

## Response to Volker Klemann

The authors propose in this manuscript a new method to consider the viscoelastic response of a viscoelastic earth to surface loading. The method is designed to consider the solid-earth feedback mechanism in coupled dynamic ice sheet models. In order to reach an efficient set up, they made some simplifications with respect to the usual solution of the glacial isostatic adjustment problem, here called GRD.

The main advantage I see in the consideration of pre-calculated Green's functions. They suggest an efficient algorithm for the convolution, although I would argue that such an algorithm should be state of the art. Furthermore, the main aspects of the algorithm only appear in the Appendices. Only after reading it becomes clear that this algorithm is not sufficient to analyse the SE-IS feedbacks for longer time scales, when efficiency breaks down and also the accuracy is reduced. Furthermore, the sea level equation is not considered regarding mass conservation, ocean loading and also the rotational feedback are not considered in this approximation.

Whereas the authors rise the impression that the GRD response is considered, at the end their approach turns out to solve the sea level equation in its simplest form (Spada et al., 2019), i.e., without mass conservation, ocean loading and rotational feedback, providing the local relative sea level change due to radial displacement and gravity change from the ice-mass change only. They should set this premise at the beginning of the study and motivate it from the specific application to solid earth--ice sheet model coupling on decadal to centennial time scales.

We thank Volker for his time and constructive review. While he acknowledges the usefulness of the proposed method, he raised some issues about its limitations, especially for its application to long-term simulations. We apologize for not making this clearer, but the main purpose of this manuscript is to facilitate ice sheet models to capture *leading-order* solid Earth feedback on the *centennial* timescale with *relative ease*.

- With *centennial-scale* simulations (the timescale of interest for IPCC and partner consortia such as CMIP and ISMIP), we show that a simple convolution of ice load and Green's functions yields (conservatively speaking) more than 90% of the self-consistent sea level/solid Earth feedback signal (see Figures 3-5).
- As ice load alone induces a large portion of the feedback signal, the ocean load effect and rotational feedback together play a secondary role (at least on centennial timescales). Consequently, ice sheet modelers -- not so familiar with glacial isostatic adjustment (GIA) processes but nonetheless interested in capturing the leading-order feedback signal -- may forgo solving a sea level equation, thereby simplifying the coupling strategy.
- Of course, the simplified coupling strategy comes at a cost (despite its ability to capture the feedback signal *sufficiently accurately*) -- the cost of not being able to (1) capture self-consistent sea level/solid Earth feedback, (2) satisfy ice/ocean mass conservation, and (3) account for the effects of farfield ice melting or

coastline migrations. We assert that all these effects play a secondary role in the centennial-scale simulations.

We propose to convey these points by clearly articulating the scope and limitations of the proposed method in the introductory paragraphs and the abstract. We will move up and blend the existing related text (e.g., lines 155-164; 185-190). Additionally, we will revise the title to enhance transparency further [underlined words are new additions]:

“Enable ice sheet models to capture centennial-scale solid Earth feedback with relative ease and sufficient accuracy.”

In particular, they show that these simplifications are sufficient for modelling the future evolution of the West Antarctic ice sheet during the coming centuries giving an error of up to a few %. I see this approach valid for the applications described, but I question its help when working over longer time scales, like a glacial cycle, when interpreting geodetic observables, or when considering lateral variations in earth structure consistently. In so far, I see this model as a small step towards a more realistic coupling of the solid earth to ice sheet dynamics, but not sufficient in order to achieve a physically consistent solution.

As noted earlier, the proposed method is designed for centennial-scale simulations. So, it is not recommended for long-timescale simulations (e.g., glacial cycles), over which the effects of ocean loads, far-field ice melting, migrating coastlines, and rotational effects all come into play (lines 185-190). In such applications, solving the sea-level equation is the only option, and no simplified method can do justice (lines 197-199). We agree that this point should be stated up front in the manuscript, which we will do in the revisions.

Like any 1-D glacial isostatic adjustment (GIA) models, the proposed method, which is based on radially stratified Earth (line 79), cannot capture the 3D Earth effect. (Kindly see our response to the second reviewer on page 10 of this manuscript.) We will make this point clear upfront in the manuscript. Thank you for pointing it out.

Your last statement correctly sums up the sentiment of this paper -- encourage ice sheet modelers to capture (leading-order) solid Earth feedback without much hassle.

My summary is minor, as the presentation of the results can be improved. Furthermore I recommend to transfer this manuscript to GMD, which I see more on the side of discussing software developments (the reason why I set novelty to Fair). In particular for TC, I do not see a major impact, also due to the fact that the applicability of this method was discussed only for the future evolution of West Antarctica. Otherwise, the setup is ok, and my further recommendations remain valid also after a possible transfer.

While there are some merits to sending this manuscript to GMD (in fact, we also contemplated about that before targeting TC), we argue that TC is still a better journal, as the method is specifically tailored for Cryosphere scientists who may not be as familiar

with solid Earth/sea level processes but still would like to capture leading-order feedback mechanisms for centennial-scale simulations (e.g., some ISMIP participants).

Further recommendations:

1. L. 7: I would skip 'virtually additional software development'. My interpretation is, that only an offline coupling is necessary, where only the interface has to be set. But such approaches were already applied in a number of coupled models like PISM (Albrecht et al., 2024), and MPI-ESM (Mikolajewicz et al., 2025 <https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-21-719-2025>). Only to list those in which I was involved.

Thank you for bringing it to our attention. We will make necessary corrections and revise the text suitably.

2. In the Introduction I miss a more structured discussion to which time and spatial scale the method is designed for.

Please see our introductory response – we will dedicate a couple of paragraphs in the Introduction to clarify the scope and limitations of the proposed method. Additionally, we will tweak the title to accurately reflect the method's scope and utility.

3. L. 22ff: Regarding the solid earth response, I miss the discussion of ELRA and Lingle and Clark, which are both considered for instance in PISM, with more realistic viscoelastic displacements but no gravity change.

Thank you for bringing it to our attention. We will acknowledge those models in the revision.

4. L. 28: I miss here the reference of Konrad et al., (2015, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2015.10.008>).

We will cite this article.

5. L. 36: Konrad et al. (2016, <https://dx.do.org/10.2312/polfor.2016.005>), compared ELRA against a global GIA model representing the solid earth response in a coupled system.

We will acknowledge this in the revised text.

6. L. 38: Coming back to my 1. suggestion.

Noted. We will revise the sentence suitably.

7. I don't see the requirement of adapting a GIA module in an existing code. Regarding VILMA it was done for CLIMBER-X (Willeit et al. 2024, <https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-20-597->

2024) but for PISM and MPI-ESM it was done off line, by only exchanging the RSL and Ice thickness.

Noted. See our response to 1 (page 3 of this document).

8. L. 55: Also, I would reserve an own equation for the definition of R.

Ok. We will introduce a new equation:  $R = S - B$ .

9. L. 74: p was not introduced.

p represents the number of computational grids (or elements) having q vertices (or nodes). It is introduced on line 62. As suggested by the second reviewer, we will create a table listing all variables, which should help navigate equations or descriptions.

10. L 82ff: The authors should specify the sampling and set up of the viscosity structures. Furthermore, they state that the time range extend from seasonal to hundreds of years. So, why do they not consider anelastic effects in their Green's functions in this study?

Thanks for this comment. We will make the following explicit in the revised manuscript.

- We computed Love numbers for 21×23 combinations of lithospheric thickness and upper-mantle viscosity. We linearly sampled 21 lithosphere thicknesses between 50 and 250 km at 10 km intervals. Mantle viscosity samples include  $1:9 \times 10^{18}$  (9 samples),  $1:9 \times 10^{19}$  (9 samples), and  $1:5 \times 10^{20}$  Pa s (5 samples). The lower mantle viscosity is fixed at  $2 \times 10^{22}$  Pa s for all models.
- Time-dependent Love numbers and Green's functions are sampled in log-space at 100 snaps between 0 (purely elastic signal) and 1,000 years. Log sampling allows us to capture denser solutions earlier after the point load is applied (see figures 2 and A1). Because the main purpose of this paper is to enable centennial-scale simulations, we limit the sampling within the 1,000 years after loading.
- We evaluated Green's functions at 500 points along the great circle distance. We use log-space sampling to accurately capture the signal gradient (a higher gradient in the near field) between 100 m and 5 km from the point load (see Figure 2). A 100 m sampling point helps avoid the inherent singularity in the elastic Green's function at the loading point; yet it is sufficient to capture high-resolution ice load associated with subtle grounding-line migration. On the other hand, 5 km is a sufficiently large distance where the Green's function hits asymptotes (see Figure 2).

Because the Adhikari and Caron (2024) dataset was computed for Maxwell rheology, the mention of a “seasonal” timescale merely implies that the method can capture elastic feedback signal. To avoid any confusion, we will stick with the “decadal to centennial” timescale throughout the manuscript, as we expect meaningful ice/Earth coupling at these timescales (rather than the seasonal timescale). Thanks for pointing it out.

11. L. 99ff: The discussion regarding the number of integrations comes a bit late, and results in a further problem which weakens the statement of 'ease' a bit. Can the author give realistic integration times? That would help the reader to estimate which further approximations have to be made.

The integration time is proportional to the mesh size, coupling interval, and simulation period. We will happily report example computational times for the self-consistent method that solves the sea level equation and for the proposed simplified method.

Conceptually speaking, for any mesh having  $x$  elements for the ice sheet domain and  $y$  elements for the global sea-level domain comprising the ice sheet, convolution takes longer for the self-consistent method because  $y > x$ , and, unlike for the ice load, the ocean load needs to be determined recursively (typically 5-7 recursions) via as many convolutions. That said, we believe “ease” in this context is not only about computational cost but also about forgoing the sea-level equation altogether if the goal is to capture leading-order feedback on the centennial timescale. Nonetheless, we propose replacing “ease” with “relative ease” [relative to solving the sea level equation] if that helps.

12. L. 105: I would expect 'validate' instead of 'scrutinize' the proposed method.

Ok. We will revise the text accordingly.

13. L. 113ff: I wonder why the authors do not consider the floating condition here. And is the rotational feedback only neglected in this experiment or everywhere. This is only clarified in the last paragraph of this study.

We do consider floating conditions when deriving ice loads. It is just that we ignore the ocean load. We will make it clearer in the revised text.

14. L. 121: I would not translate 'minor differences' into 'high accuracy', but into 'sufficient accuracy'.

Agreed. We will revise the text accordingly. As noted earlier, we propose to tweak the title, swapping “...ease and accuracy” with “...relative ease and sufficient accuracy.”

15. L. 123: the neglect of ocean load is only insignificant when considering small changes in sea level.

Yes. This is indeed the case for centennial-scale ice sheet evolution. We will clarify it.

16. Figure 3: I miss the error in  $R$  as this is the main quantity when coupling is considered.

$R$ , by definition, is the difference between  $S$  and  $B$ . Therefore, showing additional panels for  $R$  to an already busy figure will only add redundancy. We appreciate the comment, though.

17. L144: Although it becomes clear from the reference, a short note what PICOP means would help.

We will add a sentence or two to explain the PICOP model further.

18. L 147: A transient rheology is considered in the fully coupled setup. Does this mean this is also considered for the Green's functions applied for the simpler model, and so is also considered in the provided set of Green's functions, or alternatively additional transient effects are not necessary for the coupling.

Yes, we used the transient-rheology Green's functions (based on the same EBM parameter set as used in [Houriez et al., 2025](#)) for the simple method as well. The reason is that we chose to compare the proposed simplified method against the in-house state-of-the-art simulations of the coupled ice sheet/solid Earth/sea level system. We will add an appendix showing the Love numbers and Green's functions associated with the EBM model.

19. L 153: They state that for the year 2350 AD a cumulated error bias only reaches 2%, for their experiment which is rather small. But may it not affect the timing of tipping points. Also, what about local effects, which are not represented in discussing the GMSL.

Our analysis suggests that the grounding line (GL) locations predicted by the two methods (i.e., self-consistent vs. our simplified solutions) are virtually on top of each other for a 350-year WAIS simulation (see Figure 5a). That said, we are aware that even a km-off prediction of GL near bedrock ridges may impact the timing of unpinning and subsequent GL retreat by a few years to decades (e.g., [Larour et al., 2019](#); [Houriez et al., 2025](#)). Consequently, as the reviewer noted, local effects may be larger than the reported GMSL bias. Although a comprehensive analysis along these lines is beyond the scope of this paper, we will caution readers in the revised text about the possibility of larger local biases.

20. In Figure 5: I miss a comparison with LC or ELRA which are further coupled set ups.

Since the main goal of the paper is to present a simplified yet sufficiently accurate method for capturing the solid Earth feedback signal, we focused on comparing its performance against the self-consistent solutions of the sea level equation. Comparing our method against many methods that are out there -- although useful -- may not necessarily serve the main purpose of the paper. We appreciate the comment, nonetheless.

21. L 152ff: For the process I agree, that the effect is small. What about the impact on far-field aspects? Do we need a different model approach then? So, my impression is that the rotational potential is not considered and so, the degree 21 pattern in the far-field sea level is not modelled correctly. Furthermore, the ocean loading is not considered. Which results in an additional difference.

We have already addressed this issue (see our introductory response). The proposed method, by design, is not intended to capture relatively minor feedback signals (on centennial timescales) from ocean loads, far-field ice melting, migrating coastlines, and rotational effects. We have acknowledged this on lines 185-190; we will move this text to Introductory paragraphs in the revised manuscript.

22. L 163ff: I read this between the lines: This approach does not allow a straight forward representation of a self-consistent GRD. Additional effort would be necessary to reach this, but for the considered case of analyzing centennial coupling and near field processes it is sufficient.

Agreed. We believe we have already addressed this issue (see our introductory response).

23. L. 166ff: Here it becomes more clearly, where the method is applicable. Nevertheless, I wonder regarding 'accurately' and 'high accurate'. That the method holds only when coupling on decadal to centennial, I agree. At L. 83 you state also 'seasonal', so be consistent.

Thank you. As noted earlier, we will use “sufficient accuracy” (rather than high accuracy) and “decadal to centennial” timescales (rather than seasonal scale) in the revised text.

24. L. 170: You capture the GRD by a number of simplifications, which you should summarize here in view of what terms do not have to be considered in the intended scenarios.

Ok. We will state in the revised text that ocean loads (driven by local or far-field ice melting or by migrating coastlines) and rotational feedback can be neglected if the goal is to simplify the coupling strategy while capturing the leading feedback signal on the centennial timescale.

25. L. 176: Why does the neglect of a number of processes result in a strategic advantage. Migration of grounding lines, and bedrock ridges, are rather important in the discussion of grounding line evolution, especially when reaching spatial resolutions of the ice sheet models.

We believe there is an important trade-off between a simplified (yet sufficiently accurate) method and a more comprehensive (but resource-intensive) method. The former approach encourages end users -- ice sheet modelers with a standalone system and limited resources and knowledge of solid Earth processes -- to account for a reasonably accurate ice/Earth feedback signal. In the absence of such approaches, end users may have to either invest in developing their own sea-level solver, collaborate with GIA modelers, or, in the worst case, abandon the coupled simulation altogether. Additionally, a simpler, less resource-intensive method enables end users to consider shorter coupling intervals, yielding more realistic ice-sheet evolution and projections, or run a larger ensemble of

simulations, facilitating more robust uncertainty quantification. We will expand on this in the revised manuscript.

26. L. 178: Love numbers of radially symmetric viscoelastic earth models are also accessible with public domain software like TABOO. Can such sets be implemented in your setup?

Absolutely. We will ensure that TABOO is acknowledged in the revised manuscript.

27. L 182: Is the extension to more comprehensive linear rheologies necessary regarding the number of simplifications you apply and also the statement on L. 154, that the largest uncertainties are in the ice-sheet models themselves?

As noted earlier, the main meat of the paper concerns a simplified yet sufficiently accurate method for capturing solid Earth feedback. Although the method fails to account for effects of ocean loading and rotational feedback, it does not discriminate between linear rheological models (e.g., Maxwell, Burgers, EBM). We will clarify it in the revised manuscript. The quoted statement (line 182) refers to enhancing the Green's function library with more refined Earth structures and additional rheological models, which, in itself, is not problematic, whether more comprehensive rheology is adopted or not.

28. L.185ff: This final statement appears rather late to my understanding. It reads rather like a premise for the development of the code. So, I would expect this motivation and also the disclaimer at the beginning of the manuscript. This would make the discussion of the study much more transparent.

Agreed. As noted earlier (see pages 1-2 of this document), we will move up this text to the Introductory paragraphs.

## **Response to the reviewers of the second report.**

Adhikari et al. provide a method for rapidly calculating the gravitational and deformational solid Earth response (glacial isostatic adjustment) to ice sheet loading/unloading that is applicable for use near-field of ice sheets on decadal to centennial timescales. The approach outlined in this paper will be useful for ice sheet modelers who are interested in including accurate gravitational and deformational solid Earth feedbacks with low computational cost. This is a beautifully written paper that clearly articulates the method proposed, which is a simplification of a global gravitationally self-consistent sea level model.

Essentially, the authors make the argument that in places like Antarctica, the gravitational and deformational response to the ice load is the dominant control on the solid Earth response, and it is reasonable to ignore far-field ice sheet changes, ocean loads, or true polar wander. If this is the case, then calculating the gravitational and deformational response simply requires a single convolution calculation (convolving precomputed Green's functions with a given load history). They show that viscoelastic calculations using this approach differ by only a few percent compared to global self-consistent sea level models, and this small difference is dominated by rotation. Such a simplified approach can easily be adopted by ice sheet modelers to include gravitational and deformational feedbacks in dynamic ice sheet simulations and provides a computationally effective method for high resolution simulations. The authors have published a previous paper that provides a large suite of precomputed Green's functions for different Earth models, so ice sheet modelers have a range of 1D Earth structures to select from, and may even be able to better represent uncertainty on Earth structure by performing simulations with many different 1D Earth models.

There are limits to the proposed approach: it is not appropriate for thinking about global feedbacks or long-term stability of ice sheets in response to glacial isostatic adjustment. We would guess that on the millennial timescale (modeling for more than 1000 years), it will be important to include global ice sheets (global sea level change and far field effects), ocean loads, and rotation in order to match the global self-consistent sea level model. This approach also ignores 3D Earth structure heterogeneity, an important point to mention for a paper focused on Antarctica, where lateral heterogeneities can significantly alter glacial isostatic adjustment predictions (e.g. Lucas et al, Cryosphere, 2025) Below we list a few suggestions for strengthening the manuscript:

[Thank you for a positive evaluation of our manuscript. The paper was written with the sole purpose of facilitating standalone ice sheet models to capture \*leading-order\* solid Earth](#)

feedback on the *centennial* timescale with *relative* ease. Kindly see our introductory response to the first reviewer (pages 1-2 of this document) for explanation.

Any simplified methods come with limitations. The proposed method cannot capture self-consistency in GRD (gravity, rotation, deformation) processes, nor does it satisfy mass conservation in ice and ocean domains. For centennial-scale simulations of a realistic ice sheet, as shown in Figures 3-5 for Antarctica, these processes appear to be less important, as the overall effect of ocean load is much smaller than the direct effect of ice load. Consequently, the effect of farfield ice melting or coastline migration -- which primarily affects the ice sheet via a modulation of the ocean load -- is also expected to be of second-order importance on the timescale of interest. We acknowledge that long-term simulations (e.g., glacial cycles) require capturing all these features, for which there is no alternative to solving the sea-level equation.

The Antarctic mantle exhibits significant lateral heterogeneity (see [Lvins et al., 2023](#), for example). And its impact on solid Earth/sea level feedback to ice sheet dynamics is expected to be much larger than that of ocean load. Indeed, [Gomez et al. \(2024\)](#) show that the effect may be about (eyeballing their Figure 3) up to 10-15% of the 1D self-consistent GRD solution. Like any 1-D GIA models, the proposed method -- rooted in Green's function representation of the radially stratified solid Earth response -- has inherent deficiencies in capturing the effect of lateral mantle heterogeneity. (However, it is important to note that uncertainty in ice sheet processes, MICE vs MISI, leads to far greater discrepancy in sea level projection than the contribution from solid Earth feedback, let alone that of lateral mantle heterogeneity (see Figure 3 of the Gomez paper). In other words, given the large uncertainty in ice sheet models, capturing leading-order solid Earth feedback should be of primary focus than getting the solution right by accounting for additional 3D effects. This does not mean discouraging users from using the 3D Earth model that accounts for self-consistent GRD solutions; every effort should be made in this regard assuming expertise and resources are available.)

We propose to convey these points by clearly articulating the scope and limitations of the proposed method in the introductory paragraphs and the abstract. We will move up and blend the existing related text (e.g., lines 155-164; 185-190). Additionally, we will revise the title to enhance transparency further [underlined words are new additions]:

“Enable ice sheet models to capture centennial-scale solid Earth feedback with relative ease and sufficient accuracy.”

1) More specific context for readers on WAIS-earth structure:

We recommend providing additional information in the manuscript about regional variability in West Antarctic Earth structure. While the authors state in the paper that

these two Earth models represent laterally averaged Earth structure in West and East Antarctica, respectively, it would be more accurate to say the Earth model selected to represent WAIS specifically represents coastal West Antarctica, specifically the Amundsen Sea Embayment sector, and not laterally averaged Earth structure across the entire WAIS. The authors justify their choice of both WAIS-earth and EAIS-earth models by referencing the Lloyd et al. (2020) and Ivins et al. (2023b) studies in Lines 84-84; however, neither of these studies suggest an average lithospheric thickness of 50 km across West Antarctica. Lloyd et al. (2020) does not quantitatively discuss lithospheric thickness in Antarctica. Instead, we suggest referring to the lithospheric thickness estimates from Wiens et al. (2023) and Brown & Fischer et al. (2025). These studies find 60-100 km lithosphere across West Antarctica, suggesting the choice of a 50 km lithosphere as a laterally-averaged value is not consistent with seismic constraints for West Antarctica.

We are happy with the choice to include the Earth model selected to compare against the EAIS-earth model (we don't see a need to change all of the figures or results), as long as the authors specify that this Earth model represents an end member rather than an average value for the WAIS, and that this earth structure is likely representative of specific regions (e.g. Amundsen Sea Embayment). We suggest citing studies that justify this Earth model for these specific regions in coastal West Antarctica, since such an Earth model (50 km lithosphere and  $10^{19}$  Pa s upper mantle) is certainly not appropriate for places like Weddell Sea or Ross Sea sectors. Explicitly explaining the choice of Earth model and the applicable region will be important for an audience of ice sheet modelers who need to decide which earth model is appropriate for their location of study.

Because significant ice sheet retreat is projected in the Weddell and Ross sectors over the next ~3 centuries, it will be useful to explain to readers that these are regions where there is lithosphere >50 km and upper mantle viscosities  $>10^{19}$  Pa s. Accurately capturing the solid Earth and sea level response to ice mass loss in these sectors will therefore require an Earth model different from that adopted here.

We agree that a 50 km lithosphere thickness is not representative of the entire WAIS. We will make the necessary corrections to the manuscript, clarifying that this earth structure likely represents an end-member scenario and is perhaps applied to the Amundsen Sea Sector. Additionally citing [Wiens et al. \(2023\)](#) and [Brown & Fischer et al. \(2025\)](#), we will state that this structure (50 km &  $10^{19}$  Pa s) does not represent other important regions of WAIS, such as the Weddell or Ross Sea sectors, and recommend that more appropriate earth structure be chosen to capture more realistic ice/Earth

interactions in these regions. We will expand on this with a dedicated section, “Solid Earth Models,” in the revised manuscript. See our response following the next comment.

We will also clarify in the revised manuscript that these figures (Figures 2 & 4) aim to demonstrate the method’s performance across diverse scenarios, rather than to provide accurate computations of Antarctic solid-Earth response signals.

Given these comments, we believe the manuscript would be strengthened by adding a paragraph that discusses the best choice of Earth models to use for different parts of Antarctica. Such additional text will be especially useful for a paper geared towards the ice sheet modeling community, as readers will want to know that there is not a single Earth models they should use to represent West Antarctica. These users should be aware that such a thin lithosphere and low viscosity upper mantle represents one of the Earth structure end members in West Antarctica. We think this would broaden adoption of the proposed method to explain more clearly how ice sheet modelers can select from this large suite of 1D Earth models.

Thank you for this insightful comment. As the main goal of the proposed method is to enable coupled ice/Earth simulations, it is indeed important to guide end users (i.e., ice sheet modelers) in selecting appropriate Earth structures for their applications (e.g., Antarctic basins or Greenland). We also note that, in addition to its applications to modern ice sheets, the method can be applied to centennial-scale simulations of paleo ice sheets or used to deepen process understanding through synthetic experiments.

We will dedicate a section, titled “Solid Earth Models”, to expand on the topic, including the following details. [We will also include a table, listing our recommended values of lithosphere thickness and upper mantle viscosity for Greenland and Antarctic regions.]

Estimates of mantle viscosity and lithospheric thickness became possible after the GNSS uplift trends from the POLNET project became available in the early 2010s. However, there is ambiguity in the estimations caused by uncertainty in the load history (e.g., Whitehouse, 2018). In cases where we have reliable estimates of ice loading and unloading chronology, some coherent bounds on upper mantle viscosity,  $\eta_{\text{est.}}$ , have emerged. There is, nonetheless, generally an uncertainty of about  $\log_{10} \eta_{\text{est.}} = \log_{10} \eta_{\text{nom.}} \pm 0.5$ . For situations wherein either the slowness of regional seismic waves or the youthful (Neogene) tectonics dictate the examination of a quite low viscosity upper mantle ( $17.5 \leq \log_{10} \eta_{\text{nom.}} \leq 19.5$ ), solutions become hypersensitive to the decadal to centennial load history. This is a situation precisely where the method advocated in this paper may be very useful.

Table 6 of Ivins et al. (2023) gives a comprehensive region-by-region set of estimates for Antarctic upper mantle viscosity based upon both GIA-modeled and uplift rates measured on bedrock and scaling of seismic tomography models. These estimates tend to be dominated by coastal regions, as these are where GNSS stations may be located on bedrock, or where deformation and changes in gravitation caused by deglaciation from Last Glacial Maximum are recorded in relative sea-level data. Large gaps exist across vast regions of East Antarctica. Estimates for Drönning Maud Land come from GIA modeling of vertical motions on bedrock in a network (8-14°E, 71-72°S) with model lithospheric thickness of 100 km and upper mantle viscosity of  $\eta_{\text{est.}} = 10^{21}$  Pa s (Scheinert et al. 2006). Further to the east, near Prince Harald Coast, recently modeled uplift data by Okuno et al (2025) find that  $\eta_{\text{est.}} = 0.5 - 0.7 \times 10^{21}$  Pa s and lithospheric thickness 50-70 km. In the Wilkes and Aurora Subglacial Basins in East Antarctica, Hansen and Emry (2025) recently reported a relatively thin lithosphere (~100 km) and a soft mantle with low viscosity ( $\sim 10^{18}$  Pa s), although these estimates are yet to be corroborated with GIA models and GNSS data.

Analysis of Greenland GNSS data hints at the presence of transient rheology (Paxman et al., 2023) and supports a centennial-scale 1D mantle viscosity of order  $5 \times 10^{19}$  pa s (Adhikari et al., 2021; Lewright et al., 2026) and 60-80 km lithosphere thickness. A significant 3D effect is localized along the Icelandic hotspot track, having an order-of-magnitude smaller viscosity in the asthenosphere (Khan et al., 2016).

#### References [not listed in the original manuscript]:

Adhikari, S., Milne, G. A., Caron, L., Khan, S. A., Kjeldsen, K. K., Nilsson, J., et al. (2021). Decadal to centennial timescale mantle viscosity inferred from modern crustal uplift rates in Greenland. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 48, e2021GL094040.

Hansen, S.E., Emry, E.L. East Antarctic tectonic basin structure and its implications for ice-sheet modeling and sea-level projections. *Commun Earth Environ* 6, 138 (2025).

Shfaqat A. Khan *et al.*, Geodetic measurements reveal similarities between post–Last Glacial Maximum and present-day mass loss from the Greenland ice sheet. *Sci. Adv.* **2**, e1600931(2016)

Lewright, L., Austermann, J., Piecuch, C.G. et al. Projections of 21st-century sea-level fall along coastal Greenland. *Nat Commun* 17, 353 (2026).

Okuno J, Hattori A, Doi K, Aoyama Y, Fukuda Y. (2025) Mid Holocene rapid thinning and rethickening of the East Antarctic ice sheet suggested by glacial isostatic adjustment. *Sci Rep.* 15(1):40207. doi:10.1038/s41598-025-24176-4

Paxman, G. J., Lau, H. C., Austermann, J., Holtzman, B. K. & Havlin, C. Inference of the timescale-dependent apparent viscosity structure in the upper mantle beneath greenland. *AGU Adv.* **4**, e2022AV000751 (2023)

Scheinert, M., Ivins, E., Dietrich, R., Rülke, A. (2006). Vertical Crustal Deformation in Dronning Maud Land, Antarctica: Observation versus Model Prediction. In: Fütterer, D.K., Damaske, D., Kleinschmidt, G., Miller, H., Tessensohn, F. (eds) *Antarctica*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. [https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-32934-X\\_44](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-32934-X_44)

Whitehouse, P. L. (2018) Glacial isostatic adjustment modelling: historical perspectives, recent advances, and future directions, *Earth Surf. Dynam.*, **6**, 401–429

2) More discussion of the appropriate use of this methodology:

It would be helpful for the authors to include more discussion about the appropriate use (and limitations) of the proposed methods in the discussion/conclusions section. For example, even though the authors present two different Earth models for Antarctica, the proposed method ultimately requires a single 1-D Earth structure, which is not realistic across all of Antarctica. The authors need to mention this point to better situate their proposed method with respect to other methods. You might include reference to other efforts aiming to approximate bedrock deformation assuming laterally heterogeneity (i.e., van Calcar et al., in review: “Approximating ice sheet – bedrock interactions in Antarctic ice sheet projections”). It will also be useful to explicitly state the appropriate timescales and questions that this method targets. For example, adding a sentence or two that describes the potential uses of this methodology and also notes its limitations (multi millennial timescales etc.). While there is a sentence in the text that mentions long-term stability and global feedbacks, it should be explicitly stated somewhere what timescale limitations there might be using this method. Explain when it will be important to include rotation, ocean loads, and far-field effects. Describing the appropriate uses of this methodology will also be useful to emphasize in the abstract and introduction - and if the authors really wanted to look in detail they might provide information in the supplement showing at what timescale there is no longer a good fit between this methodology and that of a globally self-consistent model.

We believe that this comment has been fully addressed above. Kindly see our responses to the first reviewer (pages 1-2 of this document) and to your introductory comment (pages 9-10 of this document).

Briefly, we will provide a clear description of the scope and limitations of the proposed method in Introductory paragraphs and in the Abstract. We will also tweak the manuscript's title to enhance transparency further.

Line by line comments:

- Abstract: Need to specify somewhere in the abstract that the proposed approach assumes 1-D / laterally homogeneous Earth structure.

Agreed. We will make necessary changes.

- Line 64: the dashes in this line are slightly confusing, may be good to phrase this without the dashes.

Ok. We will make necessary changes.

- Line 81: can you define mean sea level here rather than referencing a paper. MSL is referring to sea surface height, is that correct? It is a little confusing to have GMSL and MSL in the same paper, it might be less confusing to use a different acronym.

MSL refers to the time-mean of sea surface height, intended to remove high-frequency tidal and wave effects (Gregory et al., 2019). In the present context, however, there is no significance of [time-] mean in MSL. So, we propose to use "absolute sea level (ASL)" rather than MSL in the revised manuscript.

- Similarly S is a confusing symbol for the geoid when G is usually used in papers on the sea level equation, we suggest changing  $G_x$  to  $G_{Fx}$  and making G the geoid variable, this would be simpler for the sea level community to follow given what past variable names have been used for

Ok. We will revise it accordingly.

- Rather than explaining the variables in the text, it would be useful to include a table with all the variable names as an easy reference for the reader

Sure thing. We will include a table listing all variables and their definitions.

- Line 108: I think of Kendall et al. 2005 as a standard reference for the sea-level equation, might consider including

Agreed. We will include the citation.

- Line 171: Consider adding additional references that explore coupling GIA and grounding line predictions at high resolution: Kodama, et al. "Impact of glacial isostatic adjustment on zones of potential grounding line stability in the Ross Sea Embayment (Antarctica) since the Last Glacial Maximum." *EGUsphere* 2024 (2024): 1-25., Wan, Jeannette Xiu Wen, et al. "Resolving glacial isostatic adjustment (GIA) in response to modern and future ice loss at marine grounding lines in West Antarc5ca." *The Cryosphere* 16.6 (2022): 2203-2223.

We will happily cite these articles. Thank you for bringing this to our attention.

## Figures

- Figure 1c: In the caption, it would be useful to specify that this figure represents an ice load that is shrinking through time to make the figure easier for the reader to interpret.

We will make that explicit in the revised caption.

- Figure 2: why is unit in meter per kilogram?

Figure 2 shows the solid Earth's response to a point load, which is dimensionalized by a factor introduced on line 215 (Appendix A). The noted units imply meters of vertical land motion or geoid change induced by a kilogram of point mass.

- Given the importance of the WAIS-earth and EAIS-earth models to the entire manuscript, please move (or at least repeat) the description of the WAIS-earth and EAIS-earth models to the main text instead of putting this description in the caption of Figure 2.

As noted on pages 12-14 of this document, we will include a new section, "Solid Earth Models," in the revised manuscript. In this section, we will provide a detailed description of the two models considered as examples and our recommended Earth parameters for Greenland and several regions in Antarctica. We will also revise the figure caption accordingly.

- Figure 3c: We suggest showing a global map instead of just the northern hemisphere. It is somewhat confusing to only see a portion of the northern hemisphere. A global map would help the readers better understand what is happening in Antarctica.

We will combine panels b and c to plot a single RSL map, showcasing the global ocean load driven by ice-mass change shown in panel a.

- Figure 4: It would be informative to include cumulative mean sea level changes in Figure 4, similar to how figures of mean sea level are included alongside vertical land motion in Figure 3. Plots of mean sea level in Figure 4 would be relevant to the points made in the discussion section, comparing the self-consistent model to the proposed method.

Sure thing. We will add extra panels to this figure, as suggested.

- Method accuracy for viscoelastic Earth models is only compared for 2300 in Fig. 4. It would be useful to ice sheet modelers to see other time steps comparing method accuracy, i.e., 2150. Such a figure could be included in the supplement perhaps.

Good suggestion. We will add a new figure in the Appendix for 2150.