

Seasonal ice dynamics control the timing of crevasse drainage at a fast-flowing outlet glacier

Thomas R. Chudley

Department of Geography, Durham University, Durham, UK

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8547-1132>

Chris R. Stokes

Department of Geography, Durham University, Durham, UK

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3355-1573>

James M. Lea

Department of Geography and Planning, University of Liverpool, Liverpool UK

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1885-0858>

Thomas Winterbottom

Department of Computer Science, Durham University, Durham, UK

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9976-3689>

Robert Law

Laboratory of Hydraulics, Hydrology and Glaciology (VAW), ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

Swiss Federal Institute for Forest, Snow and Landscape Research (WSL), Sion, Switzerland

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0067-5537>

Caroline C. Clason

Department of Geography, Durham University, Durham, UK

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8236-2555>

Holly E. Wytiahlowsky

Department of Geography, Durham University, Durham, UK

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5631-3677>

Jack L. Dechow

Department of Earth, Marine and Environmental Sciences, University of North Carolina, USA

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3121-7934>

Corresponding author: Thomas Chudley (thomas.r.chudley@durham.ac.uk)

Seasonal ice dynamics control the timing of crevasse drainage at a fast-flowing outlet glacier

T. R. Chudley¹, C. R. Stokes¹, J. M. Lea², T. Winterbottom³, R. Law^{4,5}, C. C. Clason¹,
H. E. Wytiahlowsky¹, J. L. Dechow⁶

¹ Department of Geography, Durham University, Durham, UK

² Department of Geography and Planning, University of Liverpool, Liverpool UK

³ Department of Computer Science, Durham University, Durham, UK

⁴ Laboratory of Hydraulics, Hydrology and Glaciology (VAW), ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

⁵ Swiss Federal Institute for Forest, Snow and Landscape Research (WSL), Sion, Switzerland

⁶ Department of Earth, Marine and Environmental Sciences, University of North Carolina, USA

Corresponding author: Thomas Chudley (thomas.r.chudley@durham.ac.uk)

KEY POINTS

- Satellite observations indicate ponded crevasse fields drain with seasonal peaks in strain rates suggesting a dynamic control.
- Where meltwater is not limited, hydrofracture modelling supports that seasonal acceleration can trigger crevasse drainage.
- This behaviour is distinct from the short-term and transient mechanisms thought to trigger supraglacial lake drainage.

ABSTRACT

Crevasse field drainage transfers at least half of the seasonal runoff from the surface to the bed of the Greenland Ice Sheet, but the patterns of drainage are complex and spatio-temporally heterogeneous. To better understand controls on crevasse drainage processes, we use an automated deep learning method to map the seasonal filling and drainage of water-filled crevasses at Sermeq Kujalleq (Store Glacier) in 2019 using 10-metre-resolution Sentinel-2 MSI imagery, alongside RACMO reanalysis melt estimates and strain rates inferred from ITS_LIVE velocity observations. The timing of crevasse drainage correlates strongly with seasonal peaks in surface strain rates, suggesting that seasonal variation in surface stress exerts a strong control on the exact timing of drainage to the bed. Linear elastic fracture mechanics (LEFM) modelling suggests that a seasonal transition to higher tensile stress regimes can trigger rapid full-depth hydrofracture at the point at which stresses exceed the threshold necessary to initiate initial fracture, provided that meltwater from early-season snowmelt is abundant. We suggest that this causal behaviour is distinct from both (i) supraglacial lake drainage, which depends on short-term (hourly-daily) transient accelerations to trigger drainage; and (ii) crevasse fields that are not observed to pond, which exist in high tensile regimes and likely readily supply water into the englacial or subglacial system from melt-season onset. The distinct mode of drainage described here requires unique parameterisation to predict spatio-temporal patterns of water transfer to the bed of ice sheets and drive models of subglacial hydrology.

PLAIN LANGUAGE SUMMARY

Meltwater produced on the surface of the Greenland Ice Sheet flows into and beneath the ice sheet before reaching the ocean. At least half of this meltwater is transferred through crevasse fields, regions of open fracture in the ice surface, but satellite observations show the distribution of meltwater in crevasse fields to be highly variable in space and time. We track water filling and drainage in crevasse fields from satellite imagery, and show that crevasse drainages appear to occur alongside seasonal peaks in the ice surface strain rate. We suggest that, as the melt season progresses and the glacier speeds up, increasing tensile stresses eventually trigger the drainage of ponded crevasses. This is distinct from the drainage of ice-surface lakes, which do not exhibit a seasonal increase in strain rates and instead depend on short-term accelerations (due to e.g. rainfall events) to trigger drainage. This may also explain why large regions of crevasse fields are not observed to pond: extensional stresses here are high throughout the season, allowing water to drain before it fills to the surface. Incorporating the disparate effects of these seasonal stress variations into models of meltwater transport will help us better represent complex ice sheet hydrology.

1. INTRODUCTION

Of the hundreds of Gigatonnes of surface runoff produced across the Greenland Ice Sheet (GrIS) each year (Slater et al., 2021), the majority is transported to the ocean through the englacial and subglacial environment (Gantayat et al., 2023; Koziol et al., 2017). As meltwater is routed through the ice sheet, a number of second-order processes can act to alter ice sheet dynamics. The conversion of latent heat into thermal energy can act to soften ice rheology (Bell et al., 2014; Colgan et al., 2015; Phillips et al., 2010), and the conversion of gravitational potential energy can increase basal melt rates (Young et al., 2022). Diurnal and seasonal velocities can also be significantly influenced by the impact of subglacial hydrology on effective pressure and ice flow, even at fast-flowing marine-terminating outlets (Cook et al., 2022; Moon et al., 2014; Sommers et al., 2024; Stevens et al., 2022; Vijay et al., 2019). Furthermore, at marine-terminating margins, meltwater plumes releasing meltwater into the fjord can act to promote calving and frontal melt (Cowton et al., 2015; Slater and Straneo, 2022). A better understanding of the spatio-temporal distribution of meltwater routing across, through and beneath ice sheets is therefore key to be able to predict these feedbacks (Banwell et al., 2016).

A notable hydrological feature in Greenland, particularly at fast-flowing outlet glaciers, are the presence of annually recurring, seasonally draining, ponded crevasse fields (Chudley et al., 2021; Everett et al., 2016; Lampkin et al., 2013, 2018), distinct in context and morphology from the more intensively studied supraglacial lake drainage events (Doyle et al., 2013; Stevens et al., 2015). Although most common in the ablation zone, observations and modelling suggest that crevasse drainage to the ice sheet bed can even extend to firn aquifers inland (Mejia et al., 2025; Poinar et al., 2017). These phenomena are likely important for controlling the spatio-temporal distribution of meltwater delivery to the bed: surface routing models suggest that crevasse fields capture anywhere from half (Koziol et al., 2017) to nearly all (Gantayat et al., 2023) of total runoff, with a

crevasses capturing higher proportions of meltwater at marine-terminating outlets. The extent and depth of crevasses have been observed to be increasing at accelerating ice sheet margins (Chudley et al., 2025; Colgan et al., 2011), suggesting that crevasse drainage may become an even larger component of the surface-to-bed drainage system in the future.

Modelling studies have suggested that the drainage of ponded crevasse fields is likely sufficient to significantly alter basal water pressures, with implications for glacier sliding (Cavanagh et al., 2017; McGrath et al., 2011; Poinar et al., 2019). However, being able to properly parameterise the process into regional-scale models of ice sheet hydrology and dynamics is challenging because the exact controls on the distribution and timing of drainage are poorly understood. Where hydrological routing models parameterise crevasse drainage, spatially uniform behaviour is assumed across crevassed regions, whether as fill-drain cycles analogous to lakes (Clason et al., 2015; Gantayat et al., 2023) or as distributed meltwater fed directly to the bed (Kozioł et al., 2017; Sommers et al., 2024). However, limited observational evidence suggests that the filling and drainage of ponded crevasse fields is in fact spatio-temporally heterogeneous, collected in discrete clusters (Lampkin et al., 2013) and likely controlled by ice dynamics rather than meltwater availability (Chudley et al., 2021; Everett et al., 2016). Parameterising these processes into models requires a more complete understanding of the temporal and spatial controls on ponded crevasse drainage.

Here, we use remotely sensed observations, supported by modelling, to explore the impact of seasonally varying ice dynamics on the distribution and drainage of ponded crevasse fields. Whilst observational studies of supraglacial lakes have suggested that short-term (< 24 hr) transient variations in ice dynamics, rather than seasonal trends, trigger drainage (Christoffersen et al., 2018; Poinar and Andrews, 2021; Stevens et al., 2015), the strong relationship between compressive background stress and observed crevasse ponding (Chudley et al., 2021) suggest that ice dynamics may have a different mechanical relationship with hydrofracture in ponded crevasse fields. We hypothesise that: (1) the seasonal evolution of ice dynamics exerts a control on the timing of crevasse drainage, (2) which is mechanically distinct to that associated with supraglacial lakes, requiring distinct parameterisation in regional models of ice sheet hydrology.

2. METHODS

2.1 Study Area

We focus on a 52 × 40 km study area (EPSG:3413 bounds: -214,000, -2,142,000, -162,000, -2,102,000) on Sermeq Kujalleq (Store Glacier), a marine-terminating outlet glacier in West Greenland (Figure 1; hereafter SKSG). SKSG was selected because it has an active surface hydrological system including seasonally draining supraglacial lakes (Chudley et al., 2019; Williamson et al., 2018b) and crevasse fields (Chudley et al., 2021; Kendrick et al., 2018). Surface meltwater inputs across SKSG have also been shown to play an important role in modulating subglacial water pressures, which act to control seasonal ice dynamics (Cook et al., 2020; Doyle et al., 2018; Howat et al., 2010). Meltwater at SKSG has also been shown to drive substantial basal




Figure 1. (a) Overview of Sermeq Kujalleq (Store Glacier) study region, showing the number of times individual pixels were classified as water through the study period (counts > 1 are shown). Black lines mark the automatically-detected boundaries of contiguous ponded crevasse fields (see Methods). Dashed black indicates location of panels b-c. (b) Example of ponded crevasse field. (c) Example of classified ponded crevasse fields bounds, with water-classified pixel counts matching panel a. Crevasse field used for Figure 2 is labelled. Background image: Sentinel-2 scene dated 2019-06-01.

melt rates (Young et al., 2022) and deliver meltwater to the glacier front, where plumes can drive frontal melt and calving activity (Cook et al., 2022, 2020).

2.2 Water Classification

We classify surface water in 10 m Sentinel-2 multispectral imagery using a U-net (Fig. S1), a convolutional neural network (CNN) architecture that performs well in semantic segmentation tasks for computer vision (Ronneberger et al., 2015). U-nets are now well-established for glaciological remote sensing problems, including the detection of supraglacial lakes (Lutz et al., 2023) and ice shelf damage (Surawy-Stepney et al., 2023). Water detection methods based around pixel thresholding, such as the Normalised Difference Water Index (NDWI), are well-established approaches for observing the GrIS from medium-resolution optical satellite imagery (Williamson et al., 2018a). However, these methods are less sensitive to high-spatial-frequency features such as crevasses and streams that frequently occur with widths of only a few pixels: detecting these features requires more specialised approaches (Zhang et al., 2023). In this context, deep learning is a desirable and suitable approach to our classification problem.

The training data for our U-net consists of semi-automatically produced maps of surface water, enhancing traditional Normalised Difference Water Index (NDWI) maps with previously published post-processing techniques (Yang et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2023) to extract high-frequency crevasse and stream features. This process produces precise maps of water coverage, but production of these training data requires scene-specific manual tuning and is manually intensive, precluding its application at scale. This makes it a suitable candidate for training data production,

with which we then train the U-net to replicate for large-scale application. We outline the full training and evaluation process in Supplementary Text 1.

We apply our water classification model to all Sentinel-2 scenes covering more than 40% of our study region that exist between April-September from 2016 and 2022. We download them from the Microsoft Planetary Computer, filtering to images that with <20% cloud cover and <80° solar zenith, resulting in a final total of a total of 862 scenes. Before classifying the images, we resample the data via cubic resampling to 10 m resolution polar stereographic north (EPSG:3413).

2.3 Time-Series Datasets

2.3.1 Identifying Contiguous Pondered Crevasse Fields

To present time-series of hydrological and dynamic behaviour specific to local crevasse fields, we defined individual contiguous crevasse field boundaries. We do this in two steps: the first is to identify a valid 'crevassed region' mask within which we reasonably interpret any water-filled pixel to be a water-filled crevasse (cf. a lake, stream, slush, etc). The second is to cluster these water-filled pixels into coherent 'pondered crevasse field' outlines within which we collate data on sum water coverage, average strain rate, etc.

In the first step, we identify a region of potential crevasse fields as the intersection of three individual masks. The first mask is the GrIMP ice mask v1.2 (Howat, 2017) (Supplementary Fig. S2a). The second is derived from a pre-existing 200 m resolution map of crevasse fields (Chudley, 2022), which was generated from the ArcticDEM mosaic (Chudley et al., 2021). We identify any 200 m pixel >5% crevasse-filled as a crevasse field, and perform a morphological dilation-erosion operation (dilation of 500 m and erosion of 200 m) in order to generously include any misclassified margins (Supplementary Fig. S2b). Finally, we define a mask of all lakes by looping through all water masks in our dataset, morphologically eroding the mask by 50 m to eliminate rivers and crevasses, and subsequently morphologically dilate the mask by 150 m to obtain a buffered estimate of lake presence. We produce a lake mask where more than three images in the complete time-series stack are identified as a potential lake pixel (Supplementary Fig. S2c). We combine these masks to derive a final mask of potentially crevassed regions (Supplementary Fig. S2d).

In the second step, we aim to derive coherent and contiguous pondered crevasse fields from the dataset. We take the entire water-classified data stack, converting each water-filled pixel to a point with x and y spatial coordinates. We cluster these points into coherent regions using a Hierarchical Density-Based Spatial Clustering of Applications with Noise (HDBSCAN) approach (Campello et al., 2013; McInnes et al., 2017; McInnes and Healy, 2017). HDBSCAN is a robust unsupervised learning approach to detect dense clusters of varying sizes within a dataset, leaving sparse background points (i.e. noise) unclassified (the benefit of this can be seen in Fig. 1c). Due to exponentially growing computational requirements as the number of points increases, we randomly sample 1% of water-classified points as input to the HDBSCAN algorithm. After points have been classified into spatially coherent clusters, we convert clustered points into individual

(multi)polygons by buffering points by 200 m and removing small polygons beneath 0.2 km^2 . Where clusters overlap, we divide the overlapping area evenly between the clusters. Finally, the automated clusters are manually quality assessed to ensure they represent real ponded crevasse fields. Out of 55 automated clusters, 48 were valid crevasse fields used for analysis: seven represented misclassified zones such as rivers or slush that were not successfully excluded by our masking process.

Based upon these crevasse field outlines (Fig. 1a), we extract time-varying records of ponded crevasse area, strain rates, and reanalysis melt data (Section 2.3.3 – 2.3.5). Although our full dataset covers 2016-2022, we focus exclusively on 2019 for detailed time-series analysis, as the year has a notably higher density of Sentinel-2 data coverage that allows for more precise determination of event timing. For each crevasse field, we identify a number of variables: whether the field drained in 2019; when the date of maximum water coverage was; and whether the maxima in water coverage was qualitatively observed to coincide with a maxima in runoff.

2.3.2 Lakes and ‘Empty’ Crevasse Fields

To assess how unique the behaviours at ponded crevasse fields are, we further compare them to the evolution of ponded water, strain rates, and melt at (i) supraglacial lakes and (ii) ‘empty’ crevasse fields, which we define as regions of crevasse fields where water is not observed to pond through the observational dataset. The identification of lakes was described in Section 2.3.1: we again manually quality-assess the mask to remove misclassified regions (e.g. slush fields), detecting a total of 52 valid lakes from 68 polygons. A sample of 20 ‘empty’ crevasse fields were manually outlined. The final ponded crevasse, lake, and empty crevasse outlines are shown in Supplementary Fig. S3.

2.3.3 Time-Series Water Data

We generate time-series records of water filling and drainage within crevasse fields and lakes from our CNN-classified Sentinel-2 scenes. Before extracting records, we first construct per-scene masks of invalid data, including NaN values and clouds. We estimate cloud cover as pixels that have a SWIR value > 0.14 , following Williamson et al. (2018a). We dilate this mask by 2 pixels (20 metres) to conservatively accommodate classification error. Following this, for every crevasse field/lake polygon, we loop through the dataset and record the area predicted to be water. If any pixels within the polygon are masked due to cloud or lack of data, the data point is rejected from further processing.

2.3.4 Time-Series Velocity and Strain Rate Data

We derive time-series logarithmic strain rates (Alley et al., 2018) from ITS_LIVE scene-pair ice velocity data (Gardner et al., 2024). We download all data between April-September 2016-22 derived from Sentinel-2 datasets and with a timestep of between 10 and 30 days. We eliminate Landsat and Sentinel-1 records because qualitative analysis showed that Sentinel-2 scenes provide a product with much lower noise through the melt season, which is important for strain rate derivation. This was a similar motivation for filtering out timesteps beneath 10 days (anything

greater than 30 days was considered of limited use for assessing strain rate evolution on the timescales of interest).

We define the surface strain rate tensor $\dot{\epsilon}_{ij}$ in terms of the surface-parallel components of velocity u and v in Polar Stereographic North coordinate directions x and y , as

$$\dot{\epsilon}_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} & \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial v}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \right) \\ \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial v}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \right) & \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{\epsilon}_{xx} & \dot{\epsilon}_{xy} \\ \dot{\epsilon}_{xy} & \dot{\epsilon}_{yy} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

Strain rates are defined as positive in extension and negative in compression. We calculate logarithmic strain rates ($\dot{\epsilon}_{xx}$, $\dot{\epsilon}_{yy}$, and $\dot{\epsilon}_{xy}$) following Alley et al. (2018). This approach calculates integrated deformation of ice parcels and is more resistant to errors than nominal strain rates in situations where large velocity gradients occur (such as at crevasse fields). The method requires a length scale value (r) to be determined as the radius from the pixel centre over which strain is calculated. Here, we set an r value of 500 m (effective length scale of 1000 m). Alley et al. (2018) originally proposed effective length scales between 3,000-6,000 m: this reflects their focus on large-scale viscous processes and longitudinal coupling on the order of ice thicknesses. Here instead, we are interested in smaller crevasse-scale processes, so desired an effective length scale ≤ 1 km. We tested with smaller r value of 250 m (effective length scale 500 m), but results did not visibly change.

We present strain rates in the form of first and second principal strain rates ($\dot{\epsilon}_1$ and $\dot{\epsilon}_2$), which we calculate as the highest (most extensional) and lowest (most compressive) eigenvalue of the strain rate tensor respectively, and the longitudinal (along-flow) strain rate ($\dot{\epsilon}_{lon}$), which we calculate following Bindschadler et al. (1996) as

$$\dot{\epsilon}_{lon} = \dot{\epsilon}_{xx} \cos^2 \alpha + 2\dot{\epsilon}_{xy} \sin \alpha \cos \alpha + \dot{\epsilon}_{yy} \sin^2 \alpha. \quad (2)$$

where α is the direction of flow. Unlike previous analysis (Poinar and Andrews, 2021), we do not attempt to incorporate reported velocity uncertainty into our strain rate analysis. ITS_LIVE Sentinel-2 velocity fields provide only a single scene-wide value for uncertainty, which provides a much more conservative value that, in qualitative analysis, was an order of magnitude greater than the clear seasonal signals visible in the data.

To obtain time series for individual crevasse fields/lakes, we take the average value of velocity/strain rates within a polygon, so long as the polygon has full coverage.

2.3.5 Reanalysis Melt Data

We obtain meltwater runoff data from RACMO2.3p2 at 1 km (statistically downscaled 5.5km) (Noël et al., 2019), based on ERA5 reanalyses. We present average daily runoff within the crevasse field/lake boundaries, expressed in mm water equivalent (w.e.). Our choice to present average daily runoff rather than accumulated total runoff reflects the fact that individual crevasses within a field likely have a very small catchment and will not be receiving the total accumulated water from across the field. Hence, average daily runoff provides a more useful indicator of the variation in

daily water supply to any individual crevasse than attempting to integrate supply across a catchment.

2.4 Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics (LEFM) modelling

Following a LEFM approach to glacier crevasses (van der Veen, 1998), crevasses propagate to the depth within the ice (here approximated as a purely elastic material) at which the stress intensity factor at the fracture tip (K_I , $\text{Pa m}^{1/2}$) is equal to fracture toughness of ice (K_{Ic}). K_I can be divided into three components:

$$K_I = K_e + K_i + K_w, \quad (3)$$

where K_e is the contribution of the far-field resistive stress, K_i is the contribution of the ice overburden stress, and K_w is the contribution of the hydrostatic stress of water.

We use an LEFM model to derive fracture depths from Mode I fracture of individual surface crevasses. While the stress concentration at fracture tips will decrease as crevasse spacing decreases – and as such, treatments of individual crevasses will overestimate depths of closely-spaced crevasse fields – there is no convenient solution for such a case that accounts for the finite thickness of an ice body (van der Veen, 1998). Hence, the single fracture case is commonly used as a proxy (Clason et al., 2015; Gantayat et al., 2023), especially as it is unlikely that a perfectly uniform crevasse field of equal depth will exist in nature (Robin, 1974). We use the implementation of Lai et al. (2020), who use foundational equations derived from standard fracture mechanics handbooks (e.g. Tada et al., 2000). Following this approach, equation 3 can be expanded into its respective components as

$$K_I = \sqrt{\pi} R_{xx} d_s^{1/2} F(\tilde{d}_s) - \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \rho_i g d_s^{3/2} f(\tilde{d}_s) + \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \rho_w g d_s^{3/2} g(\tilde{d}_s, \tilde{d}_w), \quad (4)$$

(Lai et al., 2020 Eq. S5), where d_s is the depth of a crevasse, d_w is the depth of water within the crevasse, R_{xx} is the resistive stress, g is the gravitational constant (9.81 m s^{-2}), ρ_i and ρ_w are the densities of ice (917 kg m^{-3}) and water (1000 kg m^{-3}), respectively. Functions $F(\tilde{d}_s)$, $f(\tilde{d}_s)$, and $g(\tilde{d}_s, \tilde{d}_w)$ are dimensionless weight functions (given by Tada et al. (2000, p. 71) and presented in the Supplementary Text 2. $\tilde{d}_s \equiv \frac{d_s}{H}$, $\tilde{d}_w \equiv \frac{d_w}{d_s}$, and H is the ice thickness (here set to 1000 m). To assess water depths, we numerically solve eq. 4 for d_w where $K_I = K_{Ic}$. We set a minimum d_w value of 1 m to avoid numerical instability at low values of d_w . We set a nominal ice fracture toughness of 200 kPa as a broadly representative value that falls within the range of a number of Earth observation and field-based studies (Grinsted et al., 2024; Vaughan, 1993; Wells-Moran et al., 2025).

3. RESULTS

3.1 Drainage events

Our data indicate significant differences between the draining populations of ponded crevasses and supraglacial lakes. Of the 48 contiguous ponded crevasse fields we identified, 40 (83%)




Figure 2. Evolution of exemplar crevasse field (lower-right field in Fig. 1c) over the 2019 season. (a) Total water cover. (b) Mean ITS_LIVE velocity. (c) Longitudinal strain rate, derived from ITS_LIVE velocity. (d) Mean RACMO daily runoff. Vertical black line marks maximum observed water cover.

exhibited evidence of drainage in 2019. Similarly, of the 50 lakes, 20 (40%) exhibited evidence of drainage in 2019. On average, ponded crevasse fields begin to drain earlier than lakes. Ponded crevasses begin draining between 2019-05-05 and 2019-06-24 (mean: 2019-05-22), and lakes begin draining between 2019-05-10 and 2019-08-11 (mean: 2019-05-30), with a much longer tail (Supplementary Fig. S4a). The difference is statistically significant ($p = 0.01$). There was no statistically significant difference between the populations of ponded crevasses and lakes with regards to either the mean height of the features as identified from the ArcticDEM v4.1 mosaic (Porter et al., 2023), or the date of first appearance of melt in the RACMO dataset (Supplementary Fig. S4b-c). However, there was a significant ($p = 0.01$) difference in the ‘background’ strain rate as inferred from the ITS_LIVE velocity mosaic (Supplementary Fig. S4d), with lakes exhibiting a mean background longitudinal strain rate of -0.009 a^{-1} and ponded crevasses a rate of 0.014 a^{-1} .

3.2 Seasonal evolution

We further assessed the seasonal evolution of ponding, dynamics, and melt rate at our identified crevasses and lakes. Fig. 2 provides an example of the seasonal evolution of observed water cover, ice dynamics, and surface melt for a representative ponded crevasse field (identified in Fig. 1c). The crevasse field exhibits rapid growth in total water cover from the end of April/beginning of May, peaking in area on the 28th May. After this date, total water cover decays rapidly in an asymptotic fashion, losing ~50% of its area by 7th June (10 days) and continuing to decrease over




Figure 3. Aggregated longitudinal strain rates (left column) and runoff values (right column) for draining crevasses (top row), draining supraglacial lakes (middle row), and ‘dry’ crevasses that do not express surface water (bottom row). Colour scale represents Gaussian density estimates, and black line represents time series of highest Gaussian density estimate.

the rest of the season. A visualisation of this in sequential Sentinel-2 imagery is included as Supplementary Animation 1. Parallel to this behaviour, we see a consistent increase in ice velocities through May, typical of seasonal behaviour at SKSG and understood to be caused by the onset of melt and subsequent evolution of subglacial hydrological networks (Howat et al., 2010). Longitudinal strain rates follow velocities, increasing throughout May as the crevasses fill. Whilst velocity and strain rates remain broadly constant for the rest of the season until the late-season termination of velocities, melt rates continue to increase and remain high following the drainage, suggesting that water is being routed elsewhere following the peak in water area.

To assess the extent to which the behaviour described above is quantitatively applicable across all drainage scenarios, we present aggregated data following Poinar & Andrews (2021) (Fig. 3). For crevasses and lakes that drain, we shift time series relative to the date of maximum water cover as a proxy for drainage date. For the ‘empty’ crevasses, we present time series as Julian Days. For each integer day, we take all measurements from all crevasses on that day (for velocity-derived

data, this includes all data where the day falls between the date of the first and second scenes). We then generate a Gaussian KDE plot from the data to quantify a range of likely values on that day. The highest density is taken as the ‘most likely’ value, represented as black lines in Fig. 3.

Aggregated values show clear differences in seasonal strain rate evolution between the ponded crevasse fields (Fig. 3a), lakes (Fig. 3b), and ‘dry’ crevasse fields (Fig. 3c). When assessing transient longitudinal strain rate, ponded crevasses (Fig. 3a) show a clear positive trend in the 50 days prior to drainage. This peaks at 3 days prior to maximum values. Notably, longitudinal strain rates transition from compressive values (-0.028 a^{-1} at $t = -50 \text{ d}$) to extensional values ($+0.019 \text{ a}^{-1}$ at $t = -3 \text{ d}$). A similar clear transition does not occur for supraglacial lake drainages (Fig. 3b), which even display an apparent negative deviation (-0.014 at $t = -4 \text{ d}$) – outside of this, strain rates fall within -0.01 a^{-1} to $+0.01 \text{ a}^{-1}$ throughout the entire season. However, the slight negative deviation occurs alongside some of the broadest spread of density estimates and is not replicated in the Poinar & Andrews (2021) dataset (See Fig. 11 of Poinar and Andrews, 2021). Finally, we present data for ‘empty’ non-ponding crevasses, which show that values are consistently positive ($>0.55 \text{ a}^{-1}$) through the summer season. Replicating these observations for the first principal strain rates ($\dot{\epsilon}_1$ and $\dot{\epsilon}_2$) shows a broadly similar pattern of behaviour (Supplementary Fig. S5), suggests that all measures are useful proxies for crevasse-orthogonal stresses in Mode I style fracture. We retain longitudinal strain rates in the main text as this proxy can better capture transitions from compressive to extensional strain rates, which have been suggested to be important in previous work (Chudley et al., 2021).

Aggregated RACMO runoff indicates a weak relationship between the timing of drainage and melt rates. Drainage for both ponded crevasses (Fig. 3d) and lakes (Fig. 3e) show that drainages occur swiftly after the beginning of the melt season, but not at any peak in runoff production. 3 (7.5%) of the draining crevasse fields did so in coincidence with a local peak in runoff, whilst 2 (10%) of the draining lakes did so. This suggests that melt is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for drainage in both scenarios.

3.3 LEFM Modelling

To quantitatively explore the effect of time-varying resistive stresses R_{xx} and water depths d_w on predicted fracture depth, we numerically solve LEFM equations for fracture depth d_s for a range of values of R_{xx} and d_w with fixed parameters $H = 1000 \text{ m}$ and $K_{Ic} = 200 \text{ kPa}$. We present nine cases, each lasting 1000 timesteps, for all combinations of three prescribed scenarios of R_{xx} (scenarios A-C) and d_w (scenarios 1-3), respectively. In scenario A, R_{xx} remains low at -100 kPa for the full run; in B, it increases monotonically from -100 kPa to 400 kPa ; and in C, it remains high at 400 kPa . Likewise, in scenario 1, d_w remains at 0 m (i.e. crevasses are always empty); in 2, d_w increases monotonically from 0 to 1000 m ; and in 3, d_w remains at 1000 m (i.e. the crevasses are considered to always be filled with water). These scenarios are presented graphically in Supplementary Fig. S6.




Figure 4. LEFM modelling scenarios. (a-i) Time-series evolution of crevasse and water depths under R_{xx} forcing scenarios A-C (from top-bottom) and d_w forcing scenarios 1-3 (from left-right). Vertical red lines mark the timing of full-depth fracture ($d_s = H$). Panel represent scenarios: (a) 1A; (b) 2A; (c) 3A; (d) 1B; (e) 2B; (f) 3B; (g) 1C; (h) 2C; and (i) 3C. Scenarios are presented graphically in Supplementary Fig. S6.




Figure 5. Predicted crevasse depths under the full range of R_{xx} and d_w values considered, visualising the 'cliff edge' of crevasse formation at the critical R_{xx} value.

The LEFM outputs (Fig. 4a-i) present distinct crevasse evolution outcomes. Where resistive stresses remain low (Fig. 4a-c), no crevasses will form as crevasse formation requires that the far-field stress contribution exceeds the ice fracture toughness ($K_e > K_{Ic}$), as when no crevasses exist ($d_w = 0$), K_i and K_w must be zero. When no water is present in crevasses, depths are limited (Fig. 4a,d,g), reaching no greater than 71.3 m at the maximum R_{xx} of 400 kPa. Only when water is present (and capable of filling most of the crevasse) are crevasses able to penetrate the full ice-sheet thickness to the bed. For the scenario 2B (Fig. 4e), this full-depth fracture occurs at $R_{xx} = 365$ kPa, $d_w = 930$ m, and scenario 2C (Fig. 4h) at $R_{xx} = 400$ kPa, $d_w = 426$ kPa. Under d_w

scenario 3, where water is always able to fill the crevasse completely, full-depth hydrofracture is able to occur instantaneously upon the formation of a fracture (Fig. 4f,i). Fig 4f shows that under these conditions, when R_{xx} is variable and trending towards tensile stresses, it is the point at which $K_e > K_{Ic}$ that determines the timing of crevasse drainage. This is further emphasized when visualizing predicted d_w depths under the full range of R_{xx} and d_w values (Fig. 5), where the ‘cliff edge’ is visible at the $K_e > K_{Ic}$ value. Hence, even though it is water availability that determines the ability of a crevasse to undergo full-depth hydrofracture, under scenarios where water is abundant and R_{xx} is approaching the critical fracture threshold value, the exact timing of drainage will be controlled by time-evolving ice dynamics.

4. DISCUSSION

4.1 Seasonal controls on ponded crevasse drainage

The data presented here indicate a strong relationship between crevasse drainage and ice dynamics, both in a spatial context and for time-evolving behaviour of ponded crevasses. As established in previous work (Chudley et al., 2021), ponded crevasses are preferentially likely to appear in zones of compression relative to unponded ‘empty’ crevasses. The strong correlation between the transition to extensional strain rates and the subsequent onset of crevasse drainage (Fig. 3a) further suggests that seasonal speed-ups and associated increases in far-field stress play an important role in triggering full-depth hydrofracture, particularly in contrast to the weak relationship between crevasse drainage and any peak in daily runoff (Fig. 3d). The melt-induced ‘spring event’ of seasonal acceleration is a common feature across both land-terminating (Bartholomew et al., 2010) and marine-terminating (Moon et al., 2014) sectors of the GrIS, providing a common forcing mechanism across the ablation zone.

We suggest that a causal link between extensional strain rates and the onset of crevasse drainage arises from peaks in the crevasse-orthogonal stress (R_{xx} within the LEFM framework). However, this relationship contrasts with traditional understandings of hydrofracture, whereby it is the depth of the water column within the crevasse that is the most important variable in driving crevasse propagation, and varying the resistive stresses has a much smaller effect (van der Veen, 2007, 1998; Weertman, 1973). Our LEFM modelling experiments (Section 3.3) provide an insight into this context. Unsurprisingly, the results of our experiments support the principle that crevasses cannot drain by tensile stresses alone (Fig 4a,d,g), and that crevasses must necessarily be (nearly) filled with water to propagate fully to the bed (Fig 4e,f,h,i). However, our experiments additionally include the consideration of time-varying resistive stress, whereas previously experiments have considered only fixed R_{xx} values, even where multiple options for R_{xx} have been considered (e.g. Krawczynski et al., 2009). These show that, if meltwater is abundant (i.e. sufficient water exists that the crevasse can always be water-filled), the critical factor in determining the timing of crevasse drainage is the point at which the far-field resistive stress contribution exceeds the ice strength ($K_e > K_{Ic}$) and thus fractures can begin to open. This is governed exclusively by the time-varying value of R_{xx} . Once open, the fractures can propagate to the bed by water-filling alone.




Fig 6. Schematic conceptualisation of a fracture underlying a water ‘reservoir’ in the remnant of a viscously closed surface feature. Note that the origin of z (the depth relative to the top of the fracture) is the bottom of the reservoir, rather than the ice surface.

There are two problems with relating our LEFM inferences to the observational record. First, LEFM assumes that fractures are closed under compressive or near-neutral stresses, given the model considers only elastic responses (assumed to be effectively instantaneous) rather than any viscous deformation. However, the ponded crevasses we observe already exist and appear significant in size, on the order of 10-100 m in width and 100-1000 m in length, and even the surface expression visible in metre-scale-resolution elevation datasets can be 10-100 m deep (Chudley et al., 2025; Enderlin and Bartholomaeus, 2020). Second, it requires the assumption that crevasses have access to abundant meltwater such that they can always be water-filled, regardless of the depth or volume of the crevasse. However, UAV observations suggest that these ponded crevasses are hydraulically isolated with small catchments, limiting access to runoff (Chudley et al., 2021).

We suggest that these problems can be resolved by conceptualising surface crevasses in compressive regimes as viscously closed features with a V-shaped remnant surface expression, following Poinar’s (2020) description of ‘water-filled ditches’ (Fig. 6). Here, remnant crevasse fields can fill with snow overwinter, producing a significant reservoir of water early in the melt season. The relict fracture, healed either via viscous closure or via refreezing (Hubbard et al., 2021), remains at the base of the ditch. The fracture remains susceptible to reactivation from infilling water, as has been observed to trigger the drainage of supraglacial lakes (Chudley et al., 2019; Humbert et al., 2025). The reservoir overlying this fracture cannot influence the stress intensity factor, as being substantially wider than the fracture itself, the overburden pressure is influencing both water and ice overburden (K_w and K_i) equally (see Law, 2025). Upon initial (re)opening of the fracture in response to seasonally increasing tensile stresses, water from the overlying reservoir can enter the fracture, providing an abundant and continuous supply of meltwater to promote full-depth hydrofracture.

Simple calculations show that snowfall present in relict crevasses at the beginning of the season could provide the vast majority of water necessary to encourage full-depth propagation. Nominal crevasse widths (and thus requisite reservoir volumes) are relatively low: with 0.1 – 1.0 m being a reasonable range of crevasse widths to efficiently drain lakes in LEFM modelling (Krawczynski et al., 2009), matching the 0.4 m observed by Doyle *et al.* (2013). If we assume a simplified semicircular surface relict feature of 50 m diameter that begins the season filled with compacted snow of 400 kg m^{-3} , an along-flow profile would contain 392.7 m^2 of water once fully melted. This is enough to completely fill a 0.4 m wide fracture 981.8 m deep – sufficient to induce full-depth fracture in a 1 km thick ice sheet even without any further melt through the season. With regional daily snowfall trends on the order of 1 mm/day during the accumulation season (Gallagher et al., 2022), directly accumulated snow alone is insufficient to fill large crevasses. However, in-situ observations at SKSG suggest that even large (>10 m diameter) crevasses can begin the melt season filled with snow (Figure S7), and Alpine observations indicate that wind-blown snow is a critical component of crevasse snow-filling (Ravanel et al., 2022). Strong katabatic winds and dry winter snow likely provide a highly conducive environment for snow redistribution from over large distances (Li and Pomeroy, 1997), although studies quantifying these processes over the Greenland Ice Sheet are sparse (Zuhr et al., 2021).

One final consideration is the ability for ponded crevasses to exhibit repeated fill and drainage behaviour throughout the year, as noted by Cavanagh et al. (2017). Although this is not common in our dataset (only 4 crevasse fields / 10% of the total exhibit repeat filling/drainages in 2019), the literature suggests that this appears to be relatively unique to ponded crevasses fields and not supraglacial lakes. We suggest that multiple drainages likely occur because – given the small catchment available for meltwater accumulation and delivery to individual crevasses – the ongoing rate of runoff into a fracture is insufficient to maintain an open moulin through thermomechanical erosion. Instead, the fracture can close visco-elastically, refill with water given abundant peak melt rates (Fig. 3d), and then drain again if conditions are sufficient.

4.2 Differences between ponded crevasses and other surface drainage features

4.2.1 Lakes

Our proposal that ponded crevasses drain due to a secular seasonal trend towards tensile stresses differs significantly from hypotheses relating to supraglacial lake drainage. At supraglacial lake sites, which are preferentially located in compressive regimes (Poinar and Andrews, 2021), initial hydrofracture is not preceded by increases in stress state on the scale of weeks, shown by Poinar & Andrews (2021) as well as our data (Fig. 3b). Instead, reaching sufficient tensile stresses to drain lakes requires short-term (~hours-days) transient precursor events (Christoffersen et al., 2018; Hoffman et al., 2018; Poinar and Andrews, 2021; Stevens et al., 2024, 2015). In other circumstances, relict fractures from preceding years can be reopened in subsequent years along planes of weakness (Chudley et al., 2019; Humbert et al., 2025). Observations suggest that the stress intensity factor required to reactivate fractures is not as great as required to initiate new fractures: drainage in these scenarios can occur either without a precursory dynamic event




Figure 7. (a-c) Conceptual framework showing hydrological surface features across the ablation zone of a fast-flowing outlet glacier, and (d-e) proposed evolution of water levels relative to the ice surface (z_w , blue) and resistive stresses (R_{xx} , red) until drainage occurs (dashed vertical line) at these locations. (a, d) At ponded crevasses, being water-filled is a necessary but not sufficient condition for hydrofracture: R_{xx} values must reach a critical threshold for fracture formation before drainage can occur. (b, e) At empty crevasses, resistive stresses are sufficient for fracture formation – crevasses can drain early in the season upon sufficient meltwater accumulation. (c, f) At lakes, R_{xx} remains low throughout the season: short-term transient accelerations are necessary to reach the threshold for fracture initiation.

(Chudley et al., 2019) or at lower lake volumes (Humbert et al., 2025). We suggest the mechanical difference between lake and ponded crevasse drainage is related to the different background stress regimes. Whilst lakes may exist in a compressive environment through the entire season (Fig. 3b) and require transient events to initiate fracture, ponded crevasses exist in an intermediate context, switching from compressive to extensional within the same season (Fig. 3a), a transition that facilitates full-depth hydrofracture.

A further difference between lake and crevasse field drainage is the anticipated rate of water delivery to the bed. Supraglacial lake drainages can drain completely in a matter of hours (Doyle et al., 2013; Stevens et al., 2015), which is reflected in remote sensing classification thresholds. For instance, rapid drainages are classified as lakes exhibiting >80% volume loss in ≤ 4 days at SKSG by Williamson et al. (2018a). This rapid loss in water cover is replicated in our lake drainage observations (Fig. S8). Conversely, in our contiguous crevasse field datasets, the loss in significant water-filled crevasse area instead occurs over days or weeks (Fig. 2). This reflects the fact drainage does not occur simultaneously across an entire ponded crevasse field, but as a series of sequential drainages of individual crevasses (Supplementary Animation S1). These respond to a single overriding control (increasingly tensile resistive stress) but are subject to stochastic variation based upon secondary factors (e.g. catchment and meltwater availability, stress field variability across crevassed regions, variations in the stress intensity factor). This variation likely explains why we observe strain rates to peak in the days before water cover (Fig. 3a) – fractures may begin draining prior to this date, although only once drainage rates exceed meltwater filling rates will total water cover begin to decrease.

4.2.2 'Empty' crevasses

In crevasse fields where no ponding is observed, strain rates remain tensile and high in magnitude through the entire season (Fig. 3c), suggesting highly extensional stresses may explain this behaviour. One hypothesis is that crevasses in these regions are not hydraulically isolated (Chudley et al., 2021) and can transfer water englacially through englacial fracture networks (Fountain et al., 2005), limiting the ability of substantial water build-up that could trigger full-depth hydrofracture. This water may be refrozen following the ablation season (Hubbard et al., 2021; Kendrick et al., 2018), or routed englacially to pre-existing moulins, resulting in substantially slower meltwater delivery to the bed than via full-depth hydrofracture or moulins fed by surface streams (Colgan et al., 2011; McGrath et al., 2011).

A second hypothesis is that no water is observed in 'empty' crevasses because they drain near-instantaneously upon the commencement of the melt season (forcing scenario 3C in fig. 4j). This mechanism could explain how the earliest meltwater of the season can arrive at the bed. Ponded crevasses drain as a consequence, rather than a cause, of seasonal acceleration (Fig. 3a), yet seasonal accelerations at SKSG (and many other marine-terminating outlets) are well-understood to be due to the onset of melt and reductions in effective pressure (Moon et al., 2014; Vijay et al., 2019). The ability for crevasses in tensile regimes to drain to the bed without the requirement for any seasonal acceleration may provide the initial route through which hydrologically-forced acceleration begins. However, 'active' crevasses opening in tensile regimes will lack a significant reservoir of water to initiate hydrofracture, in contrast to the 'water-filled ditches' (Poinar, 2020) overlying relict fractures in compressive regimes. This may instead be compensated by the lateral englacial water transport through open fracture networks (Benn et al., 2009), feeding initial hydrofractures and subsequent moulins. The precise mechanism is challenging to infer from remote sensing studies alone: field observations, such as airborne ice-penetrating radar, may be able to provide further insights into the nature of the hydrological networks within surface crevasse fields.

4.3 Parameterising crevasse fields in models

Spatio-temporal variability in meltwater inputs to the bed has been shown to affect the configuration of the subglacial drainage system (Andrews et al., 2014; Banwell et al., 2016; Scholzen et al., 2021), but properly representing this behaviour in modelling studies is limited by our ability to parameterise surface-to-bed meltwater routing. Within the range of studies that have included surface-to-bed routing representation in models (e.g. Clason et al., 2012, 2014; Gowan et al., 2023; Koziol and Arnold, 2018), even fewer have considered crevasse fields explicitly. A common initial approach is to approximate the distribution of crevasses based upon a threshold stress value (Clason et al., 2012, 2015; Gantayat et al., 2023; Koziol et al., 2017). Following this, two common choices are made. The first is to allow runoff generated over crevasse fields to reach the bed immediately and directly upon formation, rather than in any discrete inputs (Koziol et al., 2017; Sommers et al., 2024). This approximates a hydraulically transmissive crevasse field that readily transports runoff to the bed. The second is to allow meltwater to pond and drain following

an LEFM framework, often using the background stress as a fixed R_{xx} value (Clason et al., 2015; Everett et al., 2016; Gantayat et al., 2023). These two approaches result in considerably different patterns of meltwater delivery (spatio-temporally uniform vs discrete) which are understood to have distinct consequences for the subglacial hydrological system (Banwell et al., 2016; Schoof, 2010).

Our observations provide new insight into ways to better represent crevasse drainage processes within surface-to-bed routing models. The first is the careful consideration of which stress representation to use as a proxy for R_{xx} . Our baseline here is the Von Mises failure criterion, which is the most common choice of representative stress in surface-to-bed routing models (Clason et al., 2012, 2015; Gantayat et al., 2023). The criterion is established as a good approximation for ice failure (Vaughan, 1993), but it may not be similarly appropriate for the case of ponded crevasse fields. Von Mises thresholds predict zones of active failure, whereas ponded crevasse fields represent relict crevasse fields that have advected into compressive regimes (Fig. 7; Poinar, 2020). Second, because von Mises stress is direction-insensitive (treating tensile and compressive stresses of the same magnitude identically), it is not always a suitable proxy for processes where the sign of stress matters (Grinsted et al., 2024), as suggested by our time-series strain rate analysis (Fig. 3). Ultimately any individual choice of proxy will have weaknesses in a simple parameterisation, as crevasses in nature will be a function of complex multi-modal stresses. However, when considering Mode-I fracture (which LEFM approaches implicitly assume), using the first principal (tensile) Cauchy stress or longitudinal stress is likely more appropriate (Reynolds et al., 2024).

The second recommendation is to include time-varying stresses in surface-to-bed routing models. Whilst static background stress derived from annual velocity fields appear to be useful in predicting broad behaviours (Chudley et al., 2021; Poinar and Andrews, 2021), the exact timing of drainage of ponded crevasse fields requires knowledge of seasonally-varying stress (Fig. 3a). Everett et al. (2016) report that their LEFM model predictions of drainage date are poorer for water-filled crevasses than for supraglacial lakes, which they conclude is due to variation in subglacial hydrological potential. An additional factor may be that the seasonal evolution of stresses are important for crevasse drainage in a way that they are not for supraglacial lake drainage. To force a regional surface-to-bed routing model with time-varying stresses would require representative stress values, generated either from observations or modelling. Observationally, continuous records of stress fields could be generated from remotely-sensed velocity records. This would require methods of statistically generating infilled data – for example, Bayesian methods such as Gaussian process regression (Guillet et al., 2025). A modelling approach would require a coupled hydrology-dynamic model, which a long-term desirable goal that would be able to account for coupled feedbacks between the meltwater drainage and basal sliding (Gantayat et al., 2023).

5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Our work has presented the first assessment of the interaction between seasonal ice dynamics and crevasse hydrology at a fast-flowing outlet glacier. Combining Earth observation data with mechanical insights from LEFM, we conclude that seasonal ice dynamics exert a dominant control

over when ponded crevasse fields drain at fast-flowing Greenlandic outlets. Regions of crevasse ponding are characterised by topographically distinct relict surface ‘ditches’, formed from the viscous closure of active crevasse fields as they advect into compressive or near-neutral background stresses. These features allow for large reservoirs of water to be generated rapidly in the melt season despite small catchment areas, likely from the melt of overwinter snowfill. As the melt season progresses and the ice sheet accelerates, increasingly tensile stresses eventually reach a sufficient threshold to trigger new fracture underlying the reservoirs. Abundant meltwater provided from the overlying reservoirs allows for rapid full-depth hydrofracture to the ice sheet bed. These findings support a new conceptual framework of meltwater drainage at fast-flowing glaciers, distinct from established mechanisms of drainage at supraglacial lakes (which likely are triggered by short-term dynamic accelerations), and likely distinct from processes occurring within ‘empty’ crevasse fields where crevasses are not observed to fill with water. Crevasse drainage is thought to transfer at least half of all water to the bed of the Greenland Ice Sheet: the insights outlined here provide the groundwork to properly parameterise these behaviours into numerical models and understand their influence on the seasonal evolution of ice sheet processes.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Data and Jupyter Notebooks necessary to reproduce the study are available at <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17287272> (Chudley, 2025). Sentinel-2 data were downloaded from the Microsoft Planetary Computer. ITS_LIVE velocity data are available from Gardner et al. (2024). The GrIMP ice mask is available from Howat et al. (2017). The ArcticDEM-derived crevasse mask is available from Chudley (2022). RACMO2.3p2 data are available from the authors of Noël et al. (2019). The ArcticDEM v4.1 mosaic was downloaded using *pdemtools* (Chudley and Howat, 2024). The TensorFlow model, alongside supporting functions and explanatory Jupyter Notebook for water classification, will be made available on Github/Zenodo upon publication. A Python package for calculating logarithmic strain rates from remotely sensed velocity fields following Alley et al. (2018) will be made available on Github/Zenodo upon publication.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TRC received funding from a Leverhulme Trust Early Career Fellowship (ECF-2022-589). JML received funding from a United Kingdom Research and Innovation (UKRI) Future Leaders Fellowship (MR/X02346X/1). We are grateful to colleagues for fruitful discussions that fed into the work: to Kristin Poinar on strain rate analysis and water-filled ditches; to Jonny Kingslake on the application of overlying water to linear elastic fracture mechanics; and to Patrice Carbonneau and Wei Ji Leong on development of the deep learning architecture. This work has used Durham University’s NVIDIA CUDA Centre (NCC) cluster. NCC has been purchased through Durham University’s strategic investment funds and is installed and maintained by the Department of Computer Science.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceptualisation: TRC, CRS, JML, CCC

Methodology: TRC, TW, RL, JLD

Formal analysis: TRC

Visualisation: TRC, HEW

Funding Acquisition: TRC, CRS, JML

Writing – Original Draft: TRC

Writing – Review & Editing: TRC, CRS, JML, TW, RL, CCC, HEW, JLD

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflicts of interest relevant to this study.

REFERENCES

- Alley, K.E., Scambos, T.A., Anderson, R.S., Rajaram, H., Pope, A., Haran, T.M., 2018. Continent-wide estimates of Antarctic strain rates from Landsat 8-derived velocity grids. *Journal of Glaciology* 64, 321–332. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jog.2018.23>
- Andrews, L.C., Catania, G.A., Hoffman, M.J., Gulley, J.D., Lüthi, M.P., Ryser, C., Hawley, R.L., Neumann, T.A., 2014. Direct observations of evolving subglacial drainage beneath the Greenland Ice Sheet. *Nature* 514, 80–83. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature13796>
- Banwell, A., Hewitt, I., Willis, I., Arnold, N., 2016. Moulin density controls drainage development beneath the Greenland ice sheet. *J. Geophys. Res. Earth Surf.* 2015JF003801. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JF003801>
- Bartholomew, I., Nienow, P., Mair, D., Hubbard, A., King, M.A., Sole, A., 2010. Seasonal evolution of subglacial drainage and acceleration in a Greenland outlet glacier. *Nature Geoscience* 3, 408–411.
- Bell, R.E., Tinto, K., Das, I., Wolovick, M., Chu, W., Creyts, T.T., Frearson, N., Abdi, A., Paden, J.D., 2014. Deformation, warming and softening of Greenland's ice by refreezing meltwater. *Nature Geosci* 7, 497–502. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo2179>
- Benn, D., Gulley, J., Luckman, A., Adamek, A., Glowacki, P.S., 2009. Englacial drainage systems formed by hydrologically driven crevasse propagation. *Journal of Glaciology* 55, 513–523. <https://doi.org/10.3189/002214309788816669>
- Bindschadler, R., Vornberger, P., Blankenship, D., Scambos, T., Jacobel, R., 1996. Surface velocity and mass balance of Ice Streams D and E, West Antarctica. *Journal of Glaciology* 42, 461–475. <https://doi.org/10.3189/S0022143000003452>
- Campello, R.J.G.B., Moulavi, D., Sander, J., 2013. Density-Based Clustering Based on Hierarchical Density Estimates, in: Pei, J., Tseng, V.S., Cao, L., Motoda, H., Xu, G. (Eds.), *Advances in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp. 160–172. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-37456-2_14
- Cavanagh, J.P., Lampkin, D.J., Moon, T., 2017. Seasonal Variability in Regional Ice Flow Due to Meltwater Injection Into the Shear Margins of Jakobshavn Isbræ. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface* 122, 2488–2505. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JF004187>
- Christoffersen, P., Bougamont, M., Hubbard, A., Doyle, S.H., Grigsby, S., Pettersson, R., 2018. Cascading lake drainage on the Greenland Ice Sheet triggered by tensile shock and fracture. *Nature Communications* 9, 1064. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-03420-8>
- Chudley, T.R., 2025. Data supporting “Seasonal ice dynamics control the timing of crevasse drainage at a fast-flowing outlet glacier.” <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17287273>
- Chudley, T.R., 2022. Greenland Ice Sheet crevasse map from ArcticDEM. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6779087>
- Chudley, T.R., Christoffersen, P., Doyle, S.H., Bougamont, M., Schoonman, C.M., Hubbard, B., James, M.R., 2019. Supraglacial lake drainage at a fast-flowing Greenlandic outlet glacier. *PNAS*. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1913685116>
- Chudley, T.R., Christoffersen, P., Doyle, S.H., Dowling, T.P.F., Law, R., Schoonman, C.M., Bougamont, M., Hubbard, B., 2021. Controls on Water Storage and Drainage in Crevasses on the Greenland Ice Sheet. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface* 126, e2021JF006287. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021JF006287>

- Chudley, T.R., Howat, I.M., 2024. pDEMtools: conveniently search, download, and process ArcticDEM and REMA products. *Journal of Open Source Software* 9, 7149. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.07149>
- Chudley, T.R., Howat, I.M., King, M.D., MacKie, E.J., 2025. Increased crevassing across accelerating Greenland Ice Sheet margins. *Nat. Geosci.* 18, 148–153. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-024-01636-6>
- Clason, C., Mair, D.W.F., Burgess, D.O., Nienow, P.W., 2012. Modelling the delivery of supraglacial meltwater to the ice/bed interface: application to southwest Devon Ice Cap, Nunavut, Canada. *Journal of Glaciology* 58, 361–374. <https://doi.org/10.3189/2012JoG11J129>
- Clason, C.C., Applegate, P.J., Holmlund, P., 2014. Modelling Late Weichselian evolution of the Eurasian ice sheets forced by surface meltwater-enhanced basal sliding. *Journal of Glaciology* 60, 29–40. <https://doi.org/10.3189/2014JoG13J037>
- Clason, C.C., Mair, D.W.F., Nienow, P.W., Bartholomew, I.D., Sole, A., Palmer, S., Schwanghart, W., 2015. Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater to the bed of Leverett Glacier, Southwest Greenland. *The Cryosphere* 9, 123–138. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-9-123-2015>
- Colgan, W., Sommers, A., Rajaram, H., Abdalati, W., Frahm, J., 2015. Considering thermal-viscous collapse of the Greenland ice sheet. *Earth's Future* 3, 252–267. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015EF000301>
- Colgan, W., Steffen, K., McLamb, W.S., Abdalati, W., Rajaram, H., Motyka, R., Phillips, T., Anderson, R., 2011. An increase in crevasse extent, West Greenland: Hydrologic implications. *Geophysical Research Letters* 38. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011GL048491>
- Cook, S.J., Christoffersen, P., Todd, J., 2022. A fully-coupled 3D model of a large Greenlandic outlet glacier with evolving subglacial hydrology, frontal plume melting and calving. *Journal of Glaciology* 68, 486–502. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jog.2021.109>
- Cook, S.J., Christoffersen, P., Todd, J., Slater, D., Chauché, N., 2020. Coupled modelling of subglacial hydrology and calving-front melting at Store Glacier, West Greenland. *The Cryosphere* 14, 905–924. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-14-905-2020>
- Cowton, T., Slater, D., Sole, A., Goldberg, D., Nienow, P., 2015. Modeling the impact of glacial runoff on fjord circulation and submarine melt rate using a new subgrid-scale parameterization for glacial plumes. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans* 120, 796–812. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JC010324>
- Doyle, S.H., Hubbard, A.L., Dow, C.F., Jones, G.A., Fitzpatrick, A., Gusmeroli, A., Kulesa, B., Lindback, K., Pettersson, R., Box, J.E., 2013. Ice tectonic deformation during the rapid in situ drainage of a supraglacial lake on the Greenland Ice Sheet. *The Cryosphere* 7, 129–140. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-7-129-2013>
- Doyle, S.H., Hubbard, B., Christoffersen, P., Young, T.J., Hofstede, C., Bougamont, M., Box, J.E., Hubbard, A., 2018. Physical Conditions of Fast Glacier Flow: 1. Measurements From Boreholes Drilled to the Bed of Store Glacier, West Greenland. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JF004529>
- Enderlin, E.M., Bartholomew, T.C., 2020. Sharp contrasts in observed and modeled crevasse patterns at Greenland's marine terminating glaciers. *The Cryosphere* 14, 4121–4133. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-14-4121-2020>
- Everett, A., Murray, T., Selmes, N., Rutt, I.C., Luckman, A., James, T.D., Clason, C., O'Leary, M., Karunaratna, H., Moloney, V., Reeve, D.E., 2016. Annual down-glacier drainage of lakes and water-filled crevasses at Helheim Glacier, southeast Greenland. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface* 121, 1819–1833. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JF003831>
- Fountain, A.G., Jacobel, R.W., Schlichting, R., Jansson, P., 2005. Fractures as the main pathways of water flow in temperate glaciers. *Nature* 433, 618–621. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature03296>
- Gallagher, M.R., Shupe, M.D., Chepfer, H., L'Ecuyer, T., 2022. Relating snowfall observations to Greenland ice sheet mass changes: an atmospheric circulation perspective. *The Cryosphere* 16, 435–450. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-16-435-2022>
- Gantayat, P., Banwell, A.F., Leeson, A.A., Lea, J.M., Petersen, D., Gourmelen, N., Fettweis, X., 2023. A new model for supraglacial hydrology evolution and drainage for the Greenland Ice Sheet (SHED v1.0). *Geoscientific Model Development* 16, 5803–5823. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-16-5803-2023>
- Gardner, A., Fahnestock, M., Greene, C.A., Kennedy, J.H., Liukis, M., Lopez, L.A., Scambos, T., 2024. MEASURES ITS LIVE Regional Glacier and Ice Sheet Surface Velocities, Version 2. <https://doi.org/10.5067/JQ6337239C96>
- Gowan, E.J., Hinck, S., Niu, L., Clason, C., Lohmann, G., 2023. The impact of spatially varying ice sheet basal conditions on sliding at glacial time scales. *Journal of Glaciology* 69, 1056–1070. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jog.2022.125>
- Grinsted, A., Rathmann, N.M., Mottram, R., Solgaard, A.M., Mathiesen, J., Hvidberg, C.S., 2024. Failure strength of glacier ice inferred from Greenland crevasses. *The Cryosphere* 18, 1947–1957. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-18-1947-2024>
- Guillet, G., Benn, D.I., King, O., Shean, D., Mannerfelt, E.S., Hugonnet, R., 2025. Global detection of glacier surges from surface velocities, elevation change and SAR backscatter data between 2000 and 2024:

- a test of surge mechanism theories. *Journal of Glaciology* 71, e88.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/jog.2025.10065>
- Hoffman, M.J., Perego, M., Andrews, L.C., Price, S.F., Neumann, T.A., Johnson, J.V., Catania, G., Lüthi, M.P., 2018. Widespread Moulin Formation During Supraglacial Lake Drainages in Greenland. *Geophysical Research Letters* 45, 778–788. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GL075659>
- Howat, I., 2017. MEaSUREs Greenland Ice Mapping Project (GIMP) Land Ice and Ocean Classification Mask, Version 1. <https://doi.org/10.5067/B8X58MQBFUPA>
- Howat, I.M., Box, J.E., Ahn, Y., Herrington, A., McFadden, E.M., 2010. Seasonal variability in the dynamics of marine-terminating outlet glaciers in Greenland. *Journal of Glaciology* 56, 601–613.
<https://doi.org/10.3189/002214310793146232>
- Hubbard, B., Christoffersen, P., Doyle, S.H., Chudley, T.R., Schoonman, C.M., Law, R., Bougamont, M., 2021. Borehole-Based Characterization of Deep Mixed-Mode Crevasses at a Greenlandic Outlet Glacier. *AGU Advances* 2, e2020AV000291. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020AV000291>
- Humbert, A., Helm, V., Zeising, O., Neckel, N., Braun, M.H., Khan, S.A., Rückamp, M., Steeb, H., Sohn, J., Bohnen, M., Müller, R., 2025. Insights into supraglacial lake drainage dynamics: triangular fracture formation, reactivation and long-lasting englacial features. *The Cryosphere* 19, 3009–3032.
<https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-19-3009-2025>
- Kendrick, A.K., Schroeder, D.M., Chu, W., Young, T.J., Christoffersen, P., Todd, J., Doyle, S.H., Box, J.E., Hubbard, A., Hubbard, B., Brennan, P.V., Nicholls, K.W., Lok, L.B., 2018. Surface Meltwater Impounded by Seasonal Englacial Storage in West Greenland. *Geophysical Research Letters* 45, 10,474–10,481. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL079787>
- Koziol, C., Arnold, N., Pope, A., Colgan, W., 2017. Quantifying supraglacial meltwater pathways in the Paakitsoq region, West Greenland. *Journal of Glaciology* 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jog.2017.5>
- Koziol, C.P., Arnold, N., 2018. Modelling seasonal meltwater forcing of the velocity of the Greenland Ice Sheet. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-12-971-2018>
- Krawczynski, M.J., Behn, M.D., Das, S.B., Joughin, I., 2009. Constraints on the lake volume required for hydro-fracture through ice sheets. *Geophysical Research Letters* 36.
<https://doi.org/10.1029/2008GL036765>
- Lai, C.-Y., Kingslake, J., Wearing, M.G., Chen, P.-H.C., Gentine, P., Li, H., Spergel, J.J., van Wessem, J.M., 2020. Vulnerability of Antarctica’s ice shelves to meltwater-driven fracture. *Nature* 584, 574–578.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2627-8>
- Lampkin, D.J., Amador, N., Parizek, B.R., Farness, K., Jezek, K., 2013. Drainage from water-filled crevasses along the margins of Jakobshavn Isbræ: A potential catalyst for catchment expansion. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface* 118, 795–813. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgrf.20039>
- Lampkin, D.J., Parizek, B., Larour, E.Y., Seroussi, H., Joseph, C., Cavanagh, J.P., 2018. Toward Improved Understanding of Changes in Greenland Outlet Glacier Shear Margin Dynamics in a Warming Climate. *Frontiers in Earth Science* 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2018.00156>
- Law, R., 2025. Rapid Hydrofracture of Icy Moon Shells: Insights From Glaciology. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets* 130, e2024JE008403. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2024JE008403>
- Li, L., Pomeroy, J.W., 1997. Probability of occurrence of blowing snow. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* 102, 21955–21964. <https://doi.org/10.1029/97JD01522>
- Lutz, K., Bahrami, Z., Braun, M., 2023. Supraglacial Lake Evolution over Northeast Greenland Using Deep Learning Methods. *Remote Sensing* 15, 4360. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs15174360>
- McGrath, D., Colgan, W., Steffen, K., Lauffenburger, P., Balog, J., 2011. Assessing the summer water budget of a moulin basin in the Sermeq Avannarleq ablation region, Greenland ice sheet. *Journal of Glaciology* 57, 954–964. <https://doi.org/10.3189/002214311798043735>
- McInnes, L., Healy, J., 2017. Accelerated Hierarchical Density Based Clustering, in: 2017 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining Workshops (ICDMW). Presented at the 2017 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining Workshops (ICDMW), pp. 33–42.
<https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDMW.2017.12>
- McInnes, L., Healy, J., Astels, S., 2017. hdbscan: Hierarchical density based clustering. *Journal of Open Source Software* 2, 205. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.00205>
- Mejia, J.Z., Poinar, K., Meyer, C.R., Sommers, A.N., Chu, W., 2025. Mechanisms for upstream migration of firn aquifer drainage: preliminary observations from Helheim Glacier, Greenland. *Journal of Glaciology* 71, e5. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jog.2024.78>
- Moon, T., Joughin, I., Smith, B., van den Broeke, M.R., van de Berg, W.J., Noël, B., Usher, M., 2014. Distinct patterns of seasonal Greenland glacier velocity. *Geophys Res Lett* 41, 7209–7216.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/2014GL061836>
- Noël, B., van de Berg, W.J., Lhermitte, S., van den Broeke, M.R., 2019. Rapid ablation zone expansion amplifies north Greenland mass loss. *Science Advances* 5, eaaw0123.
<https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aaw0123>
- Phillips, T., Rajaram, H., Steffen, K., 2010. Cryo-hydrologic warming: A potential mechanism for rapid thermal response of ice sheets. *Geophysical Research Letters* 37.

- Poinar, K., 2020. Water-filled ditches: Surface expressions of dead crevasses that are not connected to the bed. ESS Open Archive. <https://doi.org/10.1002/essoar.10505037.1>
- Poinar, K., Andrews, L.C., 2021. Challenges in predicting Greenland supraglacial lake drainages at the regional scale. *Cryosphere* 15, 1455–1483. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-15-1455-2021>
- Poinar, K., Dow, C.F., Andrews, L.C., 2019. Long-Term Support of an Active Subglacial Hydrologic System in Southeast Greenland by Firn Aquifers. *Geophysical Research Letters* 46, 4772–4781. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL082786>
- Poinar, K., Joughin, I., Lilien, D., Brucker, L., Kehrl, L., Nowicki, S., 2017. Drainage of Southeast Greenland Firn Aquifer Water through Crevasses to the Bed. *Front. Earth Sci.* 5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2017.00005>
- Porter, C., Howat, I., Noh, M.-J., Husby, E., Khuvis, S., Danish, E., Tomko, K., Gardiner, J., Negrete, A., Yadav, B., Klassen, J., Kelleher, C., Cloutier, M., Bakker, J., Enos, J., Arnold, G., Bauer, G., Morin, P., 2023. ArcticDEM - Mosaics, Version 4.1. <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/3VDC4W>
- Ravanel, L., Lacroix, E., Le Meur, E., Batoux, P., Malet, E., 2022. Multiparameter monitoring of crevasses on an Alpine glacier to understand formation and evolution of snow bridges. *Cold Regions Science and Technology* 203, 103643. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coldregions.2022.103643>
- Reynolds, B., Nowicki, S., Poinar, K., 2024. Comprehensive Assessment of Stress Calculations for Crevasse Depths and Testing with Crevasse Penetration as Damage. *EGU sphere* 1–37. <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-2424>
- Robin, G.Q.D., 1974. Depth of water-filled crevasses that are closely spaced. *Journal of Glaciology* 13, 543–543. <https://doi.org/10.3189/S0022143000023285>
- Ronneberger, O., Fischer, P., Brox, T., 2015. U-Net: Convolutional Networks for Biomedical Image Segmentation, in: Navab, N., Hornegger, J., Wells, W.M., Frangi, A.F. (Eds.), *Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention – MICCAI 2015*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 234–241. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-24574-4_28
- Scholzen, C., Schuler, T.V., Gilbert, A., 2021. Sensitivity of subglacial drainage to water supply distribution at the Kongsfjord basin, Svalbard. *The Cryosphere* 15, 2719–2738. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-15-2719-2021>
- Schoof, C., 2010. Ice-sheet acceleration driven by melt supply variability. *Nature* 468, 803–806. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature09618>
- Slater, D.A., Straneo, F., 2022. Submarine melting of glaciers in Greenland amplified by atmospheric warming. *Nat. Geosci.* 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-022-01035-9>
- Slater, T., Shepherd, A., McMillan, M., Leeson, A., Gilbert, L., Muir, A., Munneke, P.K., Noël, B., Fettweis, X., van den Broeke, M., Briggs, K., 2021. Increased variability in Greenland Ice Sheet runoff from satellite observations. *Nat Commun* 12, 6069. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-26229-4>
- Sommers, A.N., Meyer, C.R., Poinar, K., Mejia, J., Morlighem, M., Rajaram, H., Warburton, K.L.P., Chu, W., 2024. Velocity of Greenland's Helheim Glacier Controlled Both by Terminus Effects and Subglacial Hydrology With Distinct Realms of Influence. *Geophysical Research Letters* 51, e2024GL109168. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2024GL109168>
- Stevens, L.A., Behn, M.D., McGuire, J.J., Das, S.B., Joughin, I., Herring, T., Shean, D.E., King, M.A., 2015. Greenland supraglacial lake drainages triggered by hydrologically induced basal slip. *Nature* 522, 73–76. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14480>
- Stevens, L.A., Das, S.B., Behn, M.D., McGuire, J.J., Lai, C.-Y., Joughin, I., Larochelle, S., Nettles, M., 2024. Elastic Stress Coupling Between Supraglacial Lakes. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface* 129, e2023JF007481. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023JF007481>
- Stevens, L.A., Nettles, M., Davis, J.L., Creyts, T.T., Kingslake, J., Ahlstrøm, A.P., Larsen, T.B., 2022. Helheim Glacier diurnal velocity fluctuations driven by surface melt forcing. *Journal of Glaciology* 68, 77–89. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jog.2021.74>
- Surawy-Stepney, T., Hogg, A.E., Cornford, S.L., Hogg, D.C., 2023. Mapping Antarctic crevasses and their evolution with deep learning applied to satellite radar imagery. *The Cryosphere* 17, 4421–4445. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-17-4421-2023>
- Tada, H., Paris, P.C., Irwin, G.R., 2000. *The Stress Analysis of Cracks Handbook*, Third Edition. ASME Press. <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.801535>
- van der Veen, C.J., 2007. Fracture propagation as means of rapidly transferring surface meltwater to the base of glaciers. *Geophysical Research Letters* 34. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006GL028385>
- van der Veen, C.J., 1998. Fracture mechanics approach to penetration of surface crevasses on glaciers. *Cold Regions Science and Technology* 27, 31–47. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-232X\(97\)00022-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-232X(97)00022-0)
- Vaughan, D.G., 1993. Relating the occurrence of crevasses to surface strain rates. *Journal of Glaciology* 39, 255–266. <https://doi.org/10.3189/S0022143000015926>
- Vijay, S., Khan, S.A., Kusk, A., Solgaard, A.M., Moon, T., Bjørk, A.A., 2019. Resolving seasonal ice velocity of 45 Greenlandic glaciers with very high temporal details. *Geophysical Research Letters* 46, 1485–1495. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL081503>

- Weertman, J., 1973. Can a water-filled crevasse reach the bottom surface of a glacier. *IASH Publ* 95, 139–145.
- Wells-Moran, S., Ranganathan, M., Minchew, B., 2025. Fracture criteria and tensile strength for natural glacier ice calibrated from remote sensing observations of Antarctic ice shelves. *Journal of Glaciology* 71, e47. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jog.2024.104>
- Williamson, A.G., Banwell, A.F., Willis, I.C., Arnold, N.S., 2018a. Dual-satellite (Sentinel-2 and Landsat 8) remote sensing of supraglacial lakes in Greenland. *The Cryosphere* 12, 3045–3065. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-12-3045-2018>
- Williamson, A.G., Willis, I.C., Arnold, N.S., Banwell, A.F., 2018b. Controls on rapid supraglacial lake drainage in West Greenland: an Exploratory Data Analysis approach. *Journal of Glaciology* 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jog.2018.8>
- Yang, K., Smith, L.C., Sole, A., Livingstone, S.J., Cheng, X., Chen, Z., Li, M., 2019. Supraglacial rivers on the northwest Greenland Ice Sheet, Devon Ice Cap, and Barnes Ice Cap mapped using Sentinel-2 imagery. *International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation* 78, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jag.2019.01.008>
- Young, T.J., Christoffersen, P., Bougamont, M., Tulaczyk, S.M., Hubbard, B., Mankoff, K.D., Nicholls, K.W., Stewart, C.L., 2022. Rapid basal melting of the Greenland Ice Sheet from surface meltwater drainage. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 119, e2116036119. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2116036119>
- Zhang, W., Yang, K., Smith, L.C., Wang, Y., van As, D., Noël, B., Lu, Y., Liu, J., 2023. Pan-Greenland mapping of supraglacial rivers, lakes, and water-filled crevasses in a cool summer (2018) and a warm summer (2019). *Remote Sensing of Environment* 297, 113781. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2023.113781>
- Zuhr, A.M., Münch, T., Steen-Larsen, H.C., Hörhold, M., Laepple, T., 2021. Local-scale deposition of surface snow on the Greenland ice sheet. *The Cryosphere* 15, 4873–4900. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-15-4873-2021>