

## **Review of Nanni et al., The Cryosphere – Peter Tuckett (University of Sheffield)**

### **General Comments**

This paper presents high temporal resolution time series of ice velocity from 48 mountain glaciers in the Western Pamir. The manuscript provides a detailed description of the feature tracking method, and successfully demonstrates how ice velocity measurements can be generated from optical satellite data in mountainous regions. Although the main method (COSI-Corr) is not novel, the stated filtering and post-processing steps advance the applicability of the method in mountain settings. Multi-year, weekly/monthly time series of satellite-derived glacier velocities in mountain regions are relatively sparse, and this dataset is therefore a useful contribution.

The most interesting scientific result is the identification and discussion of autumn speed-up events. These are less well documented than spring events, and I was interested by the discussion of their cause. I agree that these autumn speed-ups are likely the result of supraglacial input to an inefficient drainage system, but think this section would benefit from some expansion. In particular, I think there is further evidence in the velocity data for a subglacial hydrological cause which has been missed, and the section would benefit from accompanying evidence of lake drainage events from optical imagery. These would be relatively quick changes/additions, but could help to provide further evidence for the suggested cause.

I would also like to see the authors provide more of a discussion of the limitations of velocity measurements from optical satellite imagery, and how these were overcome. In particular, there is very limited explanation of how spatially and temporal variable cloud cover is treated in the method. It is stated that the region has low cloud-cover, and that cloud-pixels are 'flagged', but it is not really explained how differences in image visibility are accounted for to generate continuous and spatially consistent velocity time series.

The work is scientifically robust and presents some interesting results. The manuscript is generally well presented, although I think some of the figures could be presented more clearly, especially the colours used. The text is well written and clearly structured, although a few points need some clarification (see specific comments). The methods are well explained, and I particularly like the overall effect of figures 3-5. I would be happy to see this work published after minor edits based on the following comments and suggestions.

### **Specific Comments**

Title: I would suggest that the title is unnecessarily vague, and should at least specify that the work is related to a mountain setting, if not the region itself.

Line 94: Specify the stated recurrence times are specific for this region, since this varies spatially (e.g. there are much shorter return periods in polar regions).

Line 115: 'Different characteristics and geometries' is very vague and could be applicable to any mountainous regions – be more specific on why this region was selected.

Line 132: This wording confused me slightly – what did you investigate if you didn't analyse the data? Do you mean that velocity data were generated for 48 glaciers, but only 38 showed seasonal variations? Suggest clarifying.

Line 133: Glacier geometries? 'Wide range of glaciers' is ambiguous.

Figure 1: I found this figure a bit messy. E.g. (c) has a black outline for some of the inset but not all, GG label goes outside the main box, (b) label is not aligned with (a) label etc. Colours showing background elevation in (b) do not add anything and does not have a colourbar, so I suggest simply removing and having a white background.

Line 153: Just state the years rather than 'time periods above'.

Line 163: Why does Sentinel-2 data only start in 2017 when the satellite was launched in 2015?

Line 187: It states that you 'flag' clouds pixels, but there is then no explanation of what you do with these pixels. Even in a low-cloud region, a critical limitation of optical derived velocity data is that cloud cover can result in incomplete or inconsistent time series. This hence requires some further explanation.

Line 255: This last sentence seems a bit out of place and unnecessary. Suggest removing.

Line 260: Were central flowlines manually drawn?

Line 306: See comment for Figure 3. You mainly refer to distances upglacier, so it then seems confusing to have to specify downglacier values in brackets simply to match the figure.

Figure 3: Instinctively, I think upglacier distance would be better for the x-axis, with the axis values flipped. There are also a lot of similar colours in (b) which I think could be made clearer. Both these comments also apply for Figures 4 and 5.

Figure 5: The text boxes block some of the interesting velocity data, in particular relating to the autumn speed-up events between 1 -3 km downglacier. These are stated in the caption, so I suggest removing from the figure.

Line 538: 'It often describes' – suggest rephrasing.

Line 565: Have the authors looked at the optical imagery to see if lake drainage events are visible? It might not show anything (it could be englacial drainage which is harder to observe visually), but if it did, it would help to validate the suggested mechanism. Figure S7 shows lakes identified in the region, but it would also be useful to present some close-up images of these lakes to give an indication of their size.

Line 569: Figure 5 seems to show a sudden, transient autumn speed-up immediately followed by a slow-down to below pre-acceleration velocity. This is particularly clear at higher elevations (shown by a thin red stripe, then a thin blue stripe between 1 – 4 km downglacier). This is consistent with what would be expected from the sudden input of water to an inefficient subglacial hydrological system, but is not mentioned.

Line 583: As previously mentioned, I think this section should include something on the limitations of optical data in general for velocity retrieval.

**Technical corrections**

Line 140: Black/white colours don't match figure

Line 243: Don't think you mean Figure 1?

Line 455: 'levation' to 'elevation'

Line 513: Specify 'basal water pressure'