Accelerated Antarctic ice loss from satellite gravity measurements

J. L. Chen[1]*, C. R. Wilson[1,2], D. Blankenship[3] and B. D. Tapley[1]

Accurate quantification of Antarctic ice-sheet mass balance and its contribution to global sea-level rise remains challenging, because *in situ* measurements over both space and time are sparse. Satellite remote-sensing data of ice elevations and ice motion show significant ice loss in the range of -31 to -196 Gt yr^{-1} in West Antarctica in recent years[1-4], whereas East Antarctica seems to remain in balance or slightly gain mass[1,2,4], with estimated rates of mass change in the range of -4 to 22 Gt yr^{-1}. The Gravity Recovery and Climate Experiment[5] (GRACE) offers the opportunity of quantifying polar ice-sheet mass balance from a different perspective[6,7]. Here we use an extended record of GRACE data spanning the period April 2002 to January 2009 to quantify the rates of Antarctic ice loss. In agreement with an independent earlier assessment[4], we estimate a total loss of 190 ± 77 Gt yr^{-1}, with 132 ± 26 Gt yr^{-1} coming from West Antarctica. However, in contrast with previous GRACE estimates, our data suggest that East Antarctica is losing mass, mostly in coastal regions, at a rate of -57 ± 52 Gt yr^{-1}, apparently caused by increased ice loss since the year 2006.

Antarctic ice mass balance has long been a controversial topic, because of difficulties in estimating it, and because of its importance in understanding global climate and sea-level rise. At various times, estimates have disagreed on the sign of the mass balance, as well as its magnitude[8]. Several space-based technologies have become available in the past two decades to improve the estimates. One of these, satellite radar altimetry, suggests a mass rate for the whole continent in the range of -5 to $+85$ Gt yr^{-1} for the period 1992–2003 (ref. 9). This implies a negligible contribution to observed global sea-level rise. Estimates of rates from elevation change (from radar altimetry) are limited by spatial and temporal coverage and by uncertainties in snow density[8]. A second technology, interferometric synthetic aperture radar (InSAR) indicates that over the past decade, glacial mass discharge exceeds model predictions of snow accumulation. By this method, Antarctic ice loss is estimated to have increased 75% from 1996 to 2006, with 196 ± 92 Gt lost in 2006 alone[4].

A third space-based technique, Gravity Recovery and Climate Experiment (GRACE) satellite observations of gravity change, provides direct mass-change estimates at monthly intervals since 2002. Many studies have used GRACE data to estimate Antarctic and Greenland ice mass balance[6,7,10-12]. The spatial resolution of GRACE is limited by its ~460 km altitude, to no better than a few hundred kilometres[10,13,14]. This exceeds the scale of most glacial drainage basins. However, estimation techniques that supplement GRACE observations with geographical information of ice-sheet and glacier locations[10,14], or directly use GRACE Level 1B range-rate data[7,15] can provide better spatial resolution. Examples include

mass-rate estimates for the Patagonia ice fields of South America[16], Graham Land of the Antarctic Peninsula[14] (using GRACE spherical harmonic solutions) and Alaskan mountain glaciers[15].

GRACE estimates of Antarctic mass balance have been variable, ranging from -80 to -152 Gt yr^{-1} (refs 6, 11, 17). The wide range is due in part to uncertainty associated with other geophysical signals in GRACE data, especially post-glacial rebound (PGR). Other causes include variable time spans analysed, varied analysis methods and use of different versions of GRACE products. Still, all GRACE estimates show significant ice loss over the West Antarctic Ice Sheet (WAIS) since 2002, with estimated rates in the range -96 to -148 Gt yr^{-1} (refs 6, 11, 17). However, over the East Antarctic Ice Sheet (EAIS) there has been uncertainty in the sign of the estimated mass rate, from both GRACE and other remote-sensing data[1].

This letter presents new estimates of Antarctic ice mass rates (Fig. 1) using 79 monthly samples of the most recent GRACE release-4 (RL04) spherical harmonic solutions for the period April 2002 to January 2009. RL04 is produced at the Center for Space Research of the University of Texas of Austin[18]. With nearly seven years of data, interannual variability is far more apparent, and associated uncertainty in average rates is significantly reduced using the longer time series. There is also better suppression of alias errors[19] associated with ocean-tide model deficiencies. Although PGR effects are modelled using the IJ05 model[20], this remains the largest source of continuing uncertainty. Processing of RL04 data is a two-step procedure, first removing correlated errors (longitudinal stripes), followed by 300 km Gaussian low-pass filtering. The resulting GRACE Antarctic rate map is shown in Fig. 1. It shows two distinct regions with negative rates in the Amundsen Sea Embayment (ASE) and in Graham Land of the Antarctic Peninsula (points A and B). The ASE negative rate is the dominant feature for the entire Antarctic continent. Negative rates are also present over the EAIS, especially along the coast in Wilkes Land (point C in Fig. 1) and Victoria Land, although magnitudes are much smaller than in the ASE and Antarctic Peninsula. Positive rates south of the ASE are probably due to underestimated PGR in the IJ05 model[14,21]. A small positive rate is present in Enderby Land (Point D), where an earlier GRACE estimate ($+80 \pm 16$ Gt yr^{-1}) was so large as to suggest an unmodelled PGR contribution[21]. However, a recent study based on comparisons between predicted PGR models and observed GPS uplift rates suggests that this is not related to PGR (ref. 22).

As atmospheric pressure and barotropic oceanic signals are removed in GRACE data processing[18], we can take variability over the oceans (far enough from land to avoid spatial leakage) as representative of GRACE noise levels. Figure 1 shows ocean mass rates are below 1 cm yr^{-1} (r.m.s. 0.45 cm yr^{-1} for ocean areas between 60° S and 65° S), implying that features identified in Fig. 1

[1]Center for Space Research, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78759, USA, [2]Department of Geological Sciences, Jackson School of Geosciences, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712, USA, [3]Institute for Geophysics, Jackson School of Geosciences, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712, USA. *e-mail: chen@csr.utexas.edu.

Figure 1 | Antarctic rate map from GRACE. GRACE mass rate over Antarctica (units of centimetres of equivalent water height change per year, cm yr^{-1}) after the PGR effect is removed. Time series from four grid points (A, B, C and D) are selected for analysis.

Figure 2 | Forward-modelling scheme. The nine selected areas (shaded) used in the forward-modelling scheme with mass rates (in units of Gt yr^{-1}) uniformly distributed over each area. Mass rates are adjusted until the simulated map (Fig. 4) matches the GRACE observation (Fig. 1). Finally, regional rates are adjusted to agree with area-integrated values from Fig. 1.

are well above the noise. The task now is to quantify mass rates in individual regions, and to estimate a rate for the entire continent.

Mass rates are estimated using a forward-modelling method that has been applied in a number of recent studies[11,14,16] (see the Methods section for details). This approach accounts for biases associated with the two-step filtering applied (decorrelation and Gaussian), and the limited range of spherical harmonics in RL04. Estimates are derived assuming mass changes concentrated in nine geographical regions identified in Fig. 2. After this step, an estimate is obtained for the remainder of the continent. By separately estimating the nine regions with high mass rates, spatial leakage effects are minimized, especially in coastal regions such as the Antarctic Peninsula where much of the variance leaks into the ocean.

Results for individual regions are indicated in Fig. 2. The largest rate is the ASE with -110.1 Gt yr^{-1}, followed by the Antarctic Peninsula at -38.1 Gt yr^{-1} with most (-28.6 Gt yr^{-1}) in the northern part (Graham Land) and the rest (-9.5 Gt yr^{-1}) from Alexander Island and nearby regions. Wilkes and Victoria land rates are similar at -13.4 and -13.1 Gt yr^{-1}, respectively. The coastal region in Queen Maud Land shows a -6.5 Gt yr^{-1} rate. South of the ASE (Fig. 1), mass accumulation is estimated at $+15$ Gt yr^{-1}. Enderby and Palmer lands show accumulation of $+4.2$ and $+2.6$ Gt yr^{-1}, respectively. After the nine regional rates are estimated, the rate for the remainder of Antarctica is found to be -30.6 Gt yr^{-1}, with most, -29.1 Gt yr^{-1}, from EAIS and -1.5 Gt yr^{-1} from WAIS.

PGR model errors are probably the dominant limitation to Antarctic mass rate estimates[6,23]. PGR models in Antarctica suffer from a lack of fundamental data available in Northern Hemisphere regions, including contemporary rates of vertical motion, and geomorphological evidence constraining ice-load history. The result is variability among PGR models. The IJ05 model[20] predicts much smaller rates relative to others, such as ICE5G (refs 24–26). If PGR rates are in fact larger than IJ05, then the values in Fig. 2 are underestimates of loss rates. In the absence of better knowledge,

we take the difference between the IJ05 and ICE5G models[20,24] as an estimate of PGR model error. With this assumption, and considering GRACE errors, our estimate and associated uncertainty for the entire continent is -190 ± 77 Gt yr^{-1}, a rate much larger than previous GRACE estimates. If ICE5G is used in place of IJ05, the estimated rate is still larger, ~ -250 Gt yr^{-1}.

Our new estimate (-190 ± 77 Gt yr^{-1}) agrees well with a recent result (-196 ± 92 Gt yr^{-1}) using InSAR mass fluxes in 2006, combined with snowfall estimates from a regional atmospheric climate model[4]. Acceleration of ice loss in recent years over the entire continent is thus indicated by these two independent studies. However, there are a number of regional differences between the two estimates. For example, our value for the WAIS (-132 ± 26 Gt yr^{-1}) is well below the InSAR flux estimate[4] of -192 ± 76 Gt yr^{-1}. For the EAIS, our estimate is -57 ± 52 Gt yr^{-1}, whereas the InSAR estimate is far smaller, at -4 ± 61 Gt yr^{-1}, more similar to previous GRACE estimates[6,11,17]. Mass loss in the present GRACE estimate is mainly from coastal regions in Wilkes, Victoria and Queen Maud lands (Fig. 2). A number of factors may contribute to these regional differences between GRACE and InSAR flux estimates. One may be the PGR model, required for the GRACE estimate, but not necessary in the flux calculation. Apart from this, the new GRACE estimate represents an average over nearly seven years (2002–2009). The flux estimate combines InSAR measures of outflow in particular years with model precipitation estimates from a longer period (1980–2004), yielding values for two individual years, 1996 and 2006 (ref. 4). The comparison here is with the 2006 value, roughly the GRACE time series midpoint. An examination of the GRACE time series is useful in understanding interannual variability and consequent differences that may arise.

Figure 3 shows surface mass-change time series for points A, B, C and D in Fig. 1, computed for 1° × 1° grid regions with large mass rates. Time series are shown after seasonal sinusoids (annual and semiannual) and recognized tide alias error sinusoids (S$_2$ at 161 days and K$_2$ at 3.74 years; ref. 27) have been removed by unweighted least squares. Each series provides a representative time history for the location, but amplitudes reflect apparent surface mass-change, uncorrected for biases related to filtering and other processing steps. At point A (ASE), an accelerated rate of loss is

Figure 3 | GRACE mass time series at four selected locations. a–d, GRACE apparent surface mass time series (in blue curves with square markers) from 79 RL04 gravity solutions at the four respective locations A–D in Fig. 1. PGR effects (IJ05 model) are removed from all time series. The red lines are slopes estimated from the entire time series, and cyan and green lines are slopes determined for early (2002–2005) and late (2006–2009) periods.


Figure 4 | Antarctic rate map from forward modelling. Forward-modelled mass-change rate map (cm yr^{-1}) computed on the basis of the nine mass rates from Fig. 2. GRACE results are used for the remainder of Antarctica and ocean areas (see Supplementary Information for details).

indicated within the past three years (2006–2009), by a greater slope (-11.35 cm yr^{-1}) relative to -7.86 cm yr^{-1} for 2002–2005. Slopes for point B determined from separate sections (2002–2005 and 2006–2009) are similar to the slope from the entire series.

Time series at points C and D (EAIS) show greater variability in slope for early and late periods. For 2002–2005 at point C (Wilkes Land) the slope is near zero, whereas the 2006–2009 slope is negative, consistent with the InSAR 2006 flux estimate[4]. At point D (Enderby Land), there is similar variability among slopes. In this case, the early portion (2002–2005) indicates mass accumulation, noted in previous GRACE studies[14,21]. The later period (2006–2009) has a near-zero slope, and evidence of increased interannual variability. This indicates that the EAIS, widely considered to be in balance, may actually be out of balance in some regions. As a group, the four time series show that year-to-year variability will lead to varying interpretations when a single year or a short time series is analysed. This clarifies the importance of continuing to extend time series through operation of GRACE over the next few years, and development of a GRACE follow-on mission.

Our results suggest that over the WAIS (especially the ASE) there is accelerated ice loss since around 2005 and/or 2006, with the EAIS showing correlated changes of the same sign in this period, attributed to increased ice loss over EAIS coastal regions in recent years. Using a simple linear projection for the period 2006–2009, Antarctic ice loss rate can be as large as -220 ± 89 Gt yr^{-1} (see Supplementary Information for details). These new GRACE estimates, on average, are consistent with recent InSAR fluxes[4] but, in contrast to previous estimates, they indicate that as a whole, Antarctica may soon be contributing significantly more to global sea-level rise. More discussion of the results and analysis of uncertainty and variable ice loss rates are provided in the Supplementary Information.

Methods

Grace mass rate estimates. Much of the spatial noise in GRACE surface mass-change fields (longitudinal stripes) is apparently caused by correlations among estimated spherical harmonics[28], with extra noise increasing with spherical harmonic degree. A two-step filter is applied to reduce these effects. The first step (called P4M6) removes correlated noise by fitting and subtracting a fourth-order polynomial to even and odd coefficient pairs at spherical harmonic orders six and above. The second step involves smoothing with a 300-km Gaussian filter. After filtering, a global gridded ($1° \times 1°$) surface mass-change field is estimated from each of the 79 solutions, including harmonics up to degree and order 60. Long-term variability of low-degree zonal harmonics (C_{20}, C_{30}, C_{40}) removed during GRACE data processing was restored. At each ($1° \times 1°$) grid point, we fit the mass change time series with a linear trend and seasonal (annual, semiannual) and tidal alias (161-day, and 3.74-year) sinusoidal functions by unweighted least squares. The slope of the linear trend provides an apparent mass rate estimate, the magnitude of which is affected by various processing steps including filtering and a limited range of spherical harmonics. The 161-day and 3.74-year terms are aliases owing to recognized ocean tide model errors in S_2 and K_2 tides[16]. Both the GRACE orbit configuration and errors in tide models make these aliases relatively strong in Antarctic coastal regions[27]. Figure 1 shows GRACE mass change rates over Antarctica after PGR effects are removed using the IJ05 model[20]. The same two-step filter (P4M6+300 km Gaussian) has been applied to the IJ05 model.

Forward modelling. The GRACE map shown in Fig. 1 gives an apparent mass rate, but does not represent the true mass rate for a variety of reasons. Besides filtering and other biases, an important reason is that much of the variance leaks into surrounding areas. This is especially evident in regions with large mass rates near the oceans (where the mass rate is expected to be approximately zero), for example the Antarctic Peninsula. The forward-modelling technique developed in earlier studies[11,14,16] provides a simple way to deal with spatial leakage and other biases introduced in the processing. The idea is to identify probable locations of mass change from geographical knowledge of likely sources, to estimate mass rates for these including all processing steps used with the GRACE data, and obtain, in the end, a mass rate map that matches the GRACE data in Fig. 1. The estimate is consistent with geography, does not suffer from biases associated with filtering of spherical harmonics and has a spatial resolution better than the fundamental resolution of GRACE data. Figure 4 shows the resulting estimated (model) rate map, giving the nine regional mass rates in Fig. 2. The details of the modelling technique and related computations are described in the Supplementary Information.

Uncertainty estimates. Mass rate uncertainty is estimated by combining two error sources. One is the conventional uncertainty in a least-squares slope estimate from a time series with 79 points, while simultaneously fitting annual, semiannual and tidal (S_2 and K_2) alias sinusoids. The second is PGR model error, as we need to remove the PGR effect from GRACE measurements before estimating Antarctic ice mass rates. GRACE Antarctic mass balance estimates can be greatly affected by the use of different PGR models[6,23]. Nevertheless, the true PGR model error over the Antarctica is unknown, owing to the lack of *in situ* uplift measurements and other data. Here we use the difference between IJ05 and ICE5G model estimates to approximate PGR model error. The squared error for each region is the sum of squares of contributions from least-squares fit and PGR model errors. In most cases, PGR error dominates, but there are regions where both models predict very small PGR (for example, Graham Land and the ASE), suggesting an underestimate of PGR model error. A third error source (not quantified here) is in the GRACE data itself. Spatial filtering reduces this, and the forward-modelling approach accounts for biases associated with spatial filtering and truncation of the spherical harmonic expansion. Various GRACE solutions produced by different institutions often show large differences from month to month. However, errors in the mass-rate estimate are probably below 1 cm yr^{-1}, as indicated by the fairly uniform green colour in Fig. 1, suggesting that PGR model errors are dominant (see Supplementary Information for more on PGR error).

References

1. Zwally, J. *et al.* Mass changes of the Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets and shelves and contributions to sea-level rise: 1992–2002. *J. Glaciol.* **51,** 509–527 (2005).
2. Rignot, E. & Thomas, R. Mass balance of polar ice sheets. *Science* **297,** 1502–1506 (2002).
3. Thomas, R. *et al.* Accelerated sea-level rise from West Antarctica. *Science* **306,** 255–258 (2004).
4. Rignot, E. *et al.* Recent Antarctic ice mass loss from radar interferometry and regional climate modelling. *Nature Geosci.* **1,** 106–110 (2008).
5. Tapley, B. D., Bettadpur, S., Watkins, M. M. & Reigber, C. The gravity recovery and climate experiment; Mission overview and early results. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **31,** L09607 (2004).
6. Velicogna, I. & Wahr, J. Measurements of time-variable gravity show mass loss in Antarctica. *Science* **311,** 1754–1756 (2006).
7. Luthcke, S. B. *et al.* Recent Greenland ice mass loss by drainage system from satellite gravity observations. *Science* **314,** 1286–1289 (2006).
8. Shepherd, A. & Wingham, D. Recent sea-level contributions of the Antarctic and Greenland ice sheets. *Science* **315,** 1529–1532 (2007).
9. Davis, C. H., Li, Y., McConnell, J. R., Frey, M. M. & Hanna, E. Snowfall-driven growth in East Antarctic ice sheet mitigates recent sea-level rise. *Science* **308,** 1898–1901 (2005).
10. Chen, J. L., Wilson, C. R. & Tapley, B. D. Satellite gravity measurements confirm accelerated melting of Greenland ice sheet. *Science* **313,** 1958–1960 (2006).
11. Ramillien, G. *et al.* Interannual variations of the mass balance of the Antarctica and Greenland ice sheets from GRACE. *Glob. Planet. Change* **53,** 198–208 (2006).
12. Horwath, M. & Dietrich, R. Signal and error in mass change inferences from GRACE: The case of Antarctica. *Geophys. J. Int.* **177,** 849–864 (2009).
13. Wahr, J., Swenson, S., Zlotnicki, V. & Velicogna, I. Time-variable gravity from GRACE: First results. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **31,** L11501 (2004).
14. Chen, J. L., Wilson, C. R., Tapley, B. D., Blankenship, D. D. & Young, D. Antarctic regional ice loss rates from GRACE. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* **266,** 140–148 (2008).
15. Arendt, A. A. *et al.* Validation of high-resolution GRACE mascon estimates of glacier mass changes in the St Elias Mountains, Alaska, USA, using aircraft laser altimetry. *J. Glaciol.* **54,** 778–787 (2008).
16. Chen, J. L., Wilson, C. R., Tapley, B. D., Blankenship, D. D. & Ivins, E. R. Patagonia icefield melting observed by gravity recovery and climate experiment (GRACE). *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **34,** L22501 (2007).
17. Luthcke, S. B. *et al. Proc. 2008 GRACE Science Team Meeting,* 617–631 (GRACE Project, 2008).
18. Bettadpur, S. *Level-2 Gravity Field Product User Handbook, GRACE* 327–734 (GRACE Project, 2007).
19. Ray, R. D., Rowlands, D. D. & Egbert, G. D. Tidal models in a new era of satellite gravimetry. *Space Sci. Rev.* **108,** 271–282 (2003).
20. Ivins, E. & James, T. S. Antarctic glacial isostatic adjustment: A new assessment. *Antarctic Sci.* **17,** 541–553 (2005).
21. Chen, J. L., Wilson, C. R., Blankenship, D. D. & Tapley, B. D. Antarctic mass change rates from GRACE. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **33,** L11502 (2006).
22. Tregoning, P., Ramillien, G., McQueen, H. & Zwartz, D. Glacial isostatic adjustment and nonstationary signals observed by GRACE. *J. Geophys. Res.* **114,** B06406 (2009).
23. Barletta, V. R., Sabadini, R. & Bordoni, A. Isolating the PGR signal in the GRACE data: Impact on mass balance estimates in Antarctica and Greenland. *Geophys. J. Int.* **172,** 18–30 (2008).
24. Paulson, A., Zhong, S. & Wahr, J. Limitations on the inversion for mantle viscosity from postglacial rebound. *Geophys. J. Int.* **168,** 1195–1209 (2007).
25. Peltier, W. R. Global glacial isostasy and the surface of the ice-age Earth: The ICE-5G (VM2) Model and GRACE, Invited Paper. *Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.* **32,** 111–149 (2004).
26. Peltier, W. R. Closure of the budget of global sea level rise over the GRACE era: The importance and magnitudes of the required corrections for global isostatic adjustment. *Quart. Sci. Rev.* **28,** 1658–1674 (2009).
27. Chen, J. L., Wilson, C. R. & Seo, K.-W. S_2 tide aliasing in GRACE time-variable gravity solutions. *J. Geodesy* **83,** 679–687 (2009).
28. Swenson, S. & Wahr, J. Post-processing removal of correlated errors in GRACE data. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **33,** L8402 (2006).

Author contributions

J.L.C. planned analyses, acquired and prepared data, implemented forward modelling and wrote the paper. C.R.W., D.B. and B.D.T. analysed the data and results.

Additional information

Supplementary information accompanies this paper on www.nature.com/naturegeoscience. Reprints and permissions information is available online at http://npg.nature.com/reprintsandpermissions. Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to J.L.C.