¹ **Review article: Retrogressive thaw slump theorycharacteristics and** ² **terminology**

3 Nina Nesterova^{1,2}, Marina Leibman³₄, Alexander Kizyakov⁵Kizyakov⁴, Hugues Lantuit^{1,2}, Ilya[,] 4 Tarasevich^{3,4,5}, Ingmar Nitze¹, Alexandra Veremeeva¹, Guido Grosse^{1,2}

¹Permafrost Research Section, Alfred Wegener Institute Helmholtz Center for Polar and Marine Research, Potsdam, 14473, 6 Germany
 $7 \t2$ Institute

²Institute of Geosciences, University of Potsdam, Potsdam, 14476, Germany

3

8 ^a X. Bio Institute, University of Tyumen, Tyumen, 625003, Russia
9 ^a "Earth³Earth_sCryosphere Institute, Tyumen Scientific Centre SB RAS, Tyumen, postal 625026, Russia

10 ⁵Cryolithology⁴Cryolithology and Glaciology Department, Faculty of Geography, Lomonosov Moscow State University,

11 119991, Moscow, Russia

12 *Correspondence to*: Nina Nesterova (nina.nesterova@awi.de)

 Abstract. Retrogressive thaw slumps (RTSs in plural and RTS in singular) are spectacular landforms that occur due to the thawing of ice-rich permafrost or melting of massive ground ice often in hillslope terrain. RTSs occur in the Arctic, Subarctic as well as high mountain (Qinghai–Tibetan Plateau) permafrost regions and are observed to expand in size and number due to climate warming. As the observation of RTS is receiving more and more attention due to their important role in permafrost thaw, impacts on topography, mobilization of sediment, carbon, nutrients, and contaminants, and their effects on downstream hydrology and water quality, the thematic breadth of studies increases and scientists from different scientific backgrounds and perspectives contribute to new RTS research. At this point, a wide range of terminologies originating from different scientific 20 schools is being used and we identified the need to provide an overview of theoretical approaches, terms, and variable 21 characteristics of RTS to clarify terminologies and create common ground forease the understanding of the literature related to RTS processes, dynamics, and feedbacks. We here review the theoretical geomorphological background of RTS formation and landform characteristics to provide an up-to-date understanding of the current views on terminology and underlying processes. The presented overview can be used not only by the international permafrost community but also by scientists working on ecological, hydrological, and biogeochemical consequences of RTS occurrence as well as remote sensing 26 specialists developing automated methods for mapping RTS dynamics. The frameworkreview will foster a better understanding of the nature and diversity of RTS phenomena and provide a useful base for experts in the field but also ease

28 the introduction to the topic of RTSs for scientists who are new to it.

29 **1 Introduction**

- 30 Permafrost in the Arctic is impacted by warming and thawing in step with ongoing pronounced Arctic warming due to climate
- 31 change (Biskaborn et al., 2019; Smith et al., 2022). Thaw of ice-rich permafrost results in the formation of characteristic

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Normal, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border), Tab stops: 3.13", Centered + 6.27", Right

landforms due to sometimes rapid terrain subsidence and erosion. One typical and regionally widespread landform formed by

- the thaw of ice-rich permafrost or melting of massive ground ice is a slope failure termed retrogressive thaw slump (RTS)
- (Mackay, 1966). These spectacular, often horseshoe-shaped permafrost landforms exhibit dynamic behavior, progressing
- through stages of active growth and stabilization that may even evolve in a polycyclic fashion (Mackay, 1966; Kerfoot, 1969; Kokelj et al., 2009).
- 37 RTSs-in the Northern Hemisphere occur throughout the Arctic, Subarctic, and high mountain regions (Qinghai–Tibetan
- Plateau) with ice-rich permafrost and have a significant environmental impact (Kokelj and Lewkowicz, 1999). Figure 1 shows
- examples of different RTSs photographed across the Northern Hemisphere. RTSs exhibit regional variations in their
- appearance and characteristics.

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Normal, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border), Tab stops: 3.13", Centered + 6.27", Right

41

Figure 1 Various RTSs across the Northern Hemisphere: (a) stabilized yedoma RTS on Belkovsky Island, NE Siberia, Russia, September 2002, photo: Guido Grosse, (b) RTS in the Peel Plateau, NW Canada, July 2023, photo from th 43 September 2002, photo: Guido Grosse, (b) RTS in the Peel Plateau, NW Canada, July 2023, photo from the airplane: Guido Grosse,
44 (c) two RTSs in the central Gydan Peninsula, West Siberia, Russia, September 2020, photo 45 **in Selavik, Alaska, USA, July 2021, aerial camera image, credit: AWI, (e) yedoma RTS in Oyagos Yar, NE Siberia, Russia,** 46 **September 2002, photo: Guido Grosse, (f) RTS in The Qinghai–Tibet Plateau, China, August 2023, photo: Zhuoxuan Xia.**

3 3

Formatted: Font color: Black

 RTS initiation not only alters the topography, hydrology, and vegetation cover but also contributes to substantial sediment, carbon, and nutrient fluxes to downstream environments with impacts on water quality and aquatic ecosystems (Kokelj et al., 2005; Mesquita et al., 2010). Historically, RTS research started with the first mention of exposed ice in a retrogressive thaw slump probably dating back to 1881 by Dall in his publication on observations in Alaska (Dall, 1881) The first intensive studies on RTSRTSs were conducted much later in the mid-latter half of the 20th century (in Canada (Lamothe and St-Onge, 1961; Mackay, 1966; Kerfoot, 1969) 53 and Siberia (Popov et al., 1966; Czudek and Demek, 1970), and in recent years there has been a notable increase in). These 54 studies on RTSs were field-based and focused on ground ice, morphometry, and dynamics. The publications on this subject. 55 Variouswere written either in English or Russian language with different terms applied to these landforms depending on scientific approaches. Unfortunately, the level of knowledge exchange and reciprocal citation among RTS researchers from Canada and the USSR was relatively low, leading to the establishment of disparate views and terminology for RTS used in the literature. 59 The strong rise in scientific exchange and international collaborations at the end of the 20th century, including field methods (Czudek and Demek, 1970; Burn and Friele, 1989; Leibmanjoint expeditions within the permafrost community in general and within the topic of RTS in particular (i.e., Vaikmäe et al., 2000; Kizyakov1993; Ingólfsson, and Lokrantz, 2003; Are et al., 62 2023) and 2005), as well as the emergence of remote sensing data (methods substantially broadened the scope of RTS research (Romanenko, 1998; Lantuit and Pollard, 2005; Lantz and Kokelj, 2008; Leibman et al., 2021) are employed to study RTSs. 64 Publications). Today, a large body of recent literature predominantly focusfocuses on monitoring RTS activity by measuring retreat rates (Kizyakov et al., 2006; Wang et al., 2009; Laccelle et al., 2010) and volume changes (Kizyakov et al., 2006; Clark et al., 20202021; Jiao et al., 2022; Bernhard et al., 2022), identifying driving factors (Harris and Lewkowicz, 2000; Lacelle et al., 2010), or more generally mapping of RTSs (Pollard, 2000; Lipovsky and Huscroft, 2006; Khomutov and Leibman, 2008; Swanson, 2012; Segal et al., 2016). Recent publications on RTS mapping notably shifted away from a focus on geological and

 geomorphological aspects to developing advanced methodologies of RTS detection and classification using spatially and/or temporally high-resolution remote sensing data and digital elevation data, frequently employing artificial intelligence methods (Huang et al., 2020; Nitze et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2023).

 72 Despite the However, despite the increasing number of studies and strongly rising interest in RTS among the permafrost and 73 remote sensing research communities, we find that there is still no commonly agreed theoretical backgroundterminology on the RTS phenomenon. Various authors apply different terminology to describe the same morphology and processes or use the same terms for different processes. This leads to challenges with comparability between datasets from different RTS studies 76 and several difficulties in communication about RTS within and across research communities. First of all, since the terminology is not always clearly defined or translated in the literature it can lead to potential misunderstandings about what exact features or processes have been investigated in a particular study. The confusion about the object of the study may cause incomparability of the datasets from different RTS studies. Furthermore, different labeling of the same features may result in a completely different image of the phenomena. For example, Nitze et al. (2024, in review) conducted an experiment where

Formatted: Font color: Black

- 109 The extent of RTSs appearing at a particular position varies and is strongly controlled by the topographical and geological
- 110 characteristics of the area. For example, RTSs in mountain regions mostly occur on slopes unrelated to the waterbodies, as in

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Normal, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border), Tab stops: 3.13", Centered + 6.27", Right

Formatted: English (United States)

the Qinghai-Tibetan Plateau, China (Niu et al., 2012; Huang et al., 2018; Hu et al., 2019), or in the Yana Highlands, East

- Siberia (Kizyakov et al. 2023), while RTSs in the flat terrain of the Yamal and Gydan peninsulas, West Siberia, are generally
- found next to lake shores (Nesterova et al., 2021). A first analysis across the Arctic has not revealed any correlations between
- the influence of RTS position in the terrain and its size or activity so far (Bernhard et al., 2022).
- RTSs were found across a wide range of slopes, including on gentle terrain slopes of <5° (De Krom, 1990; Leibman et al.,
- 116 2023), medium slopes of 5 to 10° (Niu et al., 2016), as well as on steep slopes >10° (Czudek and Demek, 1970; Barry, 1992;
- Robinson, 2000). Some studies found that RTSs on steeper slopes tend to have higher headwall retreat rates (see Sect. 3.1.1)
- 118 than those that occur on less steep slopes (Robinson, 2000).
- RTSs occur on a great variety of slope aspects. While some studies investigating different regions across the Arctic reported
- that their observed RTSs tended to have different prevailing slope orientations (Kokelj et al., 2009; Lacelle et al., 2015; Jones
- et al., 2019; Nesterova et al., 2021; Bernhard et al., 2022), several other studies found that higher RTS ablation rates and
- headwall retreat (see Sect. 3.1.1) are related to southern aspects (Lewkowicz, 1987a; Grom and Pollard, 2008; Lacelle et al.,
- 2015). However, several other studies did not find any link between the slope aspect and RTS activity (Wang et al., 2009;
- Nesterova et al., 2021; Bernhard et al., 2022). Bernhard et al. (2022) suggested that differences in the RTS aspect may be
- explained by regional geological history that defines ice content and ice distribution, which are the main factors of RTS
- occurrence (Mackay, 1966; Kerfoot, 1969).

2.3. Ground ice

- 128 A high excess ground ice content is a prerequisite for RTS occurrence. The shallower the ground ice table the higher the
- likelihood that seasonal thawing will reach and start melting the ice, potentially triggering the initiation of the RTS. Regions
- with abundant ground ice presence in Canada feature widespread and ubiquitous slumps (Lamothe and St-Onge, 1961;
- Mackay, 1966; Kokelj et al., 2017). Similar observations were reported for Central Yamal, Russia (Babkina et al., 2019). RTS
- in areas with a thinner ground ice-rich layer tend to stabilize faster due to the rapid ice exhaustion (Kizyakov, 2005). The type
- 133 of ground ice and its local distribution can define some morphologic characteristics of RTS (see Sect. 3.1) and affect retreat
- rates. For example, RTS forming in syngenetic ice-rich Yedoma deposits with polygonal ice wedges are usually accompanied
- by the presence of baydzherakhs (conical remnant mounds, for details, see Sect. 3.1.6) on the slump floors. De Krom and
- Pollard (1989) found that on Herschel Island, Canada, large ice wedges melted slower than the enclosing massive ground ice
- body. While abundant ground ice is necessary for RTS formation it is not the only control for RTS occurrence.

2.4. Triggers

- 139 An RTS forms once very ice-rich permafrost or massive ground ice becomes exposed for any reason and starts melting.
- Triggers of this exposure can be any anthropogenic or natural permafrost disturbances.

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Font color: Black

175 widely, that RTS can occur in a range of different permafrost and ground ice settings, and feature processes not yet covered

176 by the current definition but important to understand their dynamics and environmental impacts.

177 **3 Commonly accepted settings of retrogressive thaw slump**

- 178 $3.1.4$ the growth of a talik that occurs in ice-rich permafrost can lead to thaw subsidence and stimulate further RTS 179 reoccurrence (Kokelj et al., 2009), or
- 180 the growth of a debris tongue (thawed sediments in the shape of a tongue, for details, see Sect. 3.1.8) can eventually
- 181 obstruct a stream valley and lead to the rise of stream base-level and further thermo-erosion that can erode and expose the 182 ground ice and secondary RTS occurrence (Kokelj et al., 2015).

183 **2.5. Polycyclicity and complex spatial aggregation**

184 RTSs are very dynamic features thatcan develop in a polycyclic fashion (Mackay, 1966; Kerfoot, 1969; Kokelj et al., 2009). 185 which means they can be active, then temporarily stabilize, and reactivate again (Mackay, 1966; Kerfoot, 1969; Kokelj et al., 186 2009). Yet some may end off in one cycle. RTSs can be considered active when there is an ongoing ablation of the exposed 187 ice and thawed material is transferred downslope. Generally, RTSs can stay active for decades, but the ablation happens only 188 in summer when the air temperature is above 0°C (Burn and Lewkowicz, 1990). Some studies reported continued headwall 189 retreat and thawed sediment fluxes even in slumps where the ice was covered by the sediments (Kokelj et al., 2015; Zwieback 190 et al., 2020). The reasons for these sediment-covered slumps to retain activity were heavy rainfalls and unsuppressed heat flux 191 to the ice. 192 RTSs can stabilize mostly due to for two reasons: 1) exposed ground ice has completely melted, or 2) the exposed ice is re-193 buried by sediments and thermally fully insulated from further melting (Burn and Friele, 1989). Once an RTS is stabilized, the

 pioneer vegetation starts to grow in the slump floor. Vegetation in stabilized RTS can go through several stages of succession and for stabilized RTS in Yukon Territory, Canada, it was reported that forest and tundra communities were re-established after 35-50 years (Burn and Friele, 1989). Some researchers found that RTSs can be stabilized for up to several hundred years in West Siberia, Russia, (Leibman and Kizyakov, 2007).et al., 2014). Such long-term stabilized RTS are namedlabeled in some studies as ancient (Nesterova et al., 2023).

- 199 New active RTS can form within the outline of another stabilized RTS, moreover, neighboring RTSs can grow and coalesce
- 200 at some point (Lantuit and Pollard, 2008). This leads to the very complex spatial aggregationorganization of nested and

201 amalgamated RTSs. of sometimes different ages. It raises additional challenges when delineating and mapping RTS and their

202 characteristics (van der Sluijs et al., 2023; Leibman et al., 2023).

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Normal, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border), Tab stops: 3.13", Centered + 6.27", Right

Formatted: Font color: Black

and Burn, 1997) and on

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Normal, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border), Tab stops: 3.13", Centered + 6.27", Right

288 3.5It also can happen that meltwater streams can go into ice wedge tunnels, disappear in sinkholes on the slump floor, and

289 reappear further down at the slump floor.

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Normal, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border), Tab stops: 3.13", Centered + 6.27", Right

 Figure 2 Concurrent processes affecting RTS: (a) ice-wedge degradation in an RTS on Yamal Peninsula, West Siberia, Russia, July 2018, UAV photo: Artem Khomutov, (b) Thermokarst subsidence indicated by yellow arrows and ice-wedge degradation indicated by a light-blue arrow in a stabilized RTS on Gydan Peninsula, West Siberia, Russia, July 2019, ESRI Basemap, GeoEye-1 satellite image, (c) Erosional niche formed due to the coastal erosion affecting RTS, Oyagos Yar, NE Siberia, Russia, September 2002, photo:
295 Guido Grosse, (d) white arrow indicates snow packs staying over summer, the purple ar **Guido Grosse, (d) white arrow indicates snow packs staying over summer, the purple arrow indicates an area where coastal erosion undercuts the coast and washes away debris tongue of an RTS on Herschel Island, Northern Canada, July 2022, photo from**
297 **heliconter: Saskia Enninger, (e) active thermal erosion in RTSs that occurred within gullies ne helicopter: Saskia Eppinger, (e) active thermal erosion in RTSs that occurred within gullies near Willow River, NW Canada, July 2023, aerial camera image, credit: AWL 2023, aerial camera image, credit: AWI.**

299 **3 Terminologies used in the literature**

300 **3.1. Morphologic parts**

- 302 types and depend on local geological conditions. (Figure 1 shows field photos with examples of different RTS morphologic
- 303 parts.³). Moreover, some morphologic parts of these RTS features can still be visible even whenafter the RTS stabilizes. There
- 304 arestabilized. Some studies use various terms used in the literature to describe the same parts of RTS, and some different
- 305 terminologies used in different studies which then are synonymous, which may lead to terms, while other studies use the same
- 306 terms but actually describe partially or fully different parts of the RTS with them. This can cause confusion when trying to
- 307 comparecomparing RTS characteristics across different studies (Table 1).
- 12 **Table 1 Morphologic parts of RTS and different terminologies used to describe them. The last column represents the presence "+" ²⁴"
309 or the absence "-" of the morphologic part in stabilized RTS.** or the absence "-" of the morphologic part in stabilized RTS,

12

Formatted: Normal, Space After: 10 pt, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border)

Formatted: Font: 9 pt, Bold, Font color: Black

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Font color: Black

14 14 border), Tab stops: 3.13", Centered + 6.27", Right

310 **3.51.1. Headwall and Side-walls**

311 The term *headwall* is used in the literature in two ways: 1) as a broad general term for the steep wall of RTSRTSs, where the

312 ice is exposed (Kerfoot, 1969; Egginton, 1976; Burn and Friele, 1989; Burn and Lewkowicz, 1990; Barry, 1992) and 2) as a

313 term for only the upper vertical part of the wall that consists of the active layer and ice-poor organic or mineral sediments

314 (Lantuit and Pollard, 2005; Lewkowicz and Way, 2019). The second lower part of the RTS wall according to these authors is

315 a steep (20°-50°) *headscarp* that consists of exposed ice-rich sediment or massive ground ice. Exposed ice is not only called a

316 *headscarp* in the literature but sometimes also an *ice face* and in such cases, the *ice face* is a part of the headwall that represents

317 the whole RTS wall in a general way (Kerfoot, 1969; De Krom, 1990; Burn and Lewkowicz, 1990; Barry, 1992).

318 There are several terms in the literature that are used to describe the whole RTS wall (*headwall* in a general way): for example,

319 *slump face* (Huang et al., 2022), *scarp* (Mackay, 1966; Kerfoot, 1969; Egginton, 1976; Fortier et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2009;

320 Nicu et al., 2021) and *escarpment* (Swanson and Nolan, 2018; Swanson, 2021). Another similar term is a *backwall* and it is

321 used to describe the whole RTS wall but separate it by its location on the back of the RTS (Lamothe and St-Onge, 1961;

322 Worsley, 1999; Leibman et al., 20212008). Those RTS walls that are located at the sides are sometimes called *side-walls*

323 (Lewkowicz, 1987b). Side-walls can be called an optional morphologic part since they mostly occur only in bowl-shape

324 morphologies.

325 Since a *headwall* is a wall with exposed ablating ice and frozen sediments, it can only be found in an active RTS. The remnants 326 of the headwall in stabilized RTSs are sometimes called in the literature as "*stable headwall*" (Kokelj et al., 2009) or "*old*

327 *headscarp*" (Zwieback et al., 2018).

328 **3.51.2. Slump floor or Scar**

329 As a *headwall* retreats it leaves a low-angle surface that can also be described as the bottom of the RTS hollow. This surface 330 is termed *slump floor* (Mackay, 1966; Lewkowicz, 1987a; Burn and Friele, 1989; De Krom, 1990; Barry, 1992; Lantuit and

> 15 15

Formatted: Font: Italic **Formatted:** Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic **Formatted:** Font: Italic

Formatted: Font color: Black

Pollard, 2005; Lacelle et al., 2010), highlighting its flatness or sometimes with the term *scar* (De Krom, 1990; Barry, 1992;

Kokelj et al., 2002; Kokelj et al., 2009) that originates from landslide terminology and means the bare surface that is left after

the removal of the mobilized sediments by mass movement. Both of the terms are equally popular in the literature and

334 sometimes ean beare used simultaneously in the same paperstudy as an interchangeable term (De Krom, 1990; Barry, 1992).

A *slump floor* or a *scar* can be found in active as well as stabilized RTSs.

3.51.3. Mudpool and Mudflows

The area of the mud in the *slump floor* right next to the headwall is often (but not always) the place where meltwater

accumulates. Some authors call this area of the RTS slump floor a *mudpool* (De Krom and Pollard, 1989; Lantuit and Pollard,

2005). Thawed sediments after their first accumulation atin the *mudpool* are transported downslope by the streams of

 meltwater. These flows of meltwater-saturated mud depending on the amount of water are generally called *mudflows* (Lamothe and St-Onge, 1961; Egginton, 1976; Lewkowicz, 1987a), but there are other terms in the literature

earth/mud flows (Leibman et al., 2014) and *debris flows* (Murton, 2001; Lipovsky and Huscroft, 2006).

3.51.4. Mud gullies and levees

 *Mudflows*Meltwater streams can lead to the formation of *mud gullies* within a *slump floor* – erosional channels that are carved by meltwater streams into debris (Lantuit and Pollard, 2005). If transported debris stagnates and dries out it may form *mud levees* bordering *mudflows* (Kerfoot, 1969; Lantuit and Pollard, 2005).

3.51.5. Slump block

 The pieces of ice-poor, often organic-rich peaty soil covered with vegetation that slide down the headwall into the slump floor and stay rigid when moving downslope with mudflows are called *slump blocks* in some studies (Swanson, 2012; Kokelj et al., 2015). If these features consist of active layer soil, they generally preserve the initial undisturbed tundra vegetation, some.

Some authors called these blocks also *remnant islands* (Burn and Friele, 1989; Bartleman et al., 2001).

3.51.6. Baydzherakh(s)

 Baydzherakhs (from the Yakutian language, but now a more commonly accepted term) are conical mounds in the s*lump floor* of RTSRTSs representing largely still frozen remnants of ice-wedge polygon centers where the surrounding polygonal large 355 ice wedges have thawed substantially already. They are typical for RTSs located on the upland slopes with ice-rich deposits 356 and large polygonal ice wedges up to 50 m thick (i.e.g., Yedoma Ice Complex) (Tikhomirov, 1958; Czudek and Demek, 1970; Zhigarev, 1975; Pizhankova, 2011; Séjourné et al., 2015). *Baydzherakhs* can reach significant sizes: up to 11 m in height, 15 m in width, and 20 m in length (Tikhomirov, 1958). Thus, they can be found not only in active but also in stabilized RTSs. As a typical feature of Yedoma upland slopes *baydzherakhs* are widely distributed in the Yedoma Ice Complex domain regions

>

Formatted: Font: Italic **Formatted:** Font: Italic

Formatted: Font color: Black

 inof Eastern and North-Eastern EurasiaSiberia, Alaska, and North-Western Canada (Strauss et al., 2021) as well as in other areas formed by ice-rich deposits with large polygonal ice wedges. *Baydzherakhs* will therefore not form in areas where RTSRTSs are formed in deposits with buried glacialthick ice or ice-rich glaciomarine depositslayers.

3.51.7. Evacuation channel

 Depending on the morphology of an RTS, thawed sediments and meltwater (debris) can leave the *slump floor* through the trench connecting the *slump floor* and the base level. This optional morphologic part of RTSRTSs is termed an *evacuation channel* (Lacelle et al., 2004; Lacelle et al., 2010; Delaney, 2015).

3.51.8. Debris tongue

 Thawed sediments and meltwater (debris) moving downslope can eventually escape from the *slump floor* directly or via an *evacuation channel*. Once this happens, thawed sediments accumulate in the shape of a "tongue" on any surface where an RTS outflow ends. Such features are generally called *debris tongues* (Worsley, 1999; Kokelj et al., 2015; Segal et al., 2016), but are sometimes referred to as *mud* or *slump lobes* (Lantuit and Pollard, 2005).

3.1.9. Edge and dropwall

 The term *edge* **of RTS is used in the literature to indicate: 1) the outline of the whole feature (van der Sluijs et al., 2023) and 2) the boundary line of active retreat (Cassidy et al., 2017; Leibman et al., 2021; Leibman et al., 2023; Kizyakov et** al., 2023). 3.5.9.

 The term *edge* of RTS is used in the literature to indicate: 1) the outline of the whole feature (van der Sluijs et al., 2023) and 2) the boundary line of active retreat (Cassidy et al., 2017; Leibman et al., 2021; Leibman et al., 2023; Kizyakov et al., 2023). In the first case, the term edge is used to indicate the outline. There is also the term *outline* itself that is used to describe the whole area of the RTS landform (Burn, 2000) or only the polygon that is considered to be the RTS detected by automated mapping methods (Yang et al., 2023). In the second caseFurthermore, the *edge* of RTS is also sometimes classified into upper edge meaning the boundary line of active retreatmentretreat of the *headwall* (Kizyakov et al., 2023), and *lower edge* meaning 382 the boundary line of the cliff retreatment retreat for RTSs on the sea coasts (Leibman et al., 2008; Leibman et al., 2021). The face (cliff) from the *lower edge* of coastal RTS to the beach is level has been called in this study a *dropwall* as a (Leibman et 384 al., 2021) to differentiate this morphologic part of the RTS being separated from the rest of the coastal cliff.

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Normal, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border), Tab stops: 3.13", Centered + 6.27", Right

385

Formatted: Font color: Black

428 examples of cryogenic earthflows in Central Yamal are demonstrated in Fig.4.

Formatted: Normal

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Normal, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border), Tab stops: 3.13", Centered + 6.27", Right

441 Leibman et al., 2014). The scheme visualizing thermocirque formation and the example of the thermocirque in Central Yamal,

442 Russia are demonstrated in Fig.5.

 (a)

Formatted: Font: 9 pt, Bold, Font color: Black

Formatted: Font: 9 pt, Bold, Font color: Black

Formatted: Font color: Black

464 (Lacelle et al., 2015).

469

 Figure 2 Concurrent processes affecting RTS: (a) ice-wedge degradation in RTS in**Central Yamal** Peninsula**, West Siberia, Russia**, July 2018, **show on (b) in a UAV photo in August 2019 (photo: Artem Khomutov**, (b) Thermokarst subsidence indicated 472 by yellow arrows and ice-wedge degradation indicated by the light-blue arrow in stabilized RTS in Gydan Pe
473 July 2019, ESRI Basemap, GeoEye 1-) and (c) in a WorldView-2 satellite image, (c) active thermal erosio July 2019, ESRI Basemap, GeoEye-1 **) and (c) in a WorldView-2 satellite image**, (c) active thermal erosion in RTS in Yamal Peninsula, Russia, July 2013, ESRI Basemap, WorldView-3 **from July 2018 (Source: ESRI satellite** image, (d) snow packs staying in RTS over summer, Yukon coast, Canada, July 2022, photo from helicopter: Saskia Eppinger, (e) coastal erosion 476 that undercuts the coast (indicated by dark-blue arrow)
477 September 2021, UAV photo: Nina Nesterova.basema September 2021, UAV photo: Nina Nesterova.**basemap).**

- 479 **4.1 Historical background**
- 480

Formatted: Normal, Space After: 10 pt, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border) **Formatted:** Font: 9 pt, Bold, Font color: Black **Formatted:** Font color: Black

Formatted: Font: 9 pt, Bold, Font color: Black

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Normal, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border), Tab stops: 3.13", Centered + 6.27", Right

3.2.4. Thermoterrace

 The term *thermoterrace* was first mentioned by Ermolaev (1932, in Russian) to describe "picturesque outcrops of ice falling vertically onto a narrow, 1-2 m wide space located along the seashore along the edge of the ice wall that can reach 30-35 m". The local term to describe these icy cliffs was muus kygams - muus кьham in Yakutian language (Ermolaev, 1932). The more precise definition of thermoterrace was given by Zenkovich and Popov (1980) as a terrace-like area in the upper part of the icy cliff at the seashore that results from the cliff retreat due to the thermal influence of warm air and solar radiation. Thermoterraces were reported to reach up to a few km in length along the coast and more than 200 m in width (Are et al., 2005). A scheme visualizing thermoterrace formation based on Kizyakov (2005) and an example of a thermoterrace on the

 Figure 6 (a) Scheme of thermoterrace formation, the black arrow indicates the direction of mass movement of thawed material; note that the scheme demonstrates the particular ground ice morphology of a layer with large ice-wedges (adapted from Kizyakov, 2005), but may also consist of other ground ice morphologies. Example of Thermoterraces in Bykovsky Peninsula, NE Siberia, Russia shown (b) on the ground in August 2016 (photo: Alexander Kizyakov) and (c) in a WorldView-2 satellite image from August 2020 (ESRI satellite basemap).

3.2.5. Active layer detachment slide

- Another closely related slope landform linked to RTS formation (see Sect. 3.2) is an active layer detachment slide or failure
- 498 (ALD). The term ALD is prevalent in recent publications (Blais-Stevens et al., 2015; Balser, 2015), yet, unlike RTS, there is
- no universally endorsed term to describe ALD phenomena in the Glossary (van Everdingen, 2005):
- active layer failure "A general term referring to several forms of slope failures or failure mechanisms commonly
- occurring in the active layer overlying permafrost" (not recommended synonym: skinflow)

Formatted: Font color: Black

3.2.6. Cryogenic translational landslide

The term *cryogenic translational landslide* (CTL) was suggested by Kaplina (1965, in Russian), and the definition was later

elaborated in further publications based on observations in Central Yamal, Russia (Leibman and Egorov, 1996; Leibman,

1997; Leibman et al., 2014). The definition of CTL summarized from the abovementioned publications can be phrased as

single-time lateral displacement of thawed soil block sliding on the surface of the seasonal ice formed at the active layer base.

This type of seasonal ice is formed due to the active layer's upward freezing, ice aggradation at the base of the active layer,

and later melting (Leibman et al., 2014; Lewkowicz, 1990).Alaska (Dall, 1881). However, the Examples of CTL in Central

 (b)

Yamal are shown in Fig.7.

 Figure 7 Example of a cryogenic translational landslide (CTL) in 2019 in Central Yamal, West Siberia, Russia (photo: Artem Khomutov), (a) view from the side and (b) view from the front.

3.3. Formation process

The process of RTS formation in the recent literature is termed in two different ways: as *thermokarst* and as *thermodenudation*.

 Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Font color: Black

3.3.1. Thermokarst

3.3.2. Thermodenudation

 The term *thermodenudation* originally was suggested by Panov (1936), defining "the influence of the sun in a direct or transformed form through soil or water on the sediments containing a certain amount of ice cement or ice masses, as well as on bedrock with negative temperature <…> that leads to mass-wasting as well as some forms of thermo-erosion or thermokarst". In the context of RTS formation, this term has been used referring to ground ice thaw and slope mass waste (Leibman et al., 2021) as well as the retreat of upper bluff edges along coastal RTS (Guenther et al., 2012).

4 Discussion

4.1 Divergent terminologies

 The terminology used to describe the RTS formation processes and related landforms in 21st-century publications has historical roots in the distinct scientific approaches developed in the USSR and North America (both Canada and the USA) during the 20th century.

541 The process of RTS formation following the initiation by various triggers and tothe further development into the landform has neither been named nor specifically classified in classical works on RTS and exposed ground ice (Mackay, 1966; Mackay, 1970; Rampton and Mackay, 1971; Lewkowicz, 1987a; Burn and Friele, 1989).

 In the literature of the 20th century, this process was often termed *solifluction, thermokarst*, and *thermodenudation*. Initially, none of these three terms took the more specific formation of RTS into account in their definitions. At some point, however, the definitions of these three terms were expanded to include RTS formation. The process of RTS formation was also previously very broadly referred to as the process of *erosion* (Lamothe and St-Onge, 1961), but this term was later no longer used in publications in this context. The general chronology of usage of these 3three terms which differ in definitions in the 20th century is shown in Fig.38. While

550 this chronology graph has some limitations due to the a) ambiguity of some definitions; b) definition reformulation by some authors through their later publications;, and c) usage of several terms for the same process etc., it helps understanding how the RTS terminology evolved in the scientific literature and how different schools of thought influenced its development.

>

Formatted: Font color: Black

 The term *solifluction* was first introduced by Andersson (1906) and describes the process of slow downslope movement of saturated unfrozen materials (van Everdingen, 2005). In non-Russian language literature, this term has always been used for very slow movements up to several centimeters per year (Smith, 1988) and never for the rapid mass-wasting that can lead to RTS. Meanwhile, Russian-language authors have included the process of slumping into the *solifluction* calling it *rapid solifluction*. Probably the most remarkable publication with such a statement was doneissued by Kaplina (1965). The concept of rapid solifluction was later criticized by Dylik (1967) and Leibman (1997) for summarizing processes that have process rates differing by several orders of magnitude under one term. Nevertheless, this approach of referring to the RTS formation process as *rapid solifluction* was frequently used in the literature until the end of the 20th century. The last publication in which *rapid solifluction* was mentioned in connection with the formation of RTS was by Yershov (1998).

562 The term *thermokarst* was first suggested by Ermolaev (1932) to ice as a similarity to the *karst* process by dissolution. In general, the term *thermokarst* has alwaysmostly been used by Russian- language researchers for describing the subsidence of the land surface (Sumgin et al., 1940; Kachurin, 1955; Mukhin, 1960; Dostovalov and Kudryavcev, 1967; Shur, 1977; Romanovskii, 1993; and many more later). The only exceptionSome exceptions can be found in two publications of Popov: one in English (Popov et al., 1966), where he included the slumping process in *thermokarst*, and another one in French (Popov, 1956), where his definition of *thermokarst* was not purely limited to the process of subsidence. Meanwhile, a different approach was suggested by Czudek and Demek (1970), who put the RTS formation process under the umbrella of the thermokarst term. They proposed two types of *thermokarst*: down-wearing which included only subsidence and back-wearing which included the RTS formation. This approach found support from French (1976), who extended this term by adding *thermal erosion* to it. French's (1976) definition of *thermal erosion* as "a dynamic process 'wearing away' by thermal means, i.e. melting of ice" differs from the one in the Glossary, where the main erosional agent is moving water: "The erosion of ice-rich permafrost by the combined thermal and mechanical action of moving water." This is the reason why the RTS formation process is sometimes called *thermal erosion*. For example, Burn (1983) relates the process of RTS formation to *thermal erosion*, which he in turn describes as part of the *thermokarst* process. Since French (1976) expanded the definition of thermokarst processes to encompass slope processes and in particular thaw slumping, the RTS formation process has consistently been perceived as a thermokarst process in the North American literature (Washburn, 1979; Burn, 1983) or sometimes specified as hillslope thermokarst (Gooseff et al., 2009). There was no agreement 579 among scholars on the terminology of the RTSs itself. RTSs were termed in the literature as tundra mudflows (Lamothe and St-Onge, 1961), ground-ice slumps (Mackay, 1966; French, 1976), retrogressive-thaw flow slides (Hughes, 1972), bi-modal

- flows (McRoberts and Morgenstern, 1974), or just thaw slumps (Washburn, 1979). The 1998 Glossary (van Everdingen, 2005) initially recommended using the term "retrogressive thaw slump", though alternative terms persist in later literature, such as
- 583 "retrogressive thaw flowslides (thawslides)" (Wolfe et al., 2001) or "retrogressive thaw flows" (Highland and Bobrowsky, 584 2008).
- Unlike RTS, the process of ALD was not always classified as thermokarst in the North American literature (Lewkowicz, 1990; Lewkowicz and Harris, 2005, etc.). For example, French (1976; 2018) describes ALD under the section of "Rapid mass

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Normal, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border), Tab stops: 3.13", Centered + 6.27", Right

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Normal, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border), Tab stops: 3.13", Centered + 6.27", Right

598

 language literature, however, it is widely used in Russian-language permafrost literature with two types of definitions: narrow 604 and wide. The term was suggested by Panov in 1936 with a narrow definition as "the influence of the 605 transformed form through soil or water on the sediments containing a certain on bedrock with negative temperature <…> that leads to mass-wasting as well as some forms of thermoerosion or 607 thermokarst". For the initial (narrow) definition see Sect. 3.3.2. Are (1968) used this term to describe the thermal effect of solar radiation and sensible heat affecting the retreating coasts.ice-rich coastal cliffs. Zhigarev (1975) highlighted the importance of the slope in his definition of thermodenudation as "a complex of gravitational and erosive processes that develop on slopes during thawing of ice-rich deposits of various genesis". The only wide definition of *thermodenudation* was introduced in the Glossary of Glaciology (Kotlyakov, 1984) as: "a set of cryogenic destructive processes and the transfer of the products of destruction downwards. *Thermodenudation* includes cryogenic weathering, nivation, cryogenic slope processes (mass movements), thermal erosion, thermal coastal erosion, thermokarst, and thermal suffosion". Here, it is worthy to define 614 cryogenesis as a set of thermophysical, physicochemical, and physicore thawing deposits (van Everdingen, 2005). The word cryogenic is usually used to describe the periglacial nature of the

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Normal, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border), Tab stops: 3.13", Centered + 6.27", Right

 processes. This wide definition by Kotlyakov (1984) of a thaw-related process is quite similar to the expanded by French (1974) version of the thermokarst term. The term *thermodenudation* was widely applied in all of its definitions to describe mass wasting responsible for the coastal retreat (Are, 1968 and 1980; Pizhankova, 2011) as well as for RTS formation (Fartyshev, 1980; Romanenko, 1998; Leibman and Kizyakov, 2007 and many moreversion of the thermokarst term by French (1976). To summarize, the 20th century was a starting point for many scientists to describe RTS formation processes and therefore 622 also to search for the terminology that would properly explain the process In the context of RTS formation and growth. In the

 21st century, mostly only two terms are used in the literature for the RTS formation process: *thermokarst* (in extended definition) in most English-language literature and , the term *thermodenudation* (was widely applied in its narrow definition) in Russian-language literature. In this review paper, we will call the first approach the North American perspective and the second the Russian perspective. The sections below summarize both of these approaches.

4.2. North American perspective

 Since French (1976) expanded the definition of thermokarst processes to encompass as a set of slope processes and in particular thaw slumping, the RTS formation process has consistently been perceived as a thermokarst process in the North American view (Washburn, 1979; Burn, 1983) or sometimes specified as hillslope thermokarst (Gooseff et al., 2009). There 631 was no agreement among scholars on the terminology of the RTS itself. RTSs were termed in the literature 632 (Lamothe and St-Onge, 1961), ground-ice slumps (Mackay 633 1972), bi-modal flows (McRoberts and Morgenstern, 1974), or just thaw 634 Everdingen, 2005) initially recommended using the term "retrogressive thaw literature, such as "retrogressive thaw flowslides (thawslides)" (Wolfe et al., 2001) or "retrogressive thaw flows" (Highland and Bobrowsky, 2008). Another closely related slope process linked to RTS formation (see Section 3.2) is active layer detachment slide or failures 638 (ALD). The term ALD is prevalent in recent publications (Blais-Stevens et al., 2015; Balser, 2015), yet, unlike RTS, the no universally endorsed term to describe ALD phenomena in the Glossary (van Everdingen, 2005): 640 • active layer failure - "A general term referring to several forms of slope failures or failure occurring in the active layer overlying permafrost" (not recommended synonym: skinflow) • detachment failure - "A slope failure in which the thawed or thawing portion of the active layer detaches from the underlying frozen material" (not recommended synonyms: skin flow, active layer glide) French (2018) defines active layer detachment slides as rapid slope failures restricted to the

645 at the middle or upper slopes. In one of several classical works on ALD

1646 mass movement on permafrost slopes without strict limitation to the active i

from the underlying substrate and sliding downslope over a thaw

Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Normal, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border), Tab stops: 3.13", Centered + 6.27", Right

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Normal, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border), Tab stops: 3.13", Centered + 6.27", Right

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Normal, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border), Tab stops: 3.13", Centered + 6.27", Right

Formatted: Font color: Black

704 is suspended, the surfaces of these landforms get revegetated very fast (Fig.6d).

Formatted: Font: 9 pt, Bold, Font color: Black **Formatted:** Normal, Space After: 10 pt, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No order), Between : (No border) **Formatted:** Font: 9 pt, Bold, Font color: Black **Formatted:** Font: 9 pt, Bold, Font color: Black **Formatted:** Font: 9 pt, Bold, Font color: Black

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Normal, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border), Tab stops: 3.13", Centered + 6.27", Right

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Font: 9 pt, Bold, Font color: Black **Formatted:** Normal **Formatted:** Font: 9 pt, Bold

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Normal, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border), Tab stops: 3.13", Centered + 6.27", Right

 shape of the landform that was also called as "amphitheater" (Kerfoot, 1969; De Krom and Pollard, 1989). However, in some cases, these landforms can also be elongated in width (i.e. Fig.1 in Swanson and Nolan, 2018) following the initial shape of

 (c)

cases, they can also have inland curves due to the shape of massive ground ice.

 (b)

 (a)

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Normal, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border), Tab stops: 3.13", Centered + 6.27", Right

735

 Figure 8 (a) Scheme of thermoterrace formation, the black arrow indicates the direction of mass movement of thawed material; note that the scheme demonstrates the particular ground ice morphology of a layer with large ice-wedges (adapted from Kizyakov, 2005), but may also consist of other ground ice morphologies. Example of Thermoterraces in Bykovsky Peninsula, Russia shown (b) on the ground in August 2016 (photo: Alexander Kizyakov) and (c) in a WorldView-2 satellite image from August 2020 (ESRI satellite Figure 8 (a)

737 **that the se**

738 **but may a**

740 **basemap**).

- 741 In some locations, the RTS landforms can be combinations of a thermoterrace with additional *thermocirques*. This is usually
- 742 found in two settings: one or more *thermocirques* form and grow in former stabilized *thermoterrace* (Fig.9a) or when
- 743 thermocirque and *thermoterrace* merge at the coast into one outline (Fig.9b).

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Normal, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border), Tab stops: 3.13", Centered + 6.27", Right

745 Figure 910 Examples of combined RTS morphologies with thermoterraces and thermocirques. (a) Thermocirque(s) growing into a ⁴
746 stabilized thermoterrace in Central Yamal, <u>West Siberia, R</u>ussia as seen in a WorldV **stabilized thermoterrace in Central Yamal, West Siberia, Russia as seen in a WorldView-3 satellite image from August 2018 (ESRI satellite basemap). (b) Thermocirque and thermoterrace merging at the coast into one outline in Western Yamal, West Siberia, Russia as seen in a WorldView-3 satellite image from August 2018 (ESRI satellite basemap).**

749 **5 Discussion**

- 750 **5.1. Correspondence of the terminology**
- 751 **4.2. Overlap in terminologies**

- 753 inevitable similarities and overlaps but also differences (Table 2).
- 754 *Cryogenic translational landslide* corresponds to shallow active layer detachment slide in North American literature that is
- 755 triggered by high pore-water pressure and low effective strength (Lewkowicz, 2007). *Cryogenic earthflow* corresponds to a
- 756 deep ALD in the North American literature and is the very early stage of RTS formation. *Thermocirque* and *thermoterrace*
- 757 signify the mature stage of RTS of different morphology.
- 758 The process of RTS formation can be-generally be described as a mass-wasting (landsliding) process resulting from the melting
- 759 of massive ground ice exposed due to various triggers. Regardless of which concept and terminology is used,
- 760 (*thermodenudation* in Russian literature or *thermokarst* in North American literature), it can be seen as a sequence of physical
- 761 events (Fig.1011): trigger, massive ground ice exposure, ice ablation, thaw-related mass movement, and landform formation.

39 39

Formatted: Normal, Space After: 10 pt, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border) **Formatted:** Font: 9 pt, Bold, Font color: Black **Formatted:** Font: 9 pt, Bold, Font color: Black

Formatted: Font: 9 pt, Bold, Font color: Black

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Font color: Black

762 The first two physical events (trigger + massive ground ice exposure) are usually considered the RTS initiation stage. Triggers

763 of massive ice exposure that lead to mass-wasting and RTS landform occurrence are described in Section 3.2.

774 **5.2. Biases of both perspectives**

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Normal, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border), Tab stops: 3.13", Centered + 6.27", Right

 in this case incorporates both directions of the process, it is crucial to clearly state that RTS formation implies back-wearing thermokarst (or hillslope thermokarst). Another confusion can appear when talking about mass movements that are deeper than the active layer and slide on the surface of massive ground ice. In the North American perspectiveliterature, such landslides can still be called active layer detachment slides. However, since these mass movements expose massive ground ice, the retrogression can already start, which means that it is actually already an early-stage RTS.

 Such mass movements on the surface of massive ground ice are called cryogenic earthflows and are considered early-stage RTS from thein Russian perspectiveliterature. However, it is difficult to distinguish an early-stage RTS (cryogenic earthflow) from a mature-stage RTS (thermocirque) since mature RTS can also be of small sizes. Clear separation of these two categories is almost impossible with remote sensing data and is quite demanding in the field since it requires thorough knowledge of the environment and the dynamics of each RTS.

Furthermore, sometimes it can be challenging to distinguish between a The definitions of *thermocirque* and a *thermoterrace*

794 since theirpresent in the literature are based on the morphology ean also differ depending on the exact location. of the features.

Considering morphology as a distinguishing factor can be subjective since no established curvature values exist in the literature

 to differentiate them. In some cases, a thermoterrace can appear more curved, rather resembling a thermocirque. In contrast, a 797 thermocirque can further elongate in width, following the initial shape of massive ground ice (e.g., Fig.1 in Swanson and

798 Nolan, 2018), while its mudflow can reach the neighboring water body base level. In such particular cases, ele

 4.4. RTS into thermocirque or thermoterrace is demanding and requires retrospective analysis of definition in the Glossary

801 With a large number of recent RTS formation, though mapping studies in different permafrost regions, it has become clear that RTS characteristics and morphologies vary widely, that RTS can occur in a range of different permafrost and ground ice 803 settings, and feature processes important for understanding their dynamics and environmental impacts. However, these specific 804 eases are aspects are not yet covered by the current definition of a "retrogressive thaw slump" in the International Permafrost Association Multi-Language Glossary of Permafrost and Related Ground-Ice Terms (van Everdingen, 2005) (see Sect. 3.2.1). This definition is rather short and describes a portion of RTS characteristics, it is limited in its scope and does not capture the full breadth of RTS variability emerging from the many studies. In particular, the definition only focuses on the active stage 808 of RTS, while the polycyclic nature of many RTS also includes the stages of stabilization without activity. rareMoreover, this definition does not reflect the variety of possible morphologies as horseshoe-like (thermocirques) or elongated along the coast (thermoterrace) and different stages of the landform evolution. Furthermore, some other settings also feature slump-like landforms that exhibit a similar headwall backwasting but were not covered in this review. Such slumps for example occur on recent dead-ice moraines that experience retrogressive rotational sliding or back slumping of the ice-cored slopes (Kjær and Krüger, 2001). Thus, a clear distinction should be drawn in the definition. We recommend considering these points when preparing the next International Permafrost Association Multi-Language Glossary of Permafrost and Related Ground-Ice Terms.

Formatted: Font: Italic **Formatted:** Font: Italic

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Normal, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border), Tab stops: 3.13", Centered + 6.27", Right

816 **4.5.3. Missing terminology**

- 817 Our review of morphologic elements of RTS (see Sect. 3.1) showed that there so far is no term to describe unthawed permafrost 818 remnants within a slump floor. The term *slump block*, in our opinion, fits the best to explain pieces of soil with vegetation that 819 move downwards while the term *remnant island* sounds rather confusing because it does not assume the moving nature of
- 820 such a feature. We rather suggest using the term *remnant island* to describe unthawed permafrost remnants within a slump
- 821 floor. These remnant islands are generally larger than slump blocks and do not move since they still have unthawed cores. An
- 822 example of such a remnant island is shown in Fig. $\frac{1112}{2}$.

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Normal, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border), Tab stops: 3.13", Centered + 6.27", Right

823

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Normal, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border), Tab stops: 3.13", Centered + 6.27", Right

827 **65 Conclusions**

824

833 in the 20th century.

45 45

Formatted: Font: 9 pt, Bold, Font color: Black

Formatted: Normal, Space After: 10 pt, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border)

Formatted: Font: 9 pt, Bold, Font color: Black

Formatted: Font: 9 pt, Bold, Font color: Black **Formatted:** Font color: Black

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Normal, Outline numbered + Level: 1 +
Numbering Style: Bullet + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5", Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border)

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Font color: Black

842 permafrost slopes can mobilize sediment, meltwater, carbon, and nutrients, how biogeochemical dynamics are influenced by 843 specific processes during the RTS formation and growth, and how RTS may pose hazards to infrastructure. More clarity on 844 used terminology and scientific views will foster this understanding and can guide new research.

845 **Author contribution**

846 NN: Conceptualization, Resources (literature sources), Investigation, Writing – original draft preparation. ML: 847 Conceptualization, Supervision, Writing – review & editing. AK: Supervision, Writing – review & editing. HL: 848 Conceptualization, Supervision, Writing – review & editing. IT: Resources (literature sources), Writing – review & editing. 849 IN: Writing – review & editing. AV: Writing – review & editing. GG: Conceptualization, Supervision, Writing – review & 850 editing.

851 **Competing interests**

852 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

853 **Acknowledgments**

 We would like to acknowledge and appreciate the helpful discussion of RTS terminology with S. Kokelj and J. van der Sluijs during the early stage of the manuscript. This review is part of the efforts in the RTSInTrain Action Group led by A. Liljedahl 856 on retrogressive thaw slumps by the International Permafrost Association. ML and IT were funded by the state assignment of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation (topic No. FWRZ-2021-0012). IN and GG were supported by the Google Permafrost Discovery Gateway. AK was funded by the state assignment «Evolution of the cryosphere under climate change and anthropogenic impact» (#121051100164-0). NN was funded by a DAAD fellowship (Grant

860 #57588368).

Formatted: Font color: Black **Formatted:** Font color: Black

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Normal, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border), Tab stops: 3.13", Centered + 6.27", Right

References

 $\overline{}$