**Application of Self-Organizing Maps to characterize subglacial radar data bedrock properties in East Antarctica based on gravity, magnetic, and radar data**

Jonas Liebsch1,\*, Jörg Ebbing1, Kenichi Matsuoka2

5 1Institue of Geosciences, Kiel University, Germany

2 Norwegian Polar Institute, Tromsø, Norway

\*Now at: University of Iceland, Reykjavik, Iceland

*Correspondence to*: Jörg Ebbing (joerg.ebbing@ifg.uni-kiel.de)

**Abstract**. Subglacial bedrock properties are key to understanding and predicting the dynamics and future evolution of the Antarctic

10 Ice Sheet. However, the ice sheet bed is largely inaccessible for direct sampling. Therefore, it is crucial to efficiently combine attributes derived from satellite and airborne geophysical surveys to characterize subglacial properties. To reduce subjective choices in the joint analysis of data and related biases, we evaluate a Self-Organizing Map (SOM), an unsupervised machine learning technique. The concept of SOMs is briefly introduced, and we discuss data selection and their associated attributes for the Antarctic bed. For this, we analysis the correlation between

15 attributes to provide a validation of an appropriate choice. The SOM is trained on attributes derived from gravity, magnetics, and ice-penetrating radar data for the Wilkes Land area in East Antarctica, a region where basal conditions may be of high importance to ice sheet flow and corresponding sea level rise, and where suitable data sets for the application of the SOM also exist. In contrast to earlier studies, our approach uses original line data as much as possible, which have a much higher resolution than the smooth gridded products, which were used in previous studies. Previous analysis indicated the

20 presence of both crystalline basement and sedimentary basins in the area, and our SOM shows a remarkable agreement, but suggests some points of difference. For example, some highlands appear similar on previous interpretations, but have quite dissimilar physical settings, which is also expressed in our results. These variations can potentially be further exploited in describing subglacial properties and the coupling between bed and overlying ice sheets.

# 25 **1 Introduction**

Subglacial bedrock properties are one of the key components in an improved understanding of the Antarctic Ice Sheet (e.g. Aitken et al. 2023, Bell et al. 2008, McCormack et al. 2022). Especially, the properties at the ice sheet bed, the ice-rock interface, can have a significant impact on ice flow dynamics from roughness and consolidation of the bed, as well as hydro(geo)logical processes, impact friction and basal sliding processes, and therefore, ice flow velocities (Koellner et al., 2019).

30 Especially the presence of layers of sediments and sedimentary rocks at the base of the ice is of interest as these can affect basal friction, water flow, and advect geothermal heat (e.g. Koellner, et al. 2019, Zoet and Iverson, 2020, Li et al. 2022, Aitken et al. 2023).

There are very few reflection seismic lines on the Antarctic continent suitable for resolving the upper crust (e.g. Anandakrishnan et al.

1998, Bayer et al. 2009, Leitchenkov et al. 2016), and geological models are conventionally based on interpretation of bed 35 topography (.g. Taylor 1914, Elliot, 1975, Jordan et al. 2020), airborne magnetic or gravity datasets (e.g. Ferraccioli et al. 2002, 2009, McLean et al. 2009, Aitken et al. 2014, Kim et al. 2022), or a combination of those (e.g. Li et al., 2023, Wu et al.

2023). Especially, aeromagnetic data are a well-suited geophysical dataset for inferring subglacial geology (Betts et al. 2024). However, the interpretation requires constraints to overcome the inherent ambiguities. Therefore, the combination with other geophysical data sets in an integrated manner is a common approach (e.g. Jordan et al. 2023, Lowe et al.

40 2024a, b).

Airborne radar data are complementary and well-suited for imaging within the ice but are almost entirely reflected at the ice-rock interface. Therefore, radar can provide information on the characteristics of the bed-ice interface; however, the physical properties of the bedrock itself are difficult to derive. Still, detailed morphology and inferred attributes like roughness can be indicative of some near-surface geological characteristics (e.g. Shepherd et al. 2006, Rippin et al., 2014; Jordan et al., 2010, Jordan et al. 2023). For example, an area with

45 elevated roughness can be inferred to have a more erosion-resistant bed. However, to complex the matter, the current and past flow speed of the ice sheets also impacts erosion and modifies the roughness (Jamieson et al., 2014). Hence, a combination of these data sets might provide a means to overcome some of the limitations.

Recently, Aitken et al. (2023) presented a detailed classification of geological bed types in Antarctica by analyzing multiple geophysical datasets and models. Hereby, they compiled and synthesized available data and models into a classification map.


50 While Aiken et al. (2023) presented continent-wide, detailed classification of geological bed types, it is in part subject to interpretations and remains equivocal at some locations due to complex geology and/or limited data coverage. Another limitation is the different methods used in establishing the subglacial property models subsequently compiled (Aitken et al., 2023).

Machine learning and statistical methods have been used in less heterogeneous models, such as estimates of geothermal heat flow (Lösing and Ebbing, 2021, Stål et al. 2021) and the presence of sedimentary rocks (Li et al., 2022). Especially, machine learning methods such as gradient boosting regression tree have become popular to map subglacial properties in both Greenland and Antarctica (e.g. Rezvanbehbahani et al. 2019, Lösing & Ebbing, 2021, Li et al. 2022, Colgan et al. 2023). These studies are commonly on the scale of an entire continent, as these approaches rely on training datasets of reasonable size, which is often a limiting factor, as data coverage and quality are variable, and the subjective choice

60 of which data type to consider as suitable.

As an alternative, we employ here Self-Organizing Maps (SOMs; Kohonen, 1990) to exploit local information. SOMs are an unsupervised machine learning approach that estimates similarities within different data types without assigning them to predefined categories. In the following, we will shortly summarize the concept of SOMs and introduce the data and attributes used for our analysis. We discuss our results both in comparison to the classification by Aitken et al. (2023), and with respect 65 to the choice of input data by studying the correlation between them.

The study area is located in Wilkes Land, East Antarctica (Figure 1), chosen for the excellent coverage with line data and as it is a key region for studying the role of tectonic boundary conditions on the behaviour of the East Antarctic Ice Sheet (Aitken et al. 2014, McCormack et al. 2022).



70 **Figure 1: Wilkes Land, East Antarctica: A) Bed elevation from Bedmachine (Morlighem, 2020, 2022). Important subglacial and geographical features are annotated. B) Ice flow speed (Mouginot, 2017), overlain by NASA Operation Ice Bridge (OIB) flightlines used in this study.**

# **2 Self-Organizing Maps**

SOMs, unlike other unsupervised learning algorithms, do not attempt to categorize data; rather, they reduce the dimensionality

75 of complex datasets. In our example, we will map the three datasets (bed elevation, gravity, and magnetics) and the related attributes into a 2D space (map) representation. In this space, similar data points are placed in proximity to each other, enabling the identification of clusters. In the following, we briefly explain the concept of SOMs. A detailed description is provided by, e.g,. Klose (2006).

Self-Organizing Maps (SOMs) are a simple neural network consisting of a single layer. Each neuron represents a cell on the

80 two-dimensional map with one weight for every dimension of the input data. Neuron j is described by its weights mj. The weights of a cell translate to a value for each data type (e.g., bed roughness or magnetic anomaly); they can therefore also be understood as coordinates in the multidimensional data space.

For a given data point *xi*, a best-matching neuron with the weights *mb* is chosen in such a way that the Euclidean distance between *xi* and *mb* is minimized:

85  ‖𝒙𝒊 − 𝒎𝒃‖ = 𝐦𝐢𝐧{‖𝒙𝒊 − 𝒎𝒋‖} (1)

𝒋

The weights of *mb* and the point *xi* are therefore very similar. Besides the weights, a neuron also has a location on the self-organizing map, which is described by the coordinate *r* in a two-dimensional space.


The network is trained iteratively *t* times for a randomly chosen input data point *xi*. The best-matching neuron for this data point is determined, and then the weights of it and its neighbours are adjusted towards *xi*. The value of the adjustment is determined

90 by a neighbourhood function *hbj(t)*, it will be 1 for the best-matching neuron and decay as the neuron is further away from the best matching neuron on the two-dimensional map. As a result of this neighbourhood function, the map is trained so that neighbouring cells on the map have similar weights and therefore will have similar data points mapping to the same cluster. Additionally, for convergence purposes, a time-dependent learning rate, *α(t),* is employed.

The training of a cell *mj(t)* can be expressed as follows:

95 𝑚𝑗(𝑡 + 1) = 𝑚𝑗(𝑡) + 𝛼(𝑡)ℎ𝑏𝑗(𝑡)[𝑥𝑖 − 𝑚𝑗(𝑡)] (2)

The choice of the neighbourhood function can vary, and we utilise a Gaussian function:

 (3)

Here, *rb* and *rj* represent the locations of the best-matching neuron and the neuron to be trained on the self-organizing map, respectively. The parameter *σ* influences the smoothness of the computed map.

100 The two-dimensional SOM does not represent a geographic map; it is an arbitrary lower dimensional representation of the higher-dimensional training dataset. E.g. an area with crystalline rocks with high gravity and magnetic value, as well as a rough bed, will appear close to similar areas, even though they are geographically far apart.

# **3 Study area, Data, and SOM analysis**

## **3.1 Study area**


105 A study area in Wilkes Land, East Antarctica (Figure 1), has been chosen due to its excellent data coverage and its importance for our understanding of evolution of the East Antarctic Ice Sheet. The area has recently gained attention due to its increasing loss in ice mass (e.g. Davison et al. 2023) and rapid basal melt rates its surrounding ice shelves (Rignot et al., 2013) and consequently its massive potential for sea-level rise. The Wilkes Land ice catchments may be more

vulnerable to change than other catchments in the East Antarctic Ice Sheet, as the ice sheet bed is predominantly below sea level (Fretwell et al., 2013) and is subject to marine ice sheet instability.

As explained by Aitken et al. (2014), the differences in the bed conditions related to topography and geology, provide persistent and strong boundary conditions on the East Antarctic Ice Sheet (see also McCormack et al. 2022), and a geological record of a substantial history of collapse and readvance exists (Aiken et al. 2016). Aitken et al. (2014) provided a detailed interpretation of subglacial geology using gravity, magnetic and subglacial topography data and studying the links to Southern Australia, as the conjugate neighbour during Gondwana, but details remain to be analysed as also seen on the recent classification of geological bed type by Aitken et al. (2023). Here, we explore the possibility of providing an additional level of detail using SOMs, making use of the availability of high-quality airborne data sets.

## **3.2 Datasets**

We use the NASA Operation Ice Bridge (OIB) dataset collected between 2009 and 2012 (Figure 2) and high-level data products derived from this dataset. The Radar Data were recorded using the Hi-Capability Radar Sounder (HiCARS) Version 1 and later on Version 2 instrument. (MacGregor et al. 2021, https://nsidc.org/data/icebridge). We used the derived bed elevation from the radargrams (Blankenship et al. 2012, 2017). This dataset, however, includes a number of short-distance data gaps even in areas where bed echo is clearly visible in the radargram. This results in larger gaps in derived attributes, as observed in Eisen et al. (2020). We applied an optimisation algorithm that filled each gap with sufficiently strong returns automatically. It specifically maximised the amplitude and the vertical gradient of the amplitude along the chosen bed elevation while minimizing the length of the bed elevation path (Liebsch 2023).



**Figure 2: Data sources for the SOM: A) Bed elevation from radar data (NASA Operation Ice Bridge), B) Magnetic anomaly (taken from ADMAP-2 (Golynsky et al. 2018), C) Bouguer gravity anomaly (after Scheinert et al. 2016).**

130 Magnetic data are taken from the ADMAP-2 compilation (Golynsky et al., 2018) along the OIB flight lines. In the supplementary database Golynsky et al., 2018), the processed line data from the individual surveys are available, which are the basis for the ADMAP-2 map. Compared to the original data, data are slightly smoothed, but suitable for our approach. For details on the magnetic processing, please see Golynsky et al. (2006, 2018).


Gravity was also collected as part of the OIB surveys. Unfortunately, the available gravity data have data gaps and only

135 parts of the data is available in a pre-processed format (see coverage in MacGregor et al. 2021). We initially planned to reprocess the data, but due to the absence of full information about the measurements, that become impossible to us. Instead, we use the gravity compilation from Scheinert et al. (2016). This 10-km-grid dataset has been sampled along the flight lines to treat it as survey data. Although, resampling cannot provide the full resolution of the survey data, we deem this adequate for our purpose, as the distance (height) between the point of observation (airplane) and the ice-bed interface is typically 3-5 km in 140 the study area, leading to only minor loss of information when using the gridded gravity signal.

## **3.3 Attributes**

We used the above datasets to generate 29 attributes for the SOM analysis. Several attributes were derived from a single dataset (e.g., bed elevation). Not only does the signal amplitude (e.g., bed elevation) characterize the signal but also the spectral characteristics and local variations (e.g., roughness). This choice is subjective; therefore, rather than limiting the


145 number of attributes we include, various attributes, even though some attributes presumably have very similar characteristics, and including both may have little impact on our result compared to including only one of them. Table 1 lists all the attributes, and Figure 3 shows examples.



**Figure 3: Example of attributes used for the SOM. A) Basal roughness ε derived from spectral domain b) Spectral Power in a 5-15** 150 **km wavelength bin from magnetic data, and c) Shape index for gravity data (see text for more details).**

Attributes like roughness from radar data or spectral power in the short-wavelength magnetic field provide information about the variability in subglacial properties, e.g., a crystalline basement-ice interface can be expected to have a stronger contrast and larger variability than an incoherent bedrock (e.g., sedimentary basin) -ice interface. Other attributes based on the gravity and magnetic data (e.g., curvature) are well suited to describe the changes between data points, while features like the shape index

155 or the tilt derivative are also known to reflect the source characteristics. For some of these, Li (2015) provides a detailed analysis of the link between source geometry and observed field.



**Table 1: List of all attributes used for the SOM and explained in the text. See examples in Figure 3. See Figure 4 for the correlation between the different attributes and Figure 5 shows the weights for the attributes.**

### 3.3.1 Radar/Bed elevation attributes

In the following, we describe the 10 attributes based on bedrock elevation and radar data. For example, roughness can be computed in various ways from the bed elevation data and used the same four roughness attributes as Eisen et al. (2020).


# Isostatically adjusted bed elevation tiso

Instead of using the bedrock topography, it can be useful to determine the isostatically adjusted topography *tiso*. This attribute is the hypothetical topographic height of the landscape, assuming that no ice is present. In a simplified form, disregarding dynamic effects, it can be estimated from the ice surface height *s* and bed elevation *z* using the concept of isostasy after Airy with:

tiso = (s − z) \*917/3200+ z. (4)


# Spectral Centroid Bed 𝐶𝑒𝑛𝑡𝑟𝑜𝑖𝑑

The spectral centroid represents the mean of all frequencies in the spectrum f(n), weighted by their spectral power S(n).

170 𝐶𝑒𝑛𝑡𝑟𝑜𝑖𝑑  (5)

# Spectral Roughness Attribute ξ

ξ is the integrated power spectral density of the bed elevation profile in a 500 m to 2000 m wavelength bin. Given the following equation:

d 𝑘 (6)

175 where S is the power spectral density and k the wavenumber in spectral domain.

# Spectral Roughness Attribute η

To also capture horizontal changes in the spectral properties, Li et al. (2010) suggest also to include the integrated power spectral density of the horizontal derivative of the bed elevation ξsl  is analogues to ξ. The spectral roughness attribute η is defined

as: η = ξ (7)

ξ𝑠𝑙

## 180 Variogram value v

This roughness attribute is derived from a variogram derived from a window along the flight line. We use a bin covering 700 m to 800 m lag distance.

# Hurst coefficient h

To complement the information on specific lag distances used in v, we also use the Hurst coefficient h. The Hurst 185 exponent corresponds to the slope of the variogram in a log-log plot and can be described as:

Δ𝑥 ℎ


𝑣(Δ𝑥) = 𝑣(Δ𝑥0) (Δ𝑥0) (8)

*Moving average filtered bed elevation*

To avoid using the bed elevations directly and reduce noise, we used a 10 km-moving average filtered bed elevation

# Standard deviation in a 10 km moving window


190 We compute the standard deviation of the bed elevation z in a 10 km moving window.

 (9)

where N is the number of points in a window. And 𝑧 is the mean of bed elevation in the window

# Kurtosis in a 10 km moving window

Analogue to the standard deviation the kurtosis w can be computed:

195 𝑤 ̅ 4 (10)


𝑁 𝜎

# Bed Echo Tail Attribute σ


We additionally derive an attribute from the shape of the bed echo. The direct interpretation of reflectivity can be challenging due to unknown attenuation within the ice (Matsuoka et al., 2011). Instead, we use the tail of the bed echo, which refers to the recorded signal after the initial backscattering from the bed has occurred. The tail originates from off-nadir backscattering. A

200 significant advantage of this approach is that a radar ray scattered at the nadir and one scattered off-nadir encounter approximately the same conditions on their way back. Consequently, the shape of the bed echo tail can be described without relying on knowledge of attenuation.

To keep the fitting procedure stable and computationally efficient across the varying conditions of the survey area we are assuming a simplistic Gaussian decay of the amplitude. This neglects losses due to beam characteristics and spherical 205 spreading. The amplitude A as a function of incident angle 𝜑 is given as:

𝐴(𝜑) = 𝐴0 ⋅ 𝑒𝑥𝑝  (11)

The bed echo tail σ can then be computed as the weighted average of 𝑡𝑎𝑛(𝜑):

  (12)

𝐴𝑖

## **3.3.2 Magnetic data attributes**

210 For the magnetic data, 10 attributes were computed along the flight lines. Since there are some data gaps, certain attributes are also computed in the spectral domain, using a window with a length of 40 km. These attributes are standard features used to describe the magnetic field. See Blakely et al. (1996) or Li et al. (2015) for more details.

# Magnetic anomaly (Mag)

This corresponds to the total field anomaly along the flight lines as explained above.

## 215 Tilt Derivative (TDX mag)

The TDX signal is the tilt derivative of the magnetic field (Salem et al. 2008) computed as

TDX = arctan (HG/Mzz) (13)

where HG is the total horizontal gradient and Mzz, the vertical gradient

# Spectral Centroid (Centroid mag)

220 Typically, magnetic fields are inspected in a power spectrum to identify the source depth. Here, we calculate the spectral centroid of the power spectrum for a 40 km window using the following equation:

∑𝑁𝑛=−𝑜1𝑓(𝑛)𝑆(𝑛) (14)

𝐶𝑒𝑛𝑡𝑟𝑜𝑖𝑑 = ∑𝑁𝑛=−𝑜1𝑆(𝑛)

Hereby, the spectral centroid represents the mean of all frequencies f(n) in the spectrum, weighted by their spectral power S(n).

# Spectral power bin (Bin Power mag)

225 The spectral power of the magnetic anomaly *ςmag*, limited to a bin of 5-15 km wavelength is calculated using the following equation:

15 𝑘𝑚

𝜍𝑚𝑎𝑔 = ∫5 𝑚 𝑆𝑚𝑎𝑔(𝑘)𝑑𝑘 (15)

where *Smag* is the classical power spectrum calculated in the wavenumber domain *k*. The range of 5-15 km has been chosen to represent subglacial sources, hereby suppressing longer wavelengths due to regional sources and to suppress noise in the short-

230 wavelength range. The intention of this attribute is to represent the wavelength corresponding to the top bedrock and is shown as an example in Figure 3 B.

# Moving average filtered magnetic anomaly (Mean mag)

This was computed by removing a linear trend from the signal within a 40 km window around each point. This attribute is enhancing the short-wavelength content in the data.

## 235 Standard deviation in moving window (Stdev mag)

The attributes represent the variability of the signal in a 40 km window around each point. Details on the calculation are provided in A8 above.

# Kurtosis in a moving window

Kurtosis is a measure to describe the sharpness of the magnetic anomaly. Details on the calculation are provided in A9 above.

## 240 Curvature (Curvature mag)

The curvature K is calculated along the flight line by

𝐾 = −𝑀𝑥𝑧/2𝑀𝑧 (16) where Mxz is the gradient along the flight line (x-direction) of the vertical magnetic field component Mz.

More details on curvature calculations can be found in Li et al. (2015).

## 245 Vertical gradient (VG mag)

This is the vertical derivative of the vertical magnetic field component:

𝜕𝑀𝑧

𝑉𝐺 = 𝑀𝑧𝑧 = 𝜕𝑧 (17)

# Analytical signal (AS mag)

The analytical signal is calculated from the vertical gradient and the gradient along the flight line as following:

250 𝐴𝑆 = √𝑀𝑥𝑧2 + 𝑀𝑧𝑧2 (18)

# Detrended Signal (Detrended mag)

The magnetic total field anomaly was detrended by removing a linear fit of the signal for 40 km window around each data point. By removing such a linear trend, the attribute is more sensitive to local scale variations.

## 255 **3.3.3 Gravity data attributes**

Many attributes that prove useful in identifying geological structures rely on gradients of the gravity signal. To compute these gradients, we used an equivalent source approach. The gravity grid from Scheinert et al. (2016) was inverted into a density grid of prisms extending from the ice bed to a depth of 10 km. From this density grid, all necessary gradients could be directly forward calculated following Nagy et al. (2000). The attributes are explained in the following and again, please see Blakely et

260 al. (1996) for more details. For the curvature attributes (C5 to C9), we are following Li et al. (2015), where the full mathematical background, tests with synthetic data and an evaluation of these attributes for airborne gravity gradients can be found in. Please see also Ebbing et al. (2018) for an example for satellite gravity data for Antarctica. Please note, that all of the following attributes are calculated for grids, not along the flight lines.

# Isostatic anomaly (Iso grv)

265 To obtain the isostatic anomaly, the free air anomaly was first mass corrected using the ice and bed elevation model Bed- Machine Antarctica v2 (Morlighem et al., 2020). To minimize isostatic effects, the undulation of the Moho boundary was estimated assuming Airy isostasy with an assumed density contrast of 530 kg/m3 and reference depth of 25 km. The resulting undulation was then forward modelled using prisms with the same density contrast and subtracted from the mass corrected anomaly.

## 270 Vertical gradient (VG grv)

The vertical gradient of the isostatic anomaly is calculated as

𝜕𝐼𝑠𝑜 𝑔𝑟𝑣

𝑉𝐺 = 𝐺𝑧𝑧 = 𝜕𝑧  (19)

# Analytical signal (AS grv)

In contrast to the magnetic data, we calculate here the 3D analytical signal using

275 𝐴𝑆 = √𝐺𝑧𝑥2 + 𝐺𝑦𝑧2 + 𝐺𝑧𝑧2 (20) where Gxz, Gyz and Gzz are the derivatives in the x-, y- and z-direction of the isostatic anomaly, respectively.

*DX Signal (TDX grv)*

See description for attribute B2 above.

# Mean curvature (Kmean grv)

280 When curvature is used to interpret gravity anomalies, we try to delineate geometric information of subsurface structures from an observed non-geometric quantity. The mean curvature is calculated as

𝐾𝑚𝑒𝑎𝑛 = 𝐺𝑥𝑥2+𝐺𝐺𝑧𝑦𝑦 (21) where Gxx, Gyy are the second derivatives in the x-, y-direction. Gz is the isostatic anomaly.

# Gaussian Curvature (KGauss grv)

285 The Gaussian curvature is the product of minimum and maximum curvatures and often exhibits rapid sign changes.

𝐺𝑥𝑥𝐺𝑦𝑦−𝐺𝑥𝑦2

𝐾𝐺𝑎𝑢𝑠𝑠 = − 𝐺𝑧2 (22)

# Maximum Curvature (Kmax grv)

From the two attributes before, we can calculate the maximum curvature:

𝐾𝑚𝑎𝑥 = 𝐾𝑚𝑒𝑎𝑛 + √𝐾𝑚𝑒𝑎𝑛2 − 𝐾𝐺𝑎𝑢𝑠𝑠2 (23)

## 290 Minimum Curvature (Kmin grv)

And similar as before, it follows the minimum curvature:

𝐾𝑚𝑖𝑛 = 𝐾𝑚𝑒𝑎𝑛 − √𝐾𝑚𝑒𝑎𝑛2 − 𝐾𝐺𝑎𝑢𝑠𝑠2 (24)

# Shape index (SI grv)

Maximum and minimum curvature can be combined as well to compute the shape index.

295 𝑆𝐼 = (𝜋2)arctan[(𝐾𝑚𝑎𝑥 + 𝐾𝑚𝑖𝑛)/(𝐾𝑚𝑎𝑥 − 𝐾𝑚𝑖𝑛)] (25)

The shape index is shown as an example for the gravity attributes in Figure 3C.

**3.4 SOM calculation, used algorithms and other considerations.**

For the calculation of the SOMs, we use the existing Python package MiniSOM (Vettigli, 2018). Before training a SOM, all attributes are normalised using their standard deviation. Additionally, we removed all values deviating by more than ten

300 standard deviations from the mean, as likely measurement errors. The threshold was arbitrarily chosen to exclude extreme outliers conservatively. All remaining points are part of the training set. A unified distance matrix is computed that contains the distance to neighbouring neurons for each neuron.

The resulting SOM has a shape of 30 by 30 and was trained using 15,000 iterations and a learning rate of 10−4. σ was set to 5 to create soft weight maps and avoid overfitting. Naturally, there are numerous possibilities and parameter sets that yield acceptable results. For visual comparison only, the final map was divided into 5 clusters, where the main attributes show similar values. Boundaries were chosen in a way that neighbouring cells are distinct from each other.

## **4 Results and discussion**


### 4.1 Correlation between attributes

We first examined correlations between individual attributes (Figure 4). Particularly high correlations or anticorrelations indicate how different datasets are affecting each other, and which ones can be used jointly in an interpretation. The correlation matrix between the attributes shows that, in general, the correlation is strongest between attributes derived from the same data type (radar, magnetic, or gravity), as expected. Some of the attributes do not follow this general observation. E.g. the Tilt-Derivative of the gravity (TDX grv) correlates stronger with radar roughness than with any other gravity-derived attribute. Roughness reflects, first of all, variations in the topography itself. Such a varying topography will cause a varying gravity and a minor portion of the magnetic signal. This is evident in the correlations between roughness and spectral attributes in magnetics, as well as with the gravity signal, which may indicate that a smooth bed-ice transition tends to be less dense and has lower susceptibility.

Some of the attributes show almost no correlation with other attributes, such as Tilt-Derivative of the magnetic field (TDX mag), Gaussian Curvature (KGauss). An absence of correlation might indicate that these attributes are sensitive to different source structures.

Another example is the correlation of the Total Magnetic Field anomaly (Mag) and its detrended version (Detrended mag). While the first shows some degree of correlation to the gravity-derived attributes, the second does not. That corresponds to the different sensitivity of the gravity and magnetic field to the sources, but might also indicate that we miss some of the gravity signal by using a gridded data set as input and not measurements along the flight lines.

Other attributes, such as the roughness attributes (ζ bed, η bed), show a correlation with both gravity and magnetic attributes, for example, the spectral centroid (Centroid mag) or the shape index (SI grv). Similarly, the power of the 5 to 15 km bin (Bin Power mag) has a correlation with the basal roughness attributes. It could indicate that sedimentary basins lack short-wavelength signals as they tend to have smoother surfaces. Similarly, correlations between the gravity attributes could support the idea that dense rocks tend to be more erosion-resistant, leading to rougher landscapes.




**Figure 4: Correlation matrix for all attributes listed in Table 1.**

### 4.2 Weights for individual attributes

Before we analyse the SOM in more detail with respect to its possible geological meaning, we show the weights for the individual attributes in Figure 5. As well as the results below, this is not a unique solution, as there are numerous possibilities and parameter sets that potentially yield acceptable results. Additionally, even with the same choice of parameters, the outcome may vary based on the initialization. Hence, the results presented here, must be seen as an example.

If weights are near zero across the whole map for a specific attribute, that indicates that the attribute has no significant impact on the SOM and could be omitted from the analysis without significant loss of information. The weights map shows that some of the attributes, e.g. SI Grav, strongly influence the results, while others, e.g. Kurtosis mag and bed, have a minor impact. That corresponds to the correlation with other attributes (Figure 4). Those attributes not correlating with other attributes have


in general, less impact on the final SOMs, while those showing a larger degree of correlation are deemed more important. That must be taken into consideration when discussing the dependency of the final SOM on the choice of attributes for analysis.

345 

**Figure 5 Weights for every attribute and cell of the SOM. All attributes were rescaled using the standard deviation before the training started.**

### 4.3 Subglacial clusters from SOMs

Next, we analyse the SOMs in more detail by discussing apparent clusters in the map. For a first comparison between our SOM and the bed type classification by Aitken et al. (2023), we map their classification on our 2D representation (Figure 6).



**Figure 6: Visualization of the SOM and class distribution. Every data point (measurement along a flight line) was assigned a class according to Aitken et al. (2023) and subsequently mapped onto the SOM. Each cell represents a neuron in the SOM and contains the data points mapped to it. The pie charts within each cell indicate the proportions of different classes present. The letters A–E highlight regions of the SOM with similar properties; they are manually defined to aid description and interpretation.**


The crystalline-basement class indicates where the bed is interpreted to consist of igneous or metamorphic rocks (including high-grade metasedimentary rocks), with either no or only a thin veneer of sedimentary cover. Typically, these regions possess the characteristics of high elevation and high gravity with high spatial variability in topography, gravity, and magnetic data. Type 1 basin class represents regions where sedimentary basins are preserved in relatively unmodified basins, with typical characteristics of low elevation and low gravity, and low spatial variability in gravity and magnetic data. Along-track roughness tends to be low. The intra-basin volcanics class includes areas where volcanic rocks are interpreted to be emplaced within a Type 1 basin sequence. Type 2 basin class, in turn, represents areas where sedimentary rocks are known or inferred but the original depositional basin is not preserved. These rocks tend to predate the formation of the present landscape, are often uplifted to high elevations, may be intruded by younger igneous rocks, may be heavily eroded, and may have geophysical characteristics more similar to crystalline basement than Type 1 basins. Mixed classes are analyzed where the geophysical characteristics are not providing clear evidence for an assignment to a single class (Aitken et al. (2023):

We expect our SOM to contribute the most to an improved understanding of the mixed or inconclusive classes. Therefore, we sample for each data point of our SOM its class according to Aitken et al. (2023). Figure 6 shows for each cell of our map the percentage of classes present as a pie chart. Form this classification map, we define 5 domains, which have a predominant class. For example, Type 1 basins are predominantly located within cluster C aligning with the expected characteristics of smooth beds, low gravity, and minimal magnetic signals. In contrast, crystalline rocks are predominantly found in the cluster E. This observation supports the assumption that strong magnetic anomalies are typically generated by crystalline rocks. Furthermore, crystalline rocks are also seen in the left side of cluster B. This sub-cluster exhibits high roughness; intense magnetic and gravity signals, as expected for crystalline rocks. Type 2 basins, however, do not show a distinct concentration, but are visible across various regions of the map. This dispersion raises questions about the feasibility of coherently inferring this class solely from the attribute compilation used here or from the robustness of defining this class over such a large region. Possibly, the Type 2 basins, in this region, mainly sedimentary rocks on highlands, have a more heterogeneous build-up or reflect different sub-types compared to the interpretation by Aitken et al. (2023). For the mixed class, no clear domain can be found on the SOM, conforming to their complex nature.

On the map in Figure 7, we show the SOM representations as a map projection from the individual flight lines, and in Figure 8, along a profile through the study area, in order to provide a spatial representation. Please note that the SOM is mapping data firstly in a 2D Domain based on attribute similarity and irrespective of the geographic location (see inset in Figure 7). Hence, the domains A to E seen in Figure 6 and Figure 7 are only to guide visual comparison.


Comparison with the bed type classification of Aitken et al. (2023) shows a general agreement (Figure 7). Particularly, the delineation of various highlands corresponds closely between the two classifications. However, for some structures, as Knox Highlands (classified as Crystalline) and Highlands A (classified as Type 2 Basin), there are differences in the results. This is coherent with the observation that the Type 2 Basin class seems to be mapped for quite dissimilar physical settings.

Additionally, most basins, including the Southern Wilkes Basin, Central Aurora Basin, and Aurora South Basin, exhibit strong consistency with the classification presented by Aitken et al. (2023). Furthermore, the sedimentary basin likelihood map as presented by Li et al. (2022) consistently indicates thick sedimentary layers in areas that were mapped within class C. The most significant disagreement between the SOM and the classification by Aitken et al. (2023) is shown for the Sabrina Basin and Aurora North Basin. In these areas, the fine-scale variations within Clusters A, D, and E of the mapped SOM appear to contradict the homogeneous classification by Aitken et al. (2023), suggesting that the SOM may be able to capture local variations, which are best observed when compared along an individual flight line (Figure 8).

 **Figure 7: Representation of the clusters from the SOM. A) Geographical distribution of the SOM., B) Unified distance matrix for the presented SOM. C) Classification of geological bed type from Aitken et al. (2023). The yellow line indicates the profile of Figure 8.**

Along a flight line (Figure 8), the interpretation by Aitken et al. (2023) does not clearly follow the boundaries visible in the data and SOM. The radar data show that there are sections of the basin where no return from the bed was detected (e.g., distance ~100 km), while it appears as a very smooth reflector in places where it was detected (~140 km). Additionally, the magnetic signal exhibits a predominantly long wavelength above the basin and shows no obvious correlation with the bed. These observations indicate the presence of non-magnetic rocks near the bed. The SOM effectively captures the abrupt change at the rise of Aurora North Basin in the north of the profile (Figure 8). For clusters B and E, the correlation between the magnetic signal and bed elevation becomes evident. This suggests the presence of magnetic rocks near the surface of Aurora North Basin, whereas it is not the case in the Aurora Basin. This illustrates how the SOM can successfully integrate information from

various data types into a single parameter clearly highlighting the most probable geological boundaries. It therefore could be a useful tool for future mapping attempts and could also help adjusting boundaries while leveraging all available data types.

410 

**Figure 8: A combined plot of magnetics, gravity, and radar data along a profile. Beneath the plots, the SOM is shown along with the classification by Aitken et al., 2023. Colour coding for SOMS is according to the inset in Figure 5.**

### 4.4 Pitfalls and possibilities of SOMs

The comparison to the expert judgment approach by Aitken et al. (2023) by compiling available data sources shows that SOMs

415 can potentially provide an added level of detail or aid in detecting possible errors or inconsistencies, as it should be based on measured data as much as possible. Nevertheless, while it seems compelling to trust the automatic interpretation of the SOM in comparison to direct studies, one should be aware of the limitations of the method. First, the presented choice of attributes is not the only possible choice. While many attributes included in our analysis show high correlation (Fig. 4), it is important not to omit attributes that may show highly similar features. However, a balanced approach is important, and focusing

420 too much on a certain kind of attribute or dataset might distort the outcome. Other attributes derived from the presented datasets or even other independent datasets, like roughness derived from ice surface elevation or ice flow velocity, could be added. Others might be omitted, for example the use of the gravity field and the vertical gradient seems to add little additional information. In general, it would be preferential to use a consistent data set, possibly line data for all observed fields to improve

interpretation at survey scale. Still, a slight trade-off might be that along-line variations may be underestimated if line orientations are not located perpendicular to the main strike direction.

But this trade-off appears to be preferential to the use of gridded data products, where interpolation and the lower resolution of grids compared to line products, affect the quality of the resulting products. Still, the insensitivity to spatial anisotropy of gridded data products might outweigh the gains in data resolution. Furthermore, additional attributes that can be derived from gridded datasets that potentially enhance the resulting SOMs. Additionally, the utilization of migrated radargrams in combination with a correspondingly adjusted bed elevation dataset could potentially reduce the correlations between roughness and ice thickness. This approach has the potential to produce improved results, with an improved overall resolution and quality of the attributes.

One drawback of the SOMs is that there is little control over the meaning of the output clusters, requiring an interpretation to assign meaning to each cluster. One should mention as well that not all features mapped by the SOMs might be a geological signal, but some, especially local features, might reflect data quality (measurement errors or noise). To generate a wellinformed classification, multiple data types should be combined and a careful assessment of the data products is required. Still, a product like SOMs will greatly assist in defining (geological) units with distinct properties and to aid interpreters to make data-optimised classifications and to understand the support for their interpretations from the data selection. Especially, when zooming in on the geology under the ice and the spatial scale that seems to be most important for understanding the coupling of ice-sheets and the underlying solid earth structure (e.g. McCormack et al. 2022), the SOMs can provide a second level of detail. As always, careful evaluation of the final results is still a crucial point in estimating subglacial properties as the SOMs do not provide immediately a new geological map, but a tool for classification and interpretation.

## **5 Conclusions**

We present a novel mapping of subglacial geology using Self-Organizing Maps applied to radar, gravity, and magnetic data sets, which mimics flight lines from the NASA Operation Ice Bridge (OIB) dataset in East Antarctica. The attributes calculated from the data sets provide a suite of products useful for interpretation; however, challenging for manual interpretation. Hence, the SOM groups the complex features into an easy to understand common framework.

Comparison to the classification of Aitken et al. (2023) generally shows good agreement for the major classes in regions of low complexity, while also indicating the non-unique nature of some classes. In such areas, the SOMs can help to refine existing interpretations and unveil previously unknown small-scale structures. To further enhance the clustering capabilities of the SOM, an in-depth exploration of hyperparameters could lead to improved results.

Furthermore, the choice of input datasets, assessed by evaluating the importance of different attributes, is worth exploring in more detail. Here, we limited ourselves to choosing similar number of attributes for the three different kind of data in order to prevent a bias towards a single data set without testing how the results would varying the number of attributes, mainly due to computational reasons, but also due to the different characteristics of the input data set (flight lines and resampled gridded products)-.

In general, data selection is a key to avoid a bias by inconsistent data sets and for example, the recently released geophysical data catalogue from the British Antarctic Survey includes multiple surveys with magnetic, gravity, and radar data (Frémand et al., 2022), presenting an opportunity to further explore the possibilities of SOMs for flight line data.

As a next step, the classification of different bed types could also serve as constraint, a priori information for (joint) inversion, that could extend the analysis from a more description of subglacial properties to a physical earth model, needed to describe the full coupling between the Solid Earth and the overlying ice-sheets.

**Code Availability:** Code will be released upon acceptance of the paper through Zenodo.

**Author contribution**: JL carried out the formal analysis and prepared all figures. JL and JE wrote the manuscript draft; KM reviewed and edited the manuscript; JE and KM supervised the study as part of the Master thesis by JL.

**Competing interests**: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

**Acknowledgments**: JL acknowledges funding received by the Erasmus+ programme of the European Union which made his stay at the Norwegian Polar Institute in Tromsø possible. We thank Alan Aitken for discussions on an earlier version of this manuscript, which helped us to improve our interpretation.

# **References**

Aitken, A. R. A., Young, D. A., Ferraccioli, F., Betts, P. G., Greenbaum, J. S., Richter, T. G., ... & Siegert, M. J..: The subglacial geology of Wilkes Land, East Antarctica. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *41*(7), 2390-2400, https://doi.org/10.1002/2014GL059405, 2014.

Aitken, A. R. A., Roberts, J. L., Ommen, T. V., Young, D. A., Golledge, N. R., Greenbaum, J. S., ... & Siegert, M. J.:Repeated large-scale retreat and advance of Totten Glacier indicated by inland bed erosion. Nature, 533(7603), 385-389, https://doi.org/10.1038/nature17447, 2016

Aitken, A. R., Li, L., Kulessa, B., Schroeder, D., Jordan, T. A., Whittaker, J. M., ... & Siegert, M. J.: Antarctic sedimentary

basins and their influence on ice‐sheet dynamics. Reviews of Geophysics, 61(3), e2021RG000767. https://doi.org/10.1029/2021RG000767, 2023.

Anandakrishnan, S., Blankenship, D. D., Alley, R. B., & Stoffa, P. L.: Influence of subglacial geology on the position of a West Antarctic ice stream from seismic observations. *Nature*, *394*(6688), 62-65, https://doi.org/10.1038/27889, 1998.

Bayer, B., Geissler, W. H., Eckstaller, A., & Jokat, W.: Seismic imaging of the crust beneath Dronning Maud Land, East Antarctica. *Geophysical Journal International*, *178*(2), 860-876, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.2009.04196.x, 2009.

Bell, R. E.,: The role of subglacial water in ice-sheet mass balance. *Nature Geoscience*, *1*(5), 297-304, https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo186 , 2008.

Betts, P. G., Moore, D., Aitken, A., Blaikie, T., Jessell, M., Ailleres, L., ... & Chukwu, C.: Geology from aeromagnetic data. *Earth-Science Reviews*, 104958, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earscirev.2024.104958, 2024.

Blakely, R. J.: *Potential theory in gravity and magnetic applications*. Cambridge University Press, https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511549816, 1996.

Blankenship et al.,: IceBridge HiCARS 2 L2 Geolocated Ice Thickness, Version 1. DOI:10.5067/9EBR2T0VXUDG. https://nsidc.org/data/IR2HI2/versions/1, 2012.

Blankenship et al.: IceBridge HiCARS 1 L1B Time-Tagged Echo Strength Profiles, Version 1. DOI: 10.5067/W2KXX0MYNJ9G. https://nsidc.org/data/IR1HI1B/versions/1, 2017.

Colgan, W., Wansing, A., Mankoff, K., Lösing, M., …, Ebbing, J., et al.: Greenland Geothermal Heat Flow Database and Map (Version 1), Earth Syst. Sci. Data, 14(5), 2209-2238, https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-14-2209-2022, 2022.

Davison, B. J., Hogg, A. E., Gourmelen, N., Jakob, L., Wuite, J., Nagler, T., ... & Engdahl, M. E.: Annual mass budget of Antarctic ice shelves from 1997 to 2021. *Science Advances*, *9*(41), eadi0186. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.adi0186, 2023.

Ebbing, J., Haas, P., Ferraccioli, F., Pappa, F., Szwillus, W., & Bouman, J.: Earth tectonics as seen by GOCE- Enhanced satellite gravity gradient imaging. *Scientific reports*, *8*(1), 16356, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-34733-9, 2018.

Eisen, O., Winter, A., Steinhage, D., Kleiner, T., & Humbert, A.: Basal roughness of the East Antarctic Ice Sheet in relation to flow speed and basal thermal state. *Annals of Glaciology*, *61*(81), 162-175, https://doi.org/10.1017/aog.2020.47, 2020.

Elliot, D. H.: Tectonics of Antarctica: a review. Am. J. Sci, 275, 45-106, 1975.

Ferraccioli, F., Bozzo, E., & Damaske, D.: Aeromagnetic signatures over western Marie Byrd Land provide insight into

510 magmatic arc basement, mafic magmatism and structure of the Eastern Ross Sea Rift flank. *Tectonophysics*, *347*(1-3), 139165, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0040-1951(01)00242-6, 2002.

Ferraccioli, F., Armadillo, E., Jordan, T., Bozzo, E., & Corr, H.: Aeromagnetic exploration over the East Antarctic Ice Sheet:

a new view of the Wilkes Subglacial Basin. *Tectonophysics*, *478*(1-2), 62-77, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2009.03.013, 2009.

515 Fretwell, P., Pritchard, H. D., Vaughan, D. G., Bamber, J. L., Barrand, N. E., Bell, R., ... & Zirizzotti, A.: Bedmap2: improved ice bed, surface and thickness datasets for Antarctica. The cryosphere, 7(1), 375-393, https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-7-3752013, 2013.

Golynsky, A., Chiappini, M., Damaske, D., Ferraccioli, F., Finn, C. A., Ishihara, T., ... & von Frese, R.: ADMAP—A digital magnetic anomaly map of the Antarctic. *Antarctica: Contributions to global earth sciences*, 109-116, 520 https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-32934-X\_12, 2006.

Golynsky, A. V., Ferraccioli, F., Hong, J. K., Golynsky, D. A., Von Frese, R. R. B., Young, D. A., ... & Roberts, J. L.: New magnetic anomaly map of the Antarctic. Geophysical Research Letters, 45(13), 6437-6449, https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL078153, 2018.

Jamieson, S. S., Stokes, C. R., Ross, N., Rippin, D. M., Bingham, R. G., Wilson, D. S., ... & Bentley, M. J.: The glacial

525 geomorphology of the Antarctic ice sheet bed. *Antarctic Science*, *26*(6), 724-741, https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954102014000212, 2014.

Jordan, T. A., Ferraccioli, F., Corr, H., Graham, A., Armadillo, E., & Bozzo, E.: Hypothesis for mega‐outburst flooding from a palaeo‐subglacial lake beneath the East Antarctic Ice Sheet. *Terra Nova*, *22*(4), 283-289, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.13653121.2010.00944.x, 2010.

530 Jordan, T. A., Riley, T. R., & Siddoway, C. S.: The geological history and evolution of West Antarctica. Nature Reviews Earth & Environment, 1(2), 117-133, https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-019-0013-6, 2020.

Jordan, T. A., Thompson, S., Kulessa, B., & Ferraccioli, F.: Geological sketch map and implications for ice flow of Thwaites Glacier, West Antarctica, from integrated aerogeophysical observations. *Science Advances*, *9*(22), eadf2639, hhtps://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.adf26, 2023.

535 Kim, H. R., Golynsky, A. V., Golynsky, D. A., Yu, H., Von Frese, R. R. B., & Hong, J. K.: New magnetic anomaly constraints on the Antarctic crust. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, *127*(3), e2021JB023329, https://doi.org/10.1029/2021JB023329, 2022.

Klose, C. D.: Self-organizing maps for geoscientific data analysis: geological interpretation of multidimensional geophysical data. *Computational Geosciences*, *10*, 265-277, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10596-006-9022-x, 2006.

540 Koellner, S., Parizek, B. R., Alley, R. B., Muto, A., & Holschuh, N.: The impact of spatially-variable basal properties on outlet glacier flow. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, *515*, 200-208, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2019.03.026, 2019.

Kohonen, T.: The self-organizing map. Proceedings of the IEEE, 78(9), 1464-1480, https://doi.org/ 10.1109/5.58325, 1990.

Leitchenkov, G. L., Antonov, A. V., Luneov, P. I., & Lipenkov, V. Y.: Geology and environments of subglacial Lake Vostok. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, *374*(2059), 20140302, https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2014.0302, 2016.

Li, X.: Curvature of a geometric surface and curvature of gravity and magnetic anomalies. *Geophysics*, *80*(1), G15-G26, https://doi.org/10.1190/geo2014-0108.1. 2015.

Li, L., Aitken, A. R., Lindsay, M. D., & Kulessa, B.: Sedimentary basins reduce stability of Antarctic ice streams through groundwater feedbacks. Nature Geoscience, 15(8), 645–650. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-022-00992-5, 2022.

Li, L., Xiao, E., Wei, X., Qiu, N., Latif, K., Guo, J., & Sun, B.: Crustal Imaging across the Princess Elizabeth Land, East Antarctica from 2D Gravity and Magnetic Inversions. *Remote Sensing*, *15*(23), 5523, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs15235523, 2023.

Liebsch, J.: Combined analysis of airborne geophysical data using machine learning to obtain sub-ice geology in East Antarctica. Master thesis at Kiel University, unpublished, 2023.

Lösing, M., & Ebbing, J.: Predicting geothermal heat flow in Antarctica with a machine learning approach. Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth, 126(6), e2020JB021499, https://doi.org/10.1029/2020JB021499, 2021.

Lowe, M., Jordan, T., Ebbing, J., Koglin, N., Ruppel, A., Moorkamp, M., ... & Larter, R.: Comparing geophysical inversion and petrophysical measurements for northern Victoria Land, Antarctica. *Geophysical Journal International*, *239*(1), 276291, ttps://doi.org/10.1093/gji/ggae272, 2024a.

Lowe, M., Jordan, T., Moorkamp, M., Ebbing, J., Green, C., Lösing, M., ... & Larter, R.: The 3D crustal structure of the Wilkes Subglacial Basin, East Antarctica, using variation of information joint inversion of gravity and magnetic data. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, *129*(10), e2023JB027794, https://doi.org/10.1029/2023JB027794 2024b.

Matsuoka, K.: Pitfalls in radar diagnosis of ice‐sheet bed conditions: Lessons from englacial attenuation models. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *38*(5). https://doi.org/10.1029/2010GL046205, 2011.

MacGregor, J. A., Boisvert, L. N., Medley, B., Petty, A. A., Harbeck, J. P., Bell, R. E., ... & Yungel, J. K.: The scientific legacy of NASA’s Operation IceBridge. Reviews of Geophysics, 59, e2020RG000712. https://doi.org/10.1029/2020RG000712, 2021.

McCormack, F. S., Roberts, J. L., Dow, C. F., Stål, T., Halpin, J. A., Reading, A. M., & Siegert, M. J.: Fine‐scale geothermal heat flow in Antarctica can increase simulated subglacial melt estimates. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *49*(15), e2022GL098539, https://doi.org/10.1029/2022GL098539, 2022.

McLean, M. A., Wilson, C. J. L., Boger, S. D., Betts, P. G., Rawling, T. J., & Damaske, D.: Basement interpretations from airborne magnetic and gravity data over the Lambert Rift region of East Antarctica. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, *114*(B6), https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JB005650, 2009.

Morlighem, M., Rignot, E., Binder, T., Blankenship, D., Drews, R., Eagles, G., ... & Young, D. A.: Deep glacial troughs and stabilizing ridges unveiled beneath the margins of the Antarctic ice sheet. Nature geoscience, 13(2), 132-137. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-019-0510-8, 2020.

Morlighem, M.: MEaSUREs BedMachine Antarctica, Version 3. [BED ELEVATION]. Boulder, Colorado USA. NASA

National Snow and Ice Data Center Distributed Active Archive Center. https://doi.org/10.5067/FPSU0V1MWUB6, 2022.

[last accessed 25/02/2025]

Mouginot, J., Scheuchl, B. and E. Rignot, E.,: MEaSUREs Annual Antarctic Ice Velocity Maps 2005-2017, Version 1. Boulder, Colorado USA. NASA National Snow and Ice Data Center Distributed Active Archive Center https://doi.org/10.5067/9T4EPQXTJYW9, 2017 [last accessed 25/02/2025]

Nagy, D., Papp, G., & Benedek, J.: The gravitational potential and its derivatives for the prism. *Journal of Geodesy*, *74*, 552560, https://doi.org/10.1007/s001900000116, 2000.

Rignot, E., Jacobs, S., Mouginot, J., and B. Scheuchl, B.: Ice shelf melting around Antarctica, *Science*, 341(6143), 266–270, https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1235798, 2013.

Rippin, D. M., Bingham, R. G., Jordan, T. A., Wright, A. P., Ross, N., Corr, H. F., ... & Siegert, M. J.: Basal roughness of the Institute and Möller Ice Streams, West Antarctica: Process determination and landscape interpretation. *Geomorphology*, *214*, 139-147, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2014.01.021, 2014.

Salem, A., Williams, S., Fairhead, D., Smith, R., & Ravat, D.: Interpretation of magnetic data using tilt-angle derivatives. *Geophysics*, *73*(1), L1-L10, https://doi.org/10.1190/1.2799992, 2008.

Scheinert, M., Ferraccioli, F., Schwabe, J., Bell, R., Studinger, M., Damaske, D., ... & Richter, T. D. (2016). New Antarctic gravity anomaly grid for enhanced geodetic and geophysical studies in Antarctica. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *43*(2), 600-610, https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL067439, 2016.

Shepherd, T., Bamber, J. L., & Ferraccioli, F.: Subglacial geology in Coats Land, East Antarctica, revealed by airborne magnetics and radar sounding. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, *244*(1-2), 323-335, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2006.01.068, 2006.

Stål, T., Reading, A. M., Halpin, J. A., & Whittaker, J. M.: Antarctic geothermal heat flow model: Aq1. *Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems*, *22*(2), e2020GC009428, https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GC009428, 2021.

Taylor, G. (1914). Physiography and glacial geology of East Antarctica. The Geographical Journal, 44(4), 365-382, 1914.

Vettigli, G.: MiniSom: minimalistic and NumPy-based implementation of the Self Organizing Map. URL: https://github.com/JustGlowing/minisom/, 2018.

Whitehouse, P. L., Gomez, N., King, M. A., & Wiens, D. A.: Solid Earth change and the evolution of the Antarctic Ice Sheet. *Nature communications*, *10*(1), 503, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-08068-y, 2019.

Wu, G., Ferraccioli, F., Zhou, W., Yuan, Y., Gao, J., & Tian, G.: Tectonic Implications for the Gamburtsev Subglacial Mountains, East Antarctica, from Airborne Gravity and Magnetic Data. *Remote Sensing*, *15*(2), 306, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs15020306, 2023.

Young, D. A., Wright, A. P., Roberts, J. L., Warner, R. C., Young, N. W., Greenbaum, J. S., ... & Siegert, M. J.: A dynamic early East Antarctic Ice Sheet suggested by ice-covered fjord landscapes. Nature, 474(7349), 72-75, https://doi.org/10.1038/nature10114, 2011.

Zoet, L. K., & Iverson, N. R.: A slip law for glaciers on deformable beds. *Science*, *368*(6486), 76-78, https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaz1183, 2020.