





Influence of geothermal heat flux variations on Greenland Ice Sheet topography and dynamics

Synne H. Svendsen, GEUS, Denmark Anne Munck Solgaard, GEUS, Denmark Signe Hillerup Larsen, GEUS, Denmark Nanna Bjørnholt Karlsson, GEUS, Denmark William Colgan, GEUS, Denmark Marion Leduc-Leballeur, CNR, Italy Catherine Ritz, CNRS, France Agnes Wansing, C-A-Universität zu Kiel, Germany Judith Freienstein, C-A-Universität zu Kiel, Germany Louise Sandberg Sørensen, DTU-Space, Denmark



4DGreenland G E U S

Model spin up

- Bedrock topography
- Ice surface topography
- Geothermal heat flux
- Climate forcings

Which geothermal heat flux field to use?

Training data for development of temperature emulator

Geothermal heat flux



Greve



Rezvanbehbahani

Lucazeau







Colgan et al, 2022, Rezvanbehbahani et al. 2017, Artemieva 2019, Martos et al. 2018, Greve 2019, Lucazeau 2019, Freienstein pers. comm.

Model and setup

PARALLEL ICE SHEET MODEL

Shallow ice approximation combined with shallow shelf approximation to account for sliding.

Thermomechanically coupled, so ice viscosity changes with ice temperature.



4DGreenland

Bed topography and ice surface topography from BedMachinev5 Present day climate: SeaRISE, Ettema et al., GRL 2017 Sea level anomaly: SeaRISE, Imbrie et al., 2006 Temperature anomaly: SeaRISE, Johnsen et al., 1997 Various geothermal heat flux fields



Structure of simulations

Constant climate runs

- Resolution effects
- Sensitivity

Paleo spinup (-125.000 years to present)

- Constant grid resolution of 10 km
- Sequence of increasing grid resolutions (20-10-5-2 km)

SeaRISE glacial cycle











Constant climate run, various geothermal heat flux fields

Rezvanbehbahani: 94.74% **Artemieva: 93.64%** Martos: 93.28% Greve: 91.66% Lucazeau: 91.86% Mean GHF field: 92.91%

Total ice mass, glacial cycle runs





Largest ice mass (2 km): Colgan 3.17*10^18 kg

Rezvanbehbahani: 94.8% Artemieva: 92.3% Martos: 91.1% Greve: 90.4% Lucazeau: 89.2% Mean BHF: 92.2%



Magnitude of surface velocity, paleo spinup, GHF MeanBHF





100

r 10⁴

- 10³

m/year

- 10¹

Colgan P-A T

Colgan-MeanBHF



GHF Colgan







Artemieva-MeanBHF

GHF Artemieva

Rezvanbehbahani-MeanBHF



GHF Rezvanbehbahani



Pressure-adjusted basal temperature, end of paleo 2km Martos P-A T





Martos-MeanBHF



GHF Martos





Greve-MeanBHF



GHF Greve



Lucazeau P-A T



Lucazeau-MeanBHF



GHF Lucazeau







GHF MeanBHF



0.00

Magnitude of ice surface velocity - Glacial cycle (125.000ky), 2 km



Colgan-MeanBHF



BHF Colgan





Rezvanbehbahani

Rezvanbehbahani-MeanBHF



BHF Rezvanbehbahani



Martos

Artemieva

Artemieva-MeanBHF

BHF Artemieva



Martos-MeanBHF



BHF Martos





Greve-MeanBHF



BHF Greve





Lucazeau-MeanBHF



BHF Lucazeau









BHF MeanBHF









Glacial cycle (125ky), 10 km, frozen/temperate bed Rezvanbehbahani temp/non-temp Artemieva temp/non-temp

MeanBHF temp/non-temp











MeanBHF temp/non-temp





Number of models with temperate ice at bedrock 10 km

6

5

- 2

- 1



Number of models with temperate ice at bedrock 2 km



Number of models with temperate ice at bedrock 10 km



Number of models with temperate ice at bedrock 2 km



2



'The basal thermal state (frozen or thawed) of the Greenland Ice Sheet is under-constrained due to few direct measurements, yet knowledge of this state is becoming increasingly important to interpret modern changes in ice flow.'

MacGregor et al., 2022



- Geothermal heat flux matters.
- Spatial resolution matters.
- For projections of future ice mass loss, more realisations of the geothermal heat flux field should be included.

GEOTHERMAL HEAT	TEMPERATE	TEMPERATE
FLUX	GRID CELLS	GRID CELLS 2
	10 KM	KM
COLGAN	10.09 %	8.84 %
REZVANBEHBAHANI	25.58 %	22.19 %
ARTEMIEVA	25.30 %	24.47 %
MARTOS	33.03 %	30.90 %
GREVE	36.41 %	32.68 %
LUCAZEAU	35.01 %	39.06 %
MEAN FIELD	26.11 %	24.97 %

SeaRISE mean present day climate (Ettema et al.)

- 280

- 270

- 260 🛩

- 250

- 240





