Authors comments on Reviewer #1 interactive comment on "Drivers for Atlantic-origin waters abutting Greenland" by Laura C. Gillard et al.

General Comments

Reviewer Comments (RC):

Using a combination of eddy-permitting and eddy-resolving ocean model simulations, the transport of warm waters through from the Greenland Shelf through the troughs towards marine terminating glaciers is examined. The manuscript contains interesting and important analysis geared toward understanding: the influence of meltwater, storms and model resolution on heat transport through the troughs. In the present form the manuscript has too many somewhat disparate sections, the progression between which is not obvious. The manuscript could be made a welcome contribution to the literature if a) the less relevant sections are removed, b) the connection/progression between sections and their contribution to the goals of the manuscript are made clearer and c) the sections of greater potential that remain are strengthened with a modest amount of additional analysis.

Authors Comments (AC): The authors would like to thank Reviewer 1 for their helpful comments and insightful questions. We have restructured our sections in hopes that this will prove to have more progresion between sections. We have removed sections that seemed less relevant and added a "Study Area" section in the Methods part of the manuscript. We hope that the reviewer will find our new version of the manuscript clearier, and stronger as we have edited sections and included some additional analysis and model validation. We have also added two observationalists as authors to assist with the model evaluation.

Specific comments

RC: Page 3, lines 10-15. The following questions (6 of them) are quite cumbersome and without any logical progression or structure. This negatively impacts the flow of the rest of the manuscript. For example (5) and (6) are sub questions of (1). It is not necessary to state (2), as their significance is implied by the nature of the study. In question (3) it is not clear what is meant by 'this'. In (1) does 'to the coast' mean 'through the troughs' or 'to the shelf edge'? Is it

not possible to capture the essence of the research with three questions? For example: 1. What is the mean and variability of heat flux through the troughs around Greenland? 2. What are the processes that drive this variability of flux? 3. How is heat flux through the troughs affected by ocean resolution?

AC: Thank you for helping clarify the questions and therefore aiding in improving the flow of the rest of the manuscript. We have updated our research questions with your suggestions.

RC: Section 2.1 Model Evaluation. As discussed in the manuscript, there were some noticeable changes in temperature between 2004-2016. The extent that the model captures these changes will affect the interpretation of the results. The authors should include some evaluation of the model's ability to capture observed temperature changes in the western SPG.

AC: The Reviewer has a great point that this manuscript should include model evaluation. We compared Davis Strait volume flux and temperature and salinity properties with observations and have included that in our updated manuscript. We have also compared the water mass structure of a section at Fylla Bank with observations.

Please find in the updated manuscript an analysis done for a section drawn across Fylla Bank to compare with observations from Ribergaard (2014) (page 6 line 25, page 7 line 2, and page 28 Figure 4). At Davis Strait we compare the temperature and salinity fields in our LowResControl (page 7, line 11-13, and page 29 Figure 5) and HighRes (page 7 line 11 and 16, page 13 line 30 and page 30 Figure 6) as well as volume flux (page 7 line 21 and 31, Figure 7) to observations in Curry et al., (2014). This shows that we are capturing the main structure of the different water masses of the Atlantic Water, West Greenland Irminger Water and the West Greenland Slope water. We also show the net transport through Davis Strait is consistent with observations, and given the good comparison for temperature, we thus expect the model heat fluxes at Davis Strait to be similar to any observation (which are not presently available).

RC: Section 2.1/Section 2.2.2. Could the authors clarify/ state that Bamber et al. (2012) encompasses melt water from Greenland's marine terminating glaciers (as the termi- nology changes somewhat throughout the manuscript). What is the time period for the monthly Bamber et al. data? In addition, could they make it clear that in the model, the ocean does not affect GrIS melting as the melting is prescribed and non-interactive.

AC: Page 4 line 18-22. We have edited this section so that it is clear for the period of 2002-2010 we use the Bamber et al. (2012) data which is then repeated from 2010 onwards to 2016 as Bamber et al. (2012) data covers a period of 1958 to 2010. We have also edited some wording here so that we introduce the runoff from icesheet and tundra which contributes to the freshwater flux. We added a note that after this section we will

refer to the freshwater flux as meltwater. We have also added a note that states that the ocean model does not impact the GrIS melting as the reviewer suggests.

RC: Section 2.2.3. Page 5, line 10. 'such as temperature and wind speeds'. Do the authors mean only temperature and wind speed? Why not specific humidity which will affect latent heat flux and the other atmospheric forcing fields?

AC: Only temperature and windspeeds were filtered out. We followed the approach of Holdsworth and Myers (2015), who did not adjust the specific humidity. Additionally, specific humidity is generally very low around Greenland and Baffin Bay. Thus we didn't think adjusting it would have a significant impact on the results.

RC: Section 3. 1. This section on 'The HighRes vs LowREs experiment' is problematic in that it has no connection with the rest of the paper. I suggest it is removed. The results section (3.1) contains more of a literature review than an analysis of new results. In addition, a large amount of Section 3.1 is a description of the resolution changes and a relatively small amount is on the impact on the circulation. With regard to HighRes vs LowRes, are not the changes in on shore heat flux (as in Fig. 6) of more relevance to the manuscript than EKE changes?

AC: Pages 7-9. We have decided to add a new section Section 2.5 called "Study Area" where we have described each region, and removed the analysis on the EKE changes in regards to HighRes vs LowRes, as we agree with the Reviewer that it lacks relevance and strength compared to other sections. We agree that Figure 6 from the original manuscript (Figure 10 from the revised manuscript, pages 35-37) adds a stronger comparison between HighRes vs LowRes.

RC: Page 9, line 7. 'Significant'. By what measure of significance.

AC: Thank you for pointing out this choice of wording, we have changed the sentence from " *a significant heat flux increase started …***" "***an increase of heat flux started …***" page 10 line 5 and left the discussion of significance at the end of the paragraph at line 8- 10. "***A change from 0.1 TW is significant, as that increase in heat can potentially melt 300 tons of ice per second. Thus, an increase in ocean heat presence in these troughs may have driven more melt from the glaciers that terminate in Melville Bay***."**

RC: Section 3.2.2 Fig. 5a and 5b. There are two peaks in the DB seasonal cycle. August coincides with warmer surface waters. The later December peak coincides with the peak in the Irminger Water. The August-December lag corresponds to the advection time from when the water was last near the surface in Irminger Sea. The lack of a summer peak at MB, suggests seasonality is dominated by the subsurface warm layer.

AC: We would like to thank the Reviewer for bringing this to our attention and adding

insight into this section. We have updated the manuscript to include this insight, see page 10, line 29.

RC: Page 10, line 25. Re: Straneo et al. 2011. Is the Atlantic Water warmer during winter in the model? If so, why does on shore heat flux not increase during the winter?

AC: **We would like to thank the reviewer for their question. Given the other reviewers comment, we have decided that it would be best to reference Jackson et al., (2014) here instead of Straneo et al., (2011). Jackson et al., (2014) study showed that water properties and heat content within Sermilik fjord vary throughout non-summer months, and are driven strongly by along-shore winds. Given our new analysis of the seasonality, we do see in Figure 9(i) page 34 in the updated manuscript, an increase in average temperature in the non-summer months. We can see that the heat flux through HGT2 is related similarly to the seasonality of the volume flux (correlation of 0.91), rather than the temperature (correlation of -0.25) as shown in Table 3, page 41.**

RC: As with all of these plots, it would be nice to see the seasonal cycle of temperature across the section to determine if Fig. 5 reflects seasonality in temperature or volume transports.

AC: **We have compared the volume flux vs heat flux as well as average temperature across the section and have done the correlation of the entire period. Please see Figure 9 page 34 and Table 3 page 41 in the updated manuscript.**

So you can see that for some areas MVBCT, HGT, KGT seasonality seems to be dependent on the volume flux seasonality, showing the dependence on the behaviour of the ocean current. Whereas other areas seem to be more dependent on the seasonality of the temperature (such as DBT and NT). Though there are areas that seem to be influenced by both the seasonality of the volume flux and the temperature (MVBCT,KGT).

RC: Section 3.3. In this section there is a comparison of HighRes vs LowRes. If the authors quantify the comparison (correlation, RMSE), it will provide some justification for the locations at which LowRes can and can not be used instead of HighRes in the sensitivity experiments (Sections 3.4 and 3.5). With this in mind, I recommend removing lowResDoubleMelt from 3.3 and making Section 3.3 about HighRes vs LowRes only.

AC: **We would like to thank the reviewer for their insight on strengthening this section. We have removed LowResDoubleMelt from Section 3.3 (Now Section 3.2 pages 13-15 in the updated manuscript) to help focus and strengthen this section. We will also provide justification as the reviewer suggests, for using LowRes instead of HighRes in the sensitivity experiments.**

RC: Fig. 6. It is quite difficult to get a picture of how important the fluctuation component is due

to the different scales. Would it be possible to plot 'total' transport on the left hand side and 'mean' transport on the right hand side on the same scale?

AC: We hope that the reviewer will find Figure 6 (now Figure 10 pages 35-37 in the updated manuscript) more clear. We have decided to keep the mean transport on the left and fluctuation of transport on the right hand side as we view this way was easiest for the readers to clearly see the difference between the two.

RC: Section 3.4. In discussing the mechanism whereby melting increases the temperature of the lower layer of the trough x-section, it is possible to include some sense of spatial scale over which one might expect the increase melt to influence the circulation? For example, this could be done by comparing maps of on shore velocity in the lower layers. The authors appear to be saying an increase in melt increases the local THC and thus the onshore transport of heat. Is there any signal of circulation change outside the MB troughs?

AC: Thank you for this idea. We have examined the velocity normal to the section for the annual average. On this scale, the differences between the two are not large, as when comparing to temperatures. Though there is a deepening in stronger velocities at depth with the LowResDoubleMelt for both MVB and DB, it is not by a significant amount. Please see the image below, caxis is in cm/s.

LowResControl Melville Bay   **LowResDoubleMelt Melville Bay**

LowResControl Disko Bay   **LowResDoubleMelt Disko Bay**

Therefore at this point, we cannot say anything about the strength of the THC, and instead the increase in temperature as well as increase in heat flux.

RC: Section 3.5. Why are the authors only looking at HG in this section? I suggest the authors should a) do all, b) do none or c) justify why their selection of sites.

RC: In this section the authors discuss changes in on shore/ off shore heat transport with storms/ no storms. Rather than look at EKE, it seems that an appropriate figure would be Figure 4 for the storms and nostorms simulations. This way, strengthening / weakening of the inflow/outflow transport paths would be more clearly seen.

AC: We added our justification on why this analysis was only done for HG, page 16 line 9-10. Previously we conducted this analysis for the other locations and HG was the only region that showed an impact to changes in the filtered storms experiment. Therefore we only include results for HG here. We found that the EKE plots show a strong contrast between the LowResControl and LowResNoStorms. We would like to keep this analysis in this section (Section 2.4 page 16).

RC: Section 3.6. The authors may wish to consider if this section is necessary. I would suggest that for it to be a helpful contribution to the manuscript it needs to be more quantitative. For example, Fig 9. suggests a very small fraction of warm water at MVB is from north of Fram Strait. A lot is south of Denmark Strait and nearly all of it is in the Atlantic Sector South of 79N. It would be helpful to know the % of particles in Fig. 9a that have come around Cape Farewell and the % that have come through, Denmark Strait and Fram Strait.

AC: We would like to thank the reviewer for their comments and insight in regards to the analysis done with the offline Lagrangian particle tracking tool, ARIANE. As we reviewed this section, and given the insight and comments from the reviewers, we therefore remove the analysis with ARIANE from the manuscript.

Technical

RC: Page 1, Line 10. 'the north-west coast and south-east coast respond...' » 'Ocean temperatures near the north-west coast and south-east coast respond...'

AC: Fixed and updated in the new manuscript.

RC: Page 2. Line 10 'Mass balance has been persistently negative' needs rephrasing. 'The annual mass balance has been persistently negative' or 'the mass of the GrIS have been declining since..'

AC: Fixed and updated in the new manuscript reworded:

Original Sentence: *The mass balance of the GrIS has been persistently negative since the rapid retreat of marine terminating glaciers began in 1995 (van den Broeke et al., 2016).*

Updated: *The annual mass balance of the GrIS has been persistently negative...*

RC: Fig. 2 Caption » 'Our model resolves larger scale processes that occur along the coastline, AND therefore, injects the meltwater from the GrIS at the first ocean'

AC: Fixed and updated in the new manuscript.

RC: Page Line 4, 30. It would be clearer to say 'The models used in this study, do not have an iceberg module and so only include river and tundra runoff (~46 % of the total)...' otherwise it hints that this is a difference between HighRes and LowRes in Section 3.3

AC: Updated to: "*The model used in this study does not have an iceberg module and so only the icesheet and tundra runoff is included (46 % of the total) of Greenland's freshwater flux. Therefore HighRes and LowResControl under represents the total of Greenland's freshwater flux. Therefore, LowResDoubleMelt, takes into account the solid mass discharge.*"

RC: Equation 1). LHS should have '(t)' after 'HeatFluxeddy'. Specify what is denoted by the overbar.

AC: Fixed and specified that the overbar denotes the larger time scale average (25 days ie. 5 model outputs) has been updated in the new manuscript.

RC: Page 9, Line 5. It did not increase for 5 years.» 'The MVBNT, MVBCT and MVBST heat transport increased between 2009 and 2010 and persisted in an anomalously high state for 5 years.'

AC: Updated into the new manuscript.

RC: Page 10, line 30. Some sections look quite small: How many model grid points across is the SBST section?

AC: The HighRes section drawn for SBST has 26 model grid points and 9 grid points for the LowRes.

RC: Fig. 4 – Please add 'N' and 'S' to the appropriate end of each panel to aid the reader. Also Figure 7.

AC: Updated into the new manuscript.

RC: Section 3.2.6. Can the authors make it clear when they are referring to SBST and when they are referring to 79NG.

AC: We have edited this section in our new manuscript and hope that this section is now more clear.

RC: Page 11, line 21. 'arrival of warm waters from the WGC' » 'arrival of warm Irminger Water from the subduction area in the Irminger Sea'

AC: Updated into the new manuscript.

RC: Page 16, line 22. 'Warm waters are replaced by sources from....'» 'Instead the pre-dominant sources of warm water are from Fram Strait...'.

AC: Updated into the new manuscript.

Authors comments to Reviewer #2 interactive comment on "Drivers for Atlantic-origin waters abutting Greenland" by Laura C. Gillard et al.

General Comments:

Authors Comments (AC): The authors would like to thank Reviewer 2 for their thorough inspection of this manuscript. We have restructured our sections in hopes that this will prove to have more progresion between sections. We have removed sections that seemed less relevant and added a "Study Area" section in the Methods part of the manuscript. We have also added a "Model Evaluation" section in the Methods part of the manuscript, more details are discussed below. We have updated all images with reviewers suggestions. We would like to thank the reviewer for their insightful and thorough questions and comments that have strengthened our analysis and manuscript. We have also added two observationalists as authors to assist with the model evaluation.

Reviewer Comment (RC): I think the set of experienced that were carried out in this study is very nice and that it could potentially be useful to understand the waters surrounding Greenland and what mechanisms are important for changes in troughs around Greenland. However the way this paper is presented resembles a bit an observational study where one is limited to a few hydrographic sections and needs to hypothesize of why some of these observations might be what they are.

AC: We picked these sections and regions due to their proximity to marine terminating glaciers with fjords that abutt these troughs in our study. We have made it more clear in our revised manuscript and hope it is more clear why we decided to pick these sections and regions.

RC: There is no attempt to understand the reported results and to explain mechanisms that are responsible for these results, at least within the context of this model. One example is the seasonality in heat flux - we see plots of seasonal signal from different sections, but there is no advance in understanding why this seasonal signal is there.

AC: We hope that the updated manuscript provides more of an explanation of the mechanism responsible for these results. We expanded our seasonality of the heat flux in more detail, and identify if the heat flux is changing due to the ocean current's seasonality or due to the seasonality of the temperature. We have provided a further

explanation to your question, under the "Major Comments" below, regarding the Figure 9 page 33 -34 in the updated manuscript.

RC: There is also no validation of this model (there are a few hand wavy remarks of how something agrees, but no actual comparison).

AC: The Reviewer has a great point that this manuscript should include model evaluation. We compared Davis Strait volume flux and temperature and salinity properties with observations and have included that in our updated manuscript. We have also compared the water mass structure of a section at Fylla Bank with observations.

Please find in the updated manuscript an analysis done for a section drawn across Fylla Bank to compare with observations from Ribergaard (2014) (page 6 line 25, page 7 line 2, and page 28 Figure 4). At Davis Strait we compare the temperature and salinity fields in our LowResControl (page 7, line 11-13, and page 29 Figure 5) and HighRes (page 7 line 11 and 16, page 13 line 30 and page 30 Figure 6) as well as volume flux (page 7 line 21 and 31, Figure 7) to observations in Curry et al., (2014). This shows that we are capturing the main structure of the different water masses of the Atlantic Water, West Greenland Irminger Water and the West Greenland Slope water. We also show the net transport through Davis Strait is consistent with observations, and given the good comparison for temperature, we thus expect the model heat fluxes at Davis Strait to be similar to any observation (which are not presently available).

RC: Another example is weak EKE in the NE and NW - it is hypothesized that it might be because of sea ice - but there is no attempt to quantify this in any way. It feels as if the authors forgot they have the whole 4-D model output that probably contains the answers.

AC: We have removed the EKE analysis from this study, and the hypothesis of the sea ice implication as we have concluded it did not strengthen the manuscript.

RC: In summary, I think these experiments suggest that responses to different forcing changes around Greenland might be regionally different, and that is useful (and it would be more useful if there was some model validation with observations). However, this paper could do much deeper than that, and actually try to help understand reasons for these differences. One option it would

be to focus on less experiments in a bit more depth.

Some (still major) comments are listed here, the more detailed comments are in the attached pdf.

AC: **We hope that the reviewer will find our new version of the manuscript clearer, and stronger as we have edited sections and included some additional analysis and model validation. More detailed comments have either been fixed directly in the manuscript or for more of an explanation will be under the "detailed comments" section below the "major comments".**

Major Comments

1) Model

RC: There is essentially no model validation. While there is a very nice description of the regional oceanography in the introduction, the reader is left wondering what the actual ocean circulation and hydrography looked like in this model.

AC: **The Reviewer has a great point that this manuscript should include model evaluation. We compared Davis Strait volume flux and temperature and salinity properties with observations and have included that in our updated manuscript. We have also compared the water mass structure of a section at Fylla Bank with observations.**

Please find in the updated manuscript an analysis done for a section drawn across Fylla Bank to compare with observations from Ribergaard (2014) (page 6 line 25, page 7 line 2, and page 28 Figure 4). At Davis Strait we compare the temperature and salinity fields in our LowResControl (page 7, line 11-13, and page 29 Figure 5) and HighRes (page 7 line 11 and 16, page 13 line 30 and page 30 Figure 6) as well as volume flux (page 7 line 21 and 31, Figure 7) to observations in Curry et al., (2014). This shows that we are capturing the main structure of the different water masses of the Atlantic Water, West Greenland Irminger Water and the West Greenland Slope water. We also show the net transport through Davis Strait is consistent with observations, and given the good comparison for temperature, we thus expect the model heat fluxes at Davis Strait to be similar to any observation (which are not presently available).

RC: There is no justification for the spin up time, which was seemingly ad-hoc chosen to be 2-years. A lot of emphasis in the discussion is on 2004-2007 increase of oceanic heat flux towards Disko Bay. However since only first 2 years of the simulation where discarded - the first analyzed year is 2004, the year on which so much emphasis is placed.

AC: **We would like to thank the Reviewer for helping strengthen our results by adding the**

justification of our models spin up time. Please find Figure 2 page 26, in the updated manuscript that shows the total kinetic energy in Baffin Bay for the LowResControl and HighRes experiments . You will see that from 2002 to the end of 2003 the LowRes TKE is lower than future years, and does increase. For the HighRes, there is low TKE in 2002 but then by 2003 the TKE reaches values consistent with the remaining period. Therefore, for the large scale Baffin Bay circulation, only taking a year for spinup, even if it would take much longer for the deep properties to evolve, is justifiable to being our analysis in 2004.

RC: There is no discussion of the sensitivity of the offline Lagrangian particle tracking to the time step used for the integration. It seems that the integration was carried out on the 5-day model output which seems large (e.g. Koszalka 2013 (JPO) found that for a 2km horizontal resolution they need a 15 min time step).

AC: We would like to thank the reviewer for their comment and insight in regards to the offline Lagrangian particle tracking. As we reviewed this section, and given the other reviewer's comments, as this section did not strengthen the manuscript, we will therefore remove the analysis with ARIANE from the manuscript.

RC: There is no discussion of how modeling choices may affect the results, e.g. the way meltwater is introduced.

AC: We would like to thank the reviewer for the advice on including more information and discussion about the modelling set up. We have updated the manuscript to discuss more about the implications of how meltwater is introduced in the model.

Page 4, Line 15 - 17 "... . Observations (Beaird et al., 2018, Beaird et al., 2017) have shown that freshwater may not only be at the surface but be mixed and entrained with ambient waters and find a neutral buoyancy at depth. Therefore this stratification assumption in this model may be misrepresenting plume dynamics that occur in fjords and may need to be rethought in future studies. "

----
2) Description of experiments

RC: The experiments need to be described more clearly. At this point there is introduction, pieces of experiment setup, and discussion all mixed up. I would suggest to first describe the LowRES in full detail. Then go to individual experiments. Say what question the experiment attempts to answer. Review the aspect of the base case that you will change. Then describe how the change will be carry out. And also how the evaluation of differences will be done.

AC: We would like to thank the reviewer for their suggestions on clarifying the description of experiments. We hope that in the updated manuscript it will be much more

clear (pages 3 to 5).

RC: It is not obvious that downscaling the HighRes simulation will reduce to LowRes simulation, because the geometry was generated using different approaches. If that is not the case, this may have implications for the comparison of the two simulations, when the effect of horizontal resolution is explored.

AC: The reviewer brings up an interesting point and we agree with the reviewer. Downscaling the HighRes simulation will not reduce to the LowRes simulation, for reasons that the reviewer brings up about the geometry. Therefore in the new manuscript we will add this caveat in the analysis so that it is brought to the readers attention when reading the results about the effect of horizontal resolution (Page 4 line 29-31).

----

3) Organization

RC: Background is mixed up in results and introduction. It would be useful to include a background section before the results, that describes the three sectors that the analysis will be focused on.

AC: We have decided to add a new section Section 2.5 called "Study Area" page 7-9 where we have described each region, and removed the analysis on the EKE changes in regards to HighRes vs LowRes, as it lacks relevance and strength compared to other sections.

----

4) Figures vs. their description

RC: I found myself disagreeing to some extent with the description of the shown figures enough times to bring it up in the major issues (examples in the minor comments). I would suggest the authors to make sure that the text and the figures are consistent.

AC: We would like to thank the reviewer for pointing out some discrepancies between the figures and text. We have gone through the reviewers minor comments and have updated the manuscript.

RC: 5) References As far as I can tell, some of the references in the paper are attributed to what the referenced work actually shows and discusses. Examples are in attached pdf.

AC: We would like to thank the reviewer for their thorough inspection to help strengthen

this manuscript and help fix incorrect references. We have gone through the examples in the reviewers pdf of the manuscript and have updated the manuscript.

RC: 6) Section 3.2 shows there is a seasonal variation of heat flux across the selected section, but it does not provide any explanation of how this seasonality is introduced. As far as I am concerned the claim that it has to do with distance from source (it is not actually specified here what the source is) is sound, however there is no analysis at all in the manuscript, that would support this claim. Some questions that I think would be worth investigating are: How is the seasonality introduced in the water properties? Is it by the same mechanism at each location? Does the model show a propagation of seasonal temperature signal? Is it possible that the seasonal changes are due to seasonal changes in the water flow and not due to temperature? Can you separate these effects?

AC: **We have compared the volume flux vs heat flux as well as average temperature across the section and have done the correlation of the entire period. Please see Figure 9 pages 33 to 34 and Table 3, page 41 in the updated manuscript.**

So you can see that for some areas MVBCT, HGT, KGT seasonality seems to be dependent on the volume flux seasonality, showing the dependence on the behaviour of the ocean current. Whereas other areas seem to be more dependent on the seasonality of the temperature (such as DBT and NT). Though there are areas that seem to be influenced by both the seasonality of the volume flux and the temperature (MVBCT,KGT).

RC: You have a full model of this region, not just a few observations, so it seems that you should be able to explore the observed seasonality in more depth.

AC: We would like to thank the reviewer for their insight on expanding our analysis of the nature of the seasonality of the flow. We hope that our updated manuscript will show a stronger analysis of the seasonality (pages 9 to 13).

RC: 7) Section 3.3

This whole section that discusses contribution of the mean flow vs the fluctuation could be significantly improved. The discussion is qualitative now, but it could be made quantitative. Rather than saying what is more or less important there could be some metric used to measure how important each component is and by how much.

AC: We would like to thank the reviewer for bringing this to our attention. We have added more analysis into this section, where we compare HighRes and LowResControl with correlations. We hope that this will make the analysis stronger and more quantitative

(Section 3.2 pages 13 to 15) .

RC: 8) Warming vs. increased heat flux, warm water vs Irminger water

There needs to be consistency in the terminology used here. Irminger water is never defined in the manuscript, but it is referred to all the time. Sometimes warm water is interchangeably used with Irminger water, but for example in the backward particle tracking particles are released below 30 m depth - so water that is not Irminger water is being traced as well.

AC: The reviewer brings up a very important point. We have gone through the manuscript to clarify wording and consistency of terminology when referring to warm water, vs increased heat flux and Irminger water.

RC: There is a lot of mentioning of warming, when what is shown is increased heat flux - and that can increase even if no actual water mass increased its temperature. It would be good to be careful with terminology and interpretation again here.

AC: We have gone through the manuscript and updated the terminology to be consistent and clear with our analysis.

RC: Please also note the supplement to this comment:

AC: Fixed in new manuscript or otherwise response to specific comments below:

Detailed Comments That Were In a PDF file

Text: *"The HighRes bathymetry (seen in Fig. 4a) is relatively shallow compared to the observations discussed."*

RC: Why didn't you include these observations in your model?

AC: The Reviewer makes an insightful point, however the way the bathymetry built at the point in which this configuration was made, was deemed adequate. This study highlights that there is need for improvement in the bathymetry. This original text was removed as this analysis of EKE has been removed.

Original Text: *"Warming in Sermilik Fjord cannot be explained by local heating or surface fluxes. The warming in the fjord is instead a result of the advection of warmer waters into the fjord,as warm waters are present on the shelf year round, peaking from July to September (Straneo et al., 2010)."*

RC: Which warming are you referring to? Do you mean temperature variability?

AC: Thank you for asking for clarification on the wording from the original sentences. We have updated the sentences hoping to clarify our meaning here.

Updated Text page 8, line 24-25: *"Temperature variability in Sermilik Fjord cannot be explained by local heating or surface fluxes. The temperature variability ..."*

RC: Has any long term trend been observed here?

AC: To our knowledge, there has not been any long term observations made available to determine a long term trend.

Text: *"Thus, an increase in ocean heat presence in these troughs may have driven more melt from the glaciers that terminate in Melville Bay."*

RC: Was any of this observed in reality?

AC: To the authors' knowledge, we have not seen a study that has looked at North west glacier's advancement or retreat that terminate into fjords in Melville Bay for years of our study (2004 to 2016).

Text: *"Partial step (Bernard et al., 2006) is also enabled to better represent the sea floor."*

RC: Partial grid cells or partial step?

AC: We use partial step topography, and we acknowledge that this can also be named partial cells.

RC: Does the model resolve eddies?

AC: **The LowRes is eddy permitting, and the HighRes is eddy resolving.**

Generally speaking the 1/4 degree simulation, i.e., the LowResControl, is eddy permitting, and 1/12 degree (HighRes) is eddy resolving in the Arctic Ocean and Atlantic Ocean. However, on the shelf around the Greenland, neither of them are high enough to resolve the 1st mode of baroclinic eddies.

RC: It would be helpful to keep the same y axis on all the fluctuation plots so that the reader can compare visually whether the fluctuation is negligible.

AC: We appreciate the reviewers comment. However since the y-axis on the mean plots change, we would prefer to change the y-axis per location for both the mean and fluctuation plots. Therefore for region such as HGT2, with a mean y-axis of [10 -40] the fluctuation has a y-axis range of [5 -3]. For NT mean with a y-axis range of [2 -5] and fluctuation of [0.3 -0.15].

In regards to Figure 8, previously Figure 4 Hovemoller plots:

RC: I don't think interpolating spatially is appropriate for such a coarse resolution - would it be possible to show a figure that has not been interpolated along the x axis instead?

AC: We would like to clarify that we did not use any interpolation for this figure. With the 1/12 degree resolution that these hovmoller plots were created, we find that this resolution is suitable in the xaxis and no interpolation was done.

RC: I think it would make more sense to choose a convention in which the same colors corresponds to heat flux on to the shelf at all sections.

AC: All colours in these plots represent the same direction, positive values (yellow to purple) represent on shore and negative values (blue to grey) represent off shore. However we have changed the colourmap/colourbar and hope that it is more clear. Yellow to red is onshore, and light blue to dark blue is off shore

----

Drivers for Atlantic-origin waters abutting Greenland

Laura C. Gillard[1], Xianmin Hu[1,2], Paul G. Myers[1], Mads H. Ribergaard[3], and Craig M. Lee[4]

[1]Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
[2]Bedford Institute of Oceanography, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada
[3]Danish Meterological Institute, Copenhagen, Denmark
[4]Applied Physics Laboratory, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, United States of America

Correspondence: Laura C. Gillard (gillard2@ualberta.ca)

Abstract.

The oceanic heat available in Greenland's troughs is dependent on the geographic location of the trough, the ~~warm~~ water origin, and how the water is impacted by local processes along the pathway to the trough. This study investigates the mechanisms that bring warm water to the shelf and into the troughs abutting the Greenland Ice Sheet (GrIS). Warm water that is exchanged from the trough into the fjord may influence the melt on the marine terminating glaciers. Regional ocean model experiments showed that warm Irminger water can extend far north into Baffin Bay, reaching as north as Melville Bay troughs. Melville Bay troughs experienced warming following 2009. An increase in ocean heat in these troughs may drive a retreat of the GrIS. In 2004 to 2006, model experiments captured an increase in onshore heat flux in the Disko Bay trough, coinciding with the observed timing of the disintegration of Jakobshavn Isbrae's floating tongue and observed ocean heat increase in Disko Bay. ~~Warm Irminger water can extend far north into Baffin Bay, reaching as north as Melville Bay troughs. However, it diminishes north of 67ºN on the east coast.~~ Seasonality of the maximum onshore heat flux differs due to distance away from the ~~original source. The~~ Irminger Sea. Ocean temperatures near the north-west coast and south-east coast respond differently to changes in meltwater from Greenland and high frequency atmospheric phenomena. With a doubling of the GrIS meltwater, Baffin Bay troughs ~~brought~~ transported ~ 40 % more heat. The lack of presence of storms resulted in an increase in heat flux (~ 20 %) through Helheim glacier's trough. These results demonstrate the ~~importance~~ regional variability of onshore heat transport through troughs and its potential implications to the GrIS.

Copyright statement. TEXT

1 Introduction

The Greenland Ice Sheet (GrIS), with the second largest storage of fresh ice on earth, has a glaciated cover of 1.81 million km^2 (Rastner et al., 2012). With the volume of ice reaching 2.96 million km^3, if the entire ice sheet were to melt, the sea level equivalent (SLE) would be ~ 7 m (Bamber et al., 2013). The GrIS recorded a maximum mass loss in 2012 with values reaching -446 ± 114 Gt yr^{-1}, a SLE of $\sim 1.2 \pm 0.3$ mm yr^{-1}, and has varied around ~ 1 mm yr^{-1} SLE since (van den Broeke et al.,

2016). Analysis of the the GrIS's mass loss and equivalent sea level rise (SLR) has shown that the GrIS has recently become a major source of global mean SLR (van den Broeke et al., 2016).

Meltwater originating off the south-west coast of the GrIS has been shown to circulate into the interior of the Labrador Sea (Gillard et al., 2016; Boning et al., 2016; Luo et al., 2016; Dukhovskoy et al., 2016). The Labrador Sea convection region is sensitive to ~~buoyancy, which impacts convection,~~ changes in buoyancy, a balance between heat loss and freshwater input ~~; the former drives deep convection and the latter lowers the density of the surface waters, slowing down convection~~ (Aagaard and Carmack, 1989; Straneo, 2006; Weijer et al., 2012). Thus, an increase of the accumulation of meltwaters in the Labrador Sea may affect and slow down deep convection ~~, the process that forms deep ocean waters by mixing surface waters down the water column (Boning et al., 2016; Weijer et al., 2012)~~ (Weijer et al., 2012; Boning et al., 2016). A weakening of the deep water formation may impact the Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation (AMOC), influencing how the earth distributes heat, impacting sea ice production and concentration of dissolved gases such as oxygen and carbon dioxide, and altering ecosystems ~~. (Boning et al., 2016; Weijer et al., 2012; Swingedouw et al., 2014; Arrigo et al., 2017).~~ (Weijer et al., 2012; Swingedouw et al., 2014; Boning et al., 2016; Arrigo et al., 2017).

Numerous studies have focused on the causation for the increase in mass loss from the GrIS, such as atmospheric warming (Box et al., 2009) and synoptic wind patterns (Christoffersen et al., 2011). The annual mass balance of the GrIS has been persistently negative since the rapid retreat of marine terminating glaciers began in 1995 (van den Broeke et al., 2016).

There are approximately 900 marine terminating glaciers on the GrIS (Rastner et al., 2012) which drain ~ 88 % of the ice sheet (Rignot and Mouginot, 2012). Therefore, it is this type of glacier that has the greatest control over the fate of the ice sheet. Past studies have concluded that the influences affecting the dynamics of marine terminating glaciers include glacier surface thinning (Csatho et al., 2014), glacier fjord ~~and~~ geometry (Porter et al., 2014; Fenty et al., 2016; Rignot et al., 2016a; Williams et al., 2017; Felikson et al., 2017), state of the ice melange (Moon et al., 2015), subglacial discharge ~~(Bartholomaus et al., 2016; Jenkins, 2011), ocean warming (Holland et al., 2008; Myers and Ribergaard, 2013; Straneo and Heimbach, 20~~ ~~, and ocean induced melting (Cai et al., 2017; Rignot et al., 2016b; Wood et al., 2018)~~ (Jenkins, 2011; Bartholomaus et al., 2016) , and ocean temperature changes (Holland et al., 2008; Myers and Ribergaard, 2013; Straneo and Heimbach, 2013; Rignot et al., 2016b; Ca . Wood et al. (2018) showed that ocean warming at intermediate depths, below 200 m, has the potential to increase ocean induced undercutting ~~, which has initialized the retreat of the majority of marine terminating glaciers~~.

The fluctuation of heat content in the North Atlantic Subpolar Gyre (NASPG) may have been the cause of ocean warming in fjords of marine terminating glaciers (Holland et al., 2008; Myers and Ribergaard, 2013; Straneo and Heimbach, 2013). The NASPG contains a ~~southern~~ branch that travels northward across the North Atlantic Ocean to the West European Basins (Fig. **??**). ~~This branch then can~~ Here, a branch travel westward, forming the Irminger Current circulating along Reykjanes Ridge. The Atlantic water that remains in the Irminger Current carries relatively warm and saline waters along the south-east coast of Greenland, while Polar waters from the Arctic Ocean and Greenland meltwaters from the East Greenland Current (EGC) and East Greenland Coastal Current merge to create a (mixed and modified) relative cold and low-saline current (Bacon et al., 2014). This current forms the West Greenland Current (WGC) near Cape Farewell. The WGC separates into two branches: one travels northward along the west coast of Greenland into Baffin Bay bringing with it both less saline, cold Polar water and

relatively warm, saline, modified Atlantic water, and the second, warmer and more saline branch joins the southward flowing Baffin Island Current at Davis Strait (Fratantoni and Pickart, 2007; Myers et al., 2009). A portion of the NASPG ~~can branch~~ branches off northward through the Iceland–Scotland ridge, which separates the Norwegian Sea from the North Atlantic Ocean, as the Norwegian Atlantic Current (NwAC) (Beszczynska-Möller et al., 2012). Instead of recirculating in the Fram Strait, a part of the NwAC can enter Barents Sea, south of Spitzbergen or north through Fram Strait (Beszczynska-Möller et al., 2012). A large volume of water that travels through Fram Strait may recirculate directly in the strait and return south to the Nordic Seas (Karcher et al., 2011; Beszczynska-Möller et al., 2012). Another ~~source of relatively warm water~~ water source in Fram Strait may have originated from the Pacific Ocean (Aksenov et al., 2010; Hu and Myers, 2013). ~~This water mass has entered~~ Pacific Water in Fram Strait is mainly the water mass entering the Arctic Ocean via the Bering Strait and ~~may follow two distinct pathways, a transpolar route crossing through the Arctic or an Alaskan route , travelling through the Canadian Arctic Archipelago (CAA)~~ delivered through the Transpolar route (Hu and Myers, 2013).

Along the shelf break of Greenland, transverse troughs extend across the coast of Greenland supplying warm water through to the mouths of fjords. Then ~~,~~ depending on the structure of the water mass at the mouth of the fjord and the height of the fjord's sills, ~~it can allow waters access to or block waters from reaching~~ warm waters can access the marine terminating glaciers and accelerating their mass loss ~~(Cai et al., 2017; Rignot et al., 2016b; Wood et al., 2018; Straneo et al., 2012)~~ (Straneo et al., 2012; Gladish et al., 2015b; Cai et al., 2017). If the warm waters from the NASPG can reach these transverse troughs, changes in heat content of the NASPG may influence the state of marine terminating glaciers on the GrIS.

This study investigates the following questions: ~~What are the processes that drive the warm water to the coast of Greenland? What is the significance of the deep troughs along Greenland's shelf to the supply of warm water to the fjords with marine terminating glaciers? How does an increase in horizontal resolution benefit an ocean model 's representation of this~~ how is heat flux through the troughs affected by ocean model resolution? What is the mean ~~state and variation of the onshore~~ and variability of heat flux through the troughs around Greenland? ~~How does the enhanced GrIS meltwater impact the renewal of ambient waters into the troughs? And what is the impact of high frequency atmospheric events on bringing warm waters to the coast?~~ What are the processes that drive the variability of flux?

2 Methods

2.1 Model description

A ~~high resolution~~ general circulation coupled ocean–sea ice model is utilized in this study. The fundamental modelling framework used is the Nucleus for European Modelling of the Ocean (NEMO) version 3.4 (Madec, 2008). The ocean component is based on Ocean Parallelise (OPA) and is used for the ocean dynamics and thermodynamics. For sea ice dynamics and thermodynamics, Louvain la Neuve Ice Model (LIM2) is used (Fichefet and Morales Maqueda, 1997). The regional domain for the coupled ocean–sea ice model covered the Arctic and Northern Hemisphere Atlantic Oceans (ANHA), with two open boundaries: one at the Bering Strait and the other at the latitude of $20°$ S. All simulations start from January 2002, and are integrated to December 2016.

Initial and monthly open boundary conditions (temperature, salinity, horizontal velocities, and sea surface height) are derived from the $^1/_4$° Global Ocean Reanalyses and Simulations (GLORYS2V3) product (Ferry et al., 2008). The surface atmospheric forcing fields (10 m surface wind, two metre air temperature and humidity, downward shortwave and longwave radiation, and total precipitation) with a temporal resolution of one hour and spatial resolution of 33 km, are from the Canadian Meteoro-
logical Centres Global Deterministic Prediction System Reforecasts (CGRF), provided by Environment and Climate Change Canada (Smith et al., 2014). The first two years of the model output are regarded as the adjustment from the initial GLORYS2V3 fields, ~~thus,~~ which have already had over 10 years to evolve. Figure. 2 shows the monthly summation of total kinetic energy (TKE) in all layers of Baffin Bay, for two configurations, that will be discussed in detail in the next section, LowResControl and HighRes (Fig. 2a,b). The TKE is low at the model start (January 2002) and increases abrupt after 2004 for the LowResControl configuration. For the HighRes, the TKE is fairly comparable for all other years having more than a magnitude higher values compared to the LowResControl. Figure 2 suggests that the spin up of the large scale Baffin Bay circulation from the initial conditions takes one to two years, although it would take much longer for the deep layer and the interannual variation is not considered. Thus, only five–day averaged model output from 2004 to 2016 are analyzed in this study.

2.2 Sensitivity experiment set-up

2.2.1 ~~Horizontal resolution experiments~~ Control experiment

The ANHA horizontal mesh grid is extracted from a global tripolar grid, ORCA (Barnier et al., 2007), ~~with two different horizontal resolutions. One is~~ at a $^1/_4$° resolution (hereafter referred to as ~~LowRes~~ LowResControl for low resolution) with a resolution ranging from ~ 11 km to ~ 15 km around Greenland~~, and the other one at a $^1/_{12}$° (hereafter referred to as HighRes for high resolution) with a resolution ranging from ~ 3.5 to ~ 5 around Greenland~~. In the vertical, the ~~ANHA configurations use~~ LowResControl configuration uses the geopotential or z–level coordinate with a total of 50 levels. The layer thickness increases ~~smoothly~~ from 1.05 m at the surface level to 453.1 m in the last level (at a depth of 5727.92 m). ~~High~~ Vertical high resolution is applied to the upper ocean, i.e., 22 levels for the top 100 m. Partial step (Bernard et al., 2006) is also enabled to better represent the sea floor. Bathymetry in ~~LowRes~~ LowResControl is taken from the existing global ORCA025 bathymetry (MEOM, 2013), which is based on a global relief model (ETOPO1) (Amante and Eakins, 2009) and a gridded bathymetric data set (GEBCO1) (BODC, 2008) with modifications (Barnier et al., 2007). ~~For HighRes , the bathymetry is~~

This study will focus on the relatively large scale processes outside of the fjords (as fjords are not resolved in this configuration) with an assumption that meltwater will reach the ocean surface once out of the fjord (Fig. 3). This assumption defines how Greenland discharge is added in the model, injected at the surface level then mixed into a 10 m thick layer. This approach is common in the present generation of ocean models at this horizontal scale, such as in Castro de la Guardia et al. (2015) and Dukhovskoy et al. (2016). Observations (Beaird et al., 2017, 2018) have shown that freshwater may not only be at the surface but be mixed and entrained with ambient waters and find a neutral buoyancy at depth. Therefore this stratification assumption in this model may be misrepresenting plume dynamics that occur in fjords and may need to be rethought in future studies.

The LowResControl simulation uses two interannual monthly runoff sources. Greenland's freshwater flux (tundra and icesheet runoff) is provided by Bamber et al. (2012) for 2002 to 2010, and 2010 runoff is repeated for the last 6 years of this study. Runoff in the rest of the model domain (not including Greenland) is provided by Dai et al. (2009). The model used in this study does not have an iceberg module and so only the icesheet and tundra runoff is included of Greenland's freshwater

5 flux ($\sim 46\%$ of the total).

2.2.2   Changes in resolution

How is heat flux through the troughs affected by ocean model resolution? A $^1/_{12}^\circ$ horizontal mesh grid is extracted from a global tripolar grid, ORCA (Barnier et al., 2007) (hereafter referred to as HighRes for high resolution) with a resolution ranging from ~ 3.5 km to ~ 5 km around Greenland. The vertical resolution remains identical to the LowRes, however the

10 HighRes bathymetry is built using a different approach. The bathymetry is generated by using ETOPO1 (Amante and Eakins, 2009) for the polar region, and the Global Predicted Bathymetry (Smith and Sandwell, 1997) from satellite altimetry and ship depth soundings for the rest of the domain.

Therefore, given the different approach of the generated bathymetry, downscaling HighRes will not reduce to LowRes. The HighRes configuration provides model fields at a finer scale that is not always visible in LowRes. This provides the potential for

15 a better simulation of warm ocean currents travelling towards the GrIS via a better representation of deep troughs. In addition, model resolution also plays a role in simulating ocean mixing and mesoscale features, such as eddies, that bring warm water towards the shelf through the trough along the GrIS. Note that, even in the $^1/_{12}^\circ$ resolution referred to as HighRes in this study, the small scale interactions of plume dynamics and glacier ice–ocean interactions within the fjord is majority of the fjords are still not resolved. Therefore, this study will focus on the relatively large scale processes outside of the fjords with

20 an assumption that the meltwater will reach the ocean surface once out of the fjord (Fig. 3). This is also consistent with how Greenland discharge is added in the model, injected at the surface level then mixed into a 10 thick layer. This approach is common in the present generation of ocean models at this horizontal scale, such as in Castro de la Guardia et al. (2015) and Dukhovskoy et al. (2016)HighRes has the same runoff and Greenland's freshwater flux setup as LowResControl. Given the numerical cost of the HighRes, LowResControl is utilized for the sensitivity experiments.

25 ### 2.2.3   Enhanced Greenland discharge experiment

LowRes and HighRes simulations use two interannual monthly runoff sources.

How can changing Greenland's freshwater flux (tundra and river runoff) is provided by Bamber et al. (2012). Runoff in the rest of the model domain is provided by Dai et al. (2009). impact the heat flux troughs around Greenland? As Castro de la Guardia et al. (2015) showed, enhanced Greenland melt can change nearby ocean circulation, e.g., Baffin Bay. Here we

30 conduct a pair of sensitivity experiments (LowResControl and LowResDoubleMelt) with more realistic spatial distribution and temporal varying Greenland meltwater freshwater flux to quantify the impact on warm waters flowing towards the marine terminating glaciers through troughs.

LowResControl ~~includes only the river and tundra runoff (∼ 46 % of the total)~~ under-represents the total of Greenland's freshwater flux. ~~This is because the version of the model used here does not have an iceberg module. ThereforeLowResControl under represents the total of Greenland's freshwater flux. Therefore~~Therefore, LowResDoubleMelt, takes into account the solid mass discharge. LowResDoubleMelt has the identical setup as LowResControl, expect for Greenland's freshwater flux. It is important to note that the entire solid discharge in LowResDoubleMelt is transformed into the liquid component (i.e., treated the same as the runoff)~~, as the version of the model used here does not have an iceberg module~~. In addition, the ocean does not affect GrIS melting as the melting is prescribed and non-interactive. This results in roughly twice as much ~~meltwater~~ freshwater flux (hereafter called meltwater) (100 % Greenland's freshwater flux, broken down by ∼ 46 % runoff and total iceberg discharge ∼ 54 %) in LowResDoubleMelt compared to LowResControl ~~.~~(roughly 46 % of Greenland's freshwater flux, only including runoff). Therefore, the total meltwater added to LowResDoubleMelt had been rouglhy doubled, and actually has a more realistic amount of meltwater than LowResControl. For this study, a comparison of the GrIS ~~freshwater flux (LowResControl) to the total GrIS melt (freshwater flux and total iceberg discharge, in liquid form) (LowResDoubleMelt)~~ meltwater is made to demonstrate the ocean model's sensitivity to increased GrIS ~~liquid melt.~~ melt. How will ocean temperatures in troughs that terminate into Baffin Bay be impacted by an increase in GrIS melt?

2.2.4 High frequency atmospheric event experiment

Previous studies (Holdsworth and Myers, 2015; Garcia-Quintana et al., 2019), have shown that high frequency atmospheric phenomena, such as storms, barrier winds, fronts, and topographic jets, ~~plays~~ play an important role in the ocean processes (e.g., deep convection in the Labrador Sea) in the study area. Do they also influence warm water brought towards the GrIS? Until this study, this has not yet been ~~studied. With the use of~~ examined.

We use the Kolmogorov–Zurbenko (KZ) filter ~~(Zurbenko et al., 1996), the~~ method (Zurbenko et al., 1996) as Eskridge et al. (1997) has shown that this filter has the same level of accuracy as the wavelet transformation method, however is much easier to use. The KZ filter is based on an iterative moving average that removes high frequency variations. We apply the moving average over a length of 10 days with one iteration as Garcia-Quintana et al. (2019) has done. Therefore, the removal of atmospheric variability (such as temperature and wind speeds) that persisted for a length of 10 days or less from the atmospheric forcing was done to drive a sensitivity simulation, called LowResNoStorms. LowResNoStorms has the identical setup as LowResControl, except for the KZ filter applied in the wind and air temperature fields (Zurbenko et al., 1996; Eskridge et al., 1997). For more information regarding the methodology of the KZ filtering, please see ~~Garcia-Quintana et al. (2019)~~Zurbenko et al. (1996); Eskridge et al. (1997). A complete list of simulations used in this study is given in Table 1.

2.3 Mean flow and its fluctuation

To evaluate the ocean's heat that reaches onto the shelf and into the troughs, heat fluxes are calculated at six sections along the coast of Greenland (across one trough per section, as shown in purple and tan, respectively, in Fig. **??**). Section names and their associated trough names are seen in Fig. **??**. To calculate the fluctuation of the heat flux, the five day ~~averaged~~ average model output of both temperature ~~and velocity~~ (T) and velocity (U) normal to the section are treated as the full current. A

moving averaged Eq. (1) was applied by taking the average of five model outputs (25 days) centered on a particular output (n) by taking outputs from two previous (($n-2$) and ($n-1$)), the centered (n), and two future . Therefore the (($n+1$) and ($n+2$)). The mean of the temperature and velocity normal to the section ($\overline{T},\overline{U}$) can be taken over a longer period (25 days). The mean values were then subtracted from the full current to get the fluctuation component of the heat flux . in Eq. (2). Given

5 Eq. (12), ρ_0 is the reference density, Cp is the specific heat capacity of sea water, n x is the length of the section, $H(z)$ $H(z,x)$ is the water depth along the section, $T(t,z,n)$ $T(t,z,x)$ is the temperature, and $U(t,z,n)$ $U(t,z,x)$ is the velocity normal to the section.

$$HeatFlux_{eddy}(\overline{U},\overline{T}) = \frac{1}{5}\sum_{n-2}^{n+2}(U,T)_n \tag{1}$$

$$HeatFlux_{eddy}(t) = \rho_0 Cp \int_0^{n\,x\;H(z\,x)} \int_0^{} U(t,z,n\,x)T(t,z,n\,x) - \overline{U}(t,z,n\,x)\overline{T}(t,z,n)dzdn\,x)dzdx \tag{2}$$

10 To understand see the importance of the fluctuation component of the flow around Greenland, the eddy kinetic energy (EKE) was calculated using the five day average averaged model outputs of velocity in the zonal (u) and the meridional (v) components. To see the annual average of EKE the EKE was calculated first The EKE was calculated using Eq. (2). The monthly EKE averages for each month was calculated, and the yearly EKE averages for each year 3). Then the annual EKE average over the period of 2004 to 2016 were calculated.

$$EKE = \frac{(\overline{u^2} - \overline{u}^2) + (\overline{v^2} - \overline{v}^2)}{2} \tag{3}$$

2.4 ~~Backward Lagrangian tracking of warm water reaching marine terminating glaciers~~ Model evaluation

~~To find the source of the warm waters (i. e. waters of temperature $> 0°$) found near marine terminating glaciers, virtual particles were released at six locations close to the model coastline (cyan lines in Fig. ??). An offline Lagrangian tool, ARIANE, was used to integrate the trajectories of warm water back to five years (??). The Lagrangian calculation is based on the~~

20 ~~simulated velocity fields of the HighRes output from 2004 to 2016. The virtual particles ($\sim$ 5000 for each location) were initially homogeneously distributed in the entire water column (excluding surface waters i. e. top 30 metres), in late June for each year. Distribution of particles below the surface excludes local surface warming and allows the analysis of~~ In order to continue with this study, a comparison was done to make sure that the model behaves similar to observations. A comparison of the model behavior against observations was done for West Greenland. The water mass structure at Fylla Bank is compared

25 to observations from Ribergaard (2014). This section is chosen, as the WGC branches shortly after it has passed Fylla Bank, with a portion moving westward and joining the Labrador Current while the other portion continues north through Davis Strait. The Fylla Bank section is shown with magenta in Fig. ?? (red in Fig. 1 in Ribergaard (2014)). The observed temperature

and salinity for June 14th, 2013 (Fig 31 in Ribergaard (2014)) is compared to the modeled averages for June 2013 (Fig. **??**). LowResControl (Fig. **??**a.) has a similar water mass structure as observations. There is cooler water at the surface with a thickness of 50 m offshore and about 100 m, just off the west side of the bank (kilometre marker 45), with warmer water (greater than $3\,^\circ C$) below 100 m depth. The cold water layer in the LowResControl is slightly saltier with the depth of the modelled 34.2 isohaline similar to that of the observed 34 isohaline (Fig. 31 in Ribergaard (2014)). For the HighRes, the cold surface layer is thicker (Fig. **??**b.) than in observations, where the ~~warm water at depth comes from .~~ $2\,^\circ C$ layer (contour in magenta) extends to about 100 m depth off the west side of Fylla Bank at kilometre marker 45. Similar to observations the $4\,^\circ C$ and warmer water mass starts below 200 m and slopes upwards towards the west. At a depth of ~ 400 m the HighRes is warmer than observations by $\sim 1\,^\circ C$. Overall, the modelled water mass structure compares well with the observations but with minor offsets in temperature and salinity. The model has a shallow fresh and colder surface layer in the west portion of the section, and deepens towards Fylla Bank. Finally, the HighRes configuration has a much stronger and better represented thermocline compared to the LowResControl configuration

Moving northward to Davis Strait, a primary gateway for meltwater and heat exchange between Baffin Bay and the North Atlantic Ocean. A comparison was done with LowResControl and HighRes to the Curry et al. (2014) moored array (see Fig. 2 in Curry et al. (2014)). The monthly modelled temperature averaged over 2004 – 2010 at Davis Strait (Fig. **??** and Fig. **??**) is compared to the mooring observations (Curry et al. 2014, their Fig. 3(c)). July through to September LowResControl (Fig. **??**) captures the same structure of the West Greenland Slow Water (WGSW) and West Greenland Irminger Water (WGIW) as in the Curry et al. (2014) study. From March to June LowResControl shows WGIW and WGSW cooler ($\sim 3\,^\circ C$) by about a degree than that of the observations ($\sim 4\,^\circ C$). LowResControl also has a tongue of relatively warm water from the WGIW protruding into the interior of Davis Strait at $\sim 200\ km$ and $\sim 200\ m$ depth. For the HighRes (Fig. **??**), the structure is similar to that of LowResControl, with the protruding tongue at $\sim 200\ km$ and $\sim 200\ m$ depth. HighRes also has a similar structure to the observations for the WGSW from July to October. Note that compared to observation, the WGSW and WGIW seems to be about $1\,^\circ C$ warmer.

3 ~~Results and discussion~~

The LowResControl and HighRes volume transport from September 2004 to September 2013 is able to satisfactorily represent the observations from a mooring array at Davis Strait (e.g. Curry et al. (2011, 2014)) (Fig. **??**). Positive values indicates southward volume fluxes through Davis Strait, and negative values indicates the waters move northward. However, the simulations underestimate the high frequency peaks of transport from the observations (values surpassing 6 Sv in some cases). Lack of tides in the model may explain why there is less fluctuation of transport compared to observations. The mean volume flux based on the Davis Strait moorings (Curry et al., 2011, 2014), calculated over the time period of Sept 21, 2004 to Sept 30, 2013, is 1.6 Sv. Over the same time period, the model transports are 1.2 Sv for LowResControl, with a correlation of 0.54, and 1.0 Sv for HighRes with a correlation of 0.49. Yet many features, such a the reduction in transport at the end of 2010, are well simulated.

2.1 Study area

2.2 ~~Impact of model resolution on EKE~~

This study focuses on six sections around Greenland (Fig. **??**) with marine terminating glaciers and deep bathymetric features. ~~To examine the sensitivity to different resolution, an examination of the EKE takes place. Figure **??** shows the comparison of~~

5 ~~EKE in regions along west, south-east and north-east coast of Greenland from the HighRes and LowResControl.~~ In Fig. **??**, the six sections are drawn (seen in light purple on the map inset **??**). HighRes model bathymetry is in grey and each section runs north to south on the x–axis starting at the left hand side of the figure indicated by the zero kilometre marker. The rest of this section will compare the six sections and discuss how observed bathymetry from other studies compares to the HighRes model bathymetry (Fig. **??**)~~as well as discuss the regions EKE (Fig. **??**).~~.

10 ~~West coast~~

In north-west Greenland, Kong Oscar is the fastest marine terminating glacier, terminating into Melville Bay (Rignot and Kanagaratnam, 2006; Rignot and Mouginot, 2012). Twenty percent of the GrIS drainage volume is directed along glaciers that feed into Melville Bay, amounting to a discharge of $\sim 80 \text{ km}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (Rignot and Kanagaratnam, 2006). Located in north-east Baffin Bay (Fig. **??**), Melville Bay holds the widest and deepest Greenland cross shelf troughs. This system consists of three

15 troughs: the North, Centre, and South Melville Bay Troughs (MVBTs: MVBNT, MVBCT, and MVBST). The MVBTs are 170 to 320 km long, 45 to 120 km wide and reach depths between 740 m to 1100 m with shallow banks (around 100 m below sea level) called inter–trough banks (Slabon et al., 2016; Morlighem et al., 2017). The HighRes bathymetry (seen in Fig. **??**a) is relatively shallow compared to the observations discussed. MVBNT is located at the kilometre markers 10 km to 120 km, MVBCT at 320 km to 450 km, and MVBST at 480 km to 580 km. The depths in the HighRes are about 400 m for MVBNT,

20 and reaching almost 700 m depth for MVBCT and MVBST.

Further south, on the west coast of Greenland, Jakobshavn Isbrae (JI) terminates into Disko Bay. The rapid retreat and disintegration of JI's floating ice tongue has been attributed to an increase in heat content, deep bathymetry, and NASPG warming (Holland et al., 2008; Myers and Ribergaard, 2013; Gladish et al., 2015a; An et al., 2017). Recent slowing down of JI's acceleration has been attributed to the glacier reaching a higher bed, high amounts of freshwater from the Canadian Arctic, a weak

25 WGC, or a cold Baffin Bay current flooding the West Greenland Shelf ~~(Joughin et al., 2012; Gladish et al., 2015a; An et al., 2017)~~ and cooling in the Labrador and Irminger Seas (Joughin et al., 2012; Gladish et al., 2015a; An et al., 2017; Khazendar et al., 2019). In HighRes, the section drawn for Disko Bay (Fig. **??**b) shows two deep bathymetric features: the first trough, located at 100 km to 200 km, and the second trough at 380 km to 500 km, now called UT (Uummannaq Trough) and DBT (Disko Bay Trough), respectively. UT connects to Uummannaq Fjord and DBT connects into Disko Bay. Both UT and DBT reach depths

30 of around 500 m, similar to observations found in (Hogan et al., 2016). In a more recent data set provided by BedMachineV3, UT similarly reaches approximately 500 m but DBT is much deeper, reaching depths of 900 m (Morlighem et al., 2017).

~~Looking at a spatial view of the EKE in the west region (Fig. **??**a, Fig. **??**b, and Fig. **??**c), the EKE is highest near changes in bathymetric features along the 250 and 500 isobaths. HighRes shows a larger magnitude for the EKE, from approximately~~

~~1×10^{-3} ~~ ~~^{2} $^{-2}$~~ ~~to about 3×10^{-3}~~ ~~^{2} $^{-2}$.~~ ~~In Fig. **??**a, there is a clearer representation of a feature near the south edge of DBT in~~ ~~comparison to Fig. **??**b.~~

~~South-east coast~~

In the south-east region there are two major glaciers of interest: Helheim Glacier (HG) and Kangerlussuaq Glacier (KG). HG terminates at a depth of 700 m in Sermilik Fjord, which is approximately 900 m deep at the U shape mouth with the adjacent continental shelf, reaching depths of 350 m (Straneo et al., 2010; Morlighem et al., 2017). ~~Warming~~ Temperature variability in Sermilik Fjord cannot be explained by local heating or surface fluxes. The ~~warming~~ temperature variability in the fjord is instead a result of the advection of warmer waters into the fjord, as warm waters are present on the shelf year round, peaking from July to September (Straneo et al., 2010). In HighRes, the section drawn for HG (Fig. **??**c) shows four unique features. The first one at kilometre marker 25 km to about 100 km shows a slumping of bathymetry reaching about 250 m in depth. Moving further south there are three deep troughs. The first trough is located at 120 km to 180 km, reaching depths surpassing 500 m, and the second and third troughs, located at 190 km to 260 km and 350 km to 375 km, respectively, reach depths closer to 700 m. Features will be referred to as Slump, HGT1, HGT2, and HGT3.

In the BedMachineV3 data set, Kangerdlussuaq trough (KT) reaches depths closer to 800 m (Morlighem et al., 2017). Atlantic water occupies the deep waters of the KT and Kangerlussuaq Fjord (KF) (Azetsu-Scott and Tan, 1997). KF~~has a bathymetrically~~ , similar to Sermilik Fjord has a deep open mouth, which could influence the Atlantic water transport that is observed there (Azetsu-Scott and Tan, 1997; Christoffersen et al., 2011; Inall et al., 2014). In HighRes, the section drawn for KT (Fig. **??**d) is drawn over an area with the maximum depth in the middle of the section, deeper than 600 m, at kilometre marker 175 km. The KT extends from 125 km to about 200 km.

~~The south-east location (Fig. **??**d, Fig. **??**e, and Fig. **??**f) has a very high EKE, larger than any other region. Maximum~~ ~~values reached 4×10^{-3}~~ ~~^{2} $^{-2}$~~ ~~in the EGC. It is clear that the EKE decreases closer to HGT2 where the bathymetry reaches~~ ~~depths of 500 . This shows a bifurcation around the 500 isobath, and the flow decreases in magnitude when it passes over~~ ~~HGT2. LowResControl captured the bifurcation and decreased magnitudes over HGT2 and the decreased magnitudes along~~ ~~the eastern shelf break of the 500 isobath, though at a coarser scale. Comparing HighRes to LowResControl, LowResControl~~ ~~appears to have higher values north of the Slump and south of HGT3.~~

~~North-east coast~~

In the north-east, Daugaard-Jensen Glacier terminates into Scoresby Sund and Nioghalvfjerdsbrae (79NG) terminates into the sound of Jøkelbugten. The BedMachineV3 shows depths of around 600 m (Morlighem et al., 2017). The HighRes section drawn for Scoresby Sund (Fig. **??**e) is outside of the opening of the coastline, from north to south, connecting fjord waters to the open ocean. The bathymetry here is smoother with fewer carved features. Instead it shows a skewed U shape in this section. The maximum depth is reached at kilometre marker 120 km with a depth slightly greater than 500 m.

79NG has a floating ice tongue that abuts Hovgaard Ø, which divides the tongue into two sections (Wilson and Straneo, 2015). The most rapid melting occurs at the grounded (pinned) front, south of Hovgaard Ø, where the ice tongue is thickest and

is exposed to deeper and warmer waters ~~(Seroussi et al., 2011; Wilson and Straneo, 2015).~~ (Mayer et al., 2000; Seroussi et al., 2011; Wilson. Schaffer et al. (2017) study showed that Atlantic Intermediate Water flows via bathymetric channels to the south of Hovgaard Ø at a pinned ice front, where there is a shorter pathway between the shelf and cavity, exposing the cavity to more shelf driven processes such as intermediary flows~~(Jackson et al., 2014)~~. The warm water is supplied from the warm water that resides in Norske Trough (NT) east of Hovgaard Ø (Fig. **??**) (Wilson and Straneo, 2015). Some of the relatively fresh glacially modified water is exported to the continental shelf via Dijmphna Sund, north of the glacier (Wilson and Straneo, 2015). In the Bed-MachineV3, NT reaches depths close to 600 m (Morlighem et al., 2017). The HighRes section drawn for 79NG (Fig. **??**f) is drawn from north to south. The HighRes bathymetry shows the deepest region exceeding depths of 300 m, though the majority of this section lies around 200 m.

~~In the north-east region (Fig. **??**g, Fig. **??**h, and Fig. **??**i), EKE increases along the troughs at the 250 and 500 isobaths. The differences of the EKE hover around -0.5×10^{-3} ^{2} $^{-2}$ to 0.5×10^{-3} ^{2} $^{-2}$. This region is unique because it is the only region that does not show as significant changes in EKE due to resolution, though HighRes captures stronger EKE over all. Turbulent mixing is highest along shelf breaks and changes of bathymetry, but predominately strongest in the south-east region (Fig. **??**). Weak EKE off the north-west and north-east coast of Greenland may be due to the semi-permanent sea ice cover.~~

3 Results and discussion

3.1 Onshore heat flux through coastal troughs

What is the significance of the deep troughs along Greenland's shelf to the supply of warm water to the fjords with marine terminating glaciers? A look at the onshore heat flux through these troughs will be shown using HighRes, as the benefits of a higher horizontal resolution have been shown. However, given the numerical costs of the HighRes, ~~LowRes~~ LowResControl is utilized for the sensitivity experiments that will be discussed later in this paper.

3.2 ~~Onshore heat flux through coastal troughs~~

3.1.1 West coast: mean state

The section drawn for Melville Bay (Fig. **??**a), located on the north-west coast of Greenland, shows three deep bathymetric troughs: the MVBNT, MVBCT, and MVBST (all troughs described in Sect. ~~**??**~~2.1). At the ~~south~~ north edge of all three troughs (kilometre marker ~~110~~ 15 km, ~~450~~ 330 km, and ~~560~~ 500 km, for MVBNT, MVBCT, and MVBST, respectively) there is an ~~onshore heat flux, and at the north edge~~ offshore heat flux. At the south edge of all three troughs (kilometre marker ~~15~~ 110 km, ~~330~~ 450 km, and ~~500~~ 560 km~~) an offshore~~, for MVBNT, MVBCT, and MVBST, respectively) there is an onshore heat flux. However, MVBNT, the shallowest of them, has the weakest onshore heat flux, 0 TW except for short periods during 2010, 2012 and 2014. This identifies that the northward warm waters travelling along the west Greenland coast are influenced by bathymetry and are steered eastward along the trough towards the coast.

MVBNT, MVBCT, and MVBST ~~experienced an increase in heat transport in 2009–2010 which persisted~~ transport increased between 2009 and 2010 and persisted in an anomalously high state for five years. For MVBNT there was little heat transfer before 2010 when the heat transport through to 2015 increased to 0.05 TW. At MVBCT, ~~a significant heat flux increase~~ an increase of heat flux started at the end of 2009, and reached a relatively stable value of 0.1 TW through to the end of 2016.

For the MVBST there was a more persistent interannual heat flux throughout the entire period, increasing from 0.1 TW to 0.2 TW starting at the end of 2009. An increase in warm water flux through troughs in northern regions of Greenland shelf ~~since 2009–2010~~ starting in 2009 for MVBCT and 2010 for MVBNT and MVBST was also identified. A change from 0.1 TW is significant, as that increase in heat can potentially melt 300 tons of ice per second. Thus, an increase in ocean heat presence in these troughs may have driven more melt from the glaciers that terminate in Melville Bay.

The section drawn for Disko Bay (Fig. **??**b), located on the west coast of Greenland, shows two deep troughs: UT and DBT. Both troughs experience an onshore heat flux at the south edge (kilometre marker about 180 km and 480 km, for UT and DBT, respectively) and an offshore heat flux at the north edge (kilometre marker 100 km to 120 km and 400 km to 420 km, for UT and DBT, respectively). In addition to modified Atlantic water travelling northward via the WGC, along the coast, this study shows that the ~~warm waters~~ ocean currents are influenced by the bathymetry and are steered eastward into the trough towards the coast.

HighRes was able to capture ~~an oceanic heat increase~~ a relatively higher heat flux in UT and DBT in the early 2000s (2005 for UT and 2004 to 2007 for DBT). For UT there are specific events when the heat flux peaked up to $\sim$ 0.3 TW, and at the end of 2005 there was a peak heat flux of about 0.1 TW and then through 2010 to 2012 there are variable pulses (0.1 TW) with maximum in the winter of 2010–2011 with a value of 0.2 TW. There is a consistent heat flux onshore in DBT from 2004 to end of 2007, and an increase in the heat flux (values showing 0.4 TW) reaching a maximum in 2010 and then decreasing back towards 0.35 TW afterwards. The increased heat flux in years of 2004 to 2006 coincide with the disintegration of the JI floating tongue, and within the period of observed oceanic heat increase ~~in Disko Bay~~ Disko Bay (from 1997 to 2007) (Holland et al., 2008).

3.1.2   West coast: seasonal and interannual variation

The seasonality of the average onshore heat flux is shown in MVBCT (Fig. **??**a). Late fall and early winter shows the maximum onshore heat flux with a peak in November. Through late winter to spring onshore heat flux is weakest, with the minimum in April. Years of 2004–2007, as indicated in a variety of blues, overall have less onshore heat flux. As time progresses, the onshore heat flux increases. 2011 and 2014 (as indicated in colours of pale green and orange) show the highest values of onshore heat flux, reaching maximums of about 13 TW and 11 TW respectively. ~~This~~ Again this indicates that more heat has been received into MVBCT in more recent years. The lack of a summer peak at MVBCT, suggests seasonality is dominated by the subsurface warm layer. MVBCT heat flux seasonality seems to be dependent on both the seasonality of the volume flux and temperature (Fig. **??**b and Fig. **??**c), with a correlation of 0.92 and 0.93 (shown in Table 2).

Further south in DBT (Fig. **??**~~b~~d), fall and winter seasons have higher onshore heat flux. However, earlier years (2004 to 2005) show above average onshore heat flux in the summer. A maximum onshore heat flux was identified in July and August

of 2004 and 2005 (reaching values around 7 TW to 10 TW). However in other years, June and July have lower values of heat flux (hovering close to 0 TW). This peak in 2004 to 2006 is shown in DBT (Fig. ??b). In 2011 there is a spike of onshore heat flux in December, reaching over 10 TW, then decreased in January (Fig. ??b̶d). For UT, in 2011, there was also a peak onshore heat flux (Fig. ??b).

5   Observations at Davis Strait see a temperature maximum in August through to November (Curry et al., 2011). The results here show DBT received onshore heat flux earlier in the season in the period of 2004 to 2006, around June and July, coinciding with warmer surface waters. As the years progressed in the model the timing of the maximum heat flux becomes later in the season, from September to January, coinciding with the peak in the Irminger Water (Fig. ??b̶). d). The August–December lag corresponds to the advection time from when the water was last near the surface in Irminger Sea. These results show an early

10 arrival in warm waters o̶c̶c̶u̶r̶s̶ occurred at the time when JI melted rapidly (Holland et al., 2008). This may therefore have been due to not only increase in ocean heat flux but perhaps an arrival of warm waters earlier in the melt season .̶and stayed for a longer time. DBT heat flux seasonality is dependent on the seasonality of the temperature of the water mass and not the seasonality of the volume flux (Fig. ??f and Fig. ??e), with a correlation of 0.93 and 0.43 (shown in Table 2).

3.1.3   South-east coast: mean state

15 The section drawn for Helheim (Fig. ??c) located off the south-east coast of Greenland, shows four unique features, Slump, HGT1, HGT2, and HGT3. For this section, HGT1 through to HGT3, at the north edge of the troughs (kilometre marker 100 km, 200 km, and 350 km) there is an onshore heat flux, and an offshore heat flux at the south edge (kilometre marker 175 km, 225 km, and 355 km). This identifies that there must be southward flowing warm water travelling along the south-east coast of Greenland, potentially drawn in from E̶G̶C̶Irminger Current, and the warm waters are again being bathymetrically

20 steered westward along the trough towards the coast. Slump shows an off shelf heat flux, oscillating from 0 TW to ∼- 0.5TW, potentially associated with lots of transient mixing and eddies.

    The section drawn for KT (Fig. ??d), highlights the extent of this trough. On the north portion of the section, from about 25 km to 100 km there is evidence of mixing of signals of on and off shelf. At the 150 km mark, throughout the years, there is a consistent onshore heat flux of greater than 0.1 TW and similar in magnitude is an offshore heat flux on the south edge of the

25 trough. This trough appears to have the strongest onshore signal of the section. At the south portion of the section (from 225 km to 325 km) there is a lot of variability of on and offshore in space and time.

3.1.4   South-east coast: seasonal and interannual variation

For HGT2 (Fig. ??e̶g), the period of August through to May has the weakest onshore heat flux. However, offshore heat flux occurs all year round making this location unique compared to all other regions. Observations from a fjord in south-east Greenland

30 s̶h̶o̶w̶e̶d̶ ̶t̶h̶a̶t̶ ̶i̶n̶ ̶t̶h̶e̶ ̶w̶i̶n̶t̶e̶r̶ ̶m̶o̶n̶t̶h̶s̶ ̶t̶h̶e̶ ̶l̶a̶y̶e̶r̶ ̶o̶f̶ ̶A̶t̶l̶a̶n̶t̶i̶c̶ ̶w̶a̶t̶e̶r̶ ̶i̶s̶ ̶w̶a̶r̶m̶e̶r̶ ̶t̶h̶a̶n̶ ̶t̶h̶e̶ ̶s̶u̶m̶m̶e̶r̶ ̶(̶?̶)̶(Sermilik Fjord) showed that water properties and heat content vary significantly on synoptic timescales throughout non-summer months (Jackson et al., 2014). Looking at HGT2 (Fig. ??e̶g), from October to March there was large variability in the magnitude and direction of the heat flux.̶, a period with an increase in average temperature (Fig. ??i).

Seasonality of HGT2 heat flux is related similarly to the seasonality of the volume flux (correlation of 0.91)(Fig. **??**h), rather than the temperature (correlation of -0.25) (Fig. **??**i) as shown in Table 2. At KT (Fig. **??**~~d~~j), a peak of onshore heat flux occurs after August for most years. Summer onshore heat peaks occur in 2004, 2005, 2015, and 2016. KT heat flux seasonality seems to be dependent on both the seasonality of the volume flux and temperature (Fig. **??**k and Fig. **??**l), with a correlation of 0.83 and 0.89 (shown in Table 2).

3.1.5 North-east coast: mean state

The section drawn for Scoresby Sund (Fig. **??**e), shows Scoresby Sund Trough (SBST). It is again on the north edge of the maximum depth, at kilometre marker 110 km that there is a consistent signal for onshore heat flux of more than 0.025 TW. On the north edge of the kilometre marker 20 km to 30 km, there is variability in the offshore heat flux. The middle of the section is where the heat is coming towards the coast.

The section drawn for 79NG (Fig. **??**f), located north-east of Greenland, is drawn from north to south. On the north side of the trough, at around 400 km there is a pattern for onshore heat flux at different periods within the time series, and also similar for 1000 km and 1100 km. This area's bathymetry is quite complex and the deeper regions such as kilometre marker, 40 km, and from 1000 km to 1100 km, has heat flux onshore. The onshore heat flux has a much smaller magnitude than any of the other sections, reaching its maximum value at about 0.04 TW.

3.1.6 North-east coast: seasonal and interannual variation

At SBST (Fig. **??**~~e~~m), onshore heat flux begins to increase in October and declines in April. Peak years include early 2005, then 2010 and 2011, with 2016 having a weaker onshore heat flux. A maximum of 10 TW is reached in 2005. SBST heat flux seasonality seems to not be solely dependent on either the seasonality of the volume flux or temperature flux alone (Fig. **??**n and Fig. **??**o). The heat flux shows a negative correlation of -0.73 for the volume flux and -0.76 for the average temperature (shown in Table 2).

At NT (Fig. **??**~~f~~p) the seasonality is not clear. A consistent growth in onshore heat flux occurs in August, with a minimum of heat flux in June. There is a lot of variability from 2004 to 2016, with maximum flux in 2004, 2005, and 2010 and strongest offshore heat flux occurring in January through May of 2015. From August to December, maximum onshore heat occurred in 2006, 2010, and 2014, with a maximum offshore heat flux in 2004, 2009 and 2007. From 2012 to 2016 there is a peak in February with a decline in March and April. The heat flux then increases steadily to a maximum in September and October, where it then declines again. Therefore, for this region, the seasonality has changed throughout the time of the study. ~~This could mean the state of the north-east GrIS may be influenced at different times by oceanic forcing.~~ NT heat flux seasonality is dependent on both the seasonality of the temperature (Fig. **??**r) an the volume flux (Fig. **??**q), with a correlation of 0.81 and -0.99 (shown in Table 2).

3.1.7 Summary of onshore heat flux through coastal troughs

Of these six regions, the region closest to Irminger Sea, HGT2, receive the ~~warmest water~~ highest heat flux in June to September. The two regions farther away from the NASPG on the west coast of Greenland (MVBCT and DBT), have warm water transported later due to the arrival of warm ~~waters from the WGC~~Irminger Water from the subduction area in the Irminger Sea. DBT has the largest onshore ocean heat flux from July to December. Further north, a later arrival occurs at MVBCT (September through December). On the north-east coast of Greenland, warm water is received from the NwAC. The transport through the three troughs peak in onshore heat flux thusly: KT from August to November, followed by SBST from November to April and the NT peaked from September to January. Therefore, HGT2 could receive warm water first from the Irminger Sea, then the WGC reaches DBT then MVBCT and the NwAC reaches KT, followed by SBST and NT. For the WGC branch, Carroll et al. (2018) identified the warmest and saltiest Irminger water in Davis Strait during summer months, this would align with the timing of the arrival of warm waters in the troughs along the west coast of Greenland, as their is a lagged time when the warm water is shown in these troughs, in summer or fall.

The seasonality of heat flux through these troughs seems to correspond with the volume flux (HGT2) or average temperature (DBT and NT), and even both components in some cases (MVBCT, KT). SBST had a negative correlation with both the volume flux and the average temperature, where there is less onshore heat flux in the summer months (July to October) there is more onshore volume flux and warmer ocean temperatures. Where in the winter months, there is more onshore heat flux, but more offshore volume flux and cooler ocean temperatures.

3.2 Contribution of the mean flow and its fluctuation

An ocean current can be broken down into two components, mean and fluctuation. Sect. 2.3 defines how the mean and fluctuation components are calculated (using Eq. (~~1~~2)). Examining the mean and fluctuation components of the current will help identify what processes drives the heat flux through the troughs (Fig. **??**). This section will compare LowResControl ~~, LowResDoubleMelt~~ and HighRes.

For the west coast of Greenland, MVBCT and DBT show that the mean flow is crucial for bringing heat on the shelf (Fig. **??**a and Fig. **??**c). For MVBCT (Fig. **??**b) the fluctuation component is negligible, approximately 0 TW with the mean component reaching a maximum of ~ 13 TW ~~. LowResDoubleMelt transports just under 10 and LowResControl closer to~~ in the HighRes. LowResControl total (mean and fluctuation) onshore heat flux correlates well with the HighRes with a value of 0.84 (Table 3). LowResControl transport is lower and reaches it's peak of approximately 7 TW at the end of 2012. ~~More GrIS melt brings more mean onshore heat flux through the majority of the period.~~ From the end of 2005 the arrival of the heat flux occurs at the end of the year, consistent with Fig. **??**a.

With DBT (Fig. **??**d), the fluctuation component is less than the mean component. The maximum absolute value of the fluctuation heat flux is 1.3 TW and the maximum absolute value of the mean heat flux is 11 TW. Mean peaks occurred throughout the period with interannual variability, with a maximum in July and August in 2004 to 2007 and at the end of the year ~~, consistent with Fig. **??**b. For all experiments, at the end of 2004 and 2005, there was a peak in onshore mean heat flux.~~

However the (November) in 2007 to 2010, 2013 and 2014 (in October). LowResControl total (mean and fluctuation) onshore heat flux does not have a strong correlation with the HighRes with a value of 0.54 (Table 3). The maximum onshore heat flux in HighRes, in 2004 and 2011 is 11 TW . HighRes resolves smaller scale features, which may prove to be important in determining the heat flux into the trough. and 7 TW for LowResControl in 2004. The summation of yearly heat flux of MBVCT and DBT is 96 % higher in the HighRes than the LowResControl (Table ??). This maybe as seen in Section 2.4 (Fig.??), that the HighRes resolves about a $1\,°C$ warmer water mass at Davis Strait than compared to observations (Curry et al., 2014).

The south-east Greenland trough, HGT2, shows that the fluctuation component has transports between 0 TW to ~ 4 TW in HighRes (~ 2.5 TW in LowResControl) of onshore heat flux (Fig. ??f). The fluctuation is crucial for bringing heat onto the shelf especially for HighRes, as there is a large mean offshore heat flux through the study period (Fig. ??e). LowResControl total (mean and fluctuation) onshore heat flux correlates well with the HighRes with a value of 0.77 (Table 3). For LowResControl the offshore heat flux ranges from -15 to 5 TW, where HighRes ranges from -30 to 0 TW . It is due to the mean velocity, normal to the section, that is driving the offshore heat exchange. The fluctuation component of the flow having an impact on the control of the oceanic heat is consistent with studies that have looked at strong wind events in this region bringing warm waters to the coast (Christoffersen et al., 2011). How winds may impact the ocean heat flux will be discussed later in this section.

For KT, both the mean component and fluctuation component contribute to the onshore heat flux similarly in both LowRes experiments (LowResControl and LowResDoubleMelt) LowResControl and HighRes (Fig. ??g and Fig. ??h). There was variability with on and offshore pulses with the mean and fluctuation components, though the fluctuation is larger for HighRes than the LowRes experimentsLowResControl. LowResControl onshore heat flux correlates well with the HighRes with a value of 0.71 (Table 3). For HighRes, the mean onshore heat flux reaches a maximum at the end of 2004 and 2014 with values of approximately 14 TW, whereas the LowRes experiments LowResControl reaches about 7 TW and 7 in those years.

It is interesting to note the differences between HGT2 and KT, in HighRes, since they are located in close proximity to each other. The summation of yearly heat flux of HGT2 and KT is 4 % higher in the HighRes than the LowResControl (Table ??). Therefore, overall there is not a large change in HighRes vs LowResControl.

In the north-east at SBST (Fig. ??i) varying the meltwater or the resolution does not impact the mean onshore heat flux. LowResControl total (mean and fluctuation) onshore heat flux correlates well with the HighRes with a value of 0.74 (Table 3).The fluctuation of the heat flux (Fig. ??j) has little contribution onshore for most of the study period, though there is an increase from $\sim \pm 2$ TW at the end of 2010 in HighResand ± 2.5 in 2016 in LowResDoubleMelt. However, the mean onshore heat flux component is consistently higher for all simulations throughout the study period with peaks of ~ 10 TW in 2005. Peaks in the mean onshore heat flux occurs at the end of each year following into the beginning of the next year, consistent with the seasonality shown in Fig. ??em.

Further north at NT (Fig. ??k), the LowResControl total (mean and fluctuation) correlations strongly with the HighRes with a value of 0.92 (Table 3). The mean component dominates over the fluctuation component for onshore heat flux. The mean component carries heat offshore as well with values reaching over -3 TW compared to ~ 0.5 TW onshore. The fluctuation component also contributes to carrying heat towards the shelf, with values reaching ~ 0.2 TW (Fig. ??l). The annual

summation of onshore heat flux for the north-east coast (SBST and NT) is 9 % higher in the HighRes than the LowResControl (Table ??).

To see what is happening further off shelf, a section was drawn called NToff (Fig. ??). ~~Now there~~ LowResControl total (mean and fluctuation) correlates strongly with the HighRes with a value of 0.92 (Table 3). There exists stronger onshore pulses of the mean heat flux (values reach 2 TW or up to as high at 4 TW) (Fig. ??m). Most onshore mean heat flux pulses occur at the end of each year though maximums of 4 TW occurred at the beginning of 2005, and end of 2011 into 2012. Like in NT, the mean heat flux still contributes to the offshore component. There is not much different between the fluctuation of the heat flux between NT and NToff (Fig. ??n).

The percent difference of the annual summation of the onshore heat through NToff verus NT is 5.3 % ~~, and~~ 6.5 % ~~, and 6.3 % for HighRes , LowResDoubleMelt, and~~ for HighRes an LowResControl, respectively. Therefore, NToff has more heat travelling through the section than NT. This may be to do the deepening off shelf allowing for warm waters to enter this region, and not closer to the shelf where the bathymetry shallows.

The correlation of the heat flux between the HighRes and LowResControl for most troughs is high (NT and NToff greater than 0.9, MVBCT greater than 0.8, and HGT, KT, and SBST greater than 0.7, see Table 3). The LowResControl compared well with observations (see Section 2.4). As running several high resolution experiments are computational expensive (such as HighRes) compared to lower resolution configurations (such as LowResControl), the LowResControl has been used for the sensitivity experiments (Section 3.3 and Section 3.4).

3.3 Impact of enhanced Greenland meltwater

Through each section, the annual average onshore heat flux and the total onshore heat flux was calculated for the study period (2004 to 2016). A comparison between the experiments were made for each sector (west includes Melville Bay, Disko Bay, south-east includes Helheim and Kangerdlussuaq, north-east includes Scoresby Sund, 79NG sections) (Table ??). With double the meltwater, the west sector had a 37 % increase in onshore heat flux. It appears that this mechanism (increase of heat flux with an increase in meltwater) is not as strong or reproduced in any other sector (-5 % and 9 % for south-east and north-east sectors).

For Melville Bay in LowResControl (Fig. ??a), a warm core of water exists at depths 100 m to 400 m, with a maximum (kilometre marker 500 km) in MVBST reaching almost $2\,^{\circ}C$. In LowResDoubleMelt (Fig. ??b), the warm water core temperature increased and MVBST reaches temperatures closer to $3\,^{\circ}C$. The cold water layer in LowResDoubleMelt thinned more than in the LowResControl. For Disko Bay, both deep troughs (UT and DBT) hold warmer water in LowResDoubleMelt ($3\,^{\circ}C$, Fig. ??d) than in LowResControl ($\sim 2\,^{\circ}C$, Fig. ??c). The maximum increase occurred in a warm core in both troughs, UT and DBT (at kilometre marker 150 km and 400 km), with a depth of 150 m to 350 m. The cooler water layer at the surface again thinned in LowResDoubleMelt (Fig. ??c). However, when examining average velocities normal to the section, for the entire period there was no clear trend that increasing the meltwater strengthens the velocities.

Previous studies, from a variety of scales of modelling, have shown that ~~addtional~~ additional freshwater can increase the presence of heat to a region. In the ocean, if GrIS melt increases, it may add more energetic plume dynamics along a glacier

face and increase the strength of the thermohaline circulation in fjords. Cai et al. (2017) showed in a 2–D model, ran for ~~on~~ one year, with ice shelf melt derived from observed melt rates for Petermann Glacier, that an increase in thermohaline circulation in the fjord can bring more heat and salt towards the ice sheet~~(Cai et al., 2017)~~. Castro de la Guardia et al. (2015) used a regional ocean model to set up eight sensitivity experiments, adjusting melt rates from the GrIS and ran for a period of 10 years. Grivault

5 et al. (2017) also used a regional ocean model, and had interannual runoff and had experiments run for a 40 year period. With an increase in the GrIS melt, the heat content increases in Baffin Bay (Castro de la Guardia et al., 2015; Grivault et al., 2017).

Of all the regions around Greenland, Baffin Bay is a unique system, as it responds to an increase in the GrIS melt in a different way than ~~any other region around Greenland~~ the two other regions around Greenland considered in this study. Identifying that ocean temperatures in troughs in Baffin Bay are indeed warming with increasing the GrIS melt provides

10 further support to ~~Castro de la Guardia et al. (2015) work but this study~~the work by Castro de la Guardia et al. (2015). This study, however, provides more realistic experiments and ~~detailed locations . Therefore in a climate change scenario, with the GrIS continuing to~~ analysis on specific locations concerning troughs which connect to fjords with large marine terminating glaciers. Therefore, with an increase in GrIS melt, Baffin Bay's ocean heat ~~may increase the most compared to other regions around Greenland~~content may increase. Thus increasing the potential for glaciers to continue to melt, impacting climate, SLR,

15 and ecosystems.

3.4 Impact of high frequency atmospheric events

A question of how the atmospheric variability may impact the region of HG for renewing heat from the shelf has been discussed in previous observational studies (Straneo et al., 2010; Christoffersen et al., 2011). ~~Section ?? showed that regions with less sea ice may have more sensitivity to atmospheric forcing, such as the region of the south-east.~~ How does filtering out storms,

20 where winds and the associated temperatures are impacted, affect the high variability in the south-east? A comparison of LowResControl and LowResNoStorms will be shown~~(where the atmospheric filter has been applied Sect. 2.2.4). .~~

Figure 12a shows the EKE integrated over the entire depth for the south-east region using ~~LowResNoStorms.~~LowResControl and Fig. 12b LowResNoStorms. A comparison was done for the north-west and north-east regions, however the south-east region has the highest EKE as well as stronger sensitivity with changes in atmospheric conditions than all other regions.

25 LowResControl (Fig. ~~??e~~12a) had EKE values reaching 4×10^{-3} m^2 s^{-2}. However, LowResNoStorms EKE peaks in magnitudes of

2.5×10^{-3} m^2 s^{-2}, i.e. turbulent energy is reduced by about half. ~~The bifurcation of the energy near~~ It is clear that the EKE decreases closer to HGT2 ~~is not as strong as it was for LowResControl .~~ where the bathymetry reaches depths of 500 m in the LowResControl (Fig. 12a). It appears that filtering out storms, decreases the EKE strength in the south-east region ~~.~~(Fig. 12b).

Figure 12~~b~~ c and Fig. 12~~c~~ d show the trend of mean heat flux and fluctuation of the heat flux on or off shelf component for HGT2 with the LowResNoStorms. The mean heat flux appears to be smaller in LowResNoStorms than LowResControl. The LowResNoStorms ~~fluctuation~~ mean component of the onshore heat flux reached values closer to 10 TW in 2004 to end of 2007. LowResControl had onshore heat flux values greater than 5 TW in 2004, 2010, 2015 and 2016. The fluctuation

component of the heat flux is smaller with the LowResNoStorms. Therefore , less storms decreases the fluctuation component of the heat flux and increases the mean component of the heat flux. Therefore, There is less mean winds from the north towards south and therefore less upper water Ekman transport towards the shelf and fjords. With less Ekman transport of deeper waters away from the fjords, the warm waters present within the deeper layers, therefore they can stay more easily within the fjord. As

5 a result, less storms may increase the overall onshore heat flux into HGT2, as the changes in mean values exceed the changes fluctuation values (~ 5 TW vs ~ 1 TW).

The summation of the onshore heat flux from 2004 to 2016 has been calculated and compared between LowResControl and LowResNoStorms. LowResNoStorms has a total of 2260.2 TW, and the LowResControl is ~ 18 % less, with a total of 1914.5 TW. This extra 345.7 TW could have the potential to melt 1037.1 kilotons of ice per second. Therefore this increase in total

10 onshore heat flux might be due to less heat being transferred off the shelf due to high variability atmospheric forcing.

3.5 Source of warm water reaching the marine terminating glaciers

West coast

As described in Sect. ??, the west coast of Greenland has fast marine terminating glaciers, such as Kong Oscar and JI. This study shows that the Irminger water's influence on the GrIS can extend far north into Baffin Bay, reaching Melville Bay and

15 its subsequent troughs. In Fig. ??a and Fig. ??b, Lagrangian trajectories show that warm waters (T>0° C, modified Atlantic water), sourced from the Irminger Sea, supplies heat to the west coast of Greenland. In both figures the highest probability (values greater than 0.1 %) of warm waters come directly from the troughs. Warm water in Melville Bay (Fig. ??a), was found to be sourced from the Irminger Sea, which had travelled via the WGC into Baffin Bay as West Greenland Irminger Water, as well as from north of Iceland, following the NwAC. These warm waters had travelled along the shelf of the south-east and

20 south-west Greenland, following the bathymetric features with the boundary currents to then reach the north-west coast of Greenland. There is a small likelihood that warm water found near Melville Bay would come from Fram Strait or the CAA. Further south on the north-west coast, near Disko Bay, Fig. ??b, warm water travelled a similar route as it did to reach Melville Bay. Warm water found north of Iceland has a higher probability to enter Disko Bay than it did to enter Melville Bay. This could be due to the timing of the five year trajectories, as the warm water reaching further north (to Melville Bay) will have

25 a longer distance to travel and endure more modification and cooling. It is evident that the Irminger Sea plays a vital role in sourcing heat to the west coast of Greenland, even in the far north of Baffin Bay (Straneo and Heimbach, 2013). Water mass changes and temperature fluctuations in the Iceland Sea may thus have more impact on glaciers that terminate into the fjord systems that reach Disko Bay and not further north into Melville Bay. Beyond the scope of this study would be to look how how the glaciers have been changing in the CAA and if warm water can be seen in the troughs or fjords in this region.

30 #### South-east coast

As described in Sect. ??, in the south-east region there are two large glaciers of interest HG and KG. The south-east coast of Greenland, where HG and KG are located, receives warm water differently than Baffin Bay. In Fig. ??c and Fig. ??e, it is

~~shown that the Irminger Sea plays a more indirect role in supplying heat to these regions. HG (Fig. **??**c) receives its warm water from the Iceland Sea with a higher probability of waters sourced through the Fram Strait. This warm water from Fram Strait has travelled via the NwAC along the shelf break into the Iceland Sea, then along the east coast along the shelf via the EGC, feeding into the troughs. There does exist a low percentage of warm water travelling north from the Irminger Sea towards~~
5 ~~the shelf, directly feeding into the troughs towards Sermilik Fjord. Further north at KG, warm water has a very low likelihood that it will be supplied from south of Iceland. This is consistent with Azetsu-Scott and Tan (1997); **?**, that Irminger Current's influence diminishes north of $67°N$ due to Denmark Strait. HG is located $\sim 65°\,N$, and KG at $\sim 67°\,N$.~~

~~Warm waters that KG (Fig. **??**d) receives are sourced similarly as explained for HG, from the Fram Strait. Figure **??**d shows more clearly that the Fram Strait water is most likely recirculated Atlantic water that has travelled across the Iceland-Scotland~~
10 ~~Ridge and continued as the NwAC. The recirculated Atlantic water travelled south, shoaling and travelling onto the shelf to KG, and reaches the trough, KT, supplying the coast with warm water.~~

~~**North-east coast**~~

~~As described in Sect. **??**, in the north-east, Daugaard-Jensen Glacier terminates into Scoresby Sund and 79NG terminates into the sound of Jøkelbugten, north-east of Greenland. Scoresby Sund differs from the previously mentioned KG paths, as it is~~
15 ~~more defined (Fig. **??**e). This warm water has either been recirculated via NwAC and travelled through the Fram Strait, or is water from the Arctic which has travelled along the coast of Canada, another possible route of Pacific Water as seen in Hu and Myers (2013). If the warm water has been recirculated via NwAC it has travelled along the shelf break at a depth of $\sim$ 300 , and if it has travelled from the Arctic, this water travelled east, at a depth of $\sim$ 550 along the Canadian Shelf and into the Fram Strait.~~

20 ~~Warm water that travels to 79NG (seen in Fig. **??**f) follows the shallow bathymetry of the north-east Greenland shelf. Warm waters which have been fed through the Fram Strait are most likely to be received south through NT, as seen in Wilson and Straneo (2015); **?**. It appears that this location has the highest chance of receiving warm waters from the Arctic. It is possible that these warm waters may be sourced from the Arctic, being modified Atlantic waters or potentially the Pacific Water, by travelling through the Arctic via the transpolar route (Hu and Myers, 2013; **?**). This highlights the importance of~~
25 ~~ocean properties in the Fram Strait and how they may impact marine terminating glaciers on the north-east coast. Therefore, a change in water mass at this location may impact the marine terminating glaciers on the north-east and east coast of Greenland.~~

4   Conclusions

The oceanic heat available in Greenland's troughs is dependent on both the location of the trough, variability of the warm water
30   origin, how the water is transformed as it travels to the troughs, as well as local processes occurring, such as heat loss to the atmosphere. It is important to understand the processes that bring this warm water to the shelf and into the troughs, as this water can be then exchanged into the fjords. Warm water that exists in fjords ~~create~~ creates an oceanic heat forcing on the marine ter-

minating glaciers ~~(Cai et al., 2017; Rignot et al., 2016b; Wood et al., 2018)~~(Rignot et al., 2016b; Cai et al., 2017; Wood et al., 2018) . To our knowledge this is the first look at changes in heat flux in troughs that are connected to fjords with marine terminating glaciers.

This study showed that the presence of warm water at depth can extend far north into Baffin Bay, reaching as north as Melville Bay and its subsequent troughs. The study's model experiments showed that Melville Bay troughs experienced ~~a warming following 2009.~~ an increased heat flux. Therefore an increase in ocean heat presence in these troughs may have driven more heat to glaciers that terminate here. In 2004 to 2006, model experiments captured an increase in onshore heat flux in DBT, coinciding with the timing of the disintegration of JI floating tounge and ~~observed ocean heat increase in Disko Bay~~ within the period of observed oceanic heat increase Disko Bay (from 1997 to 2007) (Holland et al., 2008).

~~This study showed that the Irminger water can extend far north into Baffin Bay, reaching as north as Melville Bay and its subsequent troughs. The Irminger water's influence on the east coast of the GrIS diminishes north of $\sim 67^\circ N$ (as Azetsu-Scott and Tan (1997); ? have shown) . Warm waters are replaced by sources from Fram Strait either of recirculated Atlantic Water via Nordic Seas as Wilson and Straneo (2015); ? have seen and or Pacific Water, which other studies have shown, exported through Fram Strait (?Hu and Myers, 2013; ?).~~

Seasonality of the maximum onshore heat flux through troughs around the GrIS differs due to distance away from the ~~original warm water source~~the Irminger Sea. The seasonality of the maximum onshore heat flux through all six regions were presented. For the Irminger Current influence the peaks begin: June for HGT2, July for DBT and September for MVBCT. Then for the areas receiving warm water from the NwAC: August for KT, November for SBS, and September to January for NT.

The ~~EKE was shown to have the highest values along shelf breaks and changes in bathymetry. This study found that the~~ south-east region has the highest ~~values of EKE . Weak EKE off the north-west and north-east coast may be due to semi-permanent sea ice cover. This study also found that Baffin Bay troughs (MVBCT and DBT) and SBST received onshore heat flux through the mean component of the ocean flow. South-east Greenland troughs (HGT2 and KT) and NT received onshore heat flux through the fluctuation component of the ocean flow. NToff receives more onshore heat flux than NT due to having deeper bathymetry offshore.~~

~~The south-east region has the highest EKE~~ EKE as well as stronger sensitivity with changes in atmospheric conditions than all other regions. ~~Therefore the~~ The south-east coast of Greenland is impacted the most by the atmospheric filter (i.e. no storms). No storms resulted in a reduction of EKE (~ 50 %) and less offshore heat transport and therefore more heat flux ($\sim$ 20 %) through the Helheim glacier trough (HGT2).

It is imperative to try to understand how sensitive the ocean is to additional meltwater from Greenland. Baffin Bay is a unique system, as it responds to an increase in the GrIS melt in a different way than any other region around Greenland. Baffin Bay troughs will bring more heat (~ 40 %) towards the GrIS if the GrIS freshwater flux doubles. This study shows that a doubling of the GrIS melt may cause a warming in Baffin Bay and an increase in heat flux through troughs, potentially escalating the melt of the GrIS, consistent with Castro de la Guardia et al. (2015) but now in a more realistic set–up with Greenland meltwater temporally and spatially distributed.

Since ~~global or regional ocean models do~~ the model used in this study does not have the capability to resolve small scale processes such as fjord circulation, the exchange between fjords and troughs cannot be looked into. Instead, there is an assumption in place, that the water characteristics that exist in the troughs will match those in the fjords due to dynamics of cross shelf exchanges (Jackson et al., 2014; Sutherland et al., 2014). A warming of ocean heat in troughs may lead to a warming of ocean heat to fjords. Due to the model bathymetry under representing the depth of these troughs, this study may be underestimating the amount of ocean heat available to enter these troughs. ~~Ocean models should take advantage of recent bathymetric data sets to improve their models bathymetry such as BedMachineV3 (Morlighem et al., 2017). Beyond the scope of this study would be to look how the glaciers have been changing in the CAA and if warm water can be seen in the troughs or fjords in that region. Additionally, the study~~ The study only looked at the impact from the freshwater flux of the GrIS. The inclusion of an iceberg model coupled with an ocean model may give further insight to the heat and freshwater budget in regions of high GrIS discharge, such as explained in Marson et al. (2018).

Author contributions. L.G. and P.M. designed the study and L.G. carried it out. X.H. developed the model configuration and performed the simulations. L.G. prepared the manuscript with contributions from all co-authors. M.R. and C.L. provided comments on the manuscript, with C.L. also provided Davis Strait transport data.

Competing interests. No competing interest are present.

Disclaimer. TEXT

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank Yarisbel Garcia Quintana for carrying out the LowResNoStorm experiment. We ~~would like to thank the Compute Canada staff for providing and maintaining the high performance computing system which our simulations took place on.~~ are grateful to the NEMO development team and the Drakkar project for providing the model and continuous guidance, and to Westgrid and Compute Canada for computational resources, where all model experiments were performed and archived (http://www.computecanada.ca). We gratefully acknowledge the financial and logistic support of grants from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) of Canada. These include Discovery Grant (rgpin227438) awarded to Dr. P.G. Myers, Climate Change and Atmospheric Research Grant (VITALS - RGPCC 433898), and an International Create (ArcTrain - 432295). The author would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments and suggestions that have contributed to improving this paper.

References

Aagaard, K. and Carmack, E. C.: The role of sea ice and other fresh water in the Arctic circulation, Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans, 94, 14 485–14 498, https://doi.org/10.1029/JC094iC10p14485, 1989.

Aksenov, Y., Bacon, S., Coward, A. C., and Holliday, N. P.: Polar outflow from the Arctic Ocean: A high resolution model study, Journal of Marine Systems, 83, 14 – 37, https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jmarsys.2010.06.007, 2010.

Amante, C. and Eakins, B.: ETOPO1 1 Arc-Minute Global Relief Model: Procedures, Data Sources and Analysis, NOAA Technical Memorandum NESDIS NGDC-24, https://doi.org/10.7289/V5C8276M, 2009.

An, L., Rignot, E., Elieff, S., Morlighem, M., Millan, R., Mouginot, J., Holland, D. M., Holland, D., and Paden, J.: Bed elevation of Jakobshavn Isbrae, West Greenland, from high-resolution airborne gravity and other data, Geophysical Research Letters, 44, 3728–3736, https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GL073245, http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2017GL073245, 2017GL073245, 2017.

Arrigo, K. R., van Dijken, G. L., Castelao, R. M., Luo, H., Rennermalm, s. K., Tedesco, M., Mote, T. L., Oliver, H., and Yager, P. L.: Melting glaciers stimulate large summer phytoplankton blooms in southwest Greenland waters, Geophysical Research Letters, 44, 6278–6285, https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GL073583, https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2017GL073583, 2017.

Azetsu-Scott, K. and Tan, F. C.: Oxygen isotope studies from Iceland to an East Greenland Fjord: behaviour of glacial meltwater plume, Marine Chemistry, 56, 239 – 251, https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0304-4203(96)00078-3, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304420396000783, modern Chemical and Biological Oceanography: The Influence of Peter J. Wangersky, 1997.

Bacon, S., Marshall, A., Holliday, N. P., Aksenov, Y., and Dye, S. R.: Seasonal variability of the East Greenland Coastal Current, Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans, 119, 3967–3987, https://doi.org/10.1002/2013JC009279, 2014.

Bamber, J., Van Den Broeke, M., Ettema, J., Lenaerts, J., and Rignot, E.: Recent large increases in freshwater fluxes from Greenland into the North Atlantic, Geophysical Research Letters, 39, 2012.

Bamber, J. L., Griggs, J. A., Hurkmans, R. T. W. L., Dowdeswell, J. A., Gogineni, S. P., Howat, I., Mouginot, J., Paden, J., Palmer, S., Rignot, E., and Steinhage, D.: A new bed elevation dataset for Greenland, The Cryosphere, 7, 499–510, https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-7-499-2013, 2013.

Barnier, B., Brodeau, L., Le Sommer, J., Molines, J., Penduff, T., Theetten, S., Treguier, A. M., Madec, G., Biastoch, A., Bőning, C., Dengg, J., Gulev, S., Bourdallé, B. R., Chanut, J., Garric, G., Alderson, S., Coward, A., de Cuevas, B., New, A., Haines, K., Smith, G., Drijfhout, S., Hazeleger, W., Severijns, C., and Myers, P.: Eddy-permitting ocean circulation hindcasts of past decades, CLIVAR Exchanges, 12, 8–10, 2007.

Bartholomaus, T. C., Stearns, L. A., Sutherland, D. A., Shroyer, E. L., Nash, J. D., Walker, R. T., Catania, G., Felikson, D., Carroll, D., Fried, M. J., and et al.: Contrasts in the response of adjacent fjords and glaciers to ice-sheet surface melt in West Greenland, Annals of Glaciology, 57, 25–38, https://doi.org/10.1017/aog.2016.19, 2016.

Beaird, N., Straneo, F., and Jenkins, W.: Characteristics of meltwater export from Jakobshavn Isbræ and Ilulissat Icefjord, Annals of Glaciology, 58, 107–117, https://doi.org/10.1017/aog.2017.19, 2017.

Beaird, N. L., Straneo, F., and Jenkins, W.: Export of Strongly Diluted Greenland Meltwater From a Major Glacial Fjord, Geophysical Research Letters, 45, 4163–4170, https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL077000, https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2018GL077000, 2018.

Bernard, B., Madec, G., Penduff, T., Molines, J.-M., Treguier, A.-M., Le Sommer, J., Beckmann, A., Biastoch, A., Böning, C., Dengg, J., Derval, C., Durand, E., Gulev, S., Remy, E., Talandier, C., Theetten, S., Maltrud, M., McClean, J., and De Cuevas, B.: Impact of partial

steps and momentum advection schemes in a global ocean circulation model at eddy-permitting resolution, Ocean Dynamics, 56, 543–567, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10236-006-0082-1, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10236-006-0082-1, 2006.

Beszczynska-Möller, A., Fahrbach, E., Schauer, U., and Hansen, E.: Variability in Atlantic water temperature and transport at the entrance to the Arctic Ocean, 1997–2010, ICES Journal of Marine Science: Journal du Conseil, https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fss056, 2012.

5 ~~Blanke, B. and Raynaud, S.: Kinematics of the Pacific Equatorial Undercurrent: An Eulerian and Lagrangian approach from GCM results, Journal of Physical Oceanography, 27, 1038–1053, 1997.~~
~~Blanke, B., Arhan, M., Madec, G., and Roche, S.: Warm water paths in the equatorial Atlantic as diagnosed with a general circulation model, Journal of Physical Oceanography, 29, 2753–2768, 1999.~~

BODC: British Oceanographic Data Center's General Bathymetric Chart of the Oceans, 2008.

10 Boning, C. W., Behrens, E., Biastoch, A., Getzlaff, K., and Bamber, J. L.: Emerging impact of Greenland meltwater on deepwater formation in the North Atlantic Ocean, Nature Geosci, 9, 523–527, https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo2740, 2016.

Box, J. E.and Yang, L., Bromwich, D. H., and Bai, L.: Greenland Ice Sheet Surface Air Temperature Variability: 1840–2007, Journal of Climate, 22, 4029–4049, https://doi.org/10.1175/2009JCLI2816.1, 2009.

Cai, C., Rignot, E., Menemenlis, D., and Nakayama, Y.: Observations and modeling of ocean-induced melt beneath Petermann Glacier
15 Ice Shelf in northwestern Greenland, Geophysical Research Letters, https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GL073711, http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2017GL073711, 2017.

Carroll, D., Sutherland, D. A., Curry, B., Nash, J. D., Shroyer, E. L., Catania, G. A., Stearns, L. A., Grist, J. P., Lee, C. M., and de Steur, L.: Subannual and Seasonal Variability of Atlantic-Origin Waters in Two Adjacent West Greenland Fjords, Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans, 123, 6670–6687, https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JC014278, https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.
20 1029/2018JC014278, 2018.

Castro de la Guardia, L., Hu, X., and Myers, P. G.: Potential positive feedback between Greenland Ice Sheet melt and Baffin Bay heat content on the west Greenland shelf, Geophysical Research Letters, 42, 4922–4930, https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL064626, 2015.

Christoffersen, P., Mugford, R. I., Heywood, K. J., Joughin, I., Dowdeswell, J. A., Syvitski, J. P. M., Luckman, A., and Benham, T. J.: Warming of waters in an East Greenland fjord prior to glacier retreat: Mechanisms and connection to large-scale atmospheric conditions,
25 Cryosphere, 5, 701–714, 2011.

Csatho, B. M., Schenk, A. F., van der Veen, C. J., Babonis, G., Duncan, K., Rezvanbehbahani, S., van den Broeke, M. R., Simonsen, S. B., Nagarajan, S., and van Angelen, J. H.: Laser altimetry reveals complex pattern of Greenland Ice Sheet dynamics, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 111, 18 478–18 483, https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1411680112, http://www.pnas.org/content/111/52/18478, 2014.

30 Curry, B., Lee, C. M., and Petrie, B.: Volume, Freshwater, and Heat Fluxes through Davis Strait, 2004–05, Journal of Physical Oceanography, 41, 429–436, https://doi.org/10.1175/2010JPO4536.1, https://doi.org/10.1175/2010JPO4536.1, 2011.
~~Dai, A., Qian, T., Trenberth, K. E., and Milliman, J. D.: Changes in continental freshwater discharge from 1948 to 2004, Journal of Climate, 22, 2773–2792, 2009.~~
~~Dmitrenko, I. A., Kirillov, S. A., Rudels,~~

35 Curry, B., ~~Babb, D. G., Myers, P. G., Stedmon, C. A., Bendtsen, J., Ehn, J. K., Pedersen, L. T., Rysgaard, S., and Barber, D. G.: Variability of the Pacific-Derived Arctic Water Over the Southeastern Wandel Sea Shelf (Northeast Greenland) in 2015–2016~~ Lee, C., Petrie, B., Moritz, R., and Kwok, R.: Multiyear volume, liquid freshwater, and sea ice transports through Davis Strait, 2004-10, Journal of ~~Geophysical Research: Oceans, 124, 349–373, , , 2019.~~ Physical Oceanography, 44, 1244–1266, https://doi.org/10.1175/JPO-D-13-0177.1, 2014.

Dodd, P.

Dai, A., ~~Rabe, B., Hansen, E., Falck,~~ Qian, T., Trenberth, K. E., ~~Mackensen, A., Rohling, E., Stedmon, C., and Kristiansen, S.: The freshwater composition of the Fram Strait outflow derived from a decade of tracer measurements~~ and Milliman, J. D.: Changes in continental freshwater discharge from 1948 to 2004, Journal of ~~Geophysical Research: Oceans, 117, , , 2012.~~ Climate, 22, 2773–2792, 2009.

Dukhovskoy, D. S., Myers, P. G., Platov, G., Timmermans, M.-L., Curry, B., Proshutinsky, A., Bamber, J. L., Chassignet, E., Hu, X., Lee, C. M., and Somavilla, R.: Greenland freshwater pathways in the sub-Arctic Seas from model experiments with passive tracers, Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans, https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JC011290, 2016.

Eskridge, R. E., Ku, J. Y., Rao, S. T., Porter, P. S., and Zurbenko, I. G.: Separating Different Scales of Motion in Time Series of Meteorological Variables, Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 78, 1473–1484, https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477(1997)078<1473:SDSOMI>2.0.CO;2, https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477(1997)078<1473:SDSOMI>2.0.CO;2, 1997.

Felikson, D., Bartholomaus, T. C., Catania, G. A., Korsgaard, N. J., Kjær, K. H., Morlighem, M., Noël, B., van den Broeke, M., Stearns, L. A., Shroyer, E. L., Sutherland, D. A., and Nash, J. D.: Inland thinning on the Greenland Ice Sheet controlled by outlet glacier geometry, Nature Geoscience, 10, 366–369, https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo2934, 2017.

Fenty, I., Willis, J. K., Khazendar, A., Dinardo, S., Forsberg, R., Fukumori, I., Holland, D., Jakobsson, M., Moller, D., Münchow, J. M. A., Rignot, E., Schodlok, M., Thompson, A. F., Tinto, K., Rutherford, M., and Trenholm, N.: Oceans Melting Greenland: Early Results from NASA's Ocean-Ice Mission in Greenland , Oceanography, 29, https://doi.org/10.5670/oceanog.2016.100, 2016.

Ferry, N., Greiner, E., Garric, G., Penduff, T., Treiguier, A.-M., and Reverdin, G.: GLORYS-1 Reference Manual for Stream 1 (2002-2007), GLORYS project report, 2008.

Fichefet, T. and Morales Maqueda, M.: Sensitivity of a global sea ice model to the treatment of ice thermodynamics and dynamics, Journal of Geophysical Research, 102, 12 609–12 646, 1997.

Fratantoni, P. S. and Pickart, R. S.: The western North Atlantic shelfbreak current system in summer, Journal of Physical Oceanography, 37, 2509–2533, 2007.

~~Garcia Quintana~~

Garcia-Quintana, Y., Courtois, P., Hu, X., Pennelly, C., Kieke, D., and Myers, P. G.: Sensitivity of Labrador Sea Water formation to changes in model resolution, atmospheric forcing and freshwater input, Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans, 0, 2019.

Gillard, L. C., Hu, X., Myers, P. G., and Bamber, J. L.: Meltwater pathways from marine terminating glaciers of the Greenland Ice Sheet, Geophysical Research Letters, 43, 10,873–10,882, https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL070969, http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2016GL070969, 2016.

Gladish, C., Holland, D., and Lee, C.: Oceanic boundary conditions for Jakobshavn Glacier. Part II: Provenance and sources of variability of disko bay and Ilulissat Icefjord waters, 1990-2011, Journal of Physical Oceanography, 45, 33–63, https://doi.org/10.1175/JPO-D-14-0045.1, ~~2015.~~ 2015a.

Gladish, C., Holland, D., Rosing-Asvid, A., Behrens, J., and Boje, J.: Oceanic boundary conditions for Jakobshavn Glacier. Part I: Variability and renewal of Ilulissat Icefjord waters, 2001-14, Journal of Physical Oceanography, 45, 3–32, https://doi.org/10.1175/JPO-D-14-0044.1, 2015b.

Grivault, N., Hu, X., and Myers, P. G.: Evolution of Baffin Bay Water Masses and Transports in a Numerical Sensitivity Experiment under Enhanced Greenland Melt, Atmosphere-Ocean, 55, 169–194, https://doi.org/10.1080/07055900.2017.1333950, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07055900.2017.1333950, 2017.

Hogan, K. A., Cofaigh, C. ., Jennings, A. E., Dowdeswell, J. A., and Hiemstra, J. F.: Deglaciation of a major palaeo-ice stream in Disko Trough, West Greenland, Quaternary Science Reviews, 147, 5 – 26, https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quascirev.2016.01.018, http:

//www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0277379116300208, special Issue: PAST Gateways (Palaeo-Arctic Spatial and Temporal Gateways), 2016.

Holdsworth, A. M. and Myers, P. G.: The Influence of High-Frequency Atmospheric Forcing on the Circulation and Deep Convection of the Labrador Sea, Journal of Climate, 28, 4980–4996, https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-14-00564.1, https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-14-00564.

5   1, 2015.

Holland, D. M., Thomas, R. H., De Young, B., Ribergaard, M. H., and Lyberth, B.: Acceleration of Jakobshavn Isbrae triggered by warm subsurface ocean waters, Nature Geoscience, 1, 659–664, 2008.

Hu, X. and Myers, P. G.: A Lagrangian view of Pacific water inflow pathways in the Arctic Ocean during model spin-up, Ocean Modelling, 71, 66 – 80, https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ocemod.2013.06.007, 2013.

10   Inall, M. E., Murray, T., Cottier, F. R., Scharrer, K., Boyd, T. J., Heywood, K. J., and Bevan, S. L.: Oceanic heat delivery via Kangerdlugssuaq Fjord to the south-east Greenland Ice Sheet, Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans, 119, 631–645, https://doi.org/10.1002/2013JC009295, 2014.

Jackson, R. H., Straneo, F., and Sutherland, D. A.: Externally forced fluctuations in ocean temperature at Greenland glaciers in non-summer months, Nature Geoscience, 7, 503–508, 2014.

15   Jenkins, A.: Convection-driven melting near the grounding lines of ice shelves and tidewater glaciers, Journal of Physical Oceanography, 41, 2279–2294, 2011.

~~Jiskoot, H., Juhlin, D., St Pierre, H., and Citterio, M.: Tidewater glacier fluctuations in central East Greenland coastal and fjord regions (1980s-2005), Annals of Glaciology, 53, 35–44, , 2012.~~

Joughin, I., Alley, R. B., and Holland, D. M.: Ice-Sheet Response to Oceanic Forcing, Science, 338, 1172–1176,

20   https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1226481, 2012.

Karcher, M., Beszczynska-Möller, A., Kauker, F., Gerdes, R., Heyen, S., Rudels, B., and Schauer, U.: Arctic Ocean warming and its consequences for the Denmark Strait overflow, Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans, 116, https://doi.org/10.1029/2010JC006265, 2011.

Khazendar, A., Fenty, I. G., Carroll, D., Gardner, A. an Lee, C. M., Fukumori, I., Wang, O., Zhang, H., Seroussi, H., Moller, D., Noël, B. P. Y., van den Broeke, M. R., Dinardo, S., and Willis, J.: Interruption of two decades of Jakobshavn Isbrae acceleration and thinning as regional

25   ocean cools, Nature Geoscience, 12, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-019-0329-3, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-019-0329-3, 2019.

Luo, H., Castelao, R. M., Rennermalm, A. K., Tedesco, M., Bracco, A., Yager, P. L., and Mote, T. L.: Oceanic transport of surface meltwater from the southern Greenland Ice Sheet, Nature Geoscience, https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo2708, 2016.

Madec, G.: NEMO ocean engine, Note du Pole de modélisation, 2008.

Marson, J. M., Myers, P. G., Hu, X., and Le Sommer, J.: Using Vertically Integrated Ocean Fields to Characterize Greenland Icebergs' Distri-

30   bution and Lifetime, Geophysical Research Letters, 45, 4208–4217, https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL077676, https://agupubs.onlinelibrary. wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2018GL077676, 2018.

Mayer, C., Reeh, N., Jung-Rothenhäusler, F., Huybrechts, P., and Oerter, H.: The subglacial cavity and implied dynamics under Nioghalvfjerdsfjorden Glacier, NE-Greenland, Geophysical Research Letters, 27, 2289–2292, https://doi.org/10.1029/2000GL011514, https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2000GL011514, 2000.

35   MEOM: Bathymetry ORCA0.25, http://servdap.legi.grenoble-inp.fr/meom/ORCA025-I/, 2013.

Moon, T., Joughin, I., and Smith, B.: Seasonal to multiyear variability of glacier surface velocity, terminus position, and sea ice/ice mélange in northwest Greenland, Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface, 120, 818–833, https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JF003494, https: //agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2015JF003494, 2015.

Morlighem, M., Williams, C. N., Rignot, E., An, L., Arndt, J. E., Bamber, J. L., Catania, G., Chauché, N., Dowdeswell, J. A., Dorschel, B., Fenty, I., Hogan, K., Howat, I., Hubbard, A., Jakobsson, M., Jordan, T. M., Kjeldsen, K. K., Millan, R., Mayer, L., Mouginot, J., Noël, B. P. Y., O'Cofaigh, C., Palmer, S., Rysgaard, S., Seroussi, H., Siegert, M. J., Slabon, P., Straneo, F., van den Broeke, M. R., Weinrebe, W., Wood, M., and Zinglersen, K. B.: BedMachine v3: Complete Bed Topography and Ocean Bathymetry Mapping of Greenland From Multibeam Echo Sounding Combined With Mass Conservation, Geophysical Research Letters, 44, 11,051–11,061, https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GL074954, https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2017GL074954, 2017.

Myers, P. G. and Ribergaard, M. H.: Warming of the polar water layer in Disko Bay and potential impact on Jakobshavn Isbrae, Journal of Physical Oceanography, 43, 2629–2640, 2013.

Myers, P. G., Donnelly, C., and Ribergaard, M. H.: Structure and variability of the West Greenland Current in Summer derived from 6 repeat standard sections, Progress in Oceanography, 80, 93–112, 2009.

Porter, D. F., Tinto, K. J., Boghosian, A., Cochran, J. R., Bell, R. E., Manizade, S. S., and Sonntag, J. G.: Bathymetric control of tidewater glacier mass loss in northwest Greenland, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 401, 40 – 46, https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2014.05.058, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0012821X14003744, 2014.

Rastner, P., Bolch, T., Mölg, N., Machguth, H., Le Bris, R., and Paul, F.: The first complete inventory of the local glaciers and ice caps on Greenland, The Cryosphere, 6, 1483–1495, https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-6-1483-2012, https://www.the-cryosphere.net/6/1483/2012/, 2012.

Ribergaard, M. H.: Oceanographic Investigations off West Greenland 2013, NAFO Scientific Council Documents, 14/001, 2014.

Rignot, E. and Kanagaratnam, P.: Changes in the velocity structure of the Greenland Ice Sheet, Science, 311, 986–990, 2006.

Rignot, E. and Mouginot, J.: Ice flow in Greenland for the International Polar Year 2008-2009, Geophysical Research Letters, 39, 2012.

Rignot, E., Fenty, I., Xu, Y., Cai, C., Velicogna, I., Cofaigh, C. ., Dowdeswell, J. A., Weinrebe, W., Catania, G., and Duncan, D.: Bathymetry data reveal glaciers vulnerable to ice-ocean interaction in Uummannaq and Vaigat glacial fjords, west Greenland, Geophysical Research Letters, 43, 2667–2674, https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL067832, http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2016GL067832, 2016GL067832, 2016a.

Rignot, E., Xu, Y., Menemenlis, D., Mouginot, J., Scheuchl, B., Li, X., Morlighem, M., Seroussi, H., den Broeke, M. v., Fenty, I., Cai, C., An, L., and Fleurian, B. d.: Modeling of ocean-induced ice melt rates of five west Greenland glaciers over the past two decades, Geophysical Research Letters, 43, 6374–6382, https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL068784, https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2016GL068784, 2016b.

Schaffer, J., von Appen, W.-J., Dodd, P. A., Hofstede, C., Mayer, C., de Steur, L., and Kanzow, T.: Warm water pathways toward Nioghalvfjerdsfjorden Glacier, Northeast Greenland, Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans, 122, 4004–4020, https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JC012462, https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2016JC012462, 2017.

Seroussi, H., Morlighem, M., Rignot, E., Larour, E., Aubry, D., Ben Dhia, H., and Kristensen, S. S.: Ice flux divergence anomalies on 79north Glacier, Greenland, Geophysical Research Letters, 38, https://doi.org/10.1029/2011GL047338, http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2011GL047338, l09501, 2011.

Slabon, P., Dorschel, B., Jokat, W., Myklebust, R., Hebbeln, D., and Gebhardt, C.: Greenland ice sheet retreat history in the northeast Baffin Bay based on high-resolution bathymetry, Quaternary Science Reviews, 154, 182 – 198, https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.quascirev.2016.10.022, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0277379116304930, 2016.

Smith, G. C., Roy, F., Mann, P., Dupont, F., Brasnett, B., Lemieux, J.-F., Laroche, S., and Bélair, S.: A new atmospheric dataset for forcing ice-ocean models: Evaluation of reforecasts using the Canadian global deterministic prediction system, Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society, 140, 881–894, 2014.

Smith, W. H. F. and Sandwell, D. T.: Global seafloor topography from satellite altimetry and ship depth soundings, Science, 277, 1957–1962, 1997.

Straneo, F.: Heat and freshwater transport through the central Labrador Sea, Journal of Physical Oceanography, 36, 606–628, 2006.

Straneo, F. and Heimbach, P.: North Atlantic warming and the retreat of Greenland's outlet glaciers, Nature, 504, 36–43, 2013.

5   Straneo, F., Hamilton, G., Sutherland, D., Stearns, L. A., Davidson, F., Hammill, M., Stenson, G. B., and A., R.: Rapid circulation of warm subtropical waters in a major glacial fjord in East Greenland, Nature Geosci, 3, 182–186),, 2010.

~~Straneo, F., Curry, R. G., Sutherland, D. A., Hamilton, G. S., Cenedese, C., Våge, K., and Stearns, L. A.: Impact of fjord dynamics and glacial runoff on the circulation near Helheim Glacier, Nature Geoscience, 4, 322–327, 2011.~~

Straneo, F., Sutherland, D. A., Holland, D., Gladish, C., Hamilton, G. S., Johnson, H. L., Rignot, E., Xu, Y., and Koppes, M.: Characteristics

10   of ocean waters reaching Greenland's glaciers, Annals of Glaciology, 53, 202–210, 2012.

Sutherland, D. A., Straneo, F., and Pickart, R. S.: Characteristics and dynamics of two major Greenland glacial fjords, Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans, 119, 3767–3791, 2014.

Swingedouw, D., Rodehacke, C. B., Olsen, S. M., Menary, M., Gao, Y., Mikolajewicz, U., and Mignot, J.: On the reduced sensitivity of the Atlantic overturning to Greenland Ice Sheet melting in projections: a multi-model assessment, Climate Dynamics, 2014.

15   van den Broeke, M. R., Enderlin, E. M., Howat, I. M., Kuipers Munneke, P., Noël, B. P. Y., van de Berg, W. J., van Meijgaard, E., and Wouters, B.: On the recent contribution of the Greenland Ice Sheet to sea level change, The Cryosphere, 10, 1933–1946, https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-10-1933-2016, https://www.the-cryosphere.net/10/1933/2016/, 2016.

Weijer, W., Maltrud, M. E., Hecht, M. W., Dijkstra, H. A., and Kliphuis, M. A.: Response of the Atlantic Ocean circulation to Greenland Ice Sheet melting in a strongly-eddying ocean model, Geophysical Research Letters, 39, 2012.

20   Williams, C. N., Cornford, S. L., Jordan, T. M., Dowdeswell, J. A., Siegert, M. J., Clark, C. D., Swift, D. A., Sole, A., Fenty, I., and Bamber, J. L.: Generating synthetic fjord bathymetry for coastal Greenland, The Cryosphere, 11, 363–380, https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-11-363-2017, https://www.the-cryosphere.net/11/363/2017/, 2017.

Wilson, N. J. and Straneo, F.: Water exchange between the continental shelf and the cavity beneath Nioghalvfjerdsbrae (79 North Glacier), Geophysical Research Letters, 42, 7648–7654, https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL064944, 2015.

25   Wood, M., Rignot, E., Fenty, I., Menemenlis, D., Millan, R., Morlighem, M., Mouginot, J., and Seroussi, H.: Ocean-Induced Melt Triggers Glacier Retreat in Northwest Greenland, Geophysical Research Letters, 45, 8334–8342, https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL078024, https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2018GL078024, 2018.

Zurbenko, I., Porter, P. S., Gui, R., Rao, S. T., Ku, J. Y., and Eskridge, R. E.: Detecting Discontinuities in Time Series of Upper-Air Data: Development and Demonstration of an Adaptive Filter Technique, Journal of Climate, 9, 3548–3560, https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-

30   0442(1996)009<3548:DDITSO>2.0.CO;2, https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442(1996)009<3548:DDITSO>2.0.CO;2, 1996.

The schematic shows how the model injects meltwater. The left side of the figure shows what the model cannot resolve. This includes a glacier, small scale melting from the glacier, and the plume dynamics that occurs along the face of the glacier. Our model resolves larger scale processes that occur along the coastline, therefore, injects the meltwater from the GrIS at the first ocean model layer at the surface, and then is mixed to a thickness of 10 . HighRes LowResControl HighRes minus LowResControl

West coast LowResControl (a) (b) (c)

South-east coast

(d) (e) (f) HighRes (b)

Figure 2. Monthly summation of total kinetic energy in Baffin Bay for two configurations, LowResControl and HighRes.

Figure 3. The schematic shows how the model injects meltwater. The left side of the figure shows what the model cannot resolve. This includes a glacier, small scale melting from the glacier, and the plume dynamics that occurs along the face of the glacier. Our model resolves larger scale processes that occur along the coastline, and therefore, injects the meltwater from the GrIS at the first ocean model layer at the surface, and then is mixed to a thickness of 10 m.

North-east coast

(a)

(b)

(c)

(ed)

(f) (g)

Figure 12. This figure shows ~~where~~ how filtering the ~~source of warm water comes from. The selected regions are shown~~ atmospheric forcing in ~~cyan in Fig~~LowResNoStorms, affects the turbluent areas. ~~??. The backward probability of five year transport of warm water with virtual particles (∼ 5000~~a) ~~. Initial positions are homogeneously distributed in space~~ and ~~time in each of~~ (b) shows the ~~six regions in~~ Eddy Kinetic Energy integrated over the ~~HighRes configuration~~entire depth at the south-east region of Greenland for LowResControl (a) and LowResNoStorms (b). ~~Plots~~The EKE here ~~show virtual particles released below 30 metres~~ is the average EKE for the period of 2004 to 2016. The thick dashed lines mark the ~~water column~~bathymetry at 250 m and the thin dashed line marks the 500 m depth. ~~Values here correspond to~~ (c) shows the ~~percentage out of all particles~~ mean heat flux and ~~grid cells that virtual particles can be found~~ (d) shows the fluctuation heat flux through Helheim Trough (HT) (location identified in ~~a given grid cell~~Fig. ??). The LowResNoStorms configuration in black solid lines, LowResControl configuration in red solid lines.

Simulation	Resolution	Runoff	Atmospheric forcing
LowResControl	$1/4^o$	50 % Greenland FWF	CGRF
HighRes	$1/12^o$	50 % Greenland FWF	CGRF
LowResDoubleMelt	$1/4^o$	**100 %** Greenland FWF	CGRF
LowResNoStorms	$1/4^o$	50 % Greenland FWF	CGRF **Filtered** winds and temperature

Table 1. ANHA-NEMO simulations used in this study. All experiments include interannual river discharge from Dai et al. (2009) except the Greenland region, which is obtained by the Greenland Freshwater Flux (FWF) ~~provides~~ provided by Bamber et al. (2012). All simulations use the same atmospheric forcing, CGRF (Smith et al., 2014), but with the winds and temperature filtered in the LowResNoStorms.

Correlations of Heat Flux in Troughs Along the GrIS		
Trough	**Volume Flux with Heat Flux**	**Average Temperature with Heat Flux**
MVBCT	0.92	0.93
DBT	0.43	0.93
HGT	0.91	-0.25
KT	0.83	0.89
SBST	-0.73	-0.76
NT	-0.99	0.81

Table 2. Correlations of the averaged volume flux, heat flux and temperature for the entire timeseries (shown in the black line in Fig. **??**) in troughs along the GrIS. The middle column shows the correlation between the volume flux and the heat flux and the column on the right shows the correlation between the average temperature across the section and the heat flux.

Troughs along the GrIS	Correlation between HighRes and LowResControl
MVBCT	0.84
DBT	0.54
HGT2	0.77
KT	0.71
SBST	0.74
NT	0.92
NToff	0.92

Table 3. This table shows the correlation of the total onshore heat flux summation of yearly heat (mean and fluctuation) fluxes from two configurations, HighRes, and LowResControl from 2004 to 2016. Troughs along the GrIS include Melville Bay Central Trough (MVBCT), Disko Bay Trough (DBT), Helheim Trough (HGT2), Kangerdlussuaq Trough (KT), Scoresby Sund Trough (SBST), Norske Trough (NT) and Norske Trough Off (NToff). These troughs can be identified in Fig. **??**.