



Fast uplift in the Southern Patagonian Andes due to long and short term deglaciation and the asthenospheric window underneath

4

5 Veleda A. P. Muller¹, Pietro Sternai¹, Christian Sue^{2,3}

¹ Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Ambiente e della Terra (DISAT), Università degli Studi di
 Milano-Bicocca, Piazza della Scienza 4, Milan, Italy

8 ² Institute des Sciences de la Terre (ISTerre), Université Grenoble Alpes, Université Savoie

9 Mont Blanc, CNRS, IRD, IFSTTAR, Université Gustave Eiffel, Grenoble, France.

10 ³ Université de Franche Comté, Besançon, France.

11 *Correspondence to*: Veleda A.P. Muller (v.paivamuller@campus.unimib.it)

12 13

14 Abstract. An asthenospheric window underneath much of the South American continent 15 increases the heat flow in the Southern Patagonian Andes, where glacial-interglacial cycles 16 drive the building and melting of the Patagonian Icefields since the latest Miocene. The Last 17 Glacial Maximum (LGM) was reached ~20000 years ago, and an acceleration of the 18 deglaciation rate is recorded since the Little Ice Age (LIA), ~400 years ago. Fast uplift rates 19 of up to 41±3 mm/yr are measured by GNSS around the Southern Patagonian Icefield and 20 currently ascribed to post-LIA lithospheric rebound, but the possible longer-term post-LGM 21 rebound is poorly constrained. These uplift rates, in addition, are one order of magnitude 22 higher than those measured on other glaciated orogens (e.g., the European Alps), which raises 23 questions about the role of the asthenospheric window in affecting the vertical surface displacement rates. Here, we perform geodynamic thermo-mechanical numerical modelling 24 25 to estimate the surface uplift rates induced by post-LIA and post-LGM deglaciation 26 accounting for temperature dependent rheologies and different thermal regimes in the 27 asthenosphere. Our modelled maximum postglacial rebound matches the observed uplift rate 28 budget only when both post-LIA and post-LGM deglaciation are accounted for and if a 29 standard continental mantle potential temperature is increased by 150-200 °C. The 30 asthenospheric window thus plays a key role in controlling the magnitude of presently 31 observed uplift rates in the Southern Patagonian Andes.





32 1 Introduction

33 Vertical displacements of the Earth's surface with respect to the geoid occur in 34 response to the motion of crustal and mantle rock masses due to plate tectonics and the associated redistribution of sediments, water, and ice by surface processes (e.g., Molnar and 35 36 England, 1990; Watts, 2001; Champagnac et al., 2012; Sternai, 2023; Cloetingh et al., 2023). 37 For instance, excess of topography in orogenic regions due to convergence and crustal 38 stacking deflects the lithosphere downward, whereas unloading by erosion and ice melting 39 causes upward deflection of the lithosphere, known as "isostatic" adjustment (e.g., Peltier and 40 Andrews, 1976; Peltier, 1996, 2004; Mitrovica and Forte, 1997; Butler and Peltier, 2000; 41 Kaufman and Lambeck, 2002; Watts, 2001; Turcotte and Schubert, 2002). The magnitude of 42 surface uplift rates is set primarily by the lithosphere and asthenosphere viscosities, which 43 depend, amongst other factors, on the thermal field at depth (McKenzie and Richter, 1981; 44 McKenzie and Bickle, 1988; Gurnis, 1989; Ranalli, 1995, 1997; Kaufman et al., 1997; Watts, 45 2001; Turcotte and Schubert, 2002). Although the theory that relates surface ice load changes 46 and isostatic adjustment is well developed (e.g., Peltier and Andrews, 1976; Peltier, 1996, 2004; Mitrovica and Forte, 1997; Kaufman and Lambeck, 2002; Stuhne and Peltier, 2015; 47 48 Van der Wal et al., 2015), recognizing and quantifying expressions of such dynamics in 49 natural settings is difficult.

50 The Southern Patagonian Andes in the South American Continent are located above a 51 transition zone between the subducting Antarctic and Nazca plates and a wide asthenospheric window (Fig. 1a; Cande and Leslie, 1986). The Chile Triple Junction (CTJ) at ~46 °S 52 53 delimits the surface tip of the asthenospheric window, which opened during the last ~ 16 Ma 54 from south to north (Ramos and Kay, 1992; Breitsprecher and Thorkelson, 2009). First order 55 effects of the asthenospheric flow on the surface continental geology are the inhibition of arc 56 volcanism in favour of retroarc magmatism, forward propagation of the fold-and-thrust belt, 57 and rock uplift (Ramos and Kay, 1992; Ramos, 2005; Breitsprecher and Thorkelson, 2009; 58 Guillaume et al., 2009; Lagabrielle et al., 2010; Georgieva et al., 2016). Rock uplift due to 59 asthenospheric upwelling, in particular, was estimated as < 0.15 mm/yr in the last 3 Ma over 60 an area of about 100000 km² around the CTJ latitude (Guillaume et al., 2009). The heat flow was calculated as $>100 \text{ mW/m}^2$ near the CTJ, $\sim 70-90 \text{ mW/m}^2$ in the center of the 61 asthenospheric window (~50 °S), and 50-60 mW/m² near its northern boundary (~46 °S) 62 63 (Ávila and Dávila, 2018), suggesting that the mantle temperature beneath Southern Patagonia 64 is likely higher than in normal subduction zones (Ranalli, 1997).





65 The Patagonian Ice Sheet covered the Southern Patagonian Andes between ~30000 and ~17000 years ago, extending from latitudes 38 to 55 °S with estimated area of ~490000 66 67 $\rm km^2$ and volume of ~550000 km³ (Fig. 1 a) based on preserved glacial geomorphologies, stratigraphic and paleoecological records, and geochronological data (Moreno et al., 1999, 68 69 2005; McCulloch et al., 2000, 2005; Hulton et al., 2002; Rabassa, 2008; Glasser et al., 2005, 70 2016; Glasser and Jansson, 2008; Hein et al., 2010; Boex et al, 2013; Bourgois et al., 2016; 71 Martinod et al., 2016; Bendle et al., 2017; Thorndycraft et al., 2019; Davies et al., 2020). The average and maximum ice thickness were estimated as ~1100 m and ~2500 m, respectively 72 (McCulloch et al., 2000; Hulton et al., 2002; Boex et al., 2013; Davies et al., 2020). 73 Currently, the SPI covers an area of ~13219 km² with a volume of 3632 ± 675 km³, whereas 74 the Northern Patagonian Icefield (NPI) covers an area of \sim 3976 km² with a volume of 1124 \pm 75 76 260 km^3 (Fig. 1). The present-day ice thickness reaches up to ~2000 m in deep glacial valleys (Millan et al., 2019). The long term ice loss rate is uncertain, but more than 75% of ice was 77 78 certainly lost since the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM, approximately 20000 years ago), and 79 some models predicted more than 95% of ice loss with separation between the SPI and NPI in 80 the first 5000 to 10000 years of post-LGM deglaciation (McCulloch et al., 2000; Hulton et 81 al., 2002; Boex et al., 2013; Bourgois et al., 2016; Thorndycraft et al., 2019; Davies et al., 82 2020).

83 GNSS and remote sensing data show ongoing vertical rock uplift rates between 30 ± 3 84 and 41 ± 3 mm/yr in the northern part of the Southern Patagonian Icefield (SPI, Fig. 1b), 85 gradually decreasing toward its peripheral parts (Aniya, 1996; Aniya et al., 1997; Rignot et al., 2003; Ivins and James, 1999, 2004; Dietrich et al., 2010; Willis et al., 2012; Lange et al., 86 87 2014). Such outstandingly high uplift rates are currently ascribed to lithospheric viscoelastic 88 glacial isostatic adjustment (GIA) following the Little Ice Age (LIA), with apex around 1630 89 AD (Ivins and James, 1999, 2004; Glasser et al., 2011). Deglaciation since the LIA was responsible for an ice loss of 503 ± 101.1 km³ in the SPI (Glasser et al., 2011), with a 90 91 substantial increase of the glacial recession after the 20th century (Aniya, 1996; Aniya et al., 1997; Rignot et al., 2003; Glasser et al., 2011; Davies and Glasser, 2012; Ivins et al., 2011; 92 93 Willis et al., 2012). To match the very high observed uplift rate budget, previous GIA studies infer low asthenosphere viscosity (in the order of 10^{18} Pa s) and thin elastic lithosphere (~35 94 95 km thick) (Ivins and James, 1999, 2004; Klemann et al., 2007; Dietrich et al., 2010; Lange et al, 2014). However, although this is consistent with abnormally high mantle temperatures, 96 97 viscosity estimates from previous studies are untied to the regional thermal regime, which





98 prevents a more thorough characterization of the role of the asthenospheric window 99 underneath the SPI in affecting the observed uplift rates. In addition, the contribution of post-100 LGM deglaciation to present-day rock uplift rate was marginally addressed. Here, we perform fully coupled thermo-mechanical numerical geodynamic experiments forced by 101 102 surface unloading scaled on post-LIA and post-LGM ice melting to evaluate their relative 103 contribution to the observed regional uplift rates. Numerical experiments account for a range 104 of positive thermal anomalies in the asthenosphere to further asses the role of the 105 asthenospheric window in setting the mantle viscosity and associated postglacial rebound. 106 Focusing on the magnitude, rather than the pattern, of the inferred surface uplift rates, we use 107 the observed budget of rock uplift rate to constrain plausible thermal and viscosity structures 108 at depth as well as the timing of postglacial rebound.

109

110 2 Methodology

111 **2.1 Numerical model**

We use a fully coupled thermo-mechanical, visco-elasto-plastic, numerical geodynamic model to quantify the effect of thermal anomalies in the mantle on the magnitude of surface uplift rates due to deglaciation. We provide a short overview of the governing equations hereafter, while a detailed description of numerical technique can be found, for instance, in Gerya and Yuen (2007), Gerya et al. (2019), Sternai (2020), and Muller et al. (2022). The continuity equation allows for the conservation of mass during the displacement of a geological continuum:

119 (1)
$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla(\rho v) = 0$$

120 where ρ is the local density, *t* is time, *v* is the velocity vector, and ∇ is the divergence 121 operator. The momentum equation describes the changes in velocity of an object in the 122 gravity field due to internal and external forces:

123 (2)
$$\frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}}{\partial x_i} + \rho g_i = \rho \left(\frac{\partial v_i}{\partial t} + v_j \frac{\partial v_i}{\partial x_j} \right)$$

where σ_{ij} is the stress tensor, x_i and x_j are spatial coordinates, and g_i is the *i*-th component of the gravity vector. The energy equation allows for the conservation of energy during advective and conductive heat transfer in the continuum:

127 (3)
$$\rho C_P \frac{DT}{Dt} - div(c\nabla T) + v\nabla T = H_r + H_s + H_a + H_l$$





where *P* is pressure, *T* is temperature, C_P is specific heat capacity at a constant *P*, *c* is the thermal conductivity, $H_r + H_s + H_a + H_l$ are the volumetric heat productions by radiogenic, shear, adiabatic and latent heat, respectively. $H_a \propto \frac{DP}{Dt}$, $H_s = \sigma'_{ij} \varepsilon'_{ij(viscous)}$, and H_r and H_l are the radiogenic and latent heat productions.

132 Ductile deformation is thermally activated generating viscous flow, which involves133 diffusion and dislocation creep, calculated according to the material shear viscosity:

134 (4)
$$\frac{1}{\eta_{ductile}} = \frac{1}{\eta_{diff}} + \frac{1}{\eta_{disl}}$$

135 with

136
$$\eta_{diff} = \frac{\eta_0}{2\sigma_{cr}^{n-1}} exp\left(\frac{E_a + PV_a}{RT}\right)$$
, and

137
$$\eta_{disl} = \frac{\eta_0^{\frac{1}{n}}}{2} exp\left(\frac{E_a + PV_a}{nRT}\right) \dot{\varepsilon}_{II}^{\frac{1}{n}-1}$$

where η_{diff} and η_{disl} are the shear viscosity for diffusion and dislocation creep, respectively, η_0 is the material static viscosity, σ_{cr} is the diffusion-dislocation transition critical stress, *n* is the stress exponent, E_a is the activation energy, V_a is the activation volume, *R* is the gas constant, and ε_{II} is the second invariant of the strain rate tensor. The viscous deviatoric strain rate tensor, ε'_{ij} (*viscous*), is defined by:

143 (5)
$$\dot{\varepsilon}'_{ij\,(viscous)} = \frac{1}{2\eta_{ductile}} \sigma'_{ij} + \delta_{ij}\eta_{bulk} \dot{\varepsilon}_{kk} = \frac{1}{2\eta_{diff}} \sigma'_{ij} + \frac{1}{2\eta_{disl}} \sigma'_{ij} + \delta_{ij}\eta_{bulk} \dot{\varepsilon}_{kk}$$

144 where σ'_{ij} is the deviatoric stress tensor, δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta, $\dot{\varepsilon}_{kk}$ is the volumetric 145 strain rate (e.g., related to phase transformations), and η_{bulk} is the bulk viscosity. 146 Recoverable deformation is defined by the elastic deviatoric strain rate tensor, $\dot{\varepsilon}'_{ij}$ (elastic), as:

147 (6)
$$\dot{\varepsilon}'_{ij (elastic)} = \frac{1}{2\mu} \frac{\breve{D}\sigma'_{ij}}{Dt}$$

148 where μ is the shear modulus and $\frac{\breve{D}\sigma r_{ij}}{Dt}$ is the objective co-rotational time derivative of the 149 deviatoric stress tensor. The plastic deformation, brittle and localised, occurs at low 150 temperature when the absolute shear stress limit, σ_{yield} , is reached, with

151 (7)
$$\sigma_{yield} = C + \sin(\varphi) H$$

152 where *C* is cohesion and φ is the effective internal friction angle. The plastic strain rate 153 tensor, $\dot{\varepsilon}'_{ij (plastic)}$, is defined as:

154 (8)
$$\dot{\varepsilon}'_{ij\,(plastic)} = 0 \text{ for } \sigma_{II} < \sigma_{yield}, \dot{\varepsilon}'_{ij\,(plastic)} = \chi \frac{\partial \sigma'_{ij}}{2\sigma_{II}} \text{ for } \sigma_{II} \ge \sigma_{yield}$$

155 where \mathcal{X} is the plastic multiplier which satisfies the plastic yielding condition $\sigma_{II} = \sigma_{yield}$.

156 The bulk strain rate tensor, $\dot{\varepsilon}'_{ij(bulk)}$, integrates the viscous, elastic and plastic deformation:





157 (9) $\dot{\varepsilon}'_{ij(bulk)} = \dot{\varepsilon}'_{ij(viscous)} + \dot{\varepsilon}'_{ij(elastic)} + \dot{\varepsilon}'_{ij(plastic)}$

158 **2.2 Reference model setup and modeling approach**

159 The model domain, scaled on the study region, is 700 km wide and 120 km thick. 160 From top to bottom, the model accounts for 10 km of 'sticky' air, 30 km of continental crust 161 (with rheology of quartzite, Ranalli, 1995), 30 km of lithospheric mantle, and 50 km of 162 asthenospheric mantle (with rheology of dry dunite, Ranalli, 1995), in agreement with 163 literature data (e.g., Klemann et al., 2007). The initial geotherm is piece-wise linear resulting 164 from an adiabatic temperature gradient of 0.5 °C/km in the asthenosphere (Turcotte and Schubert, 2002) and thermal boundary conditions equal to 0 °C at the surface and 1327 °C at 165 the bottom of the lithosphere, with nil horizontal heat flux across the vertical boundaries. The 166 167 rheologic and thermal structure of the reference model give a lithospheric elastic thickness, 168 Te (sensu Burov and Diament, 1995), of ~30 km, comparable to previous estimates 169 underneath the SPI based on GIA models (Ivins and James, 1999; Dietrich et al., 2010; Lange 170 et al., 2014), heat flow data (Ávila and Dávila, 2018), and waveform inversion (Robertson 171 Maurice et al., 2003). Rocks rheological properties are listed in Table 1.

172 The numerical model uses the finite differences with marker-in-cell technique, 173 resolved by 51×61 nodes in x and y directions, respectively, distributed on a Eulerian grid 174 that accounts for a maximum resolution of 1 km along the y direction in the upper part of the model domain, and ~ 13 km in the x direction. 400×400 Lagrangian markers are randomly 175 176 distributed along the x and y dimensions and used for advecting the material properties (Gerya and Yuen, 2007; Gerya et al., 2019). The material properties carried by Lagrangian 177 markers are then interpolated onto the Eulerian grid via a 4th order Runge-Kutta interpolation 178 179 scheme. An internal free surface is simulated through the 10 km thick layer of sticky air. The 180 velocity boundary conditions are free slip at all boundaries (x = 0 and x = 700 km; y = 0 and 181 y = 120 km).

On the top of the crust and in the middle of the model domain we impose a 2 km thick
pseudo-icecap to simulate lithospheric unloading during deglaciation. The pseudo-icecap is
70 km wide for the post-LIA model set and 200 km wide for the post-LGM model sets (Fig. 2

a). We compute the surface load, *L*, as

 $186 (10) L = \rho_{ice}gh_{ice},$

187 where ρ_{ice} is the pseudo-icecap density, g is the gravity acceleration, and h_{ice} is the pseudo-188 icecap thickness, and deglaciation occurs by gradually reducing h_{ice} in time (Fig. 2 b, c). We 189 run two sets of experiments for the post-LGM deglaciation. In *Model set 1*, 75% of ice loss





190 occurs in 20000 years (i.e., 1500 m drop of ice thickness, Fig. 2 b), thus assuming a 191 conservative estimate of ice loss since the beginning of the LGM until the present-day. In 192 Model set 2, 95% of ice loss occurs in 10000 years (i.e., 1900 m drop of ice thickness, Fig. 2 193 b), assuming faster deglaciation rates of the Patagonian Ice Sheet in the first half of post-194 LGM deglaciation (McCulloch et al., 2000; Hulton et al., 2002; Boex et al., 2013; Bendle et 195 al., 2017; Thorndycraft et al., 2019; Davies et al., 2020). For the post-LIA deglaciation, we 196 simulate 10% of ice loss in 400 years (i.e., 200 m drop of ice thickness, Fig. 2 c) (Aniya, 197 1996; Aniya et al., 1997; Rignot et al., 2003; Ivins and James, 1999, 2004; Dietrich et al., 198 2010; Willis et al., 2012; Lange et al., 2014).

199 In the models the initial lateral extent of the pseudo-icecap does not change 200 throughout the deglaciation. Although this simplification may affect the inferred pattern of 201 postglacial rebound, it greatly facilitates the simulation of deglacial lithospheric unloading 202 without significantly affecting the magnitude of postglacial rebound, which is the main focus 203 here. All simulations account for some spin up time before the deglaciation begins, so that the 204 lithosphere-asthenosphere system adjusts to the pseudo-icecap initial load. The surface uplift 205 rate during the deglaciation is calculated through time as the surface elevation change 206 resulting from the modelled strain field divided by the viscoelastic timestep. Given the 207 geologically short time window investigated here, we neglect deformation related to longer 208 term tectonic forces. The parametric study focuses on the mantle potential temperature (sensu 209 McKenzie and Bickle, 1988) which accounts for positive thermal anomalies, TA, of up to 200 °C in steps of 50 ° C, added to the reference mantle potential temperature of 1265 °C 210 (McKenzie and Bickle, 1988; Currie and Hyndman, 2006; Ávila and Dávila, 2018; Sternai, 211 212 2020) to mimic the presence of a slab window at depth.





213 3 Results

214 Results are shown in Table 2 and Figs. 4-7. In agreement with the theory of 215 lithospheric flexure (e.g., Turcotte and Schubert, 2002) the deglaciation triggers uplift in the 216 region covered by the melting pseudo-icecap and subsidence in the neighbouring regions 217 (Figs. 4-6). Overall, increasing the mantle potential temperature decreases the asthenospheric 218 viscosity, with significant effects on the magnitude of the modelled surface velocity field. The asthenosphere viscosity ranges between 10^{22} - 10^{19} Pa s in simulations with TA equal to 0 219 (reference model), 50 and 100 °C, and between 10¹⁹-10¹⁶ Pa s in simulations with TA equal 220 221 to 150 and 200 °C (Fig. 3 a-d). Lithospheric warming due to increasing mantle potential temperature also leads to a reduction of the lower lithosphere viscosity (from 10^{22} to 10^{20} Pa 222 223 s), thereby decreasing the integrated lithospheric strength.

224 In Model set 1 for Post-LGM deglaciation, when TA is 0 (reference model) the 225 maximum uplift rates is < 1 mm/yr during the first 5000 years of the deglaciation, increasing 226 gradually up to 9.5 mm/yr in the later stages of the deglaciation (i.e., 20000 years, Fig. 4). When TA equals 50, 100, 150 and 200 °C, the maximum uplift rates can reach up to $\sim 2, \sim 5$, 227 228 \sim 12, and \sim 15 mm/yr, respectively, already in the first 1000 years of the deglaciation (Fig. 4 229 a). When TA is 50 and 100 °C the maximum uplift rate is subject to a protracted increase in 230 time, reaching up to ~ 12 and ~ 14 mm/yr after 20000 years of deglaciation (Figs. 4 b-d and 7 231 a). For TA equal to 150 and 200 °C, the maximum uplift rate reach a plateau between 11 and 232 17 mm/yr during the 20000 years of deglaciation (Figs. 4 and 7 a, Table 2). After the end of 233 the deglaciation, the maximum uplift rate takes longer than about 5000 years to re-equilibrate 234 to 0 mm/yr when TA \leq 100 °C, whereas it drops to 0 mm/yr almost immediately when TA is 235 150 or 200 °C (Fig. 7 a).

236 In the Model set 2 for Post-LGM deglaciation, the maximum uplift rate is less than 2 237 mm/yr during the first 1000 years of deglaciation when TA is 0, 50 and 100 °C, whereas it 238 reaches up to \sim 22 and \sim 30 mm/yr during in the first 1000 years of deglaciation when TA is 239 150 and 200 °C (Fig. 5 a, 7 b, and Table 2). Between 5000 and 10000 years of deglaciation, 240 the maximum uplift rate increases to ~ 19 , ~ 25 and ~ 36 mm/yr, respectively when TA is 0, 50 241 and 100 °C, whereas it reach up to between 36 and 41 mm/yr between 50000 and 1000 years 242 of deglaciation when TA equal to 150 and 200 °C. The maximum uplift rate decreases slower 243 if TA is 0, 50 and 100 °C, taking longer than 5000 year after the deglaciation to drop to values <5 mm/yr (Fig. 7 b and Table 2), whereas it quickly drops to <2 mm/yr when the 244 deglaciation is over and TA is 150 and 200°C (Figs. 5 b-d and 7b). Overall, a warmer and 245





less viscous asthenosphere generates a higher magnitude and fast changing postglacialrebound than a cooler and more viscous asthenosphere.

248 In the post-LIA model set, the maximum uplift rate is ~ 1.4 , ~ 2.3 and ~ 2.2 mm/yr during the first 100 years of deglaciation when TA is respectively 0, 50, and 100 °C, whereas 249 250 it reaches ~8.3 and ~23 mm/yr during the same interval when TA is respectively 150 and 200 251 °C (Figs. 6 a, 7 c, and Table 2). Between 200 and 400 years of deglaciation, the maximum 252 uplift rate reaches ~1.9, ~2.5 and ~3 mm/yr when TA equal to 0, 50 and 100 °C, and ~14 and ~25.5 mm/yr when TA is 150 and 200 °C, respectively (Figs. 6 c-d, 7 c, and Table 2). When 253 254 the deglaciation ends, the maximum uplift rate drops to ~0 mm/yr in ~ 100 years when TA \leq 100 °C, whereas it takes longer than 1000 years when TA equals 150 °C or 200 °C (Fig. 7 c). 255 256 Overall, a warmer and less viscous asthenosphere generates a higher magnitude postglacial 257 rebound which, however, takes much longer to re-equilibrate to 0 mm/yr after the end of the 258 deglaciation than a cooler and more viscous asthenosphere.

259

260 4 Discussion and conclusions

261 Our modelling is simplistic in that we impose a linear and uniform ice loss instead of 262 a more realistic ice-sheet melting pattern in space and time. This choice is motivated by the 263 limited data reporting on the SPI melting velocities and associated redistribution of the 264 surface masses, which cover time spans much shorter than the post-LIA and post-LGM time 265 windows investigated here (Aniya, 1996; Aniya et al., 1997; Rignot et al., 2003; Ivins and 266 James, 1999, 2004; Willis et al., 2012; Dietrich et al., 2010; Lange et al., 2014). As 267 previously highlighted (Hulton et al., 2002; Rabassa, 2008; Glasser et al., 2011; Davis and 268 Glasser, 2012; Martinod et al., 2016; Bendle et al., 2017; Davies et al., 2020), constraints 269 regarding the ice-sheet mass balance and melting velocities throughout the time windows of 270 interest are difficult to obtain from the preserved geomorphological, stratigraphic and 271 geochronological records. We also assume a homogeneous lithosphere and neglect lateral 272 viscosity variations in the asthenosphere (Klemann et al., 2007) despite the long-term 273 southern Andean orogenic history (Cande and Leslie, 1986; Ramos, 2005; Muller et al., 274 2021). Notwithstanding these limitations, however, our fully coupled numerical thermo-275 mechanical geodynamic models provide realistic uplift rates that one can compare to current 276 geodetic observations. Following the example of previous studies (Ivins and James, 1999, 277 2004; Klemann et al., 2007; Dietrich et al., 2010; Lange et al., 2014), we discuss our results 278 assuming that GNSS-measured rock uplift rates are mostly related to the deglaciation history





and only marginally controlled by the longer term geodynamics (e.g., Ramos, 2005; Muller etal., 2021).

281 We first remark that inferred maximum post-LIA uplift rate of up to a few mm/yr from experiments without or with a low asthenospheric thermal anomaly (TA ≤ 100 °C) are 282 283 within the same order of magnitude of maximum uplift rates measured in collisional orogens 284 such as the European Alps (Sue et al., 2007; Serpelloni et al., 2013; Walpersdorf et al., 2015; 285 Sternai et al., 2019) and the Himalayas (Larson et al., 1999). Since these collisional orogens 286 are characterized by a thicker lithosphere (Geissler et al., 2010; Ravikumar et al., 2020), they 287 are likely less sensitive to mantle dynamics than the Southern Patagonian Andes. When we 288 consider lithospheric unloading due to post-LGM deglaciation of a wider ice sheet, however, 289 the inferred maximum uplift rate via Model set 1 and Model set 2 reaches up to 10 mm/yr for 290 and 20 mm/yr, respectively, even without asthenospheric thermal anomaly. This suggests a 291 that a contribution from long-term postglacial rebound to the present-day uplift rates 292 measured in the SPI is likely.

293 In the Southern Patagonian Andes, the regional asthenosphere viscosity was estimated between 1.6 and 8×10^{18} Pa s from GIA models based on GNSS and satellite observations 294 295 (Ivins and James, 1999, 2004; Klemann et al., 2007; Dietrich et al., 2010; Willis et al., 2012; 296 Lange et al., 2014). Similarly, the asthenosphere viscosity from our models when TA > 100 $^{\circ}$ C is $< 10^{19}$ Pa s, with the lowest viscosity value of 10^{16} Pa s imposed where partial melting, 297 298 supported by the regional Holocene volcanism (Stern and Kilian, 1996), occurs. Under these 299 conditions, however, our experiments provide uplift rates between 14 and 26 mm/yr for post-300 LIA deglaciation indicating that, even with a very low viscosity asthenosphere, the rebound 301 due to the short-term post-LIA deglaciation does not reach the presently observed maximum 302 uplift rates of 41 ± 3 mm/yr. Experiments that account for a low viscosity asthenosphere and 303 long-term post-LGM deglaciation lasting for 20000 years and 10000 years reach up to ~ 25 304 and ~42 mm/yr of uplift rate, respectively, comparable to present-day values. Results, 305 therefore, indicate that the outstanding observational budget of rock uplift in the SPI is 306 matched only when accounting for higher-than-normal mantle temperatures, thereby 307 highlighting the relevance of the regional asthenospheric window.

Because of the limited knowledge regarding the timing and amount of ice loss since the LGM (e.g., Davies et al., 2020), it is difficult to position in time present-day uplift rate measurements within the investigated deglaciation scenarios to assess the contribution of post-LGM and post-LIA deglaciation to the maximum uplift rate budget. In the faster post-LGM deglaciation scenario (*Model set 2*) the observed maximum uplift rate budget is





attained in about 10000 years of deglaciation, but only minor residual rebound could be 313 314 observed today regardless of the amount of ice loss (Fig. 7 b). If post-LGM deglaciation 315 occurred slower (Model set 1), this event may contribute to up to 40% to the present-day 316 uplift rate budget. Although it is difficult to reconcile this scenario with the geomorphological and geochronological evidences (Hulton et al., 2002; Boex et al., 2013; Davis and Glasser, 317 2012; Martinod et al., 2016; Bendle et al., 2017; Thorndycraft et al., 2019; Davies et al., 318 319 2020), it appears that post-LIA rebound alone cannot cover the entire budget of the observed 320 uplift rates even with the highest tested TA, which points to a non-negligible contribution 321 from post-LGM deglaciation. This latter conclusion is reinforced by estimates of the mantle 322 relaxation time, τ_r , as (Turcotte and Schubert, 2002):

323 (11)
$$\tau_r = \frac{4\pi v}{g\lambda}$$
,

where v is the asthenosphere viscosity, λ is the width of the ice sheet, and g is the gravity acceleration. Using $10^{16} < v < 10^{18}$ Pa s and $\lambda = 200$ km leads to $\sim 2000 < \tau_r < \sim 200000$ years, a time range considerably longer than the post-LIA deglaciation and including full Pleistocene glacial-interglacial cycles (Ruddiman et al., 1986). We therefore propose that currently observed uplift rates in the Southern Andes are driven by both post-LGM and post LIA lithospheric rebound enhanced by a thermal anomaly of at least 150 °C due to the regional asthenospheric window which lowers mantle viscosities.

As a final consideration, our models suggest that we shall measure regional uplift rates in the order of the tens of cm/yr in the next century if the currently observed ice loss rate of at least -20 Gt/yr in the SPI (Willis et al., 2012) will continue until the total meltdown of the ice sheet in ~200 years.

335

336 5 Acknowledgements

337

This work was supported by the Italian Ministry of Education, MUR (Project Dipartimenti di Eccellenza 2023-2027, TECLA, Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Milano-Bicocca), and the Fondazione Cariplo and Fondazione CDP (Grant n° 2022 – 1546_001). The Université Grenoble Alpes and the French CNRS also supported this work.





344 References

- Aniya, M. (1996). Holocene variations of Ameghino glacier, southern Patagonia. *The Holocene*, 6(2), 247-252.
- Aniya, M., Sato, H., Naruse, R., Skvarca, P., & Casassa, G. (1997). Recent glacier variations
 in the Southern Patagonia icefield, South America. *Arctic and Alpine Research*, 29(1), 1-12.
- Ávila, P., & Dávila, F. M. (2018). Heat flow and lithospheric thickness analysis in the
 Patagonian asthenospheric windows, southern South America. *Tectonophysics*, 747, 99-107.
- Bendle, J. M., Palmer, A. P., Thorndycraft, V. R., & Matthews, I. P. (2017). High-resolution
 chronology for deglaciation of the Patagonian Ice Sheet at Lago Buenos Aires (46.5 S)
 revealed through varve chronology and Bayesian age modelling. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 177, 314-339.
- Boex, J., Fogwill, C., Harrison, S., Glasser, N. F., Hein, A., Schnabel, C., & Xu, S. (2013).
 Rapid thinning of the late Pleistocene Patagonian Ice Sheet followed migration of the
 Southern Westerlies. *Scientific Reports*, 3(1), 1-6.
- Bourgois, J., Cisternas, M. E., Braucher, R., Bourlès, D., & Frutos, J. (2016). Geomorphic records along the general Carrera (Chile)–Buenos Aires (Argentina) glacial lake (46–48 S), climate inferences, and glacial rebound for the past 7–9 ka. *The Journal of Geology*, *124*(1), 27-53.
- Breitsprecher, K., & Thorkelson, D. J. (2009). Neogene kinematic history of Nazca–
 Antarctic–Phoenix slab windows beneath Patagonia and the Antarctic Peninsula. *Tectonophysics*, 464(1-4), 10-20.
- Burov, E. B., & Diament, M. (1995). The effective elastic thickness (T e) of continental
 lithosphere: What does it really mean?. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*,
 100(B3), 3905-3927.
- Butler, S. L., & Peltier, W. R. (2000). On scaling relations in time-dependent mantle
 convection and the heat transfer constraint on layering. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 105(B2), 3175-3208.
- Cande, S. C., & Leslie, R. B. (1986). Late Cenozoic tectonics of the southern Chile trench. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 91(B1), 471-496.
- Champagnac, J. D., Molnar, P., Sue, C., & Herman, F. (2012). Tectonics, climate, and
 mountain topography. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, *117*(B2).
- 375 Cloetingh, S., Sternai, P., Koptev, A., Ehlers, T. A., Gerya, T., Kovács, I., Oerlemans, J.,
- 376 Beekman, F., Lavallée, Y., Dingwell, D., Békési, E., Porkolab, K., Tesauro, M., Lavecchia,
- 377 A., Botsyun, S., Muller, V., Roure, F., Serpelloni, E., Matenco, L., Castelltort, S.,
- Giovannelli, D., Brovarone, A.V., Malaspina, N., Coletti, G., Valla, P., & Limberger, J.
 (2023). Coupled surface to deep Earth processes: Perspectives from TOPO-EUROPE with an
- 379 (2023). Coupled surface to deep Earth processes: Perspectives from TOPO-EUROPE with an
 380 emphasis on climate-and energy-related societal challenges. *Global and Planetary Change*,
 381 104140.
- Currie, C. A., & Hyndman, R. D. (2006). The thermal structure of subduction zone back arcs.
 Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth, 111(B8).
- Davies, B. J., & Glasser, N. F. (2012). Accelerating shrinkage of Patagonian glaciers from the
 Little Ice Age (~ AD 1870) to 2011. *Journal of Glaciology*, 58(212), 1063-1084.
- 386 Davies, B. J., Darvill, C. M., Lovell, H., Bendle, J. M., Dowdeswell, J. A., Fabel, D., García,





- 387 J.-L., Geiger, A., Glasser, N.F., Gheorghiu, D.M., Harrison, S., Hein, A.S., Kaplan, M.R.,
- Martin, J.R.V., Mendelova, M., Palmer, A., Pelto, M., Rodés, A., Segredo, E.A., Smedley,
 R.K., Smellie J., & Thorndycraft, V. R. (2020). The evolution of the Patagonian Ice Sheet
- from 35 ka to the present day (PATICE). *Earth-Science Reviews*, 204, 103152.
- Dietrich, R., Ivins, E. R., Casassa, G., Lange, H., Wendt, J., & Fritsche, M. (2010). Rapid
 crustal uplift in Patagonia due to enhanced ice loss. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*,
 289(1-2), 22-29.
- Geissler, W. H., Sodoudi, F., & Kind, R. (2010). Thickness of the central and eastern
 European lithosphere as seen by S receiver functions. *Geophysical Journal International*, *181*(2), 604-634.
- Georgieva, V., Melnick, D., Schildgen, T. F., Ehlers, T. A., Lagabrielle, Y., Enkelmann, E.,
 & Strecker, M. R. (2016). Tectonic control on rock uplift, exhumation, and topography above
 an oceanic ridge collision: Southern Patagonian Andes (47 S), Chile. *Tectonics*, *35*(6), 13171341.
- Gerya, T. (2019). Introduction to numerical geodynamic modelling. Cambridge University
 Press.
- Gerya, T. V., & Yuen, D. A. (2007). Robust characteristics method for modelling multiphase
 visco-elasto-plastic thermo-mechanical problems. *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 163(1-4), 83-105.
- Glasser, N. F., Harrison, S., Jansson, K. N., Anderson, K., & Cowley, A. (2011). Global sealevel contribution from the Patagonian Icefields since the Little Ice Age maximum. *Nature Geoscience*, 4(5), 303-307.
- Glasser, N. F., Jansson, K. N., Harrison, S., & Rivera, A. (2005). Geomorphological evidence
 for variations of the North Patagonian Icefield during the Holocene. *Geomorphology*, 71(3-4), 263-277.
- Glasser, N., & Jansson, K. (2008). The glacial map of southern South America. *Journal of Maps*, 4(1), 175-196.
- 414 Glasser, N. F., Jansson, K. N., Duller, G. A., Singarayer, J., Holloway, M., & Harrison, S.
- 415 (2016). Glacial lake drainage in Patagonia (13-8 kyr) and response of the adjacent Pacific
 416 Ocean. Scientific reports, 6(1), 21064.
- Guillaume, B., Martinod, J., Husson, L., Roddaz, M., & Riquelme, R. (2009). Neogene uplift
 of central eastern Patagonia: dynamic response to active spreading ridge subduction?. *Tectonics*, 28(2).
- 420 Gurnis, M. (1989). A reassessment of the heat transport by variable viscosity convection with 421 plates and lids. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *16*(2), 179-182.
- Hein, A. S., Hulton, N. R., Dunai, T. J., Sugden, D. E., Kaplan, M. R., & Xu, S. (2010). The
 chronology of the Last Glacial Maximum and deglacial events in central Argentine
 Patagonia. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 29(9-10), 1212-1227.
- 425 Hirschmann, M. M. (2000). Mantle solidus: Experimental constraints and the effects of 426 peridotite composition. *Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems, 1*(10).
- 427 Hulton, N. R., Purves, R. S., McCulloch, R. D., Sugden, D. E., & Bentley, M. J. (2002). The 428 last glacial maximum and deglaciation in southern South America. *Quaternary Science*
- 429 Reviews, 21(1-3), 233-241.
- 430 Ivins, E. R., & James, T. S. (1999). Simple models for late Holocene and present-day





- 431 Patagonian glacier fluctuations and predictions of a geodetically detectable isostatic response.
 432 *Geophysical Journal International*, 138(3), 601-624.
- 433 Ivins, E. R., & James, T. S. (2004). Bedrock response to Llanquihue Holocene and present-
- 434 day glaciation in southernmost South America. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *31*(24).
- Ivins, E. R., Watkins, M. M., Yuan, D. N., Dietrich, R., Casassa, G., & Rülke, A. (2011). Onland ice loss and glacial isostatic adjustment at the Drake Passage: 2003–2009. *Journal of*
- 437 Geophysical Research: Solid Earth, 116(B2).
- Johannes, W. (1985). The significance of experimental studies for the formation of
 migmatites. In: *Migmatites*, Ed. Ashworth, J. R. Blackie & Son Ltd, USA Chapman & Hall.
- Kaufmann, G., & Lambeck, K. (2002). Glacial isostatic adjustment and the radial viscosity
 profile from inverse modeling. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 107(B11),
 ETG-5.
- Kaufmann, G., Wu, P., & Wolf, D. (1997). Some effects of lateral heterogeneities in the
 upper mantle on postglacial land uplift close to continental margins. Geophysical Journal
 International, 128(1), 175-187.
- Klemann, V., Ivins, E. R., Martinec, Z., & Wolf, D. (2007). Models of active glacial isostasy
 roofing warm subduction: Case of the South Patagonian Ice Field. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, *112*(B9).
- Lagabrielle, Y., Scalabrino, B., Suarez, M., & Ritz, J. F. (2010). Mio-Pliocene glaciations of Central Patagonia: New evidence and tectonic implications. *Andean Geology*, *37*(2), 276-299.
- Lange, H., Casassa, G., Ivins, E. R., Schröder, L., Fritsche, M., Richter, A., Groh, A., &
 Dietrich, R. (2014). Observed crustal uplift near the Southern Patagonian Icefield constrains
 improved viscoelastic Earth models. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *41*(3), 805-812.
- Larson, K. M., Bürgmann, R., Bilham, R., & Freymueller, J. T. (1999). Kinematics of the
 India-Eurasia collision zone from GPS measurements. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 104(B1), 1077-1093.
- Martinod, J., Pouyaud, B., Carretier, S., Guillaume, B., & Hérail, G. (2016). Geomorphic
 Records along the General Carrera (Chile)–Buenos Aires (Argentina) Glacial Lake (46°–48°
 S), Climate Inferences, and Glacial Rebound for the Past 7–9 ka: A discussion. The Journal
 of Geology, 124(5), 631-635.
- McCulloch, R. D., Bentley, M. J., Purves, R. S., Hulton, N. R., Sugden, D. E., & Clapperton,
 C. M. (2000). Climatic inferences from glacial and palaeoecological evidence at the last
 glacial termination, southern South America. *Journal of Quaternary Science: Published for the Quaternary Research Association*, 15(4), 409-417.
- McCulloch, R. D., Fogwill, C. J., Sugden, D. E., Bentley, M. J., & Kubik, P. W. (2005).
 Chronology of the last glaciation in central Strait of Magellan and Bahía Inútil, southernmost
 South America. *Geografiska Annaler: Series A, Physical Geography*, 87(2), 289-312.
- 468 Mckenzie, D. A. N., & Bickle, M. J. (1988). The volume and composition of melt generated 469 by extension of the lithosphere. *Journal of petrology*, *29*(3), 625-679.
- 470 McKenzie, D., & Richter, F. M. (1981). Parameterized thermal convection in a layered region
- and the thermal history of the Earth. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 86(B12),
 11667-11680.
- 473 Moreno, P. I., Lowell, T. V., Jacobson Jr, G. L., & Denton, G. H. (1999). Abrupt vegetation





- 474 and climate changes during the last glacial maximum and last termination in the Chilean Lake 475 District: a case study from Canal de la Puntilla (41 S). Geografiska Annaler: Series A,
- 476 Physical Geography, 81(2), 285-311.
- Millan, R., Rignot, E., Rivera, A., Martineau, V., Mouginot, J., Zamora, R., Uribe, J.,
 Lenzano, G., De Fleurian, B., Li, X., Gim, Y., & Kirchner, D. (2019). Ice thickness and bed
 elevation of the Northern and Southern Patagonian Icefields. *Geophysical Research Letters*,
 46(12), 6626-6635.
- 481 Mitrovica, J. X., & Forte, A. M. (1997). Radial profile of mantle viscosity: Results from the
 482 joint inversion of convection and postglacial rebound observables. *Journal of Geophysical*483 *Research: Solid Earth*, *102*(B2), 2751-2769.
- 484 Molnar, P., & England, P. (1990). Late Cenozoic uplift of mountain ranges and global 485 climate change: chicken or egg? *Nature*, *346*(6279), 29-34.
- Moreno, P. I., Denton, G. H., Moreno, H., Lowell, T. V., Putnam, A. E., & Kaplan, M. R.
 (2015). Radiocarbon chronology of the last glacial maximum and its termination in northwestern Patagonia. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, *122*, 233-249.
- Muller, V. A., Calderón, M., Fosdick, J. C., Ghiglione, M. C., Cury, L. F., Massonne, H. J.,
 Fanning, M.C., Warren, C.J., Ramírez de Arellano, C., & Sternai, P. (2021). The closure of
 the Rocas Verdes Basin and early tectono-metamorphic evolution of the Magallanes Foldand-Thrust Belt, southern Patagonian Andes (52–54° S). *Tectonophysics*, 798, 228686.
- 493 Muller, V. A., Sternai, P., Sue, C., Simon-Labric, T., & Valla, P. G. (2022). Climatic control 494 on the location of continental volcanic arcs. *Scientific Reports*, *12*(1), 1-13.
- Peltier, W. R. (1996). Mantle viscosity and ice-age ice sheet topography. *Science*, 273(5280),
 1359-1364.
- 497 Peltier, W. R. (2004). Global glacial isostasy and the surface of the ice-age Earth: the ICE-5G
 498 (VM2) model and GRACE. *Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.*, *32*, 111-149.
- 499 Peltier, W. R., & Andrews, J. T. (1976). Glacial-isostatic adjustment—I. The forward 500 problem. *Geophysical Journal International*, 46(3), 605-646.
- Rabassa, J. (2008). Late cenozoic glaciations in Patagonia and Tierra del Fuego.
 Developments in quaternary sciences, 11, 151-204.
- Ramos, V. A. (2005). Seismic ridge subduction and topography: Foreland deformation in the
 Patagonian Andes. *Tectonophysics*, 399(1-4), 73-86.
- Ramos, V. A., & Kay, S. M. (1992). Southern Patagonian plateau basalts and deformation:
 backarc testimony of ridge collisions. *Tectonophysics*, 205(1-3), 261-282.
- 507 Ranalli, G. (1995). Rheology of the Earth. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Ranalli, G. (1997). Rheology of the lithosphere in space and time. *Geological Society,* London, Special Publications, 121(1), 19-37.
- 510 Ravikumar, M., Singh, B., Pavan Kumar, V., Satyakumar, A. V., Ramesh, D. S., & Tiwari,
- 511 V. M. (2020). Lithospheric density structure and effective elastic thickness beneath Himalaya
- 512 and Tibetan Plateau: Inference from the integrated analysis of gravity, geoid, and topographic
- 513 data incorporating seismic constraints. *Tectonics*, *39*(10), e2020TC006219.
- Rignot, E., Rivera, A., & Casassa, G. (2003). Contribution of the Patagonia Icefields of South
 America to sea level rise. *Science*, *302*(5644), 434-437.
- 516 Robertson Maurice, S. D., Wiens, D. A., Koper, K. D., & Vera, E. (2003). Crustal and upper





- mantle structure of southernmost South America inferred from regional waveform inversion.
 Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth, 108(B1).
- 519 Ruddiman, W. F., Raymo, M., & McIntyre, A. (1986). Matuyama 41,000-year cycles: North
- Atlantic Ocean and northern hemisphere ice sheets. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 80(1-2), 117-129.
- 522 Serpelloni, E., Faccenna, C., Spada, G., Dong, D., & Williams, S. D. (2013). Vertical GPS
- 523 ground motion rates in the Euro-Mediterranean region: New evidence of velocity gradients at
- different spatial scales along the Nubia-Eurasia plate boundary. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 118(11), 6003-6024.
- Stern, C. R., & Kilian, R. (1996). Role of the subducted slab, mantle wedge and continental
 crust in the generation of adakites from the Andean Austral Volcanic Zone. Contributions to
 mineralogy and petrology, 123, 263-281.
- 529 Sternai, P. (2020). Surface processes forcing on extensional rock melting. *Scientific reports*,
 530 10(1), 1-13.
- Sternai, P. (2023). Feedbacks between internal and external Earth dynamics. In *Dynamics of Plate Tectonics and Mantle Convection* (pp. 271-294). Elsevier.
- 533 Sternai, P., Sue, C., Husson, L., Serpelloni, E., Becker, T. W., Willett, S. D., Faccenna, C., Di
- 534 Giulio, A., Spada, G., Jolivet, L., Valla, P., Petit, C., Nocquet, J.-M., Walpersdorf, A., & 535 Castelltort, S. (2019). Present-day uplift of the European Alps: Evaluating mechanisms and
- 536 models of their relative contributions. *Earth-Science Reviews*, 190, 589-604.
- Stuhne, G. R., & Peltier, W. R. (2015). Reconciling the ICE-6G_C reconstruction of glacial
 chronology with ice sheet dynamics: The cases of Greenland and Antarctica. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, 120(9), 1841-1865.
- Sue, C., Delacou, B., Champagnac, J. D., Allanic, C., & Burkhard, M. (2007). Aseismic
 deformation in the Alps: GPS vs. seismic strain quantification. *Terra Nova*, 19(3), 182-188.
- Thorndycraft, V. R., Bendle, J. M., Benito, G., Davies, B. J., Sancho, C., Palmer, A. P.,
 Fabel, D., Medialdea, A., & Martin, J. R. (2019). Glacial lake evolution and Atlantic-Pacific
 drainage reversals during deglaciation of the Patagonian Ice Sheet. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 203, 102-127.
- 546 Turcotte, D. L., & Schubert, G. (2002). *Geodynamics*. Cambridge university press.
- van der Wal, W., Whitehouse, P. L., & Schrama, E. J. (2015). Effect of GIA models with 3D
 composite mantle viscosity on GRACE mass balance estimates for Antarctica. Earth and
 Planetary Science Letters, 414, 134-143.
- Walpersdorf, A., Sue, C., Baize, S., Cotte, N., Bascou, P., Beauval, C., Collard, P, Daniel, G.,
 Dyer, H., Grasso, J.-R., Hautecoeur, O., Helmstetter, A., Hok, S., Langlais, M., Menard, G.,
 Mousavi, Z., Ponton, F., Rizza, M., Rolland, L., Souami, D., & Martinod, J. (2015).
 Coherence between geodetic and seismic deformation in a context of slow tectonic activity
 (SW Alps, France). *Journal of Geodynamics*, *85*, 58-65.
- 555 Watts, A. B. (2001). Isostasy and Flexure of the Lithosphere. Cambridge University Press.
- 556 Willis, M. J., Melkonian, A. K., Pritchard, M. E., & Rivera, A. (2012). Ice loss from the
- 557 Southern Patagonian ice field, South America, between 2000 and 2012. *Geophysical research*
- 558 *letters*, 39(17).







560 Fig. 1. Regional context and uplift rate data. a) Map of southern Patagonia with the Southern Patagonian Icefield (SPI), Northern Patagonian Icefield (NPI), and the Cordillera Darwin Icefield (CDI) in light blue, the approximate extension of the icefields at the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM limit), and the approximate extension of the present-day asthenospheric window (dashed region) beneath the South American Continent (SAM). In the Pacific Ocean, the spreading ridges (s.r., thick black lines) and transform faults (t.f., thin black lines) separate the Nazca (NZ) and the Antarctic (AT) plates. The subduction trench is also highlighted in black. The arrows show the approximate rate and direction of subduction of the oceanic plates. b) Zoom on the SPI with GPS stations (circles) used to estimate the viscoelastic uplift rates, from Lange et al. (2014).







Fig. 2. Reference numerical model setup. a) Thermo-mechanical numerical model domain with rheological layers (Table 1), isotherms (white lines), and yield strength ($\Delta\sigma$) profile (yellow line). (b, c) Ice thickness vs. time used in the numerical models to simulate the post-IGM deglaciation in two model sets (b), and the post-LIA deglaciation (c).







Fig. 3. Distribution of viscosity and velocity vectors in the numerical models. a) Reference model without an asthenospheric thermal anomaly, TA = 0 °C, and b) model with the higher simulated asthenospheric thermal anomaly, TA = 200 °C, in the last timestep of post-LIA deglaciation. c) Reference model with TA = 0 °C, and d) model with TA = 200 °C, in the last timestep of *Model set 1* of post-LGM deglaciation. Velocity vectors do not have the same scaling and are only meant for visualization purpose.







Fig. 4. Surface uplift rates vs. distance for *Model set 1* of post-LGM deglaciation. a) t = 1000 years of deglaciation, b) t = 5000 years of deglaciation, c) t = 10000 of deglaciation, d) 20000 years of deglaciation. Different line colours correspond to different TA.







Fig. 5. Surface uplift rates vs. distance for *Model set 2* of post-LGM deglaciation. a) t = 1000 years of deglaciation, b) t = 5000 years of deglaciation, c) t = 10000 of deglaciation, d) 20000 years of deglaciation. Different line colours correspond to different TA.

585







Fig. 6. Surface uplift rates vs. distance for post-LIA deglaciation model set. a) t = 100 years of deglaciation, b) t = 200 years of deglaciation, c) t = 300 years of deglaciation, d) 400 years of deglaciation. Different line colours correspond to different TA.







590 Fig. 7. Maximum uplift rates vs. time for model sets of deglaciation with different TA. a) *Model set 1* of post-LGM deglaciation accounting of 75% of ice loss in 20000 years, b) *Model set 2* of post-LGM deglaciation accounting of 95% of ice loss in 10000 years, and c) Post-LIA deglaciation model set accounting 10% of ice loss in 400 years (blue-shaded region). Blue-shaded regions highlight the modeled deglaciation intervals.





	ρ_{θ}^{s} (km/m ³)	E _a (kJ/mo l)	<i>V_a</i> (m ³ / mol)	n	C (M pa)	<i>Visc</i> . flow law	Sin (ø _{eff})	с (W/m/K)	μ (Gp a)	C _p (J/kg/ K)	<i>Hr</i> (μW/ m ³)	H _l (kJ/k g)	α (1/ k)	β (1/P a)
Crust	2800	154	0	2.3	10	Wet Qz.	0.2	0.64+807/(T+ 77)	10	1000	1	300	3x1 0 ⁻⁵	1x1 0 ⁻¹¹
Lithos- pheric mantle	3250	532	10	3.5	10	Dry Ol.	0.6	0.73+1293/(T +77)	67	1000	0.022	400	3x1 0 ⁻⁵	1x1 0 ⁻¹¹
Asthenos- pheric mantle	3250	532	10	3.5	10	Dry Ol.	0.6	0.73+1293/(T +77)	67	1000	0.022	400	3x1 0 ⁻⁵	1x1 0 ⁻¹¹
Ice	920	154	0	2.3	10		0	0.73+1293/(T +77)	67	1000	0.022	400	3x1 0 ⁻⁵	1x1 0 ⁻¹¹

 Table 1 – Material properties used in the numerical experiments.

595 ρ_0^s is the standard densities of solid rocks; E_a is the activation energy; V_a is the activation volume; n is the stress exponent; C is cohesion; φ_{eff} is the effective internal friction angle; c is thermal conductivity; μ is the shear modulus; C_p is the specific heat capacity; H_r and H_I are the radiogenic and latent heat productions, respectively; α is thermal expansion; β is compressibility. Qz and OI are quartzite and olivine, respectively. All rheological and partial melting laws/parameters are based on experimental rock mechanics and petrology (Ranalli, 1995; Hirschmann, 2000; Johannes, 1985; Turcotte and Schubert, 2002).

600





Table 2 – Maximum uplift rates derived from the numerical models with a thermal anomaly (TA) of 0, 50, 100, 150 and 200 °C for the *Model set 1* (a) and *Model set 2* (b) of post-LGM deglaciation, and the post-LIA deglaciation model set (c). The t = 0 is the timestep immediately before the beginning of deglaciation. Fig. 7 is a plot of the maximum uplift rate vs. time calculated for each timestep in all numerical models.

a) <i>Model set 1</i> of post-LGM deglaciation (20000 years)												
TA (°C)	Maximum uplift rate (mm/yr)											
0	0.0425 0.0412		0.9781	3.2849	6.4337	9.5049	4.9781					
50	0.0481	0.5650	2.2171	6.9983	10.7568	12.7473	4.6591					
100	0.0674	3.5812	5.1450	11.3702	13.6265	14.3080	4.0696					
150	0.0471	11.7188	12.7860	14.3219	15.1838	15.5924	1.3896					
200	0.1513	11.4839	15.0235	16.2639	16.4590	16.2576	0.8946					
	t = 0	t = 1000 yr	t = 5000 yr	t = 10000 yr	t = 15000 yr	t = 20000 yr	t = 25000 yr					
b) <i>Model set 2</i> of post-LGM deglaciation (10000 years)												
TA (°C)	Maximum uplift rate (mm/yr)											
0	0.5011	1.0885	8.0324	19.4849	5.6972	3.1222	2.1536					
50	0.2527	1.5170	15.9284	24.8744	5.2380	2.7184	1.7310					
100	0.3270	1.2905	26.9424	36.0223	4.9357	2.3015	1.4085					
150	0.4273	22.3004	36.3278	37.1107	1.9319	0.9322	0.5953					
200	0.3725	30.0494	39.4609	41.9771	1.4801	0.7525	0.4868					
	t = 0	t = 1000 yr	t = 5000 yr	t = 10000 yr	t = 15000 yr	t = 20000 yr	t = 25000 yr					
c) post-LIA d	eglaciation mod	el set (400 years)										
TA (°C)	Maximum uplift rate (mm/yr)											
0	0.4317 1.4151		1.6660	1.8366	1.9492	0.1764	0.1025					
50	0.0352	2.2776	2.4264	2.5706	2.4514	0.3044	0.2340					
100	0.0350	2.2024	2.3235	2.5241	2.9878	0.4854	0.3775					
150	0.0933	8.2708	11.5730	14.0325	11.8261	8.1148	7.1503					
200	0.0962	22.8938	25.7002	25.572	18.9666	3.9966	2.5535					
	t = 0	t = 100 yr	t = 200 yr	t = 300 yr	t = 400 yr	t = 500 yr	t = 600 yr					

605