84.5	47.3	0.77	3.2	34.6	25.3

Glacier Name	Latitude (°N)	Longitude (°E)	Maximum Observed Depth (m)
Ryder	81.7802	-50.4556	10.9
Harald Moltke	76.5718	-67.5659	21.1
Kong Oscar	76.0267	-59.7052	47.0
Illullip	74.4026	-55.9341	46.6
Upernavik North	72.9511	-54.1183	59.9
Upernavik	72.8461	-54.1578	36.3
Inngia	72.1022	-52.5047	29.3
Umiammakku	71.7685	-52.3880	35.3
Rink	71.7381	-51.6096	31.6
Jakobshavn	69.1166	-49.4560	58.6
Heimdal	62.8969	-42.6730	24.0
Koge Bugt	65.2097	-41.2156	35.1
Helheim	66.3941	-38.3800	64.9
Midgård	66.5119	-36.7300	55.4
Kangerlussuaq	68.5864	-32.8397	50.0
Dendrit	69.3449	-25.1687	23.9
Magga Dan	69.9375	-27.1410	33.1
Daugaard-Jensen	71.8797	-28.6788	55.9
Zachariae	78.9161	-21.0828	19.1

Deleted:

Deleted: within 5km of the terminus

Deleted: within 5km of the terminus

Deleted: and

Deleted: estimate

740 Table 1: Observed and modeled crevasse characteristics within 5 km of the terminus. The name, location, maximum and median observed crevasse depths, median concentration of crevasses, maximum and median Nye-modeled crevasse depth, median tuned deformation enhancement factor, maximum tuned water depth, and maximum and median LEFM-modeled crevasse depths for each study site.