Simulation of the current and future dynamics of permafrost near the northern limit of permafrost on the Qinghai–Tibet Plateau
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Abstract: Permafrost has been warming and thawing at a global scale with subsequent effects on the climate, hydrological, ecosystem and engineering system. However, the variation of permafrost thermal state in the northern lower limit of the permafrost zone (Xidatan) on the Qinghai–Tibetan Plateau (QTP) is unclear. To evaluate and project the permafrost changes, this study simulated the spatiotemporal dynamics of this marginal permafrost historically (1970–2019) based on the detailed investigation and monitoring datasets from 1987 in this study region, improved remote sensing–based Land Surface Temperature product (LST) and climate projections from Global Climate Model (GCM) outputs of Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 5 and 6 (CMIP5, CMIP6). Our model takes into consideration of phase change processes of soil pore water, thermal property difference between frozen and thawed soil, geothermal flux flow, and ground ice effect. The results indicate that 1) our model can consistently reproduce the vertical ground temperature profiles and
active layer thickness (ALT), is superior in recognizing permafrost boundaries, and would realistically capture the evolution of the permafrost thermal regime, 2) spatial distribution of permafrost and its thermal conditions over the study area were controlled by elevational with a strong influence of slope aspects, 3) from 1970 to 2019, the regional averaged means annual ground temperature (MAGT) had warmed by 0.49 °C in the continuous permafrost zone and 0.40 °C in the discontinuous permafrost zone, and the lowest elevation of permafrost boundary (on north-facing slopes) rose approximately 47 m, as well as the northern boundary of discontinuous permafrost has approximately retreated southwards 1-2 km, while the lowest elevation of permafrost boundary remains unchanged for continuous permafrost zone, 4) the warming rate in MAGT is projected to be slighter higher under Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSPs) than that of Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPs), but no distinct discrepancies in the areal extent of the continuous, discontinuous permafrost and seasonally frozen ground among SSP and RCP scenarios. This study highlights the slow delaying process in the response of mountain permafrost to a warming climate, especially in terms of the areal extent of permafrost distribution.

1 Introduction

Permafrost is one of the crucial components of the cryosphere that is sensitive to climate changes (Li et al., 2008; Nitze et al., 2018; Smith et al., 2022). Owing to its high elevation (mean elevation above 4000 m above sea level (a.s.l.)) and extreme cold climate, the Qinghai–Tibet Plateau (QTP) is the largest and highest elevational permafrost region (occupies a permafrost area of 1.06×10^6 km^2 or 40 % of the total area of the QTP) in the mid– to low– latitude regions on earth (Zhou et al., 2000; Yang et al., 2010; Zou et al., 2017; Zhao et al., 2020). Since the 20th century, climatic warming has been evident on the QTP, particularly in the permafrost regions, which has significantly impacted the permafrost, manifested by rising ground temperatures, increasing in ALT, thinning of permafrost, melting of ground ice, and disappearing of permafrost ultimately (Wang et al., 2000; Cheng and Wu, 2007; Wu et al., 2008; Jin et al., 2011; Li et al., 2012; Zhao et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2021). Changes in the permafrost conditions have substantial impacts on the hydrological process (Cheng et al., 2013; Zhao et al., 2019), energy exchange (Xiao et al., 2013; Hu et al., 2017), natural hazards (Hjort et al., 2022), carbon budgets (Schädel et al., 2016; Miner et
al., 2022; Hjort et al., 2022; Fewster et al., 2022), and ecological environments (Yi et al., 2014; Jin et al., 2021). Therefore, it has become an imperative issue of research programs on climate change impact to diagnose how and at what rate permafrost responds to global warming accurately, and it has prompted a great concern of geocryologists, cold regions engineers, and international society (IPCC, 2019).

The northern fringe on the continuous permafrost zone of QTP is exceptionally vulnerable to climatic variability, as characterized by permafrost and seasonally frozen ground coexistence, and a thicker active layer, much thinner and warmer permafrost in this region compared with permafrost in the interior of the QTP (Wu et al., 2005; Liu et al., 2020). Given the location of the northern lower limit of the continuous permafrost zone on the QTP, and on the other hand, detailed permafrost environmental investigation and monitoring here have been systematically conducted since 1987 (Zhao et al., 2021), and new information on remote sensing spatial products with a high resolution (e.g., Zou et al., 2014, 2017; Li et al., 2015b) is readily available so that the Xidatan constitutes an ideal region to assess the response of marginal permafrost to a warming climate. To aid infrastructure construction of the Qinghai–Tibetan Highway (QTH), some field investigations and borehole monitoring started in the late 1960s, and documented warming and thawing of permafrost have been striking in this study region (Jin et al., 2000, 2006; Cheng et al., 2007). However, there is little knowledge about the spatial variations, owing to the costly and challenging logistics of borehole installation in some remote areas (e.g., remote alpine mountain areas with steep and complex topography). Moreover, the high spatial heterogeneity (e.g., permafrost and seasonally frozen ground coexist) in parameters strongly influenced permafrost distribution (Cheng et al., 2004). A simple point observation to represent regional conditions is problematic. Therefore, it is hard to be accurately delineated the margin of the permafrost distribution by traditional cartographic techniques based on the limited field survey data, aerial photographs, satellite images as well as topographic features dataset (Ran et al., 2012; Zou et al., 2017). It highlighted the demand for a spatial study approach to achieve a realistic picture of permafrost distribution for further study of thermal state and dynamics in response to climate variability.

Models have the potential to overcome the shortage of in–situ monitoring and field surveying
in mapping permafrost conditions and change studies (Riseborough et al., 2008). A variety of models can be applied to the quantitative assessment of the response of marginal permafrost to the warming climate (Cheng et al., 1984; Li et al., 2008; Lawrence et al., 2012; Guo et al., 2016; Lu et al., 2017; Chang et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2019; Ni et al., 2021). However, most models are poor at interpreting marginal permafrost, especially true in the region of northern or southern permafrost boundaries, such as the Xidatan. This, in part, is attributed to the effect of local factors (e.g., topography, vegetation, snow cover, and thermal properties of the surface soil). Near the lower limit of permafrost, the permafrost and seasonally frozen ground coexist. High spatial heterogeneities of the land surface make it a challenging area for permafrost modeling (Cheng et al., 2004; Zou et al., 2017, Luo et al., 2018; Yin et al., 2021). Moreover, due to the lack of detailed field observations, most of the existing simulation results have not considered the effects of water phase change and historical climate as well as the thermal state of deep permafrost. Hence, there is a considerable discrepancy among their results on the timing, rate, and magnitude of permafrost degradation (Zhao et al., 2020; Smith et al., 2022). Which hardly makes us agree on a quantitative assessment of the response of marginal permafrost to the warm climate change. To address these issues, Sun et al. (2019) established a transient numerical heat conduction permafrost model in previous works, and it has successfully simulated the process and dynamics of the permafrost thermal regime from 1962 until the end of this century at a monitoring borehole (QT09) located in the Xidatan comprehensive observation site.

In this work, we try to upscale our model to whole areas, aiming to accurately simulate the spatial distribution and dynamics of mountain permafrost at a resolution of 1 km×1 km, for the current period of 1970–2019, and anticipate possible changes by 2100 under different climate change scenarios, forced by improved remote sensing-based spatial product (LST), and CMIP5 (under RCP 2.6, RCP4.5 and RCP8.5) and CMIP6 (under SSP1–2.6, SSP2–4.5, and SSP5–8.5) climate projections. Our model gives full consideration to the thermal property difference between frozen and thawed soil, the phase variations of the unfrozen water in frozen soil, the distribution of the ground ice, and geothermal heat flow. The model results were validated against considerable long-term continuous monitoring of soil temperatures at various depths, ALT, and observed permafrost distribution of boreholes as well as three existing permafrost distribution maps.
investigated in 1975, 2012, and 2016. Furthermore, changes in continuous and discontinuous permafrost zone in terms of the areal extent, northern boundary, and lower limits are analyzed first, and its characteristics (MAGT, permafrost table, permafrost base, and permafrost thickness) variation were investigated subsequently. Moreover, what is the difference in responses of continuous and discontinuous permafrost zone to climate change will also be discussed. We expect this study can realistically simulate the distribution of marginal permafrost on the QTP and quantitatively assess spatiotemporal dynamics of the thermal regime under current climate change, and reasonably anticipate possible changes for future diffident climate scenarios. The findings are fundamental prerequisites for a further reasonable understanding of the patterns and processes of permafrost degradation on a hinterland QTP or global scale, thus supporting policy–makers, the public, and researchers to develop strategies for the cold regions in environmental management, hazard mitigation, adaptation, stability of engineering foundations design, conservation of land and water resources, etc.

2 Study area, materials and methods

2.1 Study area

The study focuses on the Xidatan of QTP, situated in a narrow down–faulted basin at the northern foot of the Eastern Kunlun Mountains within the northern limit of the permafrost on the QTP (Fig. 1a). The region encompasses a land area of ~220 km² and is characterized by discontinuous permafrost (Wu et al., 2005; Liu et al., 2020; Yin et al., 2021). Some periglacial landforms such as block fields, stripes, and stone rings have developed in the mountainous terrain (Luo et al., 2018), and several glaciers extend from the peaks of the East Kunlun Mountains downwards along the valley in the southern area (Fig. 1b). The elevation varies from 4100 m a.s.l. in the east to 5700 m a.s.l. in the west, and topographic relief in the majority (~90 %) is minimal (slopes lower than 5°) with some exceptions in mountainous areas. The plant community composition is mainly dominated by sparse alpine steppe, and the alpine desert consists of more than 10 m thick soil layer of gravel, fluvial sand, and silt (Wang et al., 2000; Jin et al., 2000; Yue et al., 2013; Yin et al., 2021), but most parts of the ground surface are dry and almost barren (Fig. 1b–g). According to the observations in the comprehensive experimental station (Fig. 1b), from 2004
to 2018, the mean annual air temperature and mean annual precipitation were -3.6 °C and 384.5 mm, respectively, and in 2017, permafrost thickness was approximately 26 m, with the MAGT at the depths of zero annual amplitude (ZAA, where the annual difference in ground temperature is less than 0.1 °C) was approximately -0.66 °C, and ALT is about 1.60 m (Zhao et al., 2021).

Figure 1. Geographical location of the Xidatan on the QTP, and its topography as well as the location of 24 borehole sites (a). Surface condition at monitoring borehole sites in the study area (b–g): view over the Xidatan comprehensive observation site (b), QT09, view towards the southern (c), QT09, view towards the northeast (d), view from the vicinity of QT09 towards the east (e), XD2–1–2–7, view towards the south (f), XD1–1–1–6, view towards the east (g) (the spatial distribution of permafrost is derived from Zou et al. (2017); contour line elevations were generated from the Digital Elevation Model constructed (DEM) from the Shuttle Radar Topography Missions (SRTM) with a 1-arcsecond (~30 m) (Jarvis et al., 2008), all photographs were taken during the field investigation from 23 Jul. 2021 to 2 Aug. 2021).

2.2 Materials

2.2.1 Field monitoring and borehole observation datasets

There are fifteen monitoring boreholes with long–term temperature observations established in the Xidatan (Fig. 1a). A comprehensive experimental station is located in the central part of the Xidatan, where the ground surface is composed of sparse dry alpine meadows with numerous bared
areas, and the soil layer is made of fluvial sand and gravel (Fig. 1b). A monitoring borehole QT09 (30 m in depth at 4538 m a.s.l.) and an automatic weather station (AWS) had automatically recorded long-term observed basic meteorological elements (May. 2004–Dec. 2018), the soil moisture content in the active layer (Oct. 2009–Dec. 2018), and soil temperature at various depths (Jan. 2005–Dec. 2017). Approximately 4 km from the comprehensive experimental station, another 30 m depth borehole BT01 (4530 m a.s.l.) was drilled in sparse dry steppe with considerable coarse sand and gravel on the surface, where the soil temperature measurements were taken continuously at depths of 0.5 to 30 m span from 2004 to 2017. In these two sites, the soil moisture content in shallow layers (<1.1 m) observed ranged from 4 to 11 % and from 15 to 39 %, respectively, and the organic matter content of 4.2 % and 1.68 %, respectively (Liu et al., 2020).

In addition, thirteen boreholes from 8 to 15 m in depth (XD1–1~XD1–6, XD2–1~XD2–7) were drilled along parallel altitudinal transects at the east (3.15 km length) and west (3.86 km length) part of the Xidatan in Aug. 2012 (Luo et al., 2018). The soil temperature records are available at thirteen borehole locations covering the period Nov. 2012 to Sept. 2017. The six boreholes (XD1–1~XD1–6) exist in dry and sparse grassland on the eastern altitudinal transect between 4368 m a.s.l. and 4380 m a.s.l. (Fig. 1g), among which the XD1–1~XD1–4 boreholes are all 15 m in deep, and the two other boreholes (XD1–5~XD1–6) are 8 m in depth. A frozen layer has been observed in the five uppermost boreholes (XD1–1~XD1–5) while was absent in the lowermost borehole XD1–6 (Luo et al., 2018). Similarly, seven boreholes were drilled at the western side of the Xidatan, resulting in an altitudinal transect from 4490 m a.s.l. (on the north) down to 4507 m a.s.l. (on the south). The first three boreholes XD2–1 to XD2–3 as well as XD2–6 borehole were drilled 15 m into sparse grassland while river erosion area in the sand–rich sediment at boreholes XD2–4, XD2–5, and XD2–7, with 15 m, 15 m, and 8 m in depth, respectively (Fig. 1e). The ground temperature monitoring results showed that permafrost existed in boreholes XD2–1 to XD2–3 and XD2–6, but there is no permafrost in boreholes XD2–4 to XD2–5 and XD2–7 (Luo et al., 2018; Yin et al., 2021).

The air temperature (height of 2, 5, and 10 m) and the volumetric unfroze water content in the active layer data were recorded, respectively, by a CR1000/CR3000 data acquisition instrument (Campbell Scientific Inc., USA, with ± 0.5 °C accuracy), and by a hydra–soil moisture sensor.
connecting to a CR1000 datalogger (Campbell Scientific, USA, with an accuracy of ± 2.5 %). A
cable equipped with 20 to 30 high accuracy (± 0.1 °C) thermistors (SKLFSE, CAREERI, CAS)
chain is connected to a CR3000/CR1000 (Campbell Scientific, Logan, UT, USA) data loggers and
vertically arranged at depths from 0 to 30 m (the depths are not the same for all sites, details see
Table 1). The ground temperature has been recorded automatically every 1 or 4 h at different
horizons. For more detailed description of the dataset as well as the thermistor set up and
installations can be found in Luo et al. (2018) and Zhao et al. (2021). Before further proceeding, the
values which are clearly an error in the sensor were identified and cleared, and the outliers were
replaced with valued generated by the data before and after (see Zhao et al. (2021) for more details
on the quality control procedures). Then, the data are re–sampled for the daily average used to
calibrate and validate the model performance. The spatial distribution of these borehole sites is
displayed in Fig. 1a, and the crucial information about these boreholes employed for model
calibration and validation is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. A list of monitoring boreholes in the study area and a summary of the ground properties are shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borehole</th>
<th>Coordinates</th>
<th>Sensor depths (m)</th>
<th>Frozen ground type</th>
<th>Soil stratigraphy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QT09</td>
<td>35°43'02&quot;N 94°07'05&quot;W</td>
<td>0.5–5 m (0.5 m intervals)</td>
<td>Permafrost</td>
<td>0.5–0.2 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5–20 m (1 m intervals)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy loam (0.2–1.4 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20–30 m (2 m intervals)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy with gravel (1.4–2.4 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rock (10–21 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy loam (0–1.2 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sand (1.3–3 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sand with gravel (3–10 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weathered mudstone (&gt;10 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB01</td>
<td>35°43'00&quot;N 94°04'09&quot;W</td>
<td>Same as QT09</td>
<td>Permafrost</td>
<td>0.5–10 m (0.5 m intervals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fluvial sand (4.5–15 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XD1–1</td>
<td>35°41'55&quot;N 94°12'05&quot;W</td>
<td>0.5–10 m (0.5 m intervals)</td>
<td>Permafrost</td>
<td>10–15 m (1 m intervals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fluvial sand (4.5–15 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XD1–2</td>
<td>35°41'59&quot;N 94°12'07&quot;W</td>
<td>Same as XD1–1</td>
<td>Permafrost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fluvial sand (5–15 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XD1–3</td>
<td>35°42'04&quot;N 94°12'07&quot;W</td>
<td>Same as XD1–1</td>
<td>Permafrost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fluvial sand (5.5–15 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XD1–4</td>
<td>35°42'10&quot;N 94°12'07&quot;W</td>
<td>Same as XD1–1</td>
<td>Permafrost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fluvial sand (5.5–10 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XD1–5</td>
<td>35°42'16&quot;N 94°12'08&quot;W</td>
<td>0.5–8 m (0.5 m intervals)</td>
<td>Permafrost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fluvial sand (4.5–8 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sand (0–2.5 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sand with massive ground ice (2.5–7 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clay (7–9 m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Weathered mudstone (9–15 m)  
Sand (0–2.8 m)  
Sand with massive ground ice (2.5–6 m)  
Weathered mudstone (6–15 m)  
Sand cobble (0–4 m)  
Fluvial sand (4–15 m)  
Sandy cobble (4–8 m)  
Sandstone (4–8 m)

Table 2. Calibration thermophysical parameters of different soil layers used for soil temperature modeling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texture</th>
<th>K (W m⁻¹ °C⁻¹)</th>
<th>C (kJ m⁻³ °C⁻¹)</th>
<th>VWC (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frozen</td>
<td>Thawed</td>
<td>Frozen</td>
<td>Thawed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Loam    | 1.25–1.57       | 0.85–1.28       | 1639–1879 | 2208–2475 | 15–20  

Note: The symbol--is field-observed frozen ground types collected from previously published literature (Wang et al., 2000; Jin et al., 2000,2006; Cheng et al., 2007).
Clay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0.83–1.30</th>
<th>0.61–1.03</th>
<th>1756–1907</th>
<th>1881–2191</th>
<th>15–20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandy loam</td>
<td>1.31–1.93</td>
<td>1.17–1.71</td>
<td>1844–2107</td>
<td>2258–2634</td>
<td>10–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loamy sand</td>
<td>1.02–1.38</td>
<td>1.11–1.24</td>
<td>2040–2208</td>
<td>2541–2676</td>
<td>15–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand cobble</td>
<td>1.0–1.29</td>
<td>0.89–1.10</td>
<td>1639–1739</td>
<td>2007–2208</td>
<td>13–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial sand</td>
<td>1.32–1.60</td>
<td>1.09–1.30</td>
<td>1288–1413</td>
<td>1568–1819</td>
<td>6–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>1.86–2.15</td>
<td>1.48–1.64</td>
<td>1505–1639</td>
<td>1940–2208</td>
<td>10–14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>0.94–1.91</td>
<td>0.77–1.47</td>
<td>1317–1459</td>
<td>1493–1777</td>
<td>2–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand with Gravel</td>
<td>1.91–2.20</td>
<td>1.47–1.68</td>
<td>1459–1601</td>
<td>1777–2061</td>
<td>6–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weathered mudstone</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1543</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $K$ is the thermal conductivity; $C$ is the volumetric heat capacity; as well as VWC represents total volumetric water/ice content.

2.2.2 Official meteorological observations

The observed temperature dataset from China Meteorological Administration (CMA) ground–based meteorological stations were used to extend the land surface temperature (LST) series since the 1970s. For that, observed daily mean air temperature data for the 1970 to 2019 period at two AWS of CMA nearby (Wudaoliang: 35°13′ N, 93°05′ E and Golmud: 36°25′ N, 94°55′ E) was downloaded from China Meteorological Data Sharing Service System (http://data.cma.cn/).

2.2.3 Remotely sensed land surface temperature datasets

Modified Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometers Land Surface Temperature (MODIS LST) product is used to force transient heat flow model at spatially modeling alpine permafrost distribution. The MODIS onboard the Terra and Aqua satellites have provided LST measurements at a spatial resolution of 1 km×1 km since 2003, respectively (https://modis.gsfc.nasa.gov/). Here, we employ clear–sky MOD11A2 (Terra MODIS) and MYD11A2 (Aqua MODIS) products (processing version 6), which contain two night–time measurements per day for the same pixel (Zou et al., 2017). Before proceeding, time series of irregularly spaced observations owing to clouds or other factors were identified, and gaps were filled by the Harmonic Analysis Time-Series (HANTS) algorithm (Obu et al., 2019). And an empirical model (Zou et al., 2014, 2017) was subsequently established to get mean daily values from Aqua and...
Terra daytime and night time transient LST, and the model validation showed perfect well over the Xidatan, with $R^2$ above 0.9. Details of these algorithms can be found in Xu et al. (2013) and Zou et al. (2014).

### 2.2.4 Additional validation datasets

The comprehensive investigation of permafrost and its environments in the Xidatan has been conducted in 1975 and 2012, respectively (Nan et al., 2003; Luo et al., 2018). The lowest elevation of permafrost boundary in 1975 and 2012 was approximately 4360 m a.s.l and 4388 m a.s.l., respectively, by ground–penetrating radar (GPR) profiles combined with drilling boreholes. Subsequently, permafrost distribution in this region was delineated on a topographic map at a scale of 1:50000, by hand empirically using contour elevations line on the basis of the field survey data, aerial photographs, and satellite images (Fig. 6a–b). In addition, one benchmark map of permafrost distribution in 2016 was accomplished by Zou et al. (2017), which is simulated by the temperature at the top of the permafrost (TTOP) model. The abovementioned three maps were used as the validation data to evaluate model performance in the distribution of permafrost. Furthermore, the long–term continuous ALT dataset in the BT01, QT09, XD–1, XD2–4, and XD2–6 interpolated from the in–situ soil temperature profile (Liu et al., 2020; Yin et al., 2021) were also used to evaluate the model performance. Moreover, observed permafrost distribution of boreholes (CRSQTP, JXG, XD1, XD2, XD3, XD4, XDT1, XDT2, CN13) was used to assist in determining whether permafrost exists or not.

### 2.3 Methods

#### 2.3.1 Model description

We simulated the subsurface temperature dynamics along the soil column by numerically solving the one-dimensional transient Fourier’s law heat conduction equation. The physical basis and operational details of the model are documented in Sun et al. (2019), and only a brief overview of the model properties for a single grid cell is given here:

$$C_{\text{eff}}(z, T) \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( k(z, T) \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} \right) = 0$$

(1)
A constant geothermal heat flow of $Q_{\text{geo}}=0.08 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ (Wu et al., 2010) as the lower boundary condition, and LST as the upper boundary condition. The thermal properties of the ground are described in terms of heat capacity $C$, thermal conductivity $k$ and total volumetric water/ice content $VWC$. The latent heat effects of the water–ice phase transition is accounted for in terms of an effective heat capacity $C_{\text{eff}}(z, T)$. The heat transfer equation (Eq.1) was discretized along with a soil domain to 100 m depth using finite differences, and subsequently applied the trapezoidal rule to numerically solve moderately stiff ordinary differential equations (Schiesser, 1991; Westermann et al., 2013).

2.3.2 Model calibration and validation

Based on surface deposits and vegetation coverage identified by satellite images as well as surficial soil type map at a 1 km spatial resolution (Li et al., 2015b, Luo et al., 2018), we selected four borehole sets (Fig. 1a), which represented different soil type classes with various thermal properties for the initial model calibration, and the remaining sites for cross–validation. Thermophysical properties (e.g., stratigraphies, texture, ground ice content, and organic matter content, dry bulk density) of distinct soil layers were measured or assessed from field surveys, laboratory and on–site measurements, as well as tests on soil samples obtained from sixteen borehole cores (depths between 8~30 m). These boreholes were specific for each soil class and geographical location. The detailed information about test methods for the bulk density, moisture content of soil sample, readers are kindly referred to Zhao et al. (2015). Furthermore, a time series of observed soil water content dataset in the active (Sun et al., 2019, Zhao et al., 2021) vicinity of the site (QT09) and the ground ice distribution maps accomplished by Zhao et al. (2010) are served as for water content estimated of each soil type. Based on the above properties, we pre–selected narrow ranges of plausible values of typical soil thermophysical parameters (thermal conductivity and heat capacity), and fine–adjusted during model calibration. As suggested by Hipp et al. (2012), a manual, stepwise optimization procedure was used to adjust parameters. Specifically, calibration was performed firstly by systematically changing $k$ over the given plausible ranges aiming for improving the agreement between the simulated and observed ground temperature at different depth levels. Subsequently, minor adjustments were made to $C$ to promote the model performance.
After selecting the appropriate parameters, to estimate a realistic initial temperature profile before subsequent modeling, the model was initialized at the first one–year LST data of cyclical forcing until the soil temperature profile reached a steady state. The number of spin–up cycles was between 2000 to 3300, and the criterion of soil temperature profile reached equilibrium under the upper and lower boundary condition was set less than 0.0001 °C/cycle. The ground temperature profile of the last day subsequently was used as the initial condition for subsequent modeling.

The agreement between the model grid and borehole monitoring site was quantified at each depth in terms of the mean absolute error (MAE) and root mean square error (RMSE) (Willmott and Matsuura, 2005; Jafarov et al., 2012):

\[
MAE = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |Ob_i - Sm_i| \tag{2}
\]

\[
RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (Ob_i - Sm_i)^2}{n}} \tag{3}
\]

where \(Ob_i, Sm_i\) is observation and simulation value, respectively. And \(n\) is the total amount of data. The MAE shows an overall error between observing and simulating when the RMSE emphasizes an error variation.

2.3.3 Historical and future long–term LST series

To extend the LST to an earlier period, we established statistical relationships between local LST and air temperature (AT) from nearby AWS, which were subsequently used to derive long–term historical and future LST series for each grid point from historical (1970–2019) AT observation, and from the multi–model ensemble AT projection by 2100 under different climate change scenarios.

The AT_cma, AT, and LST denote the air temperature from the CMA, air temperature at 2 m heights from our comprehensive experimental station, and ground surface temperature derived from modified MODIS LST, respectively. There are three steps. 1) we established linear regression between LST and AT from the measured period of 2004 to 2018, the temperature variability is highly
correlated between LST and AT with $R^2 = 0.83$ (significant at 0.05 level), 2) daily AT series from 1970 to 2019 were generated utilizing a stepwise linear regression between measured AT during 2004 to 2018 and those extracted from CMA meteorological stations (AT_cma) at a nearby, this procedure worked well with $R^2 = 0.88$ (significant at 0.05 level). 3) based on the AT–LST linear regression model induced in step 1 and extending series AT in step 2, we generated a time series of LST starting from 1970.

For future AT projections, the latest Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Work Group1 Sixth Assessment Report (Iturbide et al., 2020; IPCC, 2021) has evaluated and projected climate change over the QTP during the 21st century (https://interactive-atlas.ipcc.ch). The models estimate warming trends between 1995–2014 and 2081–2100, and suggest a gradual linear increase in mean annual AT in QTP under three RCPs scenarios are of 0.013 °C a$^{-1}$ (RCP2.6, low concentration of emissions), 0.028 °C a$^{-1}$ (RCP4.5, stable concentration of emissions) and 0.060 °C a$^{-1}$ (RCP8.5, high concentration of emission), respectively, calculated based on the multi-model ensemble median (21–29 model outputs) of CMIP5. As regards newly designed SSP scenarios in CMIP6, the mean linear warming rate is 0.017 °C a$^{-1}$ (SSP1–2.6, strong climate change mitigation), 0.32 °C a$^{-1}$ (SSP2–4.5, moderate mitigation), and 0.064 °C a$^{-1}$ (SSP5–8.5, no mitigation), respectively, estimated from ensemble median of 31–34 model outputs. Using the AT–LST linear regression relationship model again, we can obtain a mean LST warming rate of 0.012 (RCP2.6), 0.025 (RCP4.5), and 0.050 °C a$^{-1}$ (RCP8), and a mean LST increase rate of 0.015 (SSP1–2.6), 0.030 (SSP4–4.5) and 0.057 °C a$^{-1}$ (SSP5–8.5).

### 2.3.4 Spatially modeling

Forcing the calibrated model using extended and projected LST series, we simulated the spatial distribution of permafrost in the Xidatan. Like the setup of a single grid cell (Section 2.3.1), each grid point, the ground thermal regime was simulated for a specific ground stratigraphy under boundary conditions using a one-dimensional multilayer soil profile down to the depth of 100 m. Well–adjusted thermos–physical parameters of multilayered soil columns during the model calibration were specified and assigned for each grid cell of the same soil classes in the surrounding areas of the calibrating borehole. If the maximum temperature of any soil layer in the grid point was
≤ 0°C for two consecutive years, the model cells were designated as permafrost. In contrast, the seasonally frozen ground was defined from the not–yet–assigned cells, in which the minimum soil temperature of any layer in the same two years was ≤ 0 °C. The remaining cells were defined as unfrozen ground (Wu et al., 2018). Meanwhile, the continuous permafrost zone is defined as the region where the area coverage of permafrost is more than 90 % (of the total accounts area). Otherwise, it was demarcated as a discontinuous permafrost zone (Qin et al, 2014).

In total, the simulation domain comprises about 280 km² with a horizontal resolution of 1 km ×1 km, corresponding to 280 independent runs. With comprehensive consideration of the modeling precision and computation cost, we choose the time step to be one day, and set a total of 282 vertical levels, with the vertical spatial resolution of 0.05 m (the upper 4 m) and 0.5 m (remaining soil layer to 100 m).

3 Result

3.1 Model ‘s performance evaluation

Results demonstrate that relative larger biases (with the MAE ranging from 0.69 to 2.02 °C as well as RMSE ranging from 0.87 to 2.46 °C) for shallow depth (below 1 m depth) ground temperature at all calibration sites (Fig. 2), which can be explained by frequent fluctuation and complex variation pattern of ground temperature itself at shallow depth greatly affected by local factors (e.g., terrain, water bodies, snow cover, and vegetation, etc.). However, these discrepancies between simulated and observed ground temperature gradually reduce with the increase of soil depth.

Most calibration boreholes showed a good correspondence between modelled and measured ground temperature at the intermediate (3 m, 8 m) and deep (15 m, 30 m) layers (Fig. 3), with an MAE of 0.05–0.52 °C, 0.04–0.38 °C, as well as an RMSE of 0.06–0.58 °C, 0.04–0.38 °C, respectively. The same pattern appeared at validation sites (Fig. 4–5). Ground temperature in validation sites was equally well reproduced by the calibrated model, yielding an MAE of 0.86–1.27 °C (RMSE of 1.15–1.63 °C) in the 0.5 and 1 m and 0.01–0.52 °C (RMSE of 0.08–0.80 °C) in 3 and 15 m. In general, very consistent daily fluctuations of the simulated and observed soil temperature at all observational depths for most calibration and validation sites, and indicate the daily variation of the ground
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temperature field is simulated satisfactorily by our calibrated model.

Site XD2–6 has relatively poor performance compared with other sites. It may be attributed to being located at the edge of the discontinuous permafrost zone, and the land surface exhibits high spatial heterogeneities, leading to more difficulty in accurate modeling. Nevertheless, the deviation between the modelled results and measured values for this site is within 0.38 °C at the deep layer (15 m). Furthermore, permafrost was simulated to disappear in the mid–late 2010s, which is in line with the observation (Yin et al., 2021). We can conclude that various depths of ground temperature simulated by our model are still satisfactory for this site.

Figure 2. Comparison of the simulated (dashed lines) to observed (solid lines) daily mean ground temperature (GT) at various depths (0.5 m: black, 1 m: blue, 3 m: brown) in four calibration boreholes (from the top to the bottom, each row shows the result at the BT01, XD2–7, QT09, and XD2–6, respectively) during the observation period (At the XD2–7 and XD2–6, observation data from 2004 to 2012 is not available, and 2013 to 2017 served comparison period, the BT01 and QT09 were compared during 2004–2017, and 2005–2017, respectively).
Figure 3. Same as Figure 2. but for daily mean soil temperature at 8 m (Orange), 15 m (magenta), 30 m (red).

Table 3. Error metrics for the assessment of daily average GT at different depths, which derived from the observed with simulated for individual calibration and validation site (good criteria values <0.2 °C are displayed in italics).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>0.5 m</th>
<th>1 m</th>
<th>3 m</th>
<th>8 m</th>
<th>15 m</th>
<th>30 m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BT01</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAE (°C)</td>
<td>XD2-7</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QT09</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XD2-6</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XD2-1</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XD2-4</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XD1-1</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XD1-4</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSE (°C)</td>
<td>BT01</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XD2-7</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QT09</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XD2-6</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XD2-1</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XD2-4</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XD1-1</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XD1-4</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4. Comparison of simulated (dashed lines) to observed (solid lines) daily mean GT at various depths (0.5 m: black, 1 m: blue, 3 m: brown) in four validation boreholes (from the top to the bottom, each row shows the results at the XD2–1, XD2–4, XD1–1, and XD1–4, respectively) during the observation period from 2013 to 2017.

Figure 5. Same as Figure 4, but for daily mean soil temperature at 8 m (Orange), 15 m (magenta).

To better estimate the model performance on spatial modeling, we compared our simulations with three permafrost maps investigated in 1975, 2012, and 2016. Based on the validation of the
various maps against the permafrost and seasonally frozen ground observation at 24 boreholes (Fig. 6.), we found both 1975 and 2012 map can well interpreted the relative continuous permafrost zone at the central–western Xidatan above 4500 m a.s.l. However, there are many erroneous (12.5 % for 1975, and 16.6 % for 2012) recognitions of seasonally frozen ground at the discontinuous permafrost zone where permafrost and seasonally frozen ground coexist, which is different from the investigated boreholes, and underestimated the permafrost area over this region. In addition, alpine areas in the northeastern above 4200 m a.s.l. was uniformly identified as seasonally frozen ground, which is strongly inconsistent with the 2016 map and our simulations (Fig. 6a–b). The 2016 map and our simulations showed a very consistent pattern of permafrost distribution, and identified almost all locations of continuous permafrost correctly (Fig. 6c–f). However, the 2016 map had slight errors in both permafrost (8.3 %) and seasonally frozen ground (8.3 %) locations over margins of the discontinuous continuous permafrost zone, whereas our simulation results recognized that seasonally frozen ground exists in this region, which is consistent with the investigated results.

Figure 6. Geographic distribution of permafrost and seasonally frozen ground across the Xidatan for three permafrost maps accomplished in 1975, 2012 and 2016 (left panels 1975 (a), 2012 (b), 2016 (c), published in Nan et al. (2003), Luo et al. (2018) and Zou et al.(2017)) compared to corresponding modeled outputs (right panels, 1975 (d), 2012 (e), 2016 (f)).

The ALT is a critical index in understanding permafrost thermal state and dynamics. Continuous multi–year ALTs derived from monitoring sites were compared with those from the
model-simulated (Fig. 7). Though some discrepancies between the measured and simulated ALT, overall, the value is very close to each other. Both observed and simulated ALT in the XD2–6 varied from 4.15 to 4.31 m, which is higher than that in other sites (the BT01 of 2.55 to 2.85 m; the QT09 of 1.45 m to 1.60 m; the XD2–1 of 2.30 to 2.48 m; the XD2–3 of 2.95 to 3.05 m). The model has a good performance for ALT in the QBT01, QT09, XT2–1, as well as XD2–3, with an MAE of 0.03 to 0.07 m, and an RMSE of 0.04 to 0.09 m, respectively, but a relatively high error occurred at the XD2–6 (MAE of 0.15 m, RMSE of 0.19 m).

Figure 7. Comparison between annually observed ALT and simulated at different sites (the TB01 and QT09 (Liu et al. (2019), Zhao et al. (2021) observed from period 2005 to 2017, 2005 to 2018 are available, respectively, observation period at the XD2–1, XD2–3, and XD2–6 (Yin et al. (2021)) are from 2013 to 2019, 2013 to 2017, respectively. The solid line is a 1:1 line and the dashed line shows biases within ±0.25 m, dots are colored to represent the different sites).

3.2 Historical permafrost evolution

In this study, our simulation outputs were together with topographic data (elevation and slopes) derived from 30 m-DEM to analyze the permafrost distribution and its dynamics. In addition, MAGT, permafrost table, permafrost base, and permafrost thickness are defined from temperature
profiles, as critical parameters to describe the permafrost thermal regime, were also chosen for analysis and discussion. Areas with seasonally frozen ground were excluded from the following studies.

3.2.1 Initial situation of permafrost distribution

The simulation results (Table 4–5, Fig. 8) showed the initial situation in 1970. The lower limit of continuous permafrost modeled was ca.4525 and 4732 m a.s.l., respectively, on north–and south–facing slopes. While the lowest elevation of permafrost boundary simulated was 4138 m a.s.l (on north–facing slopes) and 4357 m a.s.l (on south–facing slopes). And approximately 80 % of the total counting area was underlain by permafrost (33.93 % was continuous, and 46.07 % was discontinues) in the Xidatan. Regionally, the distribution characteristics of permafrost conditions are predominantly controlled by elevations. In general, with altitude ascending westward gradually, permafrost temperature and permafrost table display a decreasing trend, whereas the position of permafrost base and permafrost thickness show an increase. Furthermore, local topographic factors in terms of slope aspect also governed permafrost distribution in the study area. Permafrost temperature on north–facing slopes were far colder than that of on south–facing slopes within the same elevations (Fig. 8a). Specifically, on south–facing slopes (with altitudes above 4500 m a.s.l.) and north–facing slopes model presented a comparatively cold permafrost temperature (MAGT ranges from -0.5 to -4.5 °C), and the permafrost table simulated was less than 2.5 m and permafrost base of 20 to 48 m as well as permafrost thickness of up to 46 m at the maximum. Whereas on south–facing slopes with altitudes below 4500 m a.s.l., MAGT modeled is higher than -0.5 °C, the position of the permafrost table modeled varies 2.5 to 4.5 m, permafrost base is at a depth of fewer than 20 m, and permafrost thickness of approximately 4 m at the thinnest.
Figure 8. Spatial distributive features of MAGT (a), permafrost table (b), permafrost base (c), and permafrost thickness (d) for the initial simulation of the 1970s over the Xidatan (grey areas with the seasonally frozen ground were excluded).

3.2.2 Changes of permafrost conditions

From 1970 to 2019, the simulation results indicated that the lower limit of the continuous permafrost zone remained unchanged over the study areas. The lowest elevation of permafrost boundary has a remarkable rise of 47 m on north–facing slopes, while that remained unchanged on south–facing slopes (Table 4). Correspondingly, around 12.86 % of the discontinuous permafrost zone has transformed into the seasonally frozen ground (Table 5), which caused the northern boundary of discontinuous permafrost zone having approximately retreated southwards 1~2 km, but that is unchanged for the continuous permafrost zone (Fig. 9).

Table 4. The lower limit of continuous permafrost zone and the lowest elevation of permafrost boundary (in brackets) for north–and south–facing slope over the Xidatan for 1970, 2019, and that of projected changes by 2100 under different climate change scenarios (unit: m a.s.l).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>SSP1–26</th>
<th>SSP2–45</th>
<th>SSP5–85</th>
<th>RCP2.6</th>
<th>RCP4.5</th>
<th>RCP8.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North–facing</td>
<td>4525</td>
<td>4525</td>
<td>4567</td>
<td>4567</td>
<td>4567</td>
<td>4567</td>
<td>4567</td>
<td>4567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4138)</td>
<td>(4138)</td>
<td>(4308)</td>
<td>(4308)</td>
<td>(4309)</td>
<td>(4308)</td>
<td>(4308)</td>
<td>(4309)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South–facing</td>
<td>4732</td>
<td>4732</td>
<td>4732</td>
<td>4732</td>
<td>4754</td>
<td>4732</td>
<td>4732</td>
<td>4737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4357)</td>
<td>(4357)</td>
<td>(4516)</td>
<td>(4516)</td>
<td>(4570)</td>
<td>(4416)</td>
<td>(4516)</td>
<td>(4558)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. The areal extent percentage of continuous, discontinuous permafrost, and seasonally frozen ground zone over the Xidatan for 1970, 2019, and that of projected variations by 2100 under different climate change scenarios (unit: %).
As for permafrost characteristics, regional–average MAGT has increased by 0.44 °C over the past 50 years. Along with temperature warming, we found a gradual decline with a mean amplitude of 0.36 m in the position of permafrost table whereas a drastic moved up permafrost base of 1.12 m. Correspondingly, an average of nearly 1.54 m in thick of permafrost had thawed. Spatially, the mean MAGT warmed by up to 0.49 °C, and the average permafrost table declined by 0.37 m for the continuous permafrost zone, but its permafrost base (around -0.80 m) and thickness (around -1.18 m) vary comparatively minor. By comparison, comparatively low variations in MAGT (0.40 °C) and in permafrost table (average declined by 0.76 m), but dramatic changes of an average of -4.23 m occurred in discontinuous permafrost zone, which is roughly doubled compared to changes on the continuous permafrost area. Correspondingly, an average of about -1.96 m in thick permafrost had quickly thawed, owing to an effect of the permafrost base remarkably rising.

Table 6. Changes in permafrost characteristics (MAGT, permafrost table, permafrost base, and permafrost thickness) of continuous (Con.), discontinuous permafrost (Disc.) zone over the Xidatan for the period 1970 to 2019, and projected changes by the 2090s, relative to the 2010s, under different climate change scenarios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>SSP1-26</th>
<th>SSP2-45</th>
<th>SSP5-85</th>
<th>RCP2.6</th>
<th>RCP4.5</th>
<th>RCP8.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>33.93</td>
<td>33.93</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>27.14</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>29.29</td>
<td>28.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuous</td>
<td>46.07</td>
<td>33.21</td>
<td>30.36</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>21.79</td>
<td>30.36</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonally</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>32.86</td>
<td>41.07</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>51.07</td>
<td>41.07</td>
<td>43.21</td>
<td>48.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>1970–2019</th>
<th>SSP12-6</th>
<th>SSP2-45</th>
<th>SSP5-85</th>
<th>RCP2.6</th>
<th>RCP4.5</th>
<th>RCP8.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAGT (°C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con.</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc.</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permafrost table (m)</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc.</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permafrost base (m)</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>-3.52</td>
<td>-3.87</td>
<td>-3.99</td>
<td>-3.41</td>
<td>-3.81</td>
<td>-4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc.</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
<td>-4.87</td>
<td>-5.09</td>
<td>-5.17</td>
<td>-4.80</td>
<td>-5.08</td>
<td>-5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permafrost thickness (m)</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>-4.11</td>
<td>-5.23</td>
<td>-10.38</td>
<td>-3.87</td>
<td>-5.11</td>
<td>-9.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc.</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>-5.78</td>
<td>-7.94</td>
<td>-12.76</td>
<td>-5.46</td>
<td>-7.44</td>
<td>-11.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3. Projection of permafrost condition

The projected changes in the lower limit of continuous permafrost zone, the lowest elevation of permafrost boundary, and the spatial distribution of continuous, discontinuous permafrost, and seasonally frozen ground as well as its characteristics (MAGT, permafrost table, permafrost base, and permafrost thickness), are presented in Table 4–6 and Fig. 10.

The result indicated the lower limit of continuous permafrost zone on north–facing slopes is projected to increase by 42 m until 2100, relative to 2019, under all RCPs or SSPs, while, by 22 m on south–facing slopes under very high emission scenarios (SSP5–85 or RCP8.5), which is far smaller than the changes in the lowest elevation of the permafrost boundary. The lowest elevation of permafrost boundary on north–facing slopes is projected to increase by 123 m by 2100, relative to 2019, under both low and medium emission scenarios, and by 124 m under very high emission scenarios SSP5–85 or RCP8.5. As for south–facing slopes, it is projected to increase by 159 m by 2100, compared to 2019, under both low and medium emission of RCP or SSP scenarios, but a more pronounced increase of around 213 and 201 m, respectively, are projected under SSP5-85 and RCP8.5. Relative to 2019, the areal extent of continuous permafrost zone is projected to decrease by 5.36 (5.36), 5.36 (4.64), and 6.79 (5.00) %, respectively, by 2100, under SSP1–26 (RCP2.6), SSP2–45 (RCP4.5), and SSP5–8.5 (RCP8.5). Compared with the decrease of 3.57 (2.85), 4.64 (5.71), and 11.42 (10.71) % for discontinuous permafrost zone. By contrast, the areal extent of seasonally frozen ground is projected to increase by 8.93 (8.21), 10.00 (10.36), and 18.21 (15.71) %, respectively, by 2100, relative to 2019, under SSP1–26 (RCP2.6), SSP2–45 (RCP4.5), and SSP5–8.5 (RCP8.5). The northern limit of the continuous permafrost zone is projected to retreat southwards around 1–2 km under SSP1–26 (RCP2.6), SSP2–45 (RCP4.5) or SSP5–85, and about 1–3 km under SSP5–85. By comparison, the northern boundary of the discontinuous permafrost zone is anticipated to shift southward around 1 km under SSP1–26 (RCP2.6) or SSP2–45 (RCP4.5), and around 1–2 km under SSP5–85 (RCP8.5).
Figure 10. Projected spatial distributive changes of continuous, discontinuous, and seasonally frozen ground over the Xidatan in the future period by 2100 under RCPs and SSPs scenarios (left column, from top to bottom, each row shows under SSP1–2.6, SSP2–4.5, and SSP5–8.5 scenarios, right column, from top to bottom, each row shows under RCP2.6, RCP4.5, and RCP8.5 scenarios).

Under gradual warming climate scenarios, the permafrost temperature is anticipated further increase, but its variation lags substantially behind the changes in air temperature. The regional–average MAGT is projected to further warm by 0.63, 0.81, and 0.99 °C, respectively, by the 2090s, relative to the 2010s, under SSP1–2.6, SSP2–4.5, SSP5–8.5, which is slighter higher than that of RCP scenarios (0.56, 0.78, and 0.98 °C, respectively). Along with MAGT rising, relative to the 2010s, the permafrost table is projected to further decline by 0.72 to 6.70 m under SSP scenarios (0.72 m, 2.48 m, and 6.70 m, respectively, under SSP1–2.6, SSP2–4.5, and SSP5–8.5), and decline by 0.54 to 5.47 m under RCP scenarios (0.54 m, 1.73 m, and 5.47 m, respectively, under RCP2.6, RCP4.5, and RCP8.5), at the end–century (the 2090s). The average permafrost base is projected to rise by 4.22, 4.54, and 4.56 m, respectively, by the 2090s, compared to the 2010s, under SSP1–2.6, SSP2–4.5, and SSP5–8.5. Meanwhile, a relative decrease in permafrost base of 4.14, 4.43, and 4.60 m, respectively, are estimated under RCP2.6, RCP4.5, and RCP8.5. An average thinning in the permafrost thickness is projected to be 4.97, 6.66, and 11.74 m, respectively, under SSP1–2.6, SSP2–4.5, and SSP5–8.5, and that would be 4.71, 6.26, and 10.43 m, respectively, under RCP2.6, RCP4.5, and RCP8.5.
Spatially, the average MAGT is projected to rise by 0.73 (0.65), 0.94 (0.91), and 1.03 (1.06) °C, respectively, for continuous permafrost zone, under SSP1–2.6 (RCP2.6), SSP2–4.5 (RCP4.5), and SSP5–8.5 (RCP8.5). Compared with the rising of 0.53 (0.48), 0.66 (0.65), and 0.96 (0.86) °C, respectively, for discontinuous permafrost zone. As for permafrost table, both continuous and discontinuous permafrost zone are projected to gradual decline under SSP1–26 (0.56 and 0.87 m), and RCP2.6 (0.44 and 0.64 m), but a remarkable decline is projected under medium and very high emission scenarios, and a more pronounced decline is anticipated under SSPs scenarios than that projection under RCPs scenarios. The average permafrost table in continuous permafrost zone is projected to decline by 1.76 (1.23) and 6.24 (4.95) m, respectively, under SSP2–4.5 (RCP4.5) and SSP5–8.5 (RCP8.5). Compared with the decline of 3.13 (2.26) and 7.02 (6.13) m, respectively, under SSP2–4.5 (RCP4.5), and SSP5–8.5 (RCP8.5) for continuous permafrost zone. Permafrost base is projected to remarkably move up under all scenarios. For continuous permafrost zone, permafrost base is projected to rise by 3.52 (3.41), 3.87 (3.81), and 4.13 (3.99) m, respectively, under SSP1–26 (RCP2.6), SSP2–4.5 (RCP4.5), and SSP5–8.5 (RCP8.5), which is slightly smaller than that projected for discontinuous permafrost zone (4.87 (4.80), 5.09 (5.08), and 5.17 (5.17) m, respectively, under SSP1–26 (RCP2.6), SSP2–4.5 (RCP4.5), and SSP5–8.5 (RCP8.5)). The average permafrost thickness of continuous and discontinuous permafrost zone is projected to thinning 4.11 (3.87) and 5.78 (5.46) m, respectively, under SSP1–26 (RCP2.6) as the main effect of permafrost base move up. Whereas a more prominent decrease of 5.23 (5.11) and 7.94 (7.44) m, respectively, under SSP2–45 (RCP4.5), 10.38 (12.76), and 9.42 (11.65) m, respectively, under SSP5–85 (RCP8.5), owing to both effect of permafrost table declining and the permafrost base rising.

4 Discussion

4.1 Comparison with previous studies

In this work, our simulated distribution of continuous permafrost zone had a substantial agreement with three permafrost maps investigated in 1975, 2012, and 2016, but a remarkable difference in the discontinuous permafrost zone where permafrost and seasonally frozen ground coexist (Fig. 6). Compared with the 2016 map and our simulated results, the 1975 and 2012 maps
underestimated the permafrost area in the discontinuous permafrost zone. This contradiction might be due to differences using data, methods, study periods, spatial resolutions, etc. (Yang et al., 2010; Ran et al., 2012; Zou et al., 2017). The 1975 and 2012 maps were plotted on a topographic map at 1:50000 scale based on field data, aerial photographs, and satellite images (Nan et al., 2003; Luo et al., 2018). These coarse resolution maps can’t accurately consider the effect of local factors since they cannot describe variations of ground conditions over a short distance (Zhang et al., 2013). Moreover, the result is difficult to validate by comparing them with field observations. Although the 1975 and 2012 maps may represent the corresponding permafrost situations in that year, they are limited by field investigations, and there is not a clear understanding of whether permafrost existed in the northeaster high-altitude areas or not. In the 2012 map, these isolated top mountain areas are uniformly considered as the seasonally frozen ground when permafrost mapping (Luo et al., 2018), which is unreasonable and underestimated in areal coverage of the permafrost in that area. Furthermore, the artefactual errors were hard to control when mapping permafrost distribution by conventional cartographic techniques that delineated the permafrost boundaries on the topographic maps by hand (Zou et al., 2017; Ran et al., 2012). These factors inevitably led to existing uncertainties in the 1975 and 2012 maps.

By comparison, the 2016 map and our simulation results have a much higher spatial resolution (1 km × 1 km) than field investigated-based ones (e.g., 1975 and 2012 maps) by improved MODIS LST data application. In addition, it showed higher and more accuracy in identifying both permafrost and seasonally frozen ground boreholes and performed better at recognizing the seasonally frozen ground in regions with complex terrain. This finding highlights the potential advantage of remote sensing-based data in improving the spatial modeling of margins permafrost simulations on the QTP. Overall, our simulated distribution of continuous permafrost and discontinuous permafrost zone was similar to that of the 2016 map. Differences mainly the TTOP model did not consider the thermal state of the deep permafrost. Therefore, the areal extent of permafrost distribution in the 2016 map likely was slightly underestimated compared with our simulation results. Moreover, the 2016 map assumes that permafrost is in equilibrium with the long-time climate. However, the ground temperature observations of permafrost on the QTP have increased during the past several decades (Zou et al., 2017; Zhao et al., 2010, 2020; Yao et al., 2019),
and this means a disequilibrium of permafrost under ongoing climate warming. So, map based on a contemporary climate forcing is likely to underestimate the extent of permafrost (Zou et al., 2017). By contrast, in our study, we used a transient numerical heat conduction permafrost model, which integrated climate and ground condition variables to quantify the change in permafrost. Our model performed well in modeling the disappeared evolution of two permafrost islands since 1975, and shifting the northern boundary of discontinuous permafrost (Fig. 6d–f), which can be confirmed by observed boreholes (Jin et al., 2006; Luo et al., 2018; Yin et al., 2021). These phenomena implied our model could accurately capture dynamics of marginal permafrost thermal state under a warming climate.

Furthermore, using our model, we quantified the spatial distribution of permafrost over the study area. We simulated a striking elevation dependence in permafrost distribution. Specifically, permafrost temperature decreases, permafrost thickness thicker, and the permafrost table thinner with the elevation increase, which are consistent with previous observed–based studies (Cheng et al., 1984; Wu et al., 2010; Zhao et al., 2010, 2019, 2020; Li et al., 2012; Jin et al., 2011; Luo et al., 2018). Moreover, Cheng et al. (2019) indicated the MAGT varied from -5 to 0.5°C, and the average permafrost thickness was approximately 26 m here, as deduced by considerable monitoring and field investigation dataset. Furthermore, the monitoring network of ALT along the Qinghai–Tibet Highway (QTH) by Li et al. (2012) has demonstrated that the mean ALT was 218 cm, with a range from 100 to 320 cm from 1981 to 2010. These pieces of evidence are strongly corroborating the accuracy of our simulation results, which gives us more confidence in upscaling our model to the whole study area to investigate spatiotemporal dynamics and anticipate possible future changes in permafrost.

4.2 Process of permafrost degradation

In this paper, we simulated a slow response of the permafrost thermal state to a warming climate in the northern lower limit of the permafrost zone (Xidatan) on the QTP. As shown in our simulation, from 1970 to 2019, we simulated that roughly 12.86 % of the discontinuous permafrost zone over the study area has ultimately converted into the seasonally frozen ground, which is very close to a field investigation of permafrost changes (13.8 %) here in 2012 (Luo et al., 2018).
Spatially, permafrost distribution and its thermal conditions over the study area were controlled by elevational. In addition, due to the orientation of slopes influences the amount of solar radiation received by the ground surface (Cheng et al., 2004). Much thicker, colder permafrost and a thinner ALT on north-facing slopes than on south-facing slopes within the same elevation. So, a distinct spatial discrepancy of permafrost thermal regimes in response to a warming climate. Over the past 50 years, the rising rate of MAGT for the continuous permafrost zone was relatively faster (regional–average warmed by 0.49 °C) due to more energy being available to heat the ground. By contrast, as permafrost temperature is close to the thawing point (about 0 °C), accumulated energy is enormously consumed by melting ground ice, and MAGT for the discontinuous permafrost zone slowly rises (regional–average warmed by 0.40 °C). Meanwhile, both the continuous (regional–average declined by 0.37 m) and discontinuous permafrost zone (regional–average declined by 0.35 m) displayed a gradual decline in the position of the permafrost table. But we simulated a drastically risen permafrost base, especially in the discontinuous permafrost zone, which is due to heat transfer in strata from top to bottom leading the geothermal gradients in permafrost to keep dropping. When the geothermal gradient in permafrost temperature drops to less than that of the underlying thawed soil layers, the geothermal heat flux from the deep stratum is completely used to thaw the permafrost base. So, permafrost thaws from bottom to top and moves upward. As permafrost was relatively warm and thin and geothermal flow relatively high over the Xidatan (Wu et al., 2010, Sun et al., 2019), the degradation mode of permafrost over this region is simulated to be upward thawing from the permafrost base. This degradation mode is also confirmed by several monitoring boreholes across this region (Jin et al., 2006, 2011; Cheng and Wu, 2007; Liu et al., 2020). In general, the pattern of permafrost degradation over the Xidatan from 1970 to 2019 can be summarized like this: the continuous permafrost zone has gradually converted to warm permafrost, whereas the discontinuous permafrost zone has been upward thawing remarkably. Notably, the edge areas of the discontinuous permafrost zone have converted to seasonally frozen ground.

As for the projections under different climate change scenarios, the latest generation of GCMs from CMIP6 projected a substantially warmer climate by 2100 than the previous generation, for instance, CMIP5 (Fewster et al., 2022). In our study, MAGT is anticipated further increase, and the warm rate is projected to be slighter higher under SSP than that of RCP, but very small discrepancies...
among SSP and RCP scenarios in projected changes of permafrost distribution extent. This further verified the response of permafrost to climate warming is a slow and nonlinear process, and its variation lags substantially behind the changes in air temperature. But contrary findings are reported by some previous studies. Based on the empirical equilibrium model, Lu et al. (2017) predicted that extensive reduction of permafrost area on the QTP by the end of the 21st century under RCP2.6 (22.44 %) and RCP8.5 (64.31 %), and permafrost would retreat into the Qiangtang Plateau hinterland. Likewise, Chang et al. (2018) suggested that the permafrost area on the QTP is projected to shrink by 9.7 %, and 10.7 %, under RCP4.5 and RCP8.5, respectively, in the next 20 years, and that is projected to by 26.6 % and 32.7 %, respectively, in the next 50 years. Based on the surface frost index model, Guo and Wang (2016) projected almost no permafrost on the QTP by 2080 to 2099 under RCP8.5. In addition, Yin et al. (2021) projected around 26.9 %, 59.9 %, and 80.1 % of permafrost on the QTP is likely to disappear, respectively, by the end of the 21st century under SSP1–26, SSP2–45, and SSP5–85 scenarios.

The abovementioned results were modeling of permafrost degradation by the statistical relationship between the current permafrost distribution and air temperature, based on the surface energy balance theory together with heat conduction theory. However, permafrost in the QTP formed over a long period of cold paleoclimate and developed an energy state characterized by low ground temperature and ground ice in permafrost (Sun et al., 2019; Zhao et al., 2020; Jin et al., 2011). The present state of permafrost is a response to historical climate changes and impacts future development (Wu et al., 2010; Cao et al., 2014). But, Current models of future permafrost degradation do not consider the historical energy accumulation in permafrost as well as the impact of ground ice conditions buried below 1 m underground (Zhao et al., 2020; Smith et al., 2022). Therefore, the projection of the response of the permafrost degradation in climatic warming deduced by the method abovementioned shows a nearly linear with time under a warming climate and consequence more severe permafrost thawing, especially in the deep permafrost compared with our simulations. In comparison, the magnitude and evolution of permafrost degradation projections on the QTP derived from our transient simulations agree well with that of the heat conduction permafrost model account for the thermal state of deep ground ice (Li et al., 1996; Li et al., 2008; Sun et al., 2019). Both these simulations and our modeling can well–describe the heat transfer
process in permafrost and reasonably capture the attenuation and time lag of heat transfer in deep permafrost as water or ice content and ground is a poor conductor of heat. It can be noted that existing studies largely ignore the thermal properties of deeper permafrost, but our findings highlight initial permafrost thermal state is influenced by historical climate, stratigraphic thermal properties, ground ice distribution, geothermal heat flow, and propagation of the phase–transition interface plays a critical role in permafrost degradation.

4.3 Model uncertainties

In this study, the numerical simulations by our transient permafrost model may have uncertainties, including the extended MODIS LST series used as the model inputs, the parameters of the soil, and the physics of the permafrost model. Due to a significant linear relationship between LST and AT over the study area, moreover, in this work, we mainly focus on the long–trend permafrost temperature over the foreseeable future. The biases of the estimated LST by simple regression relationship of AT–LST cannot affect the long–term mean change trend in LST. Furthermore, although field and modeling studies suggest that heat transfer is a good approximation for most permafrost areas (Weismüller et al., 2011), other physical processes of energy transfer (e.g., convective, lateral) do occur and may play a vital role in transforming from stable to degrading permafrost (Jin et al., 2006, 2011; Kane et al., 2001; Westermann et al., 2016). In our study, heat conduction is considered the principal means of energy transfer on the ground. Hence, we simulated may conservatively change in the soil temperature, which can be improved by taking other physical processes of heat transfer into consideration in future studies.

5 Conclusions

This study applied a new transient numerical permafrost model for modeling permafrost distribution and its thermal dynamics at 1 km×1 km resolutions near the northern limit of permafrost on the QTP for current (1970–2019) and future (2020–2100). Overall, we simulated vertical ground temperature profiles and ALT closely match with the long-term continuous field observations over the study area, which means our model can well-describe the heat transfer process in permafrost and reasonably capture the attenuation and time lag of heat in deep permafrost. Furthermore, we
accurately identified permafrost boundaries, and can realistically capture the evolution of the permafrost thermal regime. According to the simulations, we found permafrost distribution and its thermal conditions over the study area were controlled by elevational with a strong influence of slope aspects. From 1970 to 2019, the lowest elevation of permafrost (north-facing slope aspect) rose approximately 47 m, and the northern boundary of discontinuous permafrost retreated southwards approximately 1–2 km. But that remains unchanged for the continuous permafrost area. Meanwhile, regional average MAGT has warmed by 0.44 °C, and by 0.49 °C, respectively, on continuous and discontinuous permafrost zone. In general, over the past 50 years, the continuous permafrost zone over the study area has gradually converted to warm permafrost, whereas the discontinuous permafrost zone has been upward thawing remarkably, and the edge areas of the discontinuous permafrost zone are reduced by about 12.86%. Under gradual warming climate scenarios, the MAGT is anticipated further rise in the future, and the warm rate is projected to be slighter higher under SSP than RCP. However, there are no distinct discrepancies in projection changes in the areal extent of permafrost among SSP and RCP scenarios. These findings highlight the slow process and delays in the response of mountain permafrost to a warming climate, and our projected change rate in the permafrost extent is far less than some simulation results that do not account for the effects of water phase change, historical climate change, and the thermal state of deep permafrost. In summary, our study provides improved simulations for permafrost distribution and thermal regime dynamics in marginal permafrost on the QTP at decadal to centennial time scales. More importantly, these results may give a better understanding of degradation processes and mechanisms of marginal permafrost on the QTP, and guidelines for the further accurate evaluation of changes in the areal extent of the permafrost on the QTP hinterland.

Code and data availability. Monitoring data in-situ from the field observation sites provided by the Cryosphere Research Station on Qinghai-Xizang Plateau of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS) is available online https://data.tpdc.ac.cn/en/disallow/789e838e-16ac-4539-bb7e-906217305a1d/ (Zhao et al., 2021), and https://doi.org/10.1007/s11629-017-4731-2, (Luo et al., 2018), respectively. Improved MODIS LST data were provided by (Zou et al., 2017) (https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-11-2527-2017). The historical official observed daily AT series are available from the China
Meteorological Data Sharing Service System (http://data.cma.cn/data/cdcdetail/dataCode/A.0012.0001.html). Climate projections of CMIP5 and CMIP6 data are freely available online at (https://interactive-atlas.ipcc.ch) (Iturbide et al., 2020). The Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (SRTM) with a 1-arcsecond (~30 m) DEM data were from Hole-filled seamless SRTM data V4, International Centre for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT), available at: http://srtm.csi.cgiar.org (Jarvis et al., 2008). Three existing permafrost distribution maps investigated in 1975, 2012, and 2016 were available by Nan et al. (2003) (https://doi.org/10.1007/s11629-017-4731-2), Luo et al. (2018) (https://doi.org/10.1007/s11629-017-4731-2), and Zou et al. (2017) (https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-11-2527-2017). The new permafrost model source code is available on request form the first authors or corresponding authors or co-authors of this study: Jianting Zhao, jt.zhao@nuist.edu.cn; Lin Zhao, lzhao@nuist.edu.cn; Zhe Sun, sunzhe@lzb.ac.cn.
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