

A State-Space Model for Monitoring Greenland Ice Sheet Surface Elevation Change from CryoSat-2

Natalia H. Andersen¹, Sebastian B. Simonsen¹, Karina Nielsen¹, Mai Winstруп¹, Baptiste Vandecrux², Hui Gao³, Beata Csatho³, Anton Schenk³, and Louise Sandberg Sørensen¹

¹DTU Space, Elektrovej 328, 2800 Kgs Lyngby, Denmark

²Geological Survey of Denmark and Greenland, Department of Glaciology and Climate, Øster Voldgade 10, 1350 Copenhagen K, Denmark

³Department of Earth Sciences, University at Buffalo, 413 Hochstetter Hall, Buffalo NY 14260, United States

Correspondence: Natalia H. Andersen (Naand@dtu.dk)

Abstract. Monitoring surface elevation change of the Greenland Ice Sheet at monthly resolution is important for resolving both seasonal variability and long-term trends, yet irregular sampling and data gaps in satellite altimetry make the reconstruction of consistent spatio-temporal records challenging. We present a data-driven State Space Model (SSM) framework, the Three-Dimensional Elevation Change Model (3D-ECM), for deriving monthly surface elevation changes of the Greenland Ice Sheet from CryoSat-2 radar altimetry data. Unlike approaches with pre-defined seasonal models, seasonality here emerges directly from the data, enabling the detection of seasonal cycles ~~-, and~~ long-term trends, ~~and abrupt changes~~. The method combines a Gaussian Markov Random Field for spatial dependence with an autoregressive process for temporal correlations, allowing robust signal extraction even in regions with sparse or irregular sampling. With this framework, we derive monthly surface elevation changes for the Greenland ~~ice-sheet~~ Ice Sheet in 5 km resolution over the period 2011-2025.

Validation against independent datasets shows strong agreement: ~~correlations~~ Pearson correlation coefficients between our surface elevation change (dSEC) and surface elevation records from Automatic Weather Stations (AWS) range from 0.58 to ~~0.75, with the highest agreement at the AWS station named KAN_M, 0.7,~~ while comparisons with time series derived from a fusion between laser altimetry-based data and a firm densification model yield r values up to 0.76. Additional comparisons with ICESat-2 and NASA Operation IceBridge airborne data confirm that the applied spatio-temporal ~~smoothing~~ post-processing of the dSEC ~~reduces fields~~ reduces the standard deviation by approximately 40–45% while maintaining minimal bias. Furthermore, intercomparison with two published SEC products demonstrates that dSEC achieves lower misfit relative to ICESat-2 ATL15, indicating improved agreement with independent laser altimetry.

The resulting ~~dSEC-dataset provides high-resolution, temporally consistent elevation change records that capture monthly~~ surface elevation change data set (dsec) captures both seasonal variability and long-term trends ~~of across~~ the Greenland Ice Sheet. The flexible and fully data-driven 3D-ECM framework is directly transferable to other altimetry missions and multi-sensor records, offering a pathway toward continuous, long-term monitoring of ice-sheet elevation change across satellite generations.

1 Introduction

The Arctic has been warming at up to four times the global average since 1979 (Rantanen et al., 2022; Chylek et al., 2022; Sweeney et al., 2023). This rapid atmospheric warming has accelerated the mass loss from the Greenland Ice Sheet (GrIS) over the last decades (Khan et al., 2022; Løkkegaard et al., 2024), ~~making it a significant contributor~~ contributing to global sea-level rise (~~Moon et al., 2018; Mouginot et al., 2019; Box et al., 2022; Khan et al., 2022~~) (Moon et al., 2018; Mouginot et al., 2019; Box et al., 2022). Rising sea levels will impact coastal communities worldwide in the coming decades (Bamber et al., 2010; Gardner et al., 2013; Forsberg et al., 2017; Otosaka et al., 2023).

Accurate and timely data on ice sheet dynamics are therefore essential for understanding the processes driving mass loss and refining projections of future sea-level rise (Williams et al., 2021). Satellite radar altimetry has emerged as a powerful technique for monitoring ice sheet Surface Elevation Change (SEC), which, under certain assumptions, can be converted into estimates of ice sheet mass loss and sea-level contribution (Simonsen et al., 2021). ESA’s CryoSat-2, carrying the SAR Interferometric Radar Altimeter (SIRAL) (Wingham et al., 2006), was specifically designed to measure SEC in ice-covered regions, regardless of cloud cover or solar illumination, making it particularly valuable for the polar regions. With more than a decade of continuous observations, CryoSat-2 provides an unprecedented record for assessing both long-term trends and shorter-term variability in GrIS SEC (Lai and Wang, 2022; Ravinder et al., 2024).

Capturing seasonal fluctuations and short-term events, such as glacier calving or enhanced meltwater runoff, requires a higher temporal resolution than the ~~annual SEC products traditionally~~ traditional SEC products derived from radar altimetry (Simonsen et al., 2017; Sørensen et al., 2018). Conventional approaches, such as the plane-fit algorithm (Simonsen et al., 2017; Sørensen et al., 2018), ~~extract constructs annual SEC by extracting~~ a mean SEC over a multi-year period, but this limits their ability to resolve seasonal fluctuations and short-term events. As a result, much of the seasonal signal and many episodic anomalies remain hidden in aggregated annual products. To address this, new processing methods have been developed to derive monthly SEC from radar altimetry (Lai and Wang, 2022; Zhang et al., 2022; Ravinder et al., 2024; Nilsson et al., 2024; Khan et al., 2025) (Lai and Wang, 2022; Zhang et al., 2022; Ravinder et al., 2024; Nilsson et al., 2024; Helm et al., 2024; Khan et al., 2025). These efforts mark a major step forward as they provide a finer temporal detail, which enables ~~a better integration more direct comparison and joint analysis~~ with regional climate ~~models model outputs~~ and in situ observations.

Recent studies have demonstrated advances in deriving monthly SEC products from altimetry (Zhang et al., 2022; Khan et al., 2025). Different methodological choices are made regarding spatio-temporal regularization and uncertainty treatment. Quantitative comparison against independent laser altimetry, together with inter-comparison against published SEC products, therefore provides a valuable way to place new developments in context. In this study, we evaluate the performance of our state-space framework relative to published SEC products and inter-compare against ICESat-2 ATL15, Operation IceBridge, AWS stations and Surface Elevation Reconstruction And Change detection (SERAC) timeseries.

Here, we ~~propose the integration of~~ address the spatio-temporal reconstruction step of radar altimetry processing by introducing a state space modeling framework that reconstructs monthly gridded SEC fields directly from irregular satellite observations. We integrate state-space models (SSMs) with radar altimetry ~~to be a promising avenue to detect subtle patterns in surface~~

~~elevation changes that may be overlooked by existing methods~~as a statistical framework to reconstruct spatially and temporally coherent SEC fields from irregular observations, while accounting for measurement uncertainty and spatio-temporal dependence.

SSMs have already demonstrated their potential in related Earth Observation applications, for example, in deriving temporally
60 densified water level time series for a river based on multi-mission satellite altimetry (Nielsen et al., 2022). This flexible and
data-driven SSM framework can be applied across satellite altimetry missions to generate continuous, gap-filled SEC time
series, with seasonal signals emerging directly from the data rather than from predefined models such as in previous studies by
e.g. Sørensen et al. (2018) or Khan et al. (2025). In addition, SSMs explicitly separate signal from noise, and are able to handle
irregular or missing data, and may provide coherent uncertainty estimates while accounting for spatial and temporal depen-
65 dencies (Kristensen et al., 2016). Extending this methodology to ice sheets provides a powerful means to generate continuous,
gap-filled time series of SEC across a range of spatial and temporal scales, independent of the specific satellite mission.

In this study, we develop our model 3D-ECM to derive monthly surface elevation change (dSEC) over the entire Greenland
Ice Sheet from CryoSat-2 radar altimetry data, where the prefix “d” denotes that the model can be configured to any desired
temporal resolution; here it is applied at monthly intervals. The derived dataset contains monthly ~~surface-elevation-change~~SEC
70 estimates that reflect both ~~multi-year~~multi year trends and intra-annual variations derived from the ~~state-space model~~SSM.

2 Data sets

The construction of the dSEC data product is based on CryoSat-2 Level-2 altimetry data and is validated against independent
datasets from ICESat-2, Operation IceBridge (OIB), Automatic Weather Stations (AWS), and laser altimetry-based SERAC
(~~Surface Elevation Reconstruction And Change detection~~) time series fusion, incorporating firn height change estimation.

75 2.1 ~~Cryosat-2~~CryoSat-2 data

CryoSat-2 is a radar altimetry satellite mission developed by the European Space Agency (ESA) to monitor changes in the
cryosphere. The SIRAL radar onboard CryoSat-2 operates at Ku band (13.5 GHz). Over the ice sheet margins, it leverages
its two antennas to provide synthetic aperture radar interferometric (SARIn) mode, while it only collects single-pulse, nadir-
looking data in low-resolution mode (LRM) over the ice sheet interior (~~Bouzinac, 2022~~)(Bouzinac, 2019).

80 In this study, we use Point Of Closest Approach (POCA) elevations available from CryoSat-2 Level-2 SARIn and LRM
data products from baseline E (~~Bouzinac, 2022~~)(Bouzinac, 2019) as the primary input for estimating monthly dSEC over the
Greenland Ice Sheet. POCA elevations theoretically represent the point on the ground closest to the radar beam direction, where
the strongest radar return is assumed to originate. The Level-2 data include geophysical corrections such as ionospheric delay,
wet and dry tropospheric path delays, solid Earth and ocean tides, and surface scattering corrections. In LRM mode, the SIRAL
85 pulse-limited footprint covers approximately 2.15 km², with an effective diameter of about 1.65 km. In SAR/SARIn mode, the
across-track pulse-limited footprint is similarly 1.65 km, while the along-track beam-limited footprint is approximately 305
m (yielding an effective along-track resolution of 400 m), resulting in a total Doppler-limited illuminated area of 0.5 km²
(~~Bouzinac, 2022~~)(Bouzinac, 2019).

2.2 ICESat-2 validation data

90 To validate the dSEC derived from CryoSat-2, we use data from NASA’s ICESat-2 mission, which provides high-resolution laser altimetry observations over the GrIS. Specifically, we use the ATL15 gridded SEC product (Smith et al., 2022) ~~,-which-is derived from the annual ATL11 height product~~provided at 1 km spatial resolution. For consistency with the CryoSat-2 dSEC product, the ATL15 data were regridded by averaging to a common 5 km grid prior to the comparison.

We use ATL15 lag-8 data, which correspond to 24-month SEC estimates centered around each observation month. This
95 lag setting provides a balance between temporal resolution and spatial coverage, allowing a meaningful comparison of the long-term trend with our monthly gridded dSEC product derived from CryoSat-2.

2.3 Operation IceBridge Validation Data

To complement the satellite dataset, we also validate against data from NASA’s OIB mission, which provides airborne laser altimetry measurements over the polar regions from 2009 to 2019 (Studinger et al. , 2014). OIB was designed to bridge the
100 observational gap between the ICESat and ICESat-2 missions, providing detailed measurements of ice sheet topography with high spatial resolution and accuracy.

Here, we use OIB Level-4 ~~gridded SEC products, which are SEC data~~ derived from repeated airborne laser altimetry tracks (Studinger et al. , 2014). ~~These datasets give SEC estimates computed over selected multi-year intervals and are provided on a spatial grid~~The irregular OIB observations are spatially aggregated to the 5 km CryoSat-2 grid using a median binning
105 approach, requiring at least 10 observations per grid cell.

We use data from the OIB campaigns between 2011 and 2016 over the Greenland Ice Sheet, focusing on regions that spatially overlap with our CryoSat-2 dSEC coverage.

2.4 Seasonal surface height change from accumulation and ablation at Automatic Weather Stations

The seasonal amplitudes in our dSEC product are evaluated with data from the Programme for Monitoring of the Greenland Ice
110 Sheet (PROMICE) (Ahlstrøm et al., 2008) and the Greenland Climate Network (GC-Net) AWS (Fausto et al., 2021; Vandecrux et al., 2024). AWS sites are divided between accumulation sites, where snow accumulated in winter does not melt away in the summer, and ablation sites, where the winter snow melts away and is followed by melting of the glacial ice. ~~At accumulation sites, the AWS cannot capture the surface height change stemming from firm compaction below the station’s anchoring depth.~~

A near-continuous record of surface height relative to the AWS’s installation height is derived by merging data from multiple
115 instruments (Vandecrux et al., 2024) (variable: z_surf_combined). At ablation sites, it combines data from a station-mounted sonic ranger, a stake-mounted sonic ranger, and a borehole pressure transducer. During ablation periods, the pressure transducer (or, if failing, the stake-mounted sonic ranger) defines surface height, while winter values are based on the adjusted average of both sonic ranger heights. The record is manually corrected for shifts that may occur during maintenance.

These AWS surface heights are not absolute heights, as they are referenced to the installation height and hence only rep-
120 resent the accumulation and ablation that occur at the ice sheet surface. At accumulation sites, the AWS does not capture

the surface height change stemming from firn compaction below the station's anchoring depth. They do not include bedrock-related motion, which contributes 1-2 cm uplift every year (Liu et al., 2017) , nor thinning or thickening of the ice below, which may contribute to surface height changes of the same order of magnitude as changes caused by surface melt (Bevan et al., 2015; Kehrl et al., 2017). Yet, in the absence of Greenland-wide, temporally resolved maps of thinning/thickening due to ice dynamics, the AWS-derived surface heights provide a lower bound to the summertime thinning and to the wintertime thickening.

We use AWS data from the melt periods to evaluate the seasonal amplitude in the dSEC data product at the following three locations: Stations KAN_M and JAR (West Greenland), and KPC_U (North Greenland) (See Figure 1 and ~~in~~ Table 1). These stations were selected because they are located away from the edges of the dSEC grid, ensuring a more reliable comparison with the dSEC data product.

2.5 ~~Surface elevation change~~SEC time series from laser altimetry-based SERAC and SERAC-FDM fusion

To further evaluate the seasonal amplitude of the dSEC data product, we compare it with the SERAC elevation change time series (Schenk and Csatho , 2012; Csatho et al., 2014; Schenk et al., 2014). SERAC provides localized, high-temporal-resolution elevation-change time series that complement the ATL15 and OIB validations by enabling assessment of seasonal and short-term variability. The SERAC time series are constructed for the locations of the three AWS stations (Table 1).

Table 1. Coordinates of the ~~four~~ AWS stations and their corresponding SERAC sites.

Station	AWS		SERAC ID	SERAC	
	Lon (°E)	Lat (°N)		Lon (°E)	Lat (°N)
KAN_M	-48.816526	67.065729	3001210	-48.991299	66.982621
JAR	-49.682014	69.498584	6002099	-49.699051	69.391009
KPC_U	-25.170450	79.833907	28000270	-26.024806	79.792897

The SERAC timeseries is constructed based on a 10-day ~~surface elevation change~~SEC time series derived from fusing laser altimetry-based ~~surface elevation change~~SEC time series with firn height change estimations. First the irregularly sampled ~~surface elevation change~~SEC time series are reconstructed using the SERAC method. The SERAC time series is based on data from all NASA’s airborne and satellite laser altimetry missions and includes observations from the Airborne Topographic Mapping system (ATM), the Land, Vegetation, and Ice Sensor (LVIS) airborne sensors (MacGregor et al., 2021), the Ice Cloud and land Elevation (ICESat, Zwally et al., 2002) and ICESat-2 satellites (Markus et al., 2017). SERAC reconstructs the time series of ~~surface elevation change~~SEC by simultaneously fitting 1 km² polynomial surface patches and modeling the elevation change at their centroids using all the laser altimetry measurements within the surface patches. The locations of the time series are primarily determined by ICESat ground track crossovers and ICESat’s overlaps with ATM or LVIS to obtain long-term elevation change. Over the Greenland Ice Sheet, SERAC provides over 54,000 time series with irregular temporal sampling determined by the spatiotemporal distribution of the laser altimetry data.

The 10-day resolution ~~surface elevation change time series~~ SEC time series that we use for validation is calculated as follows. We removed the Glacial Isostatic Adjustment (GIA) uplift rate (Adhikari et al., 2021; Milne et al., 2018) and firn height change from the SERAC ~~surface elevation change~~ SEC time series using the nearest neighbor in space and time to determine the ice thickness change due to ice dynamics. Firn height change, which represents the ~~surface elevation change~~ SEC due to all surface processes, such as precipitation, melt, and firn compaction, is modeled by the Firn Densification Models (FDMs). We use the FDM: ~~GEMBy1.0~~ Glacier Energy and Mass Balance firn model (GEMB) (Gardner et al., 2023). We estimated the 10-day high temporal resolution time series from the relatively smooth discrete dynamic thickness change time series using the Approximation by Localized Penalized Spline (ALPS) method (Shekhar et al., 2021). By combining the interpolated dynamic thickness change time series with the GIA correction and firn height change estimations, we derived high-temporal-resolution ~~surface elevation change~~ SEC time series at the location of the SERAC time series (~~Shekhar et al., 2021~~) based on the method by Shekhar et al. (2021).

The seasonal elevation changes in this SERAC-FDM fusion product are well constrained by laser altimetry measurements when sampled seasonally. However, during years with few or no laser altimetry measurements, the seasonal signal is primarily determined by firn height change estimations from FDMs. In this case, seasonality can vary depending on the FDMs selected, and seasonal ice thickness changes due to, e.g., ice dynamics in tidewater glaciers may be missed.

3 State-Space Model

To model the ice surface elevation as a function of time and space, we employ our model 3D-ECM, a data-driven ~~State-Space Model (SSM)~~ SSM designed to estimate monthly elevation change fields. We define a target grid of 5 km resolution ~~in a polar stereographic projection (EPSG:3413) covering the Greenland Ice Sheet~~. CryoSat-2 POCA ice surface elevations are extracted using the GrIS ice mask from ~~Rignot et al. (2012)~~ (IMBIE Team, 2020), and use elevations relative to the ArcticDEM Mosaic V 4.1 (Porter et al., 2023). The model thus estimates anomalies relative to this DEM rather than absolute surface heights.

~~The availability of the~~ Because CryoSat-2 POCA elevation anomalies ~~varies in both~~ are irregular in space and time, ~~highlighting the need for an approach that accounts for both~~ we adopt a framework that jointly models spatial and temporal correlations to reconstruct ~~a field of ice surface elevation anomalies in a novel and efficient way~~ coherent surface elevation anomaly fields. This is done via a state-space approach, in which the evolution of surface height in space and time is represented as a set of hidden states that are indirectly observed through noisy satellite elevation measurements. In this framework, the hidden states correspond to the true, but unobservable, surface height anomalies on a regular grid. The observations are the CryoSat-2 Level-2 POCA elevation anomalies relative to ArcticDEM. By linking the hidden and observed components through probabilistic relationships, a State-space model provides a statistical framework that separates measurement noise from true elevation changes.

The large amount of satellite data requires a computationally efficient approach to reconstruct the spatial-temporal field of surface elevation anomalies H^{true} . To do this, we apply a Gaussian Markov Random Field (GMRF) (Rue and Held (2005)). A GMRF is a multivariate Gaussian random field in which the probability of each location is conditionally dependent only on

180 its neighbors, leading to a sparse representation of the precision (inverse covariance) matrix. This is computationally efficient compared to a Gaussian Process (GP) model, in which each location is correlated with every other through a dense covariance matrix that requires costly matrix inversion. Instead, sparsity in the GMRF allows operations to scale almost linearly with the number of grid cells, whereas GP models typically scale cubically with data size. [The use of Gaussian Markov Random Fields for spatial modelling follows established geostatistical approaches for representing spatially correlated fields while maintaining computational efficiency \(Lindgren et al., 2011\). Similar statistical frameworks have been used to reconstruct glacier elevation change from satellite observations, where spatially and temporally correlated signals must be inferred from irregularly sampled measurements \(Hugonnet et al., 2021\).](#)

To model the ice surface elevation anomalies as a function of time and space, we define a 3-dimensional regular grid. In the spatial dimension, we use a target grid with a 5 km resolution in a polar stereographic projection (EPSG:3413) covering the Greenland Ice Sheet. In the temporal dimension, a monthly resolution is selected. [The 5 km spatial resolution and monthly temporal resolution represent a compromise between resolving spatial and seasonal variability and ensuring sufficient data density for spatio-temporal reconstruction given the CryoSat-2 sampling that has a 369 day repeat cycle and a 30-day subcycle \(Bouzinac, 2019\). For computational efficiency, the model is applied to overlapping spatial tiles that are processed independently and later merged on to the 5 km grid. Minor discontinuities may therefore appear along tile boundaries, although these effects are small and do not affect the large-scale elevation change patterns.](#)

Here, we assume that an observation of ice elevation anomaly H_i^{obs} is a function of space (x, y) and time t is represented by the following expression.

$$H_i^{obs}(x, y, t) = H_i^{model}(x, y, t) + \epsilon_i(x, y, t), \quad \epsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma_{obs}^2), \quad (1)$$

where H_i^{model} is the true unobserved elevation anomaly, and ϵ_i represents the observational error, which here is assumed to be Gaussian with the standard deviation σ_{obs} . The modeled elevation anomaly is represented by a Gaussian Markov random field consisting of a spatial and temporal component with a mean and covariance given as

$$H^{model}(x, y, t) \sim N(\mu, \sigma_p^2(Q_1 \otimes Q_2)^{-1}). \quad (2)$$

Here, Q_1 and Q_2 are the precision matrices that define the neighbor structure related to the spatial and temporal parts of the GMRF. The spatial part of the precision matrix is defined as

$$205 \quad \mathbf{Q}_1 = \phi \cdot \mathbf{Q}_0 + I,$$

where ϕ is a model parameter controlling the spatial correlation, I is the identity matrix, and $\mathbf{Q}_0$ defines the neighborhood structure, which is described as

$$\mathbf{Q}_0(i, j) = \begin{cases} \text{number of neighbors of node } i, & \text{if } i = j, \\ -1, & \text{if } i \sim j, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In our framework, the neighborhood structure is built with a 4-nearest-neighbor structure (each grid cell connects to its north, south, east, and west neighbors). The notation $i \sim j$ indicates that the grid cells i and j share an edge (are directly adjacent to that 4-neighborhood). The precision matrix $\mathbf{Q}_2$ related to the autoregressive process of order 1 is defined as

$$\mathbf{Q}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\rho & & & \\ -\rho & 1 + \rho^2 & \ddots & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & \ddots & 1 + \rho^2 & -\rho \\ & & & -\rho & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

where ρ is a parameter that controls the temporal correlation assumed to be between -1 and 1 to ensure that the process is stationary. In summary, the full model parameters vector $\theta = (\sigma_{obs}, \sigma_p, \mu, \phi, \rho)$ and the hidden states H^{true} are estimated by the joint likelihood function

$$L(H^{obs}, H^{true}, \theta) = L(H^{obs}, \theta) L(H^{true})$$

As the hidden states H^{true} are unobserved, the joint likelihood cannot be calculated directly. Instead, we form the marginal likelihood function, which is only dependent on the fixed model parameters and the observation.

$$L_M(H^{obs}, \theta) = \int L(H^{obs}, H^{true}, \theta) dH^{true}.$$

The 3D model of ice elevation anomalies is implemented in the open source software R using the Template Model Builder (RTMB) (Kristensen et al., 2016). In RTMB, the marginal likelihood is derived via the Laplace approximation. In short, this is a second-order Taylor approximation of the logarithm of the function to be integrated around the optimum. In practice, this will change an integral into an optimization problem.

The GMRF captures both the spatial coherence and temporal evolution of elevation changes. This joint formulation allows efficient and realistic reconstruction of ~~surface elevation change~~ [SEC](#) over the Greenland Ice Sheet, even in areas with irregularly distributed data. RTMB also reports the model uncertainty, which is approximated via the generalized delta-method, and the variance is expressed as

$$\text{var}(\hat{H}^{true}) = H_2^{-1} + (\nabla \hat{H}^{true}(\theta))^t H_1^{-1} \nabla \hat{H}^{true}$$

Here H_2 is the block of full Hessian matrix related to the hidden states, H_1 is the Hessian matrix related to the parameters, and $\nabla \hat{H}^{true}$ are the gradients of the hidden states with respect to the ~~models-model~~ parameters θ (see e.g. Thorson and Kristensen, 2024). (Kristensen et al., 2016). The generalized delta-method approximates the uncertainty of the reconstructed field by propagating parameter uncertainty through a first-order Taylor expansion around the optimum.

To reduce ~~unrealistic-high-frequent-variability~~ residual high-frequency variability not fully captured by the statistical model and enhance the spatiotemporal coherence of the ~~surface-elevation-change-SEC~~ dataset, we ~~subsequently~~ apply a two-step postprocessing of the monthly dSEC gridded fields. ~~The trends of both the raw (pre-smoothing) and the smoothed dSEC grids will be evaluated separately in Section 4.1.1.~~ First, each monthly elevation map is smoothed with a median spatial filter with a window size of 5 grid cells to suppress small-scale noise while retaining the larger-scale elevation signals. Secondly, for temporal consistency, a Savitzky–Golay filter (Gallagher, 2020) is applied along the time axis. For the seasonal component, we use a 17-month window, which is longer than the annual cycle and therefore provides a smoothed and damped representation of the seasonal signal while removing month-scale irregularities. To extract the multi-year trend, we use a 41-month window, which effectively isolates the long-term trends of SEC. This procedure ~~effectively-efficiently~~ suppresses noise and outlier-driven seasonal spikes, while preserving the large-scale spatial patterns and long-term elevation-change signals. ~~The trends of both the raw (pre-smoothing) and the smoothed dSEC grids will be evaluated separately in Section 4.1.1. The spatial and temporal postprocessing is applied only to the dSEC values, while the~~

~~The grid-cell uncertainties come directly are first obtained from the state-space model and are not smoothed. The uncertainties therefore, represent the posterior variance estimated from the Hessian in RTMB, independent of the filtering. Spatial median filtering and temporal Savitzky–Golay smoothing reduce high-frequency noise in the dSEC fields, but they do not modify the uncertainty estimates, which remain conservative and model-based as posterior standard deviations derived from the RTMB Hessian. These uncertainties are then propagated through the full post-processing chain using a Monte Carlo approach, in which Gaussian perturbations consistent with the model estimated variance are added to the elevation fields and passed through the same spatial and temporal post-processing chain. The final uncertainty at each grid cell and epoch is computed as the standard deviation across ensemble realizations of the filtered product.~~

For regional averages of SEC (e.g., Greenland-wide, interior, and ablation-zone means shown in Figure 3), grid-cell values are combined by taking the average of the grid cell values within each region. The uncertainty of the regional mean is obtained by propagating the grid-cell uncertainties through the weighted average.

4 Results

Using the described 3D-ECM model framework, we computed the monthly ~~surface-elevation-changes-SECs~~ across the GrIS at a 5 km resolution using radar satellite data from the CryoSat-2 L2 data product. ~~Selected elevation change timeseries~~ A spatial map of average SEC from 2011–2025 produced by our 3D-ECM are presented in Figure 1. ~~The spatial map of average elevation change from 2011–2025 (Panel D in Figure 1) places these trends in context: we observe widespread thinning), with elevation change timeseries at selected locations in Figure 2. Widespread thinning is observed~~ along the margins and generally

stable or slightly thickening conditions in the [ice sheet](#) interior (in the following defined as areas above 1500 m elevation based on ArcticDEM) ~~of the ice sheet~~. The average trend in [surface elevation change SEC](#) over the entire GrIS is -0.069 ± 0.002 ~~(m/yr)~~ [m yr⁻¹](#), as illustrated in Figure 3, whereas the trend in the ablation zone (defined as areas below 1500 m elevation based on ArcticDEM) is -0.314 ± 0.009 ~~(m/yr)~~. ~~Regional uncertainties in Figure 3 were calculated by combining the~~ [m yr⁻¹](#). ~~The shaded regions in Figure 3 represent the uncertainty of the mean elevation change at each timestep, derived from the~~ grid-cell uncertainties ~~produced~~ [estimated](#) by the state-space model ~~using an area-weighted approach. For each region, the uncertainty values from all grid cells were aggregated while accounting for the size of each cell in the polar stereographic projection. Larger cells therefore contribute proportionally more to the regional estimate than smaller ones. This provides a representative regional uncertainty that reflects both the spatial distribution and the relative area of the contributing grid cells and propagated through the spatial averaging. As the time series represent elevation anomalies at each timestep rather than cumulative changes, the uncertainties do not accumulate over time.~~

To assess regional variability and temporal evolution, we extracted time series from six locations ~~(Panels A-C and E-G in Figure 1)~~ [across the Greenland Ice Sheet \(Panels A-F in Figure 2\)](#). These sites are representative of dynamically active outlet glaciers: Petermann, Nioghalvfjærdsbræ (79° N Glacier; hereafter 79N), Zachariae, Sermeq Kujalleq, and Helheim, as well as a site representative of the relatively stable interior region at Summit Station.

The time series are extracted from single grid cells, with shaded areas in Figure 1 ~~representing~~ [2 representing the uncertainty estimated from the](#) 3D-ECM ~~estimated uncertainty model~~. Derived from the smoothed CryoSat-2 dSEC product, they reveal spatially varying elevation change patterns from 2011 to 2025. The interior site at Summit shows a modest thickening trend of 0.017 ± 0.001 ~~(m/yr)~~ [m yr⁻¹](#) over the 14-year period, ~~not far from~~ [close to](#) the negligible average ~~negative~~ trend for the ~~entire~~ interior ice sheet -0.014 ± 0.002 ~~(m/yr)~~ [of m yr⁻¹](#).

All marginal sites exhibit pronounced thinning. Sermeq Kujalleq experiences the strongest thinning of -1.7 ± 0.074 ~~(m/yr)~~, ~~which is above the general~~ -1.7 ± 0.074 [m yr⁻¹](#), ~~exceeding the mean~~ trend of the ablation zone ~~trend~~ $(-0.314 \pm 0.009$ [m yr⁻¹](#)). The maximum ~~observed~~ thinning at Sermeq Kujalleq ~~occurred~~ [occurs](#) during the early part of the ~~time period from record~~ [between](#) 2011 ~~to and~~ 2018.

The CryoSat-2 Level-2 altimetry data contain a spatial data gap over the fast-flowing part of Sermeq Kujalleq, where steep topography and complex radar scattering hinder reliable surface elevation retrievals, as seen in Figure 4, which provides a detailed example for the Sermeq Kujalleq, showing dSEC for three grid cells located inside and outside the persistent data gap for CryoSat-2 data. Grid cells B and C are located within the persistent CryoSat-2 data gap, while A is situated further inland in an area with higher data density. The associated uncertainties differ among the three points, reflecting the varying data density, with higher uncertainties in areas of sparse CryoSat-2 coverage and lower uncertainties inland where data are more abundant. [Because CryoSat-2 data density in this region is relatively consistent over time pr. grid cell, and the posterior variances are propagated through the same spatial and temporal filtering as the model output, the resulting uncertainties remain relatively constant between months.](#) These time series reveal distinct seasonal cycles and interannual variability, demonstrating the ability of this approach to resolve fine-scale temporal changes in rapidly evolving glacier systems.




Figure 1. Time-series Spatial distribution of surface elevation change rate (m yr^{-1}) over the Greenland Ice Sheet for the period 2011–2025 derived from CryoSat-2 observations. Black circles indicate the locations where elevation-change time series are extracted (shown in Figure 2). Stars mark the positions of PROMICE automatic weather stations used for comparison later.





Figure 2. Time series of SEC at six selected locations across the Greenland Ice Sheet derived from the smoothed CryoSat-2 dSEC product. Panels A-C and E-G A-F show time series of dSEC for Sermeq Kujalleq, Petermann, Summit, 79N, Zachariae, and Helheim, respectively. Shaded envelopes in the time-series panels indicate model-propagated 1σ uncertainty. Panel D shows the spatial distribution of elevation change rate (m month⁻¹) over 2011-2025. The four validation sites are marked on the map with yellow stars.

The average time series of surface elevation changes across the entire GrIS (in blue), the interior (here defined as areas above 1500 meters of elevation based on ArcticDEM; in purple), and for the marginal zone (areas below 1500 meters of elevation; in red). Shaded envelopes indicate area-weighted uncertainties adjusted for spatial



correlation:

Figure 3. The average time series of SEC across the entire GrIS (in blue), the interior (here defined as areas above 1500 meters of elevation based on ArcticDEM; in purple), and for the marginal zone (areas below 1500 meters of elevation; in red). Shaded envelopes indicate propagated 3σ uncertainty.

4.1 Validation and Intercomparison

To evaluate the accuracy and reliability of the CryoSat-2 derived dSEC product over the Greenland Ice Sheet, we performed a validation using both satellite and airborne and intercomparison using satellite, airborne, in situ, and published community SEC datasets. The validation and intercomparison of the monthly dSEC product assessment is carried out in two three stages. First, the yearly trends in the dSEC product are validated against independent measurements from NASA's OIB and Operation IceBridge (OIB) and the ICESat-2 ATL15 ATL15 data product. Second, we performed an intercomparison of seasonal amplitudes with the dSEC product is quantitatively intercompared with existing published Greenland SEC products to place the results in the context of current community datasets. Third, seasonal variability is evaluated using in situ observations from AWS and elevation change Automatic Weather Stations (AWS) and elevation change estimates from the altimetry-based SERAC time series.




Figure 4. dSEC on Sermeq Kujalleq. Panels **A-C** show time series of dSEC for three selected grid cells (stars), with shaded envelopes indicating [propagated](#) model [3σ](#) uncertainty . Panel **D** shows the spatial distribution of CryoSat-2 measurements (black dots) and the corresponding dSEC dh/dt map for 2011-2025.

4.1.1 Validation of trend

To validate the long-term trend of the dSEC product, we compare our dSEC estimates against ICESat-2 ATL15 5 km [gridded](#) [surface-elevation-change-re-gridded SEC](#) data (regridded by averaging from the 1 km data product to align with the spatial resolution of the dSEC data product) and OIB airborne altimetry measurements. These independent datasets provide complementary spatial and temporal perspectives, allowing for a robust assessment of the performance of our satellite-derived dSEC product. The validation is conducted across multiple time periods, enabling us to investigate consistency and potential biases over time. We analyze both the original (raw) and post-processed (smoothed) versions of the dSEC product to assess the impact of the applied noise-reduction techniques on the agreement with reference datasets.

To evaluate the overall agreement between the dSEC product and ICESat-2 ATL15, we first considered that the ATL15 product is provided at 1 km resolution, which we regrid by averaging to a common 5 km grid to match the resolution of our CryoSat-2 dSEC grids. To ensure temporal consistency, [we choose the timesteps in our dSEC so that they align with the](#)

timesteps-of the dSEC height time series was evaluated at the same epochs as the ICESat-2 ATL15 product. Then we ATL15 product. Because ATL15 lag-8 represents 24-month elevation-change rates centered on each observation epoch, comparable 24-month dh/dt estimates were derived from the dSEC height time series centered on the same ATL15 timestamps. We then compared the distribution of ~~elevation-change~~ ~~elevation-change~~ differences (dSEC minus ICESat-2 ATL15) for both the raw and smoothed versions (~~meaning i.e.,~~ before and after the post-processing step) of the dSEC dataset (~~Figure ??~~Table 2 and Figure 5). The smoothed dSEC product displays a narrower distribution of differences than the raw version, reducing the standard deviation (STD) from 0.96 to 0.54 ~~m/yr~~ ~~m yr⁻¹~~ and the median absolute difference (MAD) from 0.24 to 0.1 ~~m/yr~~ ~~m yr⁻¹~~. On the Figure ?? ~~m yr⁻¹~~. As shown, in the Table 2 the STD of the raw versus smoothed model output was reduced by approximately 44% , and the MAD by around 56% , while the mean difference remained unchanged at 0.11 ~~m/yr~~ ~~m yr⁻¹~~. The median differences are close to zero in both cases (-0.01 ~~m/yr~~ ~~m yr⁻¹~~ for raw and -0.02 ~~m/yr~~ ~~m yr⁻¹~~ for smoothed), suggesting minimal systematic bias. Across all selected annual periods (Table 2), ~~These,~~ ~~these~~ results demonstrate that the applied spatio-temporal smoothing effectively reduces high-frequency noise while preserving the underlying elevation change signal.

Table 2. Summary statistics of the difference between dSEC and ICESat-2 ATL15 (dSEC – ATL15) for selected ~~annual-periods~~ATL15 epochs. ATL15 lag-8 provides 24-month elevation-change rates (dh/dt) centered on each observation epoch. Comparable 24-month dh/dt estimates were derived from the dSEC height time series centered on the same epochs. The ranges listed in the first column indicate the span of ATL15 midpoint epochs included in each comparison. Each ~~period-epoch~~ includes results for both original (Raw) and post-processed (Smoothed) dSEC products. All values are in ~~m/yr~~ ~~m yr⁻¹~~. The final column shows the percentage reduction in standard deviation (STD) after smoothing.

Time-Period ATL15 Epoch Range (midpoint time)	Version	Mean	Median	MAD	STD	STD Reduction (%)
Oct 2019 – Oct 2020	Raw	0.16	-0.02	0.25	1.14	–
	Smoothed	0.13	-0.02	0.10	0.63	44.7
Jan 2020 – Dec 2020	Raw	0.21	0.03	0.22	0.97	–
	Smoothed	0.18	0.03	0.10	0.56	42.3
Apr 2020 – Apr 2021	Raw	0.16	0.03	0.22	0.98	–
	Smoothed	0.19	0.03	0.10	0.57	41.8
Jul 2020 – Jul 2021	Raw	0.15	0.07	0.21	1.01	–
	Smoothed	0.12	0.01	0.09	0.54	46.5

To further assess the accuracy of the satellite-derived dSEC estimates, we also validate the data set against multiple campaigns of OIB airborne altimetry data. Figure 6 in Panel A shows a point-by-point comparison between OIB and dSEC values for the raw and smoothed dSEC data set, respectively. After smoothing, large discrepancies are reduced, and the product aligns more closely with the OIB measurements. ~~The smoothing reduces large discrepancies, resulting in a distribution that aligns more closely with the 1:1 line.~~ This improvement is also visible from panel B, where the histogram of the differences in elevation change reveals a narrower distribution for the smoothed data: the STD of the difference between dSEC and OIB SEC




Figure 5. Left: Histogram comparing the differences between the dSEC product (raw and smoothed) with the ICESat-2 ATL15 data over the GrIS. Right: Difference between the two products (smoothed dSEC - ATL15) over the overlapping ATL15 period (2018–2025).




Figure 6. Comparison of CryoSat-2-derived dSEC with OIB airborne altimetry data from 2011-2016. (A) Scatterplot comparing both the raw (blue) and spatially smoothed (red) dSEC data to OIB SEC values. The 1:1 line is shown in black. (B) Histogram of the elevation change differences (dSEC – OIB) for raw (blue) and smoothed (red) data. (C) Spatial distribution of the difference between smoothed dSEC and OIB SEC, colored by magnitude of difference (in m/yr).

Table 3. Intercomparison of CryoSat-2-based SEC products against ICESat-2 ATL15 over the common spatio-temporal domain. Metrics summarize the distribution of differences (product minus ATL15).

Product	RMSE	STD	MAD	N
dSEC (this study)	0.685	0.685	0.140	271644
Khan et al. (2025)	0.762	0.703	0.118	10382764
Zhang et al. (2022)	2.096	2.092	0.09	268740

is reduced by 50% from 0.78 m/yr-m yr^{-1} in the raw product to 0.37 m/yr-m yr^{-1} after smoothing. Panel C maps the spatial distribution of dSEC–OIB differences across the GrIS, illustrating that the largest residuals are predominantly located around the Sermeq Kujalleq Ice Stream.

The overall results confirm that the spatio-temporal filtering applied to the satellite elevation time series ensures an enhanced agreement with independent satellite and airborne validation data, particularly by reducing noise. In the following, the post-processed version of the dSEC data set will be used.

4.1.2 Validation of seasonal amplitude using AWS and SERAC dataIntercomparison with community SEC products

In this section we intercompare our dSEC product with two published, Greenland-wide SEC products, the monthly 5km grid SEC product from Zhang et al. (2022) and the smoothed monthly Greenland 5km grid SEC product of Khan et al. (2025). While this intercomparison is not an independent validation, it provides important context for how our dSEC product performs relative to other community products.

To quantify relative performance against an independent reference, we evaluate each SEC product against ICESat-2 ATL15 over the common spatio-temporal domain. All products were brought to a common 5 km grid in EPSG:3413 and restricted to the same ice mask. Furthermore, the datasets were temporally matched by selecting the nearest available time steps to the ATL15 reference epochs. We summarize the distribution of differences with commonly used metrics; the root mean square error (RMSE), STD, and MAD.

Table 3 shows that our dSEC product achieves the lowest overall misfit relative to ATL15 among the evaluated CryoSat-2-based products. In particular, dSEC exhibits lower RMSE and reduced spread of differences compared to both Khan et al. (2025) and Zhang et al. (2022). Together, these results indicate that the proposed 3D-ECM framework yields elevation-change estimates that are comparable to, and in this evaluation show improved agreement with, independent ICESat-2 laser altimetry.

4.1.3 Evaluation of seasonal variability using AWS and SERAC observations

We evaluate the seasonal amplitude of the dSEC product at three sites (Table 1) using AWS-derived daily relative surface height (Fausto et al., 2021; Vandecrux et al., 2024) and SERAC-FDM fusion (Csatho et al., 2014; Shekhar et al., 2021). By comparing the amplitude of the melt-season signal in our satellite-derived dSEC data with that from AWS time series, we are

able to assess the consistency of the dSEC product against independent measurements. The Comparisons of the dSEC and SERAC time series are shown in the upper panels of Figure 7.

To assess average short-term variability, we compute the average seasonal cycles for these three locations~~from the linearly detrended time series~~. The mean seasonal cycles ~~are constructed from the common time period between the dSEC, AWS, and altimetry-based SERAC covering the period from~~ were computed from the linearly detrended time series by grouping observations by calendar month and calculating the mean value for each month over the common period 2011to2024. The shaded envelopes represent the $\pm 1\sigma$ variability of the detrended monthly values across all years. These mean seasonal cycles are shown in the lower panels of Figure 7. Across sites, dSEC generally reproduces the phase of seasonal variability observed in both SERAC and AWS, and the amplitude differences between sites are evident. For example, KAN_M shows a pronounced seasonal cycle in all three datasets.

We further quantify the temporal agreement between the three data sets during the period 2011–2024 (the overlap between CryoSat-2 and SERAC) by computing Pearson correlation coefficients between linearly interpolated, detrended dSEC time series and those from AWS and SERAC (Figure 8, and Table 4). The Pearson’s correlation coefficient between dSEC and AWS-derived SEC range from 0.58 at JAR to 0.75 at KAN_M. At KAN_M, for example, dSEC correlates moderately with SERAC ($r = 0.75$) and with AWS ($r = 0.75$), suggesting that dSEC captures the temporal variability observed in both records.

Table 4. Pearson correlation coefficients (r) between linearly detrended time series from the dSEC product, SERAC and AWS at each station. Correlations are computed over 2011–2024 after linear detrending and interpolation to a common temporal grid.

SERAC station_id	AWS station_name	$r_{\text{dSEC vs AWS}}$	$r_{\text{dSEC vs SERAC}}$	$r_{\text{AWS vs SERAC}}$
6002099	JAR	0.584	0.760	0.828
28000270	<i>KPC_U</i>	0.725	0.722	0.926
3001210	<i>KAN_M</i>	0.752	0.744	0.640

5 Discussion

Our results illustrate how our data-driven 3D-ECM framework can advance the monitoring of ice-sheet surface elevation from satellite radar altimetry. By integrating radar altimetry observations with a spatio-temporal statistical model, we obtain continuous, monthly estimates of dSEC over the Greenland Ice Sheet, including regions where satellite sampling is sparse or irregular. The use combination of a GMRF to capture spatial dependence, coupled representation of spatial dependence with an autoregressive temporal component allows the model to isolate meaningful elevation signalswhile reducing elevation-change signals, while additional post-processing of the radar data further reduces high-frequency noise.

This capability has important implications for interpreting both seasonal variability and interannual trends in ice sheet surface elevation change. It also highlights the potential to unify data from different altimetry missions and sensor types. Although here we ~~focused~~ focus on CryoSat-2, the same framework could be applied to past and future radar altimeters, enabling more




Figure 7. (A–C): Elevation change at three AWS validation sites (JAR, KPC_U, KAN_M). Time series of elevation change from SERAC (blue dots), dSEC (orange), and GEMB (blue), aligned to zero at the start of the CryoSat-2 period (2011) for direct comparison. (D–F): Average seasonal cycles of detrended elevation change for the same stations, based on dSEC (orange), AWS (purple), and SERAC (blue) data, with shaded envelopes indicating $\pm 1\sigma$ statistical variability within each calendar month. Note the different scale on the y-axis. The locations of the AWS stations are shown in Figure 1.

385 consistent long-term monitoring across satellite generations. [The framework can also be applied to laser altimetry missions such as ICESat-2, although in this study ICESat-2 is used solely as an independent validation dataset.](#)

Uncertainty patterns in the dSEC product highlight the dependence of model performance on data density. Figure 4 shows how the uncertainty estimates of the dSEC product are higher in grid cells B ($7.1 \text{ m} \pm 1.3 \text{ m}$) and C ($7.6 \text{ m} \pm 0.34 \text{ m}$), located within the CryoSat-2 data gap, compared to A ($4.8 \pm 1.6 \text{ m}$), which is situated in an area with a higher data density. Here, the first value denotes the average uncertainty across the time series, while the $\pm$ value represents the temporal variability (standard deviation) of the uncertainty estimate. As expected, model uncertainty, [and therefore also propagated uncertainties,](#) increases with distance to available data points; nevertheless, the 3D-ECM reconstructs coherent temporal patterns even in poorly sampled regions. For example, cells B and C capture a pronounced thinning from 2011–2016, consistent with previous studies (Khazendar et al., 2019; Joughin et al., 2020; Hansen et al., 2021), followed by reduced thinning, and reproduce the surface build-up observed between 2019 and 2021 in the trough of the Sermeq Kujalleq Ice Stream (Hansen et al., 2021),
395 despite lying within an almost persistent data gap.

The monthly dSEC product is based on satellite radar altimetry and inherits its sensitivity to changes in surface scattering properties, i.e., the way the radar signal interacts with the surface before it is reflected to the satellite. For instance, an increase




Figure 8. Correlation plots between detrended time series of elevation change. (A–C): dSEC versus AWS for the three validation sites JAR, KPC_U, and KAN_M. (D–F): dSEC versus SERAC for the same sites. (G–I): AWS versus SERAC. Each panel shows the 1:1 line (dashed) and the Pearson correlation coefficient (r).

in surface roughness will broaden and flatten the returned signal (the waveform), making the identification of the surface reflection more difficult in that waveform (Ridley et al., 1988; Rémy et al., 2009; Ricker et al., 2014). Over polar snow and firn (cold, dry conditions), CryoSat-2's Ku-band (13.6 GHz) radar typically penetrates up to about 1–2 m (Armitage et al., 2014). Variations in volume scattering within that depth range (changes of snow density or grain size) can affect the returned waveform and distort surface elevation estimates (Aubanc et al., 2021; Fredensborg et al., 2024). Likewise, the appearance of an ice layer within that penetration depth may cause a waveform peak at that horizon, which is then interpreted as the surface (Nilsson et al., 2016). Such effects introduce elevation biases that cannot be fully eliminated by statistical smoothing. Consequently, interpretation of dSEC trends must consider changing surface conditions, particularly in regions experiencing melt, refreezing, or firn densification changes.

Independent validation against ICESat-2 ATL15 and OIB ~~confirms the 3D-ECM method's effectiveness. As shown in the validation analysis~~ shows that post-processing improves quantitative agreement. Compared to the raw reconstruction, the smoothed dSEC product ~~consistently exhibits reduced spread and lower median absolute deviation compared to the raw product, with annual standard deviations decreased by~~ reduces the annual standard deviation of differences by 40–45 % : ~~These improvements demonstrate that postprocessing of~~ and lowers the median absolute deviation, indicating more stable and spatially coherent elevation-change estimates.

The intercomparison with published SEC products further contextualizes these results. Relative to existing monthly SEC products, the 3D-ECM ~~effectively suppresses outliers and measurement noise while preserving the underlying signal~~ framework shows reduced spread of differences against ICESat-2 ATL15, suggesting that the joint spatio-temporal modeling provides a more coherent reconstruction of elevation change fields.

Station-specific comparisons with AWS records and the altimetry-based SERAC product further illustrate how local glaciological conditions affect dSEC interpretation. At JAR (close to Sermeq Kujalleq), dSEC correlates moderately with AWS ($r = 0.58$) and more strongly with SERAC ($r = 0.76$). The weaker agreement with AWS likely reflects dynamic ice-thickness changes near the fast-flowing outlet glacier Sermeq Kujalleq that are not captured by surface instruments, consistent with observations of strong velocity variability in this region (Joughin et al., 2014; Mouginot et al., 2019). In contrast, ~~at-KPC_U is~~ located on an ice lobe north of the Northeast Greenland Ice Stream where seasonal dynamics are minimal—. Here dSEC, AWS, and SERAC show strong agreement (all $r > 0.72$; AWS–SERAC $r = 0.92$). KAN_M, in the southwest percolation zone, exhibits high correlation between dSEC and both AWS and SERAC but a lower correlation between AWS and SERAC themselves, consistent with the complex interplay of firn compaction, meltwater infiltration, retention, and refreezing in this region. Notably, both dSEC and SERAC record a shift toward more positive trends around 2020 at KAN_M (Figure 7), suggesting that both datasets capture the same seasonal evolution despite these challenging surface processes.

Taken together, these comparisons ~~indicate that dSEC generally show that the dSEC product~~ agrees well with both the AWS records and the altimetry-based SERAC product, ~~underseoring the ability of the~~ indicating that the 3D-ECM framework ~~to extract~~ captures physically meaningful elevation change signals ~~that are consistent with in situ observations and the altimetry/model-based SERAC~~ consistent with independent observations. However, these examples also emphasize that while

the 3D-ECM framework successfully extracts coherent elevation change patterns, interpretation at the local scale must account for the diverse physical processes that govern different climatic and glaciological regimes across Greenland.

435 ~~Integration of 3D-ECMs with radar satellite data reveals patterns and anomalies that may remain undetected with sparser observations. Beyond improving the monitoring of the GRS in great detail, such integration provides valuable input for climate model development. A central novelty of our study lies in the flexibility of the~~ The 3D-ECM framework integrates radar altimetry observations within a coherent spatio-temporal reconstruction, enabling the generation of spatially and temporally consistent, gap-filled SEC time series across the Greenland Ice Sheet. An advantage of the 3D-ECM framework is its flexibility, 440 which is applicable across multiple satellite missions and enables the production of continuous, gap-filled SEC time series at varying spatial and temporal scales. Importantly, the framework is entirely data-driven: seasonal ~~signals emerge directly from observations rather than by an applied season model, in contrast to studies such as~~ variability emerges directly from the observations through the joint spatio-temporal estimation, rather than being prescribed using a predefined harmonic (sine-cosine) formulation. In several existing SEC approaches, seasonality is represented using fixed parametric functions that implicitly 445 assume a stationary and symmetric seasonal cycle with constant amplitude and phase, as in Sørensen et al. (2018) and Khan et al. (2025). In contrast, the present framework does not impose a parametric seasonal model, the 3D-ECM framework allows for non-sinusoidal seasonal shapes as well as temporal changes in amplitude and phase. This flexibility is particularly relevant for Greenland, where seasonal elevation changes vary regionally and interannually in response to evolving melt and accumulation conditions. A potential development for future enhancement of the spatial resolution of the dSEC product is the use of swath- 450 processed CryoSat-2 data (Gray et al., 2013; Gourmelen et al., 2018; Andersen et al., 2021) instead of the Level-2 POCA dataset, due to the higher data density of the swath-processed CryoSat-2 data.

To place the reconstructed dSEC fields in the context of existing community datasets, we compared the product against two published community SEC products (Zhang et al., 2022; Khan et al., 2025) using ICESat-2 ATL15 as a reference over the common spatio-temporal domain (Table 3). The comparison shows that the dSEC product yields a lower RMSE relative to 455 ATL15 than the evaluated community products and exhibits a reduced spread of differences compared to (Zhang et al., 2022). The relatively small MAD values for all products suggest that the central tendencies of the distributions are similar, while differences in RMSE and standard deviation mainly reflect variations in the spatial and temporal coherence of the reconstructed SEC fields. Overall, this comparison indicates that the spatio-temporal state-space framework produces SEC estimates that are consistent with independent laser altimetry and comparable to, or slightly improved relative to, existing community SEC 460 products.

The 3D-ECM framework relies on several modeling assumptions that should be considered when interpreting the dSEC product. The spatio-temporal structure combines a Gaussian Markov Random Field in space with a first-order autoregressive process in time, imposing local spatial dependence and exponentially decaying temporal correlations. While computationally efficient for ice-sheet-scale reconstruction, this formulation may not fully capture long-range spatial correlations or complex 465 glacier dynamics. Observational errors are assumed to be Gaussian and uncorrelated, although radar altimetry can exhibit spatially and temporally correlated errors that are not explicitly modeled; uncertainties therefore represent posterior uncertainty under the assumed model structure. The monthly dSEC fields are subsequently smoothed using spatial median filtering and

temporal Savitzky–Golay filtering to reduce high-frequency variability. In the revised framework, uncertainties are propagated through this post-processing using a Monte Carlo approach, such that the reported 1σ uncertainty reflects the fully filtered product. For computational efficiency, the model is implemented in overlapping spatial tiles, which may introduce subtle edge effects. Despite these limitations, the 3D-ECM provides a flexible and computationally efficient framework for reconstructing coherent monthly elevation-change fields from irregularly sampled altimetry observations, balancing model complexity, interpretability, and computational feasibility at ice-sheet scale.

6 Conclusions

We have derived monthly ~~surface elevation change (dSEC)~~ dSEC across the Greenland Ice Sheet for the period 2011–2025 from CryoSat-2 radar altimetry. The state-space model combines a Gaussian Markov Random Field for spatial dependencies with an autoregressive temporal process, allowing seasonality, long-term trends, and abrupt changes to emerge directly from the data without prescribing functional forms. The reference surface was taken from ArcticDEM, and the analysis was restricted to the ~~ice mask defined by IMBIE (IMBIE Team, 2020)~~ Greenland Ice Sheet mask defined within the IMBIE framework (IMBIE Team, 2020), excluding peripheral glaciers and ice caps not dynamically connected to the main ice sheet.

The resulting dataset captures both broad spatial patterns and local outlet-glacier variability, while providing consistent point-based time series across the ice sheet. Independent validation confirms the robustness of the approach as comparisons with ICESat-2 ATL15 and NASA Operation IceBridge show strong agreement in long-term trends, with spatio-temporal smoothing reducing spread while maintaining minimal bias. Seasonal amplitudes from AWS and SERAC time series also align closely with the linearly detrended dSEC product, demonstrating that the method resolves both interannual and seasonal variability.

Intercomparison with two published community SEC products further shows that the dSEC reconstruction achieves comparable or lower misfit relative to ICESat-2 ATL15, indicating that the spatio-temporal state-space framework provides consistent SEC estimates relative to existing community datasets.

Beyond the Greenland and CryoSat-2 application, the modeling framework is directly transferable to other altimetry missions and multi-sensor combinations. Its ~~scalability and statistical rigor enable consistent,~~ computational efficiency enables long-term monitoring of polar ice sheets and ~~provide~~ provides a pathway for integrating upcoming missions such as CRISTAL into multi-decadal elevation-change records.

In summary, the presented dSEC dataset delivers monthly, high-resolution, and uncertainty-quantified estimates of ~~surface elevation change-SEC~~ across the Greenland ice sheet. The approach ~~enhances the temporal resolution of radar altimetry products, supports improved~~ provides temporally consistent monthly fields from irregularly sampled radar altimetry observations, support future assessments of ice-sheet mass balance and dynamics ~~;~~ and may establish the foundation for continuous, multi-mission monitoring of the cryosphere.

Data availability.

The dSEC dataset described in this paper provides gridded estimates of monthly elevation change across the Greenland Ice Sheet from January 2011 to March 2025. The full dataset is publicly available through the Technical University of Denmark (DTU) Data repository and can be accessed via the following link: <https://figshare.com/s/795f8793cd8bcd870a13?file=56058854>. The data are provided in NetCDF format and are compatible with common geospatial tools such as QGIS, allowing for straightforward visualization and analysis. The repository includes the gridded, CF-compliant dSEC data, associated meta-data, and documentation to support data use and reproducibility of results. To facilitate reproducibility, the supplementary material includes a simplified example code together with input data for a single processing tile, illustrating the state-space reconstruction workflow used to derive the monthly SEC fields. The PROMICE and GC-Net AWS dataset, including the multi-sensor relative surface heights, is available at <https://doi.org/10.22008/FK2/IW73UU> (How et al., 2022). The SERAC ~~surface elevation change~~ SEC time series, SERAC-GEMB fusion at 10-day resolution, and code are available at <https://github.com/hui-97/SERAC-FDM-fusion.git>. The CryoSat-2 level2 Baseline E data is available ~~at~~ for download at the ESA FTP site: <ftp://science-pds.eryosat.cryoSat.esa.int>. The ICESat-2 ATL15 gridded data is available at the NSIDC webpage: <https://nsidc.org/data/atl15/versions/4>. The ~~operation icebridge~~ Operation IceBridge data is available at the NSIDC webpage: <https://nsidc.org/data/idhdt4/versions/1>

Appendix A: Map of Model Uncertainty

Figure A1 shows the spatial distribution of ~~model uncertainty (posterior standard deviation)~~ the uncertainty for the monthly dSEC product after spatial and temporal postprocessing. The uncertainty field is derived from the model-based uncertainties produced by the state-space model and subsequently propagated through the same filtering steps applied to the elevation-change field. ~~These uncertainties are obtained directly from the RTMB sdreport (-) output, which provides the marginal posterior standard deviation of the latent spatio-temporal field at each grid cell and each time step. This ensures that the reported uncertainties represent the effective uncertainty of the final postprocessed product rather than the raw model output.~~

Higher uncertainties occur in regions with sparse CryoSat-2 coverage ~~(e.g., fast-flowing outlet glaciers with persistent data gaps),~~ while the interior of the ice sheet ~~shows substantially exhibits~~ lower uncertainty due to denser and more stable ~~altimetric~~ sampling. ~~This spatial pattern is consistent with expectations from the GMRF structure and the temporal AR(1) evolution used in the 3D-ECM sampling.~~

In addition, ~~tile boundaries are subtle patterns related to tile boundaries can be~~ visible in the ~~map; these uncertainty field.~~ These arise because the model is ~~run solved~~ in overlapping spatial tiles for computational efficiency, which can introduce ~~subtle~~ small differences along tile edges.




Figure A1. Spatial distribution of the uncertainty of the dSEC model field. Areas with sparse CryoSat–2 observations exhibit higher uncertainty, while interior regions with denser coverage show substantially lower uncertainty.

~~Spatial distribution of the posterior standard deviation of the dSEC model field. Areas with sparse CryoSat–2 observations exhibit higher uncertainty, while interior regions with denser coverage show substantially lower uncertainty.~~

Author contributions.

Natalia H. Andersen: Main technical author, set up the state-space model, performed validation, and wrote the manuscript.
530 **Sebastian B. Simonsen:** Part of the analysis board, contributed to the methodology, and provided feedback on the manuscript.
Karina Nielsen: Set up the model in R and contributed methodological support. **Mai Winstrup:** Contributed to the interpretation of results and scientific discussion. **Baptiste Vandecrux:** Provided AWS validation data, scientific discussion, and provided feedback on the manuscript. **Hui Gao, Bea Csatho, and Anton Schenk:** Contributed SERAC altimetry-based validation data and scientific discussion. **Louise Sandberg Sørensen:** Supervised the work, provided domain expertise, and provided
535 feedback on the manuscript.

Competing interests.

At least one of the (co-)authors is a member of the editorial board of The Cryosphere. The authors also have no other competing interests to declare.

Acknowledgements. The work presented in this paper has been funded through European Space Agency's (ESA) Climate Change Initiative (ESA CCI+) Greenland Ice Sheet via ESA-ESRIN contract number 4000104815/11/I-NB. The PROMICE and GC-Net programs are supported by Denmark's Ministry of Climate, Energy, and Utilities through the Danish Cooperation for Environment in the Arctic. We thank Ivan Parmuzin for the technical support in processing the SERAC ~~surface elevation change~~ SEC time series. We thank Nicole Schlegel for the GEMB model outputs.

References

545

Adhikari, S., Milne, G. A., Caron, L., Khan, S. A., Kjeldsen, K. K., Nilsson, J., et al.: Decadal to Centennial Timescale Mantle Viscosity Inferred From Modern Crustal Uplift Rates in Greenland, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 48(19), e2021GL094040, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021GL094040>, 2021.

550 Ahlstrøm, A. P., PROMICE project team. A new programme for monitoring the mass loss of the Greenland ice sheet. *GEUS Bulletin*, 15, 61–64. <https://doi.org/10.34194/geusb.v15.5045>, 2008.

Andersen, N. H., Simonsen, S. B., Winstrup, M., Nilsson, J., Sørensen, L. S. Regional assessments of surface ice elevations from swath-processed SARin data from CryoSat-2. *Remote Sensing*, 13(2213), 1–15, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs13112213> , 2021.

555 T. W. K. Armitage and M. W. J. Davidson, "Using the Interferometric Capabilities of the ESA CryoSat-2 Mission to Improve the Accuracy of Sea Ice Freeboard Retrievals," in *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 529–536, Jan. 2014, doi: 10.1109/TGRS.2013.2242082. , 2014.

Aublanc, J., Thibaut, P., Guillot, A., Boy, F., Picot, N. Ice Sheet Topography from a New CryoSat-2 SARin Processing Chain, and Assessment by Comparison to ICESat-2 over Antarctica. *Remote Sensing*, 13(22), 4508. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs13224508> , 2021.

560 Bamber, J., & Riva, R. The sea level fingerprint of recent ice mass fluxes. *The Cryosphere*, 4, 621–627. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-4-621-2010> ,2010.

Bevan, S. L., Luckman, A., Khan, S. A., and Murray, T. Seasonal dynamic thinning at Helheim Glacier. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 415, 47–53, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2015.01.031>, 2015.

565 Bouzinac, C. *CryoSat-2 Product Handbook* (Baseline-E 1.0 — Draft C, Doc ID: C2-LI-ACS-ESL-5319. European Space Agency. <https://earth.esa.int/eogateway/documents/20142/0/CryoSat-Product-Handbook-Baseline-E-draft.pdf> , 2019.

Box, J. E., Hubbard, A., Bahr, D. B., Colgan, W. T., Fettweis, X., Mankoff, K. D., Wehrlé, A., Noël, B., van den Broeke, M. R., Wouters, B., Bjørk, A. A., and Fausto, R. S. Greenland ice sheet climate disequilibrium and committed sea-level rise. *Nature Climate Change*, 12, 808–813. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-022-01441-2> , 2022.

570 Chylek, P., Folland, C. K., Klett, J. D., Wang, M., Hengartner, N., Lesins, G., & Dubey, M. K. Annual mean Arctic amplification 1970–2020: Observed and simulated by CMIP6 climate models. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 49, e2022GL099371. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022GL099371> , 2022.

Csatho, B. M., Schenk, A. F., van der Veen, C. J., Babonis, G., Duncan, K., Rezvanbehbahani, S., et al.: Laser altimetry reveals complex pattern of Greenland Ice Sheet dynamics, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 111(52), 18478–18483, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1411680112>, 2014.

575 Fausto, R. S., van As, D., Mankoff, K. D., Vandecrux, B., Citterio, M., Ahlstrøm, A. P., Andersen, S. B., Colgan, W., Karlsson, N. B., Kjeldsen, K. K., Korsgaard, N. J., Larsen, S. H., Nielsen, S., Pedersen, A.Ø., Shields, C. L., Solgaard, A. M., and Box, J. E. Programme for Monitoring of the Greenland Ice Sheet (PROMICE) automatic weather station data. *Earth System Science Data*, 13(8), 3819–3845. doi:10.5194/essd-13-3819-2021 , 2021.

Greenland and Antarctica Ice Sheet Mass Changes and Effects on Global Sea Level. In A. Cazenave, N. Champollion, F. Paul, & J. Benveniste (Eds.), *Integrative Study of the Mean Sea Level and Its Components* (Space Sciences Series of ISSI, vol. 58, pp. 91–106). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-56490-6_5, 2017.

Fredensborg Hansen, R. M., Skourup, H., Rinne, E., Jutila, A., Lawrence, I. R., Shepherd, A., Høyland, K. V., Li, J., Rodriguez-Morales, F., Simonsen, S. B., Wilkinson, J., Veyssiere, G., Yi, D., Forsberg, R., and Casal, T. G. D.: Exploring microwave penetration into snow on Antarctic summer sea ice along CryoSat-2 and ICESat-2 (CRYO2ICE) orbit from multi-frequency air- and spaceborne altimetry, EGUsphere [preprint], <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-2854>, 2024.

Gallagher, N. B. Savitzky-Golay smoothing and differentiation filter. *Control System Engineering*. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.20339.50725>, 2020.

Gardner, A. S., Moholdt, G., Scambos, T., et al. A reconciled estimate of glacier contributions to sea-level rise: 2003 to 2009. *Science*, 340(6134), 852–857 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1234532>, 2013.

Gardner, A. S., Schlegel, N.-J., and Larour, E.: Glacier Energy and Mass Balance (GEMB): a model of firn processes for cryosphere research, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 16(8), 2277–2302, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-16-2277-2023>, 2023.

Gourmelen, N., Escorihuela, M., Shepherd, A., et al. CryoSat-2 swath interferometric altimetry for mapping ice elevation and elevation change. *Advances in Space Research*, 62(6), 1226–1242. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asr.2017.11.014>, 2018.

Gray, L., Burgess, D., Copland, L., et al. Interferometric swath processing of ~~Cryosat~~ CryoSat data for glacial ice topography. *Cryosphere*, 7, 1857–1867, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-7-1857-2013>, 2013.

Helm, V., Dehghanpour, A., Hansch, R., Loebel, E., Horwath, M., & Humbert, A. AWI-ICENet1: a convolutional neural network retracker for ice altimetry. *The Cryosphere*, 18, 3933–3970. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-18-3933-2024>, 2024.

Hansen, K., Truffer, M., Aschwanden, A., Mankoff, K., Bevis, M., Humbert, A., van den Broeke, M. R., Noël, B., Bjørk, A., Colgan, W., Kjør, K. H., et al. Estimating ice discharge at Greenland’s three largest outlet glaciers using local bedrock uplift. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 48(13), e2021GL094252, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021GL094252>, 2021.

Hugonnet, R., McNabb, R., Berthier, E., Menounos, B., Nuth, C., Girod, L., Farinotti, D., Huss, M., Dussailant, I., Brun, F., and Käab, A.: Accelerated global glacier mass loss in the early twenty-first century, *Nature*, 592, 726–731, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03436-z>, 2021.

How, P.; Lund, M.C.; Ahlstrøm, A.P.; Andersen, S.B.; Box, J.E.; Citterio, M.; Colgan, W.T.; Fausto, R.S.; Karlsson, N.B.; Jakobsen, J.; Jakobsgaard, H.T.; Larsen, S.H.; Mankoff, K.D.; Nielsen, R.B.; Rutishauser, A.; Shield, C.L.; Solgaard, A.M.; Stevens, I.T.; van As, D.; Vandecrux, B.; Abermann, J.; Bjørk, A.A.; Langley, K.; Lea, J.; Prinz, R., "PROMICE and GC-Net automated weather station data in Greenland", <https://doi.org/10.22008/FK2/IW73UU>, GEUS Dataverse, V27, 2022.

The IMBIE Team. Mass balance of the Greenland Ice Sheet from 1992 to 2018. *Nature*, 579, 233–239, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1855-2>, 2020.

Joughin, I., Smith, B. E., Shean, D. E., and Floricioiu, D.: Brief communication: Further summer speedup of Jakobshavn Isbræ, *The Cryosphere*, 8, 209–214, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-8-209-2014>, 2014.

Joughin, I., Shean, D. E., Smith, B. E., and Floricioiu, D. A decade of variability on Jakobshavn Isbræ: Ocean temperatures pace speed through influence on mélange rigidity. *The Cryosphere*, 14(1), 211–227, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-14-211-2020>, 2020.

Kehrl, L. M., Joughin, I., Shean, D. E., Floricioiu, D., and Krieger, L. Seasonal and interannual variabilities in terminus position, glacier velocity, and surface elevation at Helheim and Kangerlussuaq Glaciers from 2008 to 2016. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, 122(8), 1635–1652, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JF004133>, 2017.

- Khan, S. A., Mernild, S. H., Kjeldsen, K. K. Accelerating ice loss from peripheral glaciers in North Greenland. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 49(12), e2022GL098915, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022GL098915> , 2022.
- 620 Khan, S. A., Seroussi, H., Morlighem, M., Colgan, W., Helm, V., Cheng, G., Berg, D., Barletta, V. R., Larsen, N. K., Kochtitzky, W., van den Broeke, M., Kjær, K. H., Aschwanden, A., Noël, B., Box, J. E., MacGregor, J. A., Fausto, R. S., Mankoff, K. D., Howat, I. M., Oniszk, K., Fahrner, D., Løkkegaard, A., Lippert, E. Y. H., Brätner, A., & Hassan, J. Smoothed monthly Greenland ice sheet elevation changes during 2003–2023. *Earth System Science Data*, 17, 3047–3071. <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-17-3047-2025> , 2025.
- Khazendar, A., Fenty, I. G., Carroll, D., Gardner, A., Lee, C. M., Fukumori, I., *et al.* Interruption of two decades of Jakobshavn Isbræ acceleration and thinning as regional ocean cools. *Nature Geoscience*, 12(4), 277–283, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-019-0329-3>, 2019
- 625 Kristensen, K., Nielsen, A., Berg, C. W., Skaug, H., Bell, B. M. TMB: Automatic Differentiation and Laplace Approximation. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 70(5), 1–21, <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v070.i05> , 2016.
- Lai, Y.-R., and Wang, L. Monthly surface elevation changes of the Greenland Ice Sheet from ICESat-1, CryoSat-2, and ICESat-2 altimetry missions. *IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Letters*, 19, 1–5, Art. no. 2000305 , <https://doi.org/10.1109/LGRS.2021.3058956> , 2022.
- Lindgren, F., Rue, H., and Lindström, J.: An explicit link between Gaussian fields and Gaussian Markov random fields: the stochastic partial differential equation approach, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, 73(4), 423–498, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9868.2011.00777.x>, 2011.
- 630 Liu, L., Khan, S. A., van Dam, T., Ma, J. H. Y., and Bevis, M. Annual variations in GPS-measured vertical displacements near Upernavik Isstrøm (Greenland) and contributions from surface mass loading. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 122(1), 718–734, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JB013494> , 2017.
- 635 Løkkegaard, A., Colgan, W., Hansen, K., et al. Ice acceleration and rotation in the Greenland Ice Sheet interior in recent decades. *Commun Earth Environ*, 5, 211, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-024-01322-w> , 2024.
- MacGregor, J. A., Boisvert, L. N., Medley, B., Petty, A. A., Harbeck, J. P., Bell, R. E., et al.: The Scientific Legacy of NASA's Operation IceBridge, *Rev. Geophys.*, 59(2), e2020RG000712, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020RG000712>, 2021.
- Markus, T., Neumann, T., Martino, A., Abdalati, W., Brunt, K., Csatho, B., et al.: The Ice, Cloud, and land Elevation Satellite-2 (ICESat-2): Science requirements, concept, and implementation, *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 190, 260–273, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2016.12.029>, 2017.
- 640 Milne, G. A., Latychev, K., Schaeffer, A., Crowley, J. W., Lecavalier, B. S., and Audette, A.: The influence of lateral Earth structure on glacial isostatic adjustment in Greenland, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 214(2), 1252–1266, <https://doi.org/10.1093/gji/ggy189>, 2018.
- Moon, T., Sutherland, D. A., Carroll, D., et al. Subsurface iceberg melt key to Greenland fjord freshwater budget. *Nature Geoscience*, 11, 49–54 , <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-017-0018-z> , 2018.
- 645 Mouginot, J., Rignot, E., Bjørk, A. A., van den Broeke, M., Millan, R., Morlighem, M., Noël, B., Scheuchl, B., and Wood, M. Forty-six years of Greenland Ice Sheet mass balance from 1972 to 2018. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(19), 9239–9244 , <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1904242116> , 2019.
- 650 Nielsen, K., Zakharova, E., Tarpanelli, A., Andersen, O. B., Benveniste, J. River levels from multi mission altimetry, a statistical approach. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, **270**, 112876, ISSN 0034-4257. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2021.112876>. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0034425721005964> , 2022.

- Nilsson, J., Gardner, A., Sandberg Sørensen, L., and Forsberg, R.: Improved retrieval of land ice topography from CryoSat-2 data and its impact for volume-change estimation of the Greenland Ice Sheet, *The Cryosphere*, 10, 2953–2969, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-10-2953-2016>, 2016.
- Nilsson, J. and Gardner, A. S.: Elevation Change of the Greenland Ice Sheet and its Peripheral Glaciers: 1992–2023, *Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss.* [preprint], <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2024-311>, 2024.
- Otosaka, I.N., Horwath, M., Mottram, R. et al. Mass Balances of the Antarctic and Greenland Ice Sheets Monitored from Space. *Surv. Geophys.* **44**, 1615–1652, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10712-023-09795-8>, 2023.
- Porter, Claire; Howat, Ian; Noh, Myoung-Jon; Husby, Erik; Khuvis, Samuel; Danish, Evan; Tomko, Karen; Gardiner, Judith; Negrete, Adelaide; Yadav, Bidhyananda; Klassen, James; Kelleher, Cole; Cloutier, Michael; Bakker, Jesse; Enos, Jeremy; Arnold, Galen; Bauer, Greg; Morin, Paul, "ArcticDEM - Mosaics, Version 4.1", Harvard Dataverse, V1 <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/3VDC4W>, 2023.
- Rantanen, M., Karpechko, A. Y., Lipponen, A., et al. The Arctic has warmed nearly four times faster than the globe since 1979. *Commun Earth Environ*, 3, 168, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-022-00498-3>, 2023.
- Ravinder, N., Shepherd, A., Otosaka, I., Slater, T., Muir, A., and Gilbert, L. Greenland Ice Sheet elevation change from CryoSat-2 and ICESat-2. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 51, e2024GL110822, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2024GL110822>, 2024.
- Rémy, F., & Parouty, S. Antarctic Ice Sheet and Radar Altimetry: A Review. *Remote Sensing*, 1(4), 1212–1239. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs1041212>, 2009.
- Ricker, R., Hendricks, S., Helm, V., Skourup, H., and Davidson, M.: Sensitivity of CryoSat-2 Arctic sea-ice freeboard and thickness on radar-waveform interpretation, *The Cryosphere*, 8, 1607–1622, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-8-1607-2014>, 2014.
- Ridley, J. K., & Partington, K. C. A model of satellite radar altimeter return from ice sheets. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 9(4), 601–624. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01431168808954881>, 1988.
- Rignot, E., & Mouginot, J. Ice flow in Greenland for the International Polar Year 2008–2009. *The Cryosphere*, 6, 115–123. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2012GL051634>, 2012.
- Rue, H. and Held, L. Gaussian Markov Random Fields: Theory and Applications. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability, Vol. 104, <https://doi.org/10.1201/9780203492024>, 2005.
- Schenk, T., Csatho, B., van der Veen, C., and McCormick, D.: Fusion of multi-sensor surface elevation data for improved characterization of rapidly changing outlet glaciers in Greenland, *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 149, 239–251, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2014.04.005>, 2014.
- Schenk, T., and Csatho, B.: A New Methodology for Detecting Ice Sheet Surface Elevation Changes From Laser Altimetry Data, *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, 50(9), 3302–3316, <https://doi.org/10.1109/TGRS.2011.2182357>, 2012.
- Shekhar, P., Csatho, B., Schenk, T., Roberts, C., and Patra, A. K.: ALPS: A Unified Framework for Modeling Time Series of Land Ice Changes, *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, 59(8), 6466–6481, <https://doi.org/10.1109/TGRS.2020.3027190>, 2021.
- Simonsen, S. B., Sørensen, L. S. Implications of changing scattering properties on Greenland ice sheet volume change from CryoSat-2 altimetry. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 190, 207–216, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2016.12.012>, 2017.
- Simonsen, S. B., Barletta, V. R., Colgan, W. T., Sørensen, L. S. Greenland Ice Sheet mass balance (1992–2020) from calibrated radar altimetry. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 48, e2020GL091216. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL091216>, 2021.
- Smith, B., Sutterley, T., Dickinson, S., Jelley, B. P., Felikson, D., Neumann, T. A., Fricker, H. A., Gardner, A. S., Padman, L., Markus, T., Kurtz, N., Bhardwaj, S., Hancock, D. & Lee, J. ATLAS/ICESat-2 L3B Gridded Antarctic and Arctic Land Ice Height Change. (ATL15, Version 2). [Data Set - Date Accessed 04-01-2025]. Boulder, Colorado USA. NASA National Snow and Ice Data Center Distributed Active Archive Center. <https://doi.org/10.5067/ATLAS/ATL15.002>, 2022.

- Studinger, M. IceBridge ATM L4 Surface Elevation Rate of Change. (IDHDT4, Version 1). [Data Set]. Boulder, Colorado USA. NASA National Snow and Ice Data Center Distributed Active Archive Center. <https://doi.org/10.5067/BCW6CI3TXOCY> , 2014.
- 695 Sweeney, A. J., Fu, Q., Po-Chedley, S., Wang, H., & Wang, M. Internal variability increased Arctic amplification during 1980–2022. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 50, e2023GL106060. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023GL106060> , 2023.
- Sørensen, L., Simonsen, S., Forsberg, R., Khvorostovsky, K., Meister, R., Engdahl, M. E. 25 years of elevation changes of the Greenland Ice Sheet from ERS, Envisat, and CryoSat-2 radar altimetry. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 495, 234–241, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2018.05.015> , 2018.
- 700 Vandecrux, B., Fausto, R. S., Box, J. E., Covi, F., Hock, R., Rennermalm, Å. K., Heilig, A., Abermann, J., van As, D., Bjerre, E., Fettweis, X., Smeets, P. C. J. P., Kuipers Munneke, P., van den Broeke, M. R., Brils, M., Langen, P. L., Mottram, R., and Ahlstrøm, A. P. Recent warming trends of the Greenland ice sheet documented by historical firn and ice temperature observations and machine learning. *The Cryosphere*, 18, 609–631 , <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-18-609-2024> , 2024
- Williams, J. J., Gourmelen, N., Nienow, P. Complex multi-decadal ice dynamical change inland of marine-terminating glaciers on the Greenland Ice Sheet. *Journal of Glaciology*, 67(265), 833–846, <https://doi.org/10.1017/jog.2021.31>, 2021.
- 705 Wingham, D.J., Francis, C.R., Baker, S., Bouzinac, C., Brockley, D., Cullen, R., de Chateau-Thierry, P., Laxon, S.W., Mallow, U., Mavrocordatos, C., Phalippou, L., Ratier, G., Rey, L., Rostan, F., Viau, P., and Wallis, D.W. CryoSat: A mission to determine the fluctuations in Earth's land and marine ice fields. *Advances in Space Research*, 37(4), 841–871. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asr.2005.07.027> , 2006.
- Zhang, B., Wang, Z., An, J., Liu, T., and Geng, H.: A 30-year monthly 5 km gridded surface elevation time series for the Greenland Ice Sheet from multiple satellite radar altimeters, *Earth Syst. Sci. Data*, 14, 973–988, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-14-973-2022>, 2022.
- 710 Zwally, H. J., Schutz, B., Abdalati, W., Abshire, J., Bentley, C., Brenner, A., et al.: ICESat's laser measurements of polar ice, atmosphere, ocean, and land, *J. Geodyn.*, 34(3), 405–445, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0264-3707\(02\)00042-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0264-3707(02)00042-X), 2002.