

Seven Decades of Glacier Loss on the Nevados de Chillán volcanic complex, Chile

Millie Spencer¹, Alfonso Fernandez², Emma Tyrrell¹, Robert Clasing³, Enrique Muñoz^{3,4}, Pablo A. Mendoza^{5,6}, Jorge Berkhoff⁷, and Noah P. Molotch¹

¹Department of Geography, Institute of Arctic and Alpine Research, University of Colorado, Boulder, 80309, USA

²Department of Geography, Universidad de Concepción, Concepción, 4070386, Chile

³Department of Civil Engineering, Universidad Católica de la Santísima Concepción, Concepción, 4090340, Chile

⁴Centro de Investigación en Biodiversidad y Ambientes Sustentables CIBAS, Concepción, 4090340, Chile

⁵Department of Civil Engineering, Universidad de Chile, Santiago, 8370449, Chile

⁶Advanced Mining Technology Center (AMTC), Universidad de Chile, Santiago, 8370449, Chile

⁷Institute of Geography, Friedrich-Alexander-Universität, Erlangen-Nürnberg, 91058, Germany

Correspondence to: Millie Spencer (millie.spencer@colorado.edu)

Abstract. Glaciers on the Nevados de Chillán volcanic complex are rapidly retreating, with anticipated consequences for agroforestry, tourism, and regional human and ecological security. Quantifying their mass balance is critical for understanding current meltwater contributions and for anticipating future water availability as these glaciers continue to shrink. Here we estimate the geodetic mass balance of all 28 documented glaciers on the Nevados de Chillán complex. An uncrewed aerial vehicle (UAV) campaign conducted in March 2024 provided updated elevation data for 11 glaciers on the complex, allowing calculation of volume change from 1954–2024 (70 years). For the remaining 17 glaciers, we analyzed airplane and satellite digital elevation models (DEMs) to estimate volume change from 1954–2025 (71 years). The total glacier area of the complex declined from 16.02 km² in 1975 to 2.91 km² in 2000 and 1.90 km² in 2019, totaling an 88% reduction over 44 years. Our results show a clear acceleration in glacier mass loss after 2000 for the glaciers surveyed with UAV and satellite data. Mean annual specific mass balance of the whole complex was -0.19 ± 0.31 m w.e. yr⁻¹ from 1954–2000, accelerating to -0.51 ± 0.17 m w.e. yr⁻¹ from 2000–2025, representing a near three-fold increase in the rate of mass loss. Over 2000–2025, the Cerro Blanco subcomplex lost mass at -0.59 ± 0.13 m w.e. yr⁻¹ and Glaciér Nevado, the largest glacier on the complex, at -0.69 ± 0.10 m w.e. yr⁻¹. Significant post-2000 declines in February and March streamflow at the Río Diguillín are consistent with the complex having passed peak water. Regional water resource planning should consider how increasing glacier melt rates on the Nevados de Chillán complex will impact the timing and volume of future water availability.

1 Introduction

Mountain glaciers have immense value due to their support of municipal and agricultural water demands, alpine ecosystems, and mountain tourism (Immerzeel et al., 2020). Mountain glaciers are retreating, on average, as global temperatures rise

Deleted: 70 Years

Formatted: Justified

Deleted: ,

Deleted: ²

Deleted: , Alfonso Fernandez³,

Deleted: ²

Formatted: Not Superscript/ Subscript

Formatted: Superscript

Moved down [2]: ³Department of Civil Engineering, Universidad Católica de la Santísima Concepción, Concepción, 4090340, Chile

Deleted: ³

Deleted: ²

Deleted: ¹

Formatted: Superscript

Deleted: 2000

Deleted: 46

Formatted: Not Highlight

Deleted: Mean annual specific mass balance of the Cerro Blanco subcomplex accelerated from -0.41 ± 0.33 m w.e. yr⁻¹ (1954–2024) to -0.60 ± 0.29 m w.e. yr⁻¹ (2000–2024), while that of the Las Termas subcomplex increased from -0.13 ± 0.32 m w.e. yr⁻¹ (1954–2024) to -0.36 ± 0.18 m w.e. yr⁻¹ (2000–2024).

Formatted: Justified

Deleted: As global temperatures rise,

Deleted: m

(Hugonnet et al., 2021; Zemp et al., 2015). Quantifying this retreat is essential to forecasting downstream water availability (Aguayo et al., 2024; Mark et al., 2015; Ultee et al., 2022).

Glacier retreat is well studied in Chile, particularly in the Maipo basin surrounding the capital city of Santiago, and on the Patagonian Ice Fields (e.g. Ayala et al., 2020; Carrasco-Escaff et al., 2023; Farias-Barahona et al., 2020; Schaefer et al., 2015). Compared to the extensive literature on glaciers in central Chile and Patagonia, south-central Chile remains relatively understudied, leaving the current state of its glaciers not yet fully characterized. Located between the arid Mediterranean climate to the north and the temperate climate to the south, south-central Chile (~35–40°S) encompasses a transitional zone where mean annual precipitation increases from ~447 mm yr⁻¹ in the semi-arid central region to over 3,751 mm yr⁻¹ in the humid temperate south (Caro et al., 2024; Valdés-Pineda et al., 2014). Unraveling glacier retreat and hydroclimatic trends across this steep climatic gradient is therefore valuable for understanding how glaciers respond to markedly different precipitation and temperature regimes within a relatively narrow latitudinal band. Although several important studies have documented glacier retreat in this region (e.g. Barria et al., 2019; Brock et al., 2007; Rivera et al., 2006), further research is needed to quantify glacier loss rates and improve water availability forecasting as glaciers continue to shrink.

The relative contribution of glacier melt is becoming increasingly important as south-central Chile’s traditionally humid environment shifts from year-round precipitation to increasingly rain-free summer seasons, steadily decreasing annual mean precipitation and increased drought frequency and severity (Garreaud et al., 2020; Rubio-Álvarez and McPhee, 2010; Sarricolea et al., 2017). Even small glaciers have been shown to have significant impacts on basin runoff (Nolin et al., 2010), suggesting that small alpine glaciers in south-central Chile, such as those on the Nevados de Chillán, may have outsized impacts on downstream water availability.

Nevados de Chillán is a glacierized volcanic complex in the Ñuble region of south-central Chile. Existing geodetic studies of Nevados de Chillán’s glaciers solely assess change in glacier area and do not document change in glacier volume (e.g. Zenteno et al., 2008). While glacier area change provides some insight into climate impacts, precise glacier elevation change measurements are required to accurately reconstruct the volume of meltwater contributed by mountain glaciers in south central-Chile (e.g. Mejías et al., 2025). Our study provides such data for Nevados de Chillán.

Despite frequent eruption events, the Nevados de Chillán volcanic complex was last estimated as having 28 mountain glaciers (Fig. 1B) (DGA, 2022). However, it is not clear how many of these glaciers still exist or are now debris covered. Published observations of the glaciers of Nevados de Chillán indicate a >45% reduction in area from 1863-1975, and >90% loss in glacier area by 2019 (Philippi, 1863; DGA, 2022). While previous studies documented change in glacier area, there are no long-term estimates of glacier mass balance that account for all glaciers in the complex. Despite changes in glacier area providing insights into glacier retreat, robust mass-balance (MB) measurements are necessary to accurately determine volume change, sensitivity

Deleted: ; Van Tricht et al., 2025

Deleted: .

Deleted: 8

Deleted: Glacier melt’s relative contributions are

Deleted: ; Clark et al., 2015

Deleted: glaciated

Deleted: that houses a ski resort and hot spring by the same name and is a major tourist destination for the region

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Deleted: 4

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Deleted: (Fig. 1B)

Deleted: no longer

to climate changes, relative contribution of glacier melt to regional water availability, mountain hazards, and other dynamics that control high-elevation landscapes (Owen et al., 2009). Many of these issues remain unexplored in Ñuble.

95 Previous studies have provided estimates of Chilean glacier mass balance at a variety of scales, ranging from regional to specific glacier analyses. Dussaillant et al. (2019) reported a mass balance of -0.31 ± 0.19 m w.e. yr^{-1} in the Central Andes and -0.57 ± 0.22 m w.e. yr^{-1} in Northern Patagonia. Caro et al. (2024) estimated a 2000–2019 mean annual mass balance of -0.29 ± 0.14 m w.e. yr^{-1} for the Maipo River basin (33°S), versus -0.47 ± 0.19 m w.e. yr^{-1} for the Baker River basin (47°S). On the Echaurren Norte Glacier (33°S), Farias-Barahona et al. (2019) estimated a mean glacier mass balance of -0.68 ± 0.09 m w.e. yr^{-1} from 1955–2015, showing a sharp increase in glacier loss from 2010 onwards with a mass balance of -1.20 ± 0.09 m w.e. yr^{-1} .

While glacier area change analyses and regional-scale assessments provide useful benchmarks, variability in specific glacier mass balance underscores the importance of finer-scale studies rather than relying solely on regional averages or nearby glacier measurements. Therefore, this paper provides geodetic mass balance estimates for all 28 glaciers on Nevados de Chillán across seven decades. For the full complex, we estimate mass balance for 1954–2000 (n = 46 years) using the Instituto Geográfico Militar (IGM) topographic map DEM and the Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (SRTM), and for 2000–2025 (n = 25 years) using a Pléiades stereo DEM; an Advanced Spaceborne Thermal Emission and Reflection Radiometer (ASTER) DEM for 2018 provides an intermediate constraint on the timing of mass loss acceleration. For the 11 glaciers surveyed in our 2024 UAV campaign, we additionally estimate mass balance for 2000–2024 (n = 24 years) at higher spatial resolution. Glacier area change is quantified using inventories from 1975 (DGA, 2011), 2000 (DGA, 2014), or 2019 (DGA, 2022). Further, we analyze topographic and temporal patterns in glacier melt rates, crucial to inform landscape changes and impacts on regional water management.

2 Study Area

115 The Nevados de Chillán (36.86°S, 71.39°W) volcanic complex is in the Ñuble Region of south-central Chile (Fig. 1A). Nevados de Chillán falls within the Itata River basin, which covers an area of 11,294 km² (Bobadilla et al., 2024). The volcanic complex spans approximately 14 kilometers from northwest to southeast and comprises 13 stratovolcanoes, which are divided into the Cerro Blanco subcomplex and Las Termas subcomplex (Fig. 1B) (Dixon et al., 1999; Naranjo et al., 2008). The maximum altitude of the study area is on the summit of the Cerro Blanco complex, 3151 meters above sea-level [m a.s.l.]. The glaciers vary in size and are found on all aspects of the peaks. The largest glacier on the complex, Glaciar Nevado, is housed on the Cerro Blanco subcomplex, has a south-westerly aspect, and covered approximately 0.68 km² in 2019 (Fig. 1B) (DGA, 2022). The Chilean Water Directorate (Dirección General de Aguas, DGA) estimates that there were 28 glaciers on the complex as of 2019. Despite several glaciers in the saddle between the Cerro Blanco and Las Termas subcomplex and on the

Deleted: -

Deleted: the period 1954–2000 (n=46 years) for all glaciers on Nevados de Chillán, and for 2000–2024 (n=24 years) for the 11 glaciers inventoried in our UAV campaign.

Deleted: geographic

Formatted: Justified


Deleted: The Nevados de Chillán complex

Deleted: spans

Deleted: C

Deleted: are

135 north face of the Las Termas subcomplex disappearing, remaining glaciers fractured into multiple ice bodies (DGA, 2014; 2022). From 2000 to 2019, glacier area decreased from 16.02 km² in 1975, to 2.91 km² in 2000, and 1.90 km² in 2019, totaling an 88% decrease in glacier area over 44 years (DGA, 2014; 2022). Melt from Nevados de Chillán's glaciers has immeasurable value, supporting ecological diversity and downstream water availability.



140 **Figure 1:** A) Location of the Nevados de Chillán volcanic complex (red triangle) in the Ñuble region of Chile, South America, and B) topographic map view (© OpenTopoMap contributors) of the Nevados de Chillán complex showing the Cerro Blanco, Las Termas, and Puerto los Baños subcomplexes, with glacier outlines from the 1975 (dotted), 2000 (dashed), and 2019 (solid) inventories (DGA, 2011; 2014; 2022).

145 The region has a Mediterranean climate, characterized by warm, dry summers and wet winters with heavy precipitation (Bobadilla et al., 2024). Given the near total absence of precipitation in summer months, glaciers and seasonal snowmelt are essential components of summer streamflow in the Ñuble region (Ayala et al., 2016; Ragetti and Pellicciotti, 2012). Notably, agriculture accounts for 96.3% of water consumption in the Itata River basin, with irrigation demand peaking in late summer

Deleted: From 2000 to 2019, glacier area decreased from 2.90 x 10⁶ m² to 1.21 x 10⁶ m², amounting to a 58.3% decrease in glacier area (DGA, 2014; 2022).

Moved up [3]: The Nevados de Chillán complex falls within the Itata River basin, which spans an area of 11,294 km² (Bobadilla et al., 2024).



Deleted:

Formatted: Justified

Deleted: Figure 1: A) Study area in the Ñuble region of Chile, B) satellite view (Maxar Technologies © 2025) of the Cerro Blanco and Las Termas subcomplexes on the Nevados de Chillán complex with year 2000 and 2019 glacier areas (DGA, 2014; 2022) shown in cyan and magenta, respectively, C) zoomed in on the Cerro Blanco subcomplex and D) the Las Termas subcomplex.

when glacier runoff is highest (Bobadilla et al., 2024; Webb et al., 2020; Bellisario et al., 2013; McCarthy et al., 2022). As droughts become more frequent, and Ñuble’s environment shifts from year-round precipitation to increasingly rain-free summer seasons, summer glacier discharge plays an increasingly critical role in meeting water needs (Bobadilla et al., 2024; Ayala et al., 2016; Ragettli and Pellicciotti, 2012; Garreaud et al., 2020; Rubio-Álvarez and McPhee, 2010).

3 Methods

Figure 2 presents the methodological workflow for implementing the geodetic mass balance approach, a highly reliable method to estimate glacier mass loss (Huss and Hock, 2015; Hugonnet et al., 2021; Cogley, 2009; Schuster et al., 2023). A DEM derived from a 1954 topographic map (IGM), and satellite-derived DEMs from SRTM from 2000, ASTER from 2018, and Pléiades from 2025, were used to reconstruct historic glacier surface elevations. We also conducted an uncrewed aerial vehicle (UAV) survey in March 2024 to generate a detailed DEM of the western face of the complex (Sect. 3.1 and 3.2). We differenced the historic aerial (IGM), recent satellite (SRTM, ASTER, and Pléiades), and UAV DEMs and clipped the differenced rasters to glacier areas reported by the DGA for the years 1975, 2000, and 2019 (DGA 2011; 2014; 2022) to estimate glacier volume loss and calculate mean annual geodetic mass balance (Sect. 3.4 and 3.5). Next, we analyze temperature, precipitation, and streamflow data from nearby meteorological stations and co-located gauges, assessing for hydroclimatic trend magnitude and significance (Sect. 3.6). Finally, we assess the relationship between glacier surface elevation change and topographic variables through statistical tests of rank correlation and spatial autocorrelation (Sect. 3.7).

Deleted: 1

Formatted: Justified

Deleted: a

Deleted: georeferenced aerial image

Deleted: Instituto Geográfico Militar,

Deleted: from 1954

Deleted: Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (

Deleted:)

Deleted: image

Deleted: are

Deleted: However, given the scarcity of open-source global DEMs available for recent years, the work herein relies on the production of uncrewed aerial vehicle (UAV)-derived DEMs to provide glacier elevation measurements after 2000.

Deleted: field campaign

Deleted: aerial

Deleted: and

Deleted: from the 2024 UAV DEM

Deleted: the

Deleted: generate

Deleted: Finall

Deleted: y,





Figure 2: Methodological workflow detailing the DEMs accessed (IGM, SRTM, ASTER, and Pléiades) and created (UAV) to represent glacier elevation (Sections 3.1 and 3.2), DEM co-registration (Section 3.3) and differencing to estimate glacier mass balance (Section 3.4).

Deleted: discuss the implications of these findings for glacier resilience and future water resources availability (Sect. 4 and 5).



Deleted:

Deleted: DGA

Deleted: and

Formatted: Justified

3.1 UAV Image Acquisition

The DJI Mavic 3 Enterprise (M3E) UAV integrated with a GPS Real-Time Kinematic (RTK) solution module was used for RGB imaging of Nevados de Chillán and the generation of a DEM. The DJI M3E UAV houses a L2D-20c Hasselblad brand camera designed for photogrammetry. This camera has 4/3-inch Complementary Metal Oxide Semiconductor (CMOS) digital image sensor, 20 MP effective resolution, and mechanical shutter. We utilized GPS-RTK for cm accuracy positioning during flight and for precise georeferencing of captured pictures. GPS-RTK provides a solution to improved UAV positioning in lieu of ground control points (Wigmore and Mark, 2017). RTK position accuracy is 1 cm + 1 ppm (horizontal) and 1.5 cm + 1 ppm (vertical). No ground control points were used; all image georeferencing relied on the onboard GPS-RTK positioning system.

The UAV flight campaign was carried out during the best light conditions, around midday on the 12 and 14 March 2024 and in peak-ablation season (i.e. snow-free conditions). Automated flight plans were designed using the DJI Pilot application, with a fixed flight altitude of 145 m above ground level for the Cerro Blanco subcomplex, and 315 m above ground level for the Las Termas subcomplex. Higher flight altitude was required for the Las Termas subcomplex to map the larger area (11.5 km² compared to 1.75 km² for the Cerro Blanco subcomplex) with limited battery capacity, which yielded higher resolution images of Cerro Blanco compared to Las Termas (Sect. 3.2). The flight path was programmed with 70% and 80% horizontal and vertical overlap respectively, to ensure successful 3-D model construction through SfM in image post-processing. Due to heavy winds and technical difficulties, manual flight and image capture was required over many sections on the Cerro Blanco subcomplex, resulting in a greater root mean square error (RMSE) when compared to the Las Termas subcomplex.

3.2 UAV Image Processing

AgiSoft Metashape (Version 2.1.2) software, widely used in similar glacier UAV studies, was used to process the UAV images (e.g. Wigmore and Mark, 2017; Kaufmann et al., 2018; Wigmore and Molotch, 2023; Rossini et al., 2023). As in previous studies, images were processed using the SfM photogrammetry workflow in Metashape, a proprietary software by AgiSoft (Westoby et al., 2012; Over et al., 2021). Metashape SfM reconstructed the 3-D geometry of the study scene by identifying common points that occur in multiple images from different angles and distances (Westoby et al., 2012). These common points were tracked from image to image, enabling estimation of camera position and object coordinates which were continuously refined using non-linear least-squares minimization as additional images are processed (Westoby et al., 2012). A dense point cloud was generated by aligning these tie-points with a multiple-view stereo algorithm (Frazier and Singh, 2021; Kaufmann et al., 2018). All 1,046 images were successfully aligned for Las Termas (RMS reprojection error: 0.22 px; coordinate precision: 4.31 cm), and for Cerro Blanco, 1,095 of 1,110 images were aligned (RMS reprojection error: 0.26 px; coordinate precision: 2.50 cm). Next, a triangular irregular network mesh was used to estimate 3-D point positions within the selected coordinate system to create a continuous mesh (Westoby et al., 2012). This mesh was then smoothed and an orthomosaic was

Formatted: Justified

Deleted: 2021

Deleted: Bisset et al., 2022;

Deleted: 2021

produced. Finally, a digital elevation model (DEM) was generated from the dense point cloud (Frazier and Singh, 2021; Rossini et al., 2023).

The relatively lower flight altitudes over Cerro Blanco yielded a higher DEM resolution in this area (7.82 cm/pixel) compared to Las Termas (16.70 cm/pixel). However, the RMSE was larger for the Cerro Blanco subcomplex than the Las Termas subcomplex (20.03 versus 9.24 cm, respectively), which was likely a result of manual UAV flying and image capture on the Cerro Blanco subcomplex.

3.3 Satellite and Airborne Elevation Products

We differenced DEMs across seven decades using a combination of historical, satellite, and UAV-derived elevation data, to compute glacier volume loss over time. UAV-derived DEMs, acquired in March 2024, provide high-accuracy subcomplex-level elevation data for 11 glaciers and serve as an independent validation of the full-complex Pléiades 2025 estimates for the same area. Although all DEMs were resampled to a common 30 m grid for differencing, UAV-derived 30 m pixels benefit from averaging many centimeter-scale measurements, yielding more reliable elevation values than equivalent-resolution satellite stereo products. All DEMs selected were from the southern hemisphere ablation season (~February–April) to minimize the presence of snow cover influencing ground elevation measurements.

Table 1: Sources for DEMs differenced for glacier volume loss estimates

Source	Vehicle Type	DEM	Survey Date	Resolution [per pixel]
IGM	Airplane	Topographic map	1954	30 m
SRTM	Satellite	C-band radar	11-22 February 2000	30 m
ASTER	Satellite	Stereo optical imagery (VNIR bands 3N/3B)	1 March 2018	30 m
This study	UAV	4/3" CMOS RGB Camera	12 and 14 March 2024	7.82 cm (Cerro Blanco) and 16.70 cm (Las Termas)
Pléiades	Satellite	Stereo optical photogrammetric DEM	14 April 2025	1 m native resolution, resampled to 30 m

3.3.1 Instituto Geográfico Militar DEM

The Instituto Geográfico Militar (IGM) DEM product was generated from interpolating elevations from the 1:50,000 scale topographic map “Nevados de Chillán” produced by the IGM. Published in 1968 using aerial photos from 1954, this map was built using UTM Zone 19 South and provides contour lines every 25 m and spot heights of several summits across the study area, referred to the PSAD56 datum. As the map exists only in paper format, the copy available in the Geography Department at the Universidad de Concepción was scanned, georeferenced, and digitized using the methods described in DGA (2022). The map was then displayed on ArcGIS Pro for georeferencing, employing coordinates of more than a dozen locations

Deleted: and Methods

Formatted: Justified

Deleted: To compute glacier volume loss over time,

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Deleted: we compared our 2024 UAV-derived DEM to two historic DEMs: one built from topographic maps produced by the IGM and the 2000 SRTM DEM product

Deleted: To increase the accuracy of our analysis,

Deleted: a

Deleted: used

Deleted: March

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Deleted: SOURCE

... [1]

Deleted: (IGM)

Formatted: Justified

275 corresponding to the intersections between lines defining the UTM coordinate grid closest to the glacier. Subsequently, contour
lines and spot heights were digitized on screen, producing ~~two~~ shapefiles: ~~one~~ of polylines (contours) and ~~one of~~ points (spot
heights), with their corresponding elevation assigned as an attribute. ~~The contour~~ polylines were ~~then~~ disaggregated into their
respective vertex points, ~~with a mean inter-vertex distance of 36.4 ± 21.5 m~~, and merged with the point shapefile, a merged
file that was then reprojected into WGS84 datum. These points were used to create a 30 m resolution DEM via interpolation
280 employing the Inverse Distance Weighting (IDW) method. ~~IDW was preferred over other common interpolation methods,~~
~~such as ANUDEM-based methods, because the hydrological stream network correction, central to these approaches, assumes~~
~~a stable river network, which is not the case in a rapidly deglaciating catchment (Hutchinson, 1989).~~

3.3.2 Shuttle Radar Topography Mission DEM

The second DEM used in this study was the ~~Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (SRTM)~~ 1 Arc-Second Global DEM for
285 February 2000 (USGS, 2018). SRTM provides a global 30 m resolution DEM produced from a C-band (5.6 cm) radar antenna
with observations from 11-22 February 2000, during peak summer ablation for Chilean glaciers, making it an excellent
reference for glacier ice elevation (USGS, 2018).

Both Hugonnet et al. (2021) and Dussaillant et al. ~~(2019)~~ utilized the DEM co-registration and differencing approach used
herein to estimate mean glacier elevation change. ~~Both~~ Hugonnet et al. (2021) and Dussaillant et al. ~~(2019)~~ used ~~ASTER~~
290 (optical stereo images) ~~as we do here~~, and both made use of individual ASTER stereo DEMs as a source of elevation data
~~across multiple epochs, an approach we also adopt here for 2018. When compared to SRTM, ASTER is known to suffer from~~
~~signal attenuation and reduced vertical accuracy over steep north-facing slopes due to shadowing effects, and over low-contrast~~
~~snow and ice surfaces (Berthier et al., 2024; Girod et al., 2017).~~ For these reasons, SRTM is used as the 2000 baseline elevation
reference in this study, taking advantage of its radar-based acquisition geometry and ablation-season timing to minimize snow
295 contamination and stereo-matching errors. ASTER is retained as a complementary source for an intermediate 2018 epoch,
~~where its known limitations over snow and ice are mitigated by strict quality filtering described in Section 3.3.3.~~

3.3.3 Advanced Spaceborne Thermal Emission and Reflection Radiometer DEM

The Advanced Spaceborne Thermal Emission and Reflection Radiometer (ASTER) DEM used in this study is a bias-corrected
300 30 m resolution stereo DEM acquired on 1 March 2018, obtained from the archive produced for Hugonnet et al. (2021). A
scene from March 2008 was also evaluated but excluded after quality filtering due to near-zero median elevation differences
over glacier terrain indicative of residual snow bias. The 2018 ASTER DEM provided by Hugonnet et al. (2021) was processed
using the MMASTER workflow (Girod et al., 2017), which applies cross-track polynomial, along-track sum-of-sines, and
jitter bias corrections using TanDEM-X as a co-registration reference. The ASTER acquisition dates fell within the southern
305 hemisphere ablation season, minimizing the influence of seasonal snow cover on glacier surface elevations. Prior to co-
registration and differencing, the DEM was geoid-corrected from ellipsoidal to orthometric heights using the EGM96

Deleted: one

Deleted: Next, t

Deleted: (SRTM)

Formatted: Justified

Deleted: 2020

Deleted: However

Deleted: ,

Deleted: 2020

Deleted: Advanced Spaceborne Thermal Emission and Reflection Radiometer (

Deleted:)

Deleted: where we use SRTM (radar interferometry) (USGS, 2018)

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Deleted: . The different methods used to produce ASTER and SRTM images has implications for DEM accuracy – when compared to SRTM, ASTER suffers from signal attenuation and vertical accuracy error over steep slopes and snow and ice. Moreover, SRTM resolves elevation by comparing two images taken seconds apart, whereas ASTER represents a composite elevation from ~2000-2004, which risks incorporation of winter scenes and thus distorting glacier elevation with seasonal snow cover. For these reasons, we chose SRTM over ASTER to represent the year ~2000 glacier elevation.

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Bold

undulation grid via the *pyproj* library. Quality filtering was applied following Hugonnet et al. (2021), including a stereo correlation threshold of ≥ 60 to mask low-confidence pixels, a spatial outlier filter removing pixels differing from SRTM by more than ± 200 m, and a snow bias check based on the median elevation difference over the glacier area. Of ten candidate scenes evaluated for the study area, one scene — acquired on 1 March 2018 — passed all quality criteria with $\geq 30\%$ glacier coverage and a near-zero median elevation difference over glacier terrain ($+0.11$ m), indicating minimal snow bias, and was retained for analysis.

3.3.4 Pléiades DEM

The Pléiades DEM used in this study was obtained from DGA under the Chilean Transparency Act. The DEM was built by DGA from Pléiades-1A stereoscopic imagery (PHR1A sensor, panchromatic band) acquired on 17 April 2025 over the Nevados de Chillán complex. The source imagery had virtually no cloud cover and a ground sampling distance of 0.73 m. The April acquisition date falls at the end of the southern hemisphere ablation season, minimizing the influence of seasonal snow cover. The photogrammetric processing was performed using the Ames Stereo Pipeline (ASP, version 3.5.0; Beyer et al., 2018) with RPC camera models provided with the imagery. Prior to image registration, bundle adjustment was applied to refine the camera models and reduce systematic errors. Stereo correlation was performed using *parallel stereo* and the resulting point cloud was rasterized with *point2dem*. The DEM provides full coverage of the Nevados de Chillán glacier complex and was resampled to 30 m for co-registration and differencing with the other DEMs in this study. The DEM was provided by the DGA in WGS84 ellipsoidal heights; we geoid-corrected it to orthometric heights using the EGM96 undulation grid prior to co-registration, consistent with all other ellipsoidal DEMs in this study.

3.4 DEM reprojection, alignment, and co-registration

All DEMs were first reprojected to the same coordinate system and resolution, and the UAV DEMs were reprojected to a 30 m resolution to match the IGM, SRTM, ASTER, and Pléiades DEMs. All DEMs were aligned on the same grid as the SRTM DEM using the *rasterio* Python library with bilinear interpolation.

Next, we co-registered the reprojected and aligned DEMs over stable terrain surrounding the glaciers. DEM co-registration improves accuracy when comparing elevation between DEMs by reducing horizontal and vertical shifts between images (Berthier et al., 2024). As in Shean et al. (2023) and Berthier et al. (2024), we implemented the Nuth and Kääb (2011) algorithm, which was packaged by Shean et al. (2016) in an open-source Python workflow. *Glaciated terrain was masked during co-registration using the union of the 1975, 2000, and 2019 DGA glacier inventories, ensuring that formerly glaciated terrain deglaciated between inventories was not misclassified as stable ground.* We co-registered the Cerro Blanco and Las Termas subcomplex UAV DEMs separately because the DEMs have different spatial resolutions, and thus co-registration to the SRTM DEM yielded different error values. Maps of stable areas used for glacier co-registration are provided in Appendix A.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Italic

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: three

Deleted: are

Deleted: and

Deleted: are

Deleted: with ESRI's *arcpy* package (v.2.3.0)

Deleted: using

Formatted: Font: Italic

Deleted: (See: Appendix A-C)

Deleted: We co-registered the IGM (1954) DEM to the SRTM DEM masking out all glaciers on the Nevados de Chillán complex using the year 2000 glacier polygons provided by DGA (2014) and co-registering the DEMs over surrounding stable terrain.

Deleted: complexes

Deleted: , along with error calculations,

Deleted: -C

3.5 Computing Glacier Mass Balance

Glacier mass balance was computed by clipping the co-registered DEMs to the 1975, 2000, and 2019 glacier areas and differencing the co-registered DEMs to calculate the change in height per pixel (Δh). Vertical ice loss was then converted to specific mean annual glacier mass balance, via the relative average densities of glacier ice (ρ_{ice}) and water (ρ_{water}), measured in meters water equivalent per unit area per year (m w.e. yr⁻¹).

$$MB = \left(\frac{\Delta h}{\Delta t} \right) \times \left(\frac{\rho_{ice}}{\rho_{water}} \right) \quad (1)$$

where Δh is the mean elevation within the glacier boundary defined by the 1975 (DGA, 2011), 2000 (DGA, 2014), or 2019 (DGA, 2022) inventory, Δt is the epoch duration in years, $\rho_{ice} = 850 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$ (Huss, 2013), and $\rho_{water} = 1,000 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$.

This workflow was repeated for each glacier on the complex. Due to weather and logistical limitations of our field work, only 11 of the 28 inventoried glaciers on Nevados de Chillán were covered by the UAV DEM, consisting of the southwestern face of Cerro Blanco, and the western and southern faces of the Las Termas subcomplex. Mass balance for all 28 glaciers was estimated for 1954–2000 using the IGM and SRTM DEMs, and for 2000–2025 using the SRTM, ASTER, and Pléiades DEMs. For the 11 glaciers covered by the UAV survey, mass balance was additionally estimated for 2000–2024, providing a higher-accuracy subcomplex-level record independent of satellite stereo imagery. Mass balance was calculated using a time-weighted mean area approach following Cogley et al. (2011), with mean glacier area computed as the arithmetic mean of the start and end inventory areas for each epoch. For 1954-based epochs, the 1975 glacier inventory (DGA, 2011) was used as the start area and the 2000 inventory (DGA, 2014) as the end area, as glacier outlines are not clearly delineated on the 1954 IGM topographic map, precluding direct digitization of 1954 glacier extents; the 1975 inventory represents the closest available approximation to the 1954 ice extent. For 2000-based epochs, the 2000 inventory (DGA, 2014) was used as the start area and the 2019 inventory (DGA, 2022) as the end area.

Normalized mean absolute deviation (NMAD) was computed over stable off-glacier terrain following co-registration as:

$$NMAD = 1.4826 \cdot \text{median}(|\Delta z_i - m_{\Delta z}|), \quad (2)$$

where Δz_i are elevation differences over stable off-glacier terrain and $m_{\Delta z}$ is their median. NMAD values computed over stable terrain after co-registration were 4.48 m (Las Termas UAV), 11.18 m (Cerro Blanco UAV), and 25.72 m (IGM DEM). The larger values for the Cerro Blanco UAV and IGM DEMs reflect greater data variability and irregular data distribution over their respective stable terrain areas, consistent with the smaller stable terrain extent surrounding the Cerro Blanco subcomplex.

The stable-terrain NMAD does not account for the spatial autocorrelation of DEM errors when integrating elevation change over a glacier area and therefore cannot be used directly as a mass balance uncertainty estimate. We therefore implement a two-step uncertainty propagation pipeline following Hugonnet et al. (2022) using the xDEM Python package (xDEM

Formatted: Justified

Deleted: provided by DGA (2014, 2022)

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman)

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman)

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman)

Deleted: $Mass - Balance = , \rightarrow$

Deleted: $\rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow (1)$

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman)

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Headings (Times New Roman), 10 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Headings (Times New Roman)

Formatted: ... [2]

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Deleted: w

Deleted: ,

Deleted: , n is the number of years between DEM dates, and ... [3]

Deleted: 2000 (DGA, 2014) or 2019 (DGA, 2022).

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman)

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman)

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman)

Deleted: As a result, cumulative mean annual mass balance ... [4]

Deleted: Mass-balance

Deleted: uncertainty was calculated as time-averaged n

Deleted: , a method for identifying outliers in non-normally ... [5]

Formatted: ... [6]

Deleted: $\rightarrow$

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Headings (Times New Roman)

Formatted: Justified

Formatted: ... [7]

Formatted: ... [8]

Formatted: ... [9]

Formatted: ... [10]

Formatted: ... [11]

Formatted: Justified, Line spacing: 1.5 lines

Formatted: ... [12]

Formatted: ... [13]

Formatted: ... [14]

Formatted: ... [15]

Formatted: ... [16]

Contributors, 2024). In the first step, a spatially variable per-pixel elevation error map $\sigma(x,y)$ is inferred from stable off-glacier terrain using the xDEM function `infer_heteroscedasticity` from `stable`, which models error as a function of terrain slope and maximum curvature via two-dimensional binning (Hugonnet et al., 2022). Where insufficient stable terrain pixels were available for heteroscedastic modelling (Cerro Blanco UAV DEM), a spatially uniform error equal to the stable-terrain NMAD was used.

In the second step, the spatial correlation structure of elevation errors is characterized by fitting a spherical variogram model to the empirical variogram of off-glacier elevation differences. The uncertainty in mean glacier elevation change $\sigma_{\Delta h}$ is then propagated following Rolstad et al. (2009):

$$\sigma_{\Delta h} = \sigma_{\text{pixel}} \times \sqrt{\frac{A_{\text{corr}}}{A_{\text{glacier}}}}, \text{ if } A_{\text{corr}} < A_{\text{glacier}} \quad (3)$$

$$\sigma_{\Delta h} = \sigma_{\text{pixel}} \times \sqrt{\frac{A_{\text{pixel}}}{A_{\text{glacier}}}}, \text{ if } A_{\text{corr}} \geq A_{\text{glacier}} \quad (4)$$

where $A_{\text{corr}} = \pi L^2/2$ is the area of spatial correlation, L is the variogram range, A_{glacier} is the glacier area, and A_{pixel} is the pixel area (900 m² at 30 m resolution). The first form applies where the glacier area exceeds the correlation area; the second applies for small glaciers where the correlation area exceeds the glacier extent. Estimated variogram ranges were 882 m (IGM 1954), 505 m (Cerro Blanco UAV 2024), 637 m (Las Termas UAV 2024), 187 m (Pléiades 2025), and 13 m (ASTER 2018). Mass balance uncertainty is then derived as:

$$\sigma_{MB} = \sigma_{\Delta h} \times \frac{\rho_{\text{ice}}}{\rho_{\text{water}} \times \Delta t} \quad (5)$$

where Δt is the epoch duration in years. Resulting mass balance uncertainties were ± 0.31 m w.e. yr⁻¹ (SRTM-IGM, 1954–2000), ± 0.30 m w.e. yr⁻¹ (Cerro Blanco UAV-SRTM, 2000–2024), ± 0.16 m w.e. yr⁻¹ (Las Termas UAV-SRTM, 2000–2024), ± 0.17 m w.e. yr⁻¹ (Pléiades-SRTM, 2000–2025), and ± 0.01 m w.e. yr⁻¹ (ASTER-SRTM, 2000–2018).

3.6 Hydroclimate Data

Precipitation data were sourced from two meteorological stations nearest the Nevados de Chillán complex. Las Trancas and Diguillín, located approximately 10 and 18 km aerial distance and 1366 m and 1899 m below the complex, respectively. Maximum and minimum monthly temperature data were obtained from the DGA's Diguillín meteorological station via CR2 (<https://explorador.cr2.cl/>), while no temperature data was available for the Las Trancas station. Daily streamflow data were also provided for the Diguillín station. Monthly precipitation and streamflow data were summed to compute cumulative annual precipitation for the Las Trancas and Diguillín meteorological stations. Daily minimum and maximum temperature data were

Formatted ... [17]

Formatted ... [18]

Formatted ... [19]

Formatted ... [20]

Formatted: Justified, Line spacing: 1.5 lines

Formatted ... [21]

Formatted ... [22]

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt

Formatted ... [23]

Formatted: font-claude-response-body

Deleted: Where $\Delta z_i = (z_{GCPi} - z_{DEM})$ are errors and $|\Delta z_i|$ are absolute errors, calculated from control points computed for each DEM before and after co-registration (Shean et al., 2016). NMAD is commonly used to represent elevation measurement error because DEM errors rarely display normal distributions, making RMSE and standard deviations less accurate due to their assumptions of normal distribution (Hugonnet et al., 2021; Shean et al., 2016). NMAD was then converted to m w.e. for comparison with our mass balance estimates (Appendix A-C). NMAD values were calculated for the Las Termas UAV DEM (NMAD = 5.12 m w.e.), Cerro Blanco UAV DEM (NMAD = 8.14 m w.e.), and IGM DEM (NMAD = 25.14 m w.e.), through their co-registration with the SRTM DEM. The larger NMAD values of the IGM and Cerro Blanco UAV DEMs was likely a result of larger data variability, outliers, and/or irregular data distribution. Moreover, we found a correlation between the size of the stable areas surrounding glaciers and the NMAD—more stable areas were measured over the Las Termas subcomplex than over Cerro Blanco, corresponding to lower NMAD values over the former than the latter. To produce mean annual mass-balance error estimates, NMAD was divided by the number of years between DEM observations, n , (e.g. SRTM(2000) - IGM(1954) = 46 years).

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman)

Formatted: Justified

Deleted: —...as Trancas and Diguillín, — ... [24]

500 averaged to derive mean daily temperature. From these, three temperature time series were generated representing minimum, mean, and maximum values.

Temperature, precipitation, and streamflow were analyzed for the full record and for summer months (~~January–March; JFM~~). Hydroclimatic trends were quantified using Sen’s slope estimator (Sen, 1968), which is robust to outliers, missing values, and non-normal distributions that commonly characterize climatic and hydrological time series. Sen’s slope computes the median of all pairwise slopes between observations,

$$\beta = \text{median} \left(\frac{x_j - x_i}{j - i} \right), \text{ for } j > i, \tag{6}$$

yielding a distribution-free estimate of the monotonic trend magnitude. Trends were evaluated over the full record and separately for pre- and post-2000 periods to enable comparison with glacier mass balance changes. Statistical significance of trends was assessed using the nonparametric Mann–Kendall test (Mann, 1945; Kendall, 1948), following Burkey (2006) via the *pymannkendall* package in Python. Significance was evaluated at the 95% level ($p < 0.05$).

3.7 Geospatial and Topographic Analysis

The relationship between glacier surface elevation change (Δh) and topographic variables (mean elevation, slope, and aspect) was assessed at the glacier scale using Spearman rank correlation as the primary statistical test, appropriate given the non-normal distribution of elevation change data. Pearson correlation coefficients are also reported for comparison. Spatial autocorrelation of pixel-level elevation change within glacier boundaries was characterized using Global Moran's I and Local Moran's I (LISA) statistics, implemented using the *PySAL esda* library with a rook contiguity spatial weights matrix. Statistical significance was evaluated at the 95% confidence level ($p < 0.05$) using 499 permutations.

4 Results

4.1 DEM co-registration and error calculation

520 By co-registering the UAV, IGM, ASTER, and Pléiades DEMs to the SRTM DEM, we reduce geolocation errors and thus improve the accuracy of our elevation change and mass balance calculations (Shean et al., 2023). Post-co-registration median signed error and NMAD were calculated for each DEM over stable off-glacier terrain (Table 2). All UAV and ASTER DEMs achieved median errors within ± 2.2 m after co-registration. The IGM and Pléiades DEMs show larger residual median offsets of +5.96 m and +5.12 m, respectively, reflecting systematic vertical biases on stable terrain rather than co-registration failure, which are accounted for in the uncertainty propagation described in Section 3.5.

Table 2: Post-co-registration median signed error and NMAD for each DEM over stable off-glacier terrain

Deleted: December

Deleted: February

Deleted: D

Deleted: 3

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman)

Deleted: 5

Deleted: 2021

Deleted: To identify potential hydroclimatic regime shifts, we applied the E-Divisive multiple change-point algorithm implemented in the *ecp* package in R (James and Matteson, 2015). This method is fully nonparametric and detects changes in the underlying distribution of a time-ordered sequence of multivariate observations; in this case, vectors of temperature, precipitation, streamflow station measurements (Matteson and James, 2014). Rather than assuming changes in only the mean or variance, the method assesses whether two adjacent segments of the time series differ in their joint distribution using a divergence measure based on U-statistics (Matteson and James, 2014). Candidate change points are chosen to maximize this divergence, and statistical significance is evaluated using permutation testing. A minimum window size of 10 years was imposed on both sides of a candidate change point to reduce sensitivity to short-term variability and to ensure that shifts represent sustained hydroclimatic changes relevant to regime analysis.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Bold, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Normal, Space After: 0 pt

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Italic

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Justified

Deleted: and IGM DEM

Deleted: Pre- and p

Deleted: (50th percentile)

Deleted: In all three cases, co-registering the DEMs with the SRTM DEM reduced the median positive vertical error

Deleted: When co-registering the Cerro Blanco UAV DEM to the SRTM DEM, positive vertical error surrounding Glacier Nevado was reduced from a median value of 19.88 m to 0.13 m, whereas NMAD stayed the same. For the Las Termas UAV DEM, co-registration reduced positive vertical error from a median value of 27.51 m to 0.03 m. NMAD reduced from 5.68 m to 5.12m . Finally, the positive vertical error on the IGM DEM reduced from a median of 17.78 m to 6.52 m, and a NMAD of 31.62 m to 25.64 m with co-registration.

DEM	N stable pixels	Median dh [m]	NMAD [m]
IGM 1954	189,192	5.96	25.72
ASTER 2018	7,048,858	-0.06	5.72
Cerro Blanco UAV 2024	1,225	-2.19	11.86
Las Termas UAV 2024	12,311	0.002	4.8
Pléiades 2025	251,078	5.12	17.32

565 4.2 Glacier elevation change

Glaciers thinned on average across the entirety of the Nevados de Chillán complex, and all analysis periods (Fig. 3). For the Las Termas subcomplex, mean thinning increased when using the 2019 glacier polygons versus the 2000 glacier polygons, whereas the opposite was true for the Cerro Blanco subcomplex and the complex as a whole.

Deleted: 
Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Justified

Deleted: A

Deleted: both


Deleted: the Cerro Blanco and Las Termas subcomplexes





Deleted: three

Deleted: (1954-2000, 2000-2024, and 1954-2024), glaciers thinned on average

Formatted: Justified, Line spacing: 1.5 lines

Deleted: 








Figure 3: Glacier elevation change (m) of the Cerro Blanco and Las Termas subcomplexes on Nevados de Chillán. Glacier outlines are shown for 1975 (dotted), 2000 (dashed), and 2019 (solid). (a) 1954–2000 elevation changes for the entire glacier complex derived from the IGM topographic map and SRTM DEM. (b) 1954–2024 elevation changes for Cerro Blanco and Las Termas subcomplexes constrained by UAV flight extent, derived from UAV surveys and the IGM DEM. (c) 1954–2025 elevation changes for the entire complex derived from the IGM DEM and Pléiades DEM. (d) 2000–2018 elevation changes for the entire complex derived from ASTER and SRTM DEMs. (e) 2000–2024 elevation changes for UAV-surveyed glaciers relative to SRTM 2000. (f) 2000–2025 elevation changes for the entire complex derived from Pléiades and SRTM DEMs. (g) 2018–2024 elevation changes for UAV-surveyed glaciers relative to ASTER 2018. (h) 2018–2025 elevation changes for the entire complex derived from Pléiades and ASTER DEMs. Panels (a), (c), (d), and (f) are clipped to the 1975 glacier inventory; all other panels are clipped to 2000 glacier perimeters to reflect the DEM dates. Basemap: © OpenTopoMap contributors.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar

Formatted: Justified

Deleted: Glacier elevation change [m] of the Cerro Blanco and Las Termas subcomplexes on Nevados de Chillán within year 2000 glacier perimeters. A) 1954–2000 elevation changes are mapped for the entire glacier complex, whereas 1954–2024 (B and D) and 2000–2024 (C and E) changes were constrained by UAV flight limitations (Sources: Esri, TomTom, Garmin, FAO, NOAA, USGS, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community | Powered by Esri).

Glacier loss was greatest near the tongue of each glacier, showing a relationship between greater glacier thinning and lower elevation. Between 2000 and 2019, the glaciers situated on the saddle between the Cerro Blanco and Las Termas subcomplexes (Puerto los Baños) disappeared entirely (Fig. 3). Positive elevation change shown in blue on Fig. 3 a-c likely corresponds to lava lobes from eruptions during that period (1954-2000), the formation of the Arrau crater, or persistent seasonal snow at the time of imaging, rather than glacier thickening (Dixon et al., 1999; Naranjo et al., 2008). Given that we were unable to survey the northeastern aspect of the complex with UAV, the melt dynamics of those glaciers are constrained by the Pléiades and ASTER DEMs only. Glacier thinning was observed across the full complex in both satellite datasets. On the Cerro Blanco subcomplex, elevation decrease was greatest on the southern and western faces, with slightly less thinning observed on the northern and eastern faces. A similar pattern was observed on the Las Termas subcomplex, where the southern and western faces showed the greatest elevation decrease.

Mean and median glacier thinning on the Cerro Blanco subcomplex exceeds that on the Las Termas subcomplex across all periods (Fig. 3). Furthermore, ice loss from 2000–2024 (UAV-SRTM) for the two subcomplexes far exceeds that measured from 1954–2000 for the whole complex, indicating an increase in the rate of mass loss post-2000 for these glaciers. This acceleration is further corroborated by the ASTER 2018 and Pléiades 2025 full-complex estimates, which show -0.51 ± 0.01 m w.e. yr^{-1} from 2000–2018 (ASTER-SRTM) and -0.51 ± 0.17 m w.e. yr^{-1} from 2000–2025 (Pléiades-SRTM), both substantially more negative than the 1954–2000 whole-complex estimate of -0.19 ± 0.31 m w.e. yr^{-1} .

We analyzed the relationship between elevation change (Δh) and pixel topographic variables (aspect, slope, and elevation), and found that these topographic factors explained up to 13% of observed elevation change (Pléiades (2025) – SRTM (2000), $r^2=0.13$, $p=0.06$), with no correlation reaching statistical significance ($p>0.05$ in all cases), meaning that most of the variation is controlled by other factors (Appendix B). Spearman rank correlation was used as the primary statistical test given the non-normal distribution of elevation change data, with Pearson correlation reported for comparison. While topographic patterns vary by glacier subcomplex and by year, topographic variables had a very small and insignificant effect on glacier surface elevation change overall. We also observed significant ($p = 0.001$) spatial autocorrelation in pixels with elevation change, calculating Global Moran's I values for the glacier elevation change raster layers ranging from a minimum of 0.72 to a maximum of 0.96. Using Local Moran's I analysis, we found a high degree of spatial clustering of elevation change across all epochs, though the nature of clustering varied by period (Appendix C). For the 2000–2025 Pléiades epoch, 97.4% of pixels fell within significant clusters, of which 93.4% were high-high clusters (HH), indicating that high mass loss pixels are overwhelmingly surrounded by other high-mass-loss pixels, consistent with spatially uniform thinning across the complex in the recent period. For longer-term epochs (1954–2000, 1954–2025), significant clusters were predominantly low-low (LL, ~10%), reflecting spatially coherent low-loss areas corresponding to higher-elevation accumulation zones. In other words, glacier elevation loss on Nevados de Chillán is spatially coherent, and the spatial organization of mass loss has shifted from

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Deleted: Given that we were unable to survey the northeastern aspect of the complex, the melt dynamics of those glaciers were not determined (Fig. 3). Pixels that increased in elevation were mostly clustered on the southern face of the Las Termas subcomplex.

Deleted: elevation

Deleted: -

Deleted: -

Deleted: geographic

Deleted: only

Deleted: 6

Deleted: ($p<0.05$)

Deleted: D

Deleted: geographic

Deleted: geographic

Deleted: 69

Deleted: 82

Deleted: , i.e. pixels with high (low) elevation loss are near pixels with high (low) elevation loss (Appendix E). In other words, we found that glacier elevation loss on Nevados de Chillán is spatially coherent.

localized preservation within accumulation zones in the long-term record to near-uniform thinning across glacier surfaces in the most recent period.





Figure 4: Distribution of glacier elevation change by glacier outline (1975, 2000, and 2019) for the Cerro Blanco and Las Termas subcomplexes and the entire Nevados de Chillán complex with median, 25th and 75th percentiles plotted.

We also observed the impact of glacier outline choice (2000 vs 2019) on measured glacier elevation change (Fig. 4). Our primary mass balance estimates use a time-weighted mean area approach following Cogley et al. (2011), which accounts for glacier area change and reduces sensitivity to outline choice. For the full Nevados de Chillán complex, mean elevation differences were nearly identical between inventories and not significant (Pléiades 2000–2025: $\Delta\text{median} = +0.49\text{ m}$, Cohen's $d = 0.057$, $p = 0.23$). The Las Termas subcomplex showed slightly greater glacier thinning using 2019 outlines, but the difference was negligible and not significant ($\Delta\text{median} = -0.69\text{ m}$, Cohen's $d = 0.102$, $p = 0.17$). In contrast, the Cerro Blanco subcomplex showed a small but statistically significant difference ($\Delta\text{median} = +2.50\text{ m}$, Cohen's $d = -0.183$, $p = 0.022$), though the effect size remains negligible ($|d| < 0.2$). These results demonstrate that mass balance estimates for smaller subcomplexes are more sensitive to the choice of glacier inventory, while the overall complex is largely unaffected.

4.3 Mean Mass Balance of Nevados de Chillán Complex

For the full complex, mean annual specific mass balance was $-0.19 \pm 0.31\text{ m w.e. yr}^{-1}$ from 1954–2000, within the range of measurement uncertainty, and accelerated to $-0.51 \pm 0.17\text{ m w.e. yr}^{-1}$ from 2000–2025 (Pléiades) and $-0.51 \pm 0.01\text{ m w.e. yr}^{-1}$ from 2000–2018 (ASTER), both significant. We used a time-weighted mean area approach for mass balance calculations following Cogley et al. (2011), with the 1975 glacier inventory (DGA, 2011) serving as the reference outline for 1954-based epochs given that a reliable earlier reference outline was not available. The Cerro Blanco subcomplex had a mean annual

Deleted: 1



Deleted:

Deleted: . The Las Termas subcomplex showed slightly greater elevation loss using 2019 outlines, but the change was not significant. In contrast, the Cerro Blanco subcomplex exhibited small but significant differences: relative to SRTM, the mean difference increased from -17.0 m (2000) to -15.3 m (2019) ($t = -2.31$, $p = 0.021$), and relative to IGM, from -33.4 m to -30.3 m ($t = -3.60$, $p = 0.00033$), indicating slightly reduced apparent ice loss using the 2019 outlines (Appendix F). These results demonstrate that mass balance estimates for smaller subcomplexes are more sensitive to the choice of glacier inventory, while the overall complex is largely unaffected.

Deleted: F

specific mass balance of -0.59 ± 0.13 m w.e. yr^{-1} (2000–2025, Pléiades) and -0.59 ± 0.30 m w.e. yr^{-1} (2000–2024, UAV), indicating close agreement between the two independent datasets. The Las Termas subcomplex had a mean annual specific mass balance of -0.47 ± 0.16 m w.e. yr^{-1} from 2000–2024 (UAV), which is significant, while the Pléiades-derived estimate of -0.27 ± 0.30 m w.e. yr^{-1} for 2000–2025 falls within the range of measurement uncertainty. The discrepancy between the two estimates likely reflects differences in point density and spatial coverage, as the UAV-derived DEM benefits from centimeter-scale measurements resampled to 30 m, yielding more reliable elevation values over the complex terrain of the Las Termas subcomplex than the Pléiades stereo product. Importantly, the Las Termas subcomplex showed acceleration in mass loss from 2000–2018 (-0.39 ± 0.02 m w.e. yr^{-1}) to 2018–2024 (-0.55 ± 0.06 m w.e. yr^{-1}), a statistically significant increase of $\sim 43\%$. This suggests accelerating melt across the complex in the past 25 years when compared to the 1954–2000 period. Fig. 5 summarizes mass balance and error estimates for all time periods within both the 2000 and 2019 glacier outlines.

Mean glacier thinning of the Cerro Blanco subcomplex far exceeded that of the Las Termas subcomplex. For the 1954–2024 period, Cerro Blanco lost an average of -31.1 ± 10.2 m in elevation (Fig. 3). For Las Termas, the most reliable cumulative estimate is -12.5 ± 4.6 m over 2000–2024, as the 1954-based Las Termas value carries large uncertainty due to the limited coverage of the 1975 glacier inventory over this subcomplex. The relatively higher measurement error of the 1954 IGM DEM means the 1954–2000 contribution to total ice loss cannot be precisely partitioned for either subcomplex. This epoch yields a slightly positive but statistically insignificant mean mass balance ($+0.07 \pm 0.47$ m w.e. yr^{-1} for SRTM-IGM), which we attribute to the geometric mismatch between the large 1975 Las Termas polygons (4.99 km^2) and the much smaller current glacier footprint (0.65 km^2), resulting in inclusion of recently deglaciated terrain in the mean area calculation. This estimate is therefore excluded from trend analysis.

The mass balance of Glaciar Nevado, the largest glacier on Nevados de Chillán, was calculated for the 1954–2000 and 2000–2024/2025 sub-periods (DGA, 2011; 2014; 2022). Individual glacier-level estimates for 1954-based epochs are not available as the 1975 inventory predates the fragmentation of the complex into the discrete glacier units identified in the 2000 and 2019 inventories, reflecting the much greater ice extent at that time. From 2000–2018, the ASTER-derived mean annual mass balance of Glaciar Nevado was -0.48 ± 0.01 m w.e. yr^{-1} , increasing to -0.59 ± 0.30 m w.e. yr^{-1} from 2000–2024 (UAV) and -0.69 ± 0.10 m w.e. yr^{-1} from 2000–2025 (Pléiades) (Fig. 5). The close agreement between these three independent estimates increases confidence in the reported mass loss signal. These results suggest an increasing rate of glacier mass loss over time. The magnitude of glacier loss from 1954–2000 for the whole complex was within the range of measurement uncertainty. Mass loss was significant across all 2000-based epochs for both the Cerro Blanco subcomplex and Glaciar Nevado. The Las Termas Pléiades-derived 2000–2025 estimate (-0.27 ± 0.30 m w.e. yr^{-1}) was also within measurement uncertainty, however the UAV-derived estimate (-0.47 ± 0.16 m w.e. yr^{-1}) and the 2018–2024 ASTER-UAV estimate (-0.55 ± 0.06 m w.e. yr^{-1}) confirm significant and accelerating mass loss at Las Termas.

Deleted: rom 1954–2024, the Cerro Blanco subcomplex had a mean annual specific mass balance of -0.41 (-0.37) ± 0.33 m w.e. yr^{-1} within the year 2000 (2019) glacier outlines, whereas the Las Termas subcomplex had a mean annual specific mass balance of -0.13 (-0.16) ± 0.18 m w.e. yr^{-1} . More recently, from 2000–2024, the Cerro Blanco subcomplex had a mean annual specific mass balance of -0.60 (-0.54) ± 0.29 m w.e. yr^{-1} within the year 2000 (2019) glacier outlines, whereas the Las Termas subcomplex had a mean annual specific mass balance of -0.32 (-0.36) ± 0.18 m w.e. yr^{-1} within the year 2000 (2019) glacier outlines. This suggests accelerating melt for these 11 glaciers in the past 24 years when compared to the entire 70-year study period.

Deleted: calculations

Deleted: For the entire 70-year period, Cerro Blanco lost an average of -33.43 ± 8.14 m in elevation, compared to just -8.46 ± 5.12 m on average from Las Termas (Fig. 3).

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Deleted: The relatively higher measurement error calculated for the 1954 IGM DEM precludes precise estimations on how much of that ice loss occurred before the year 2000.

Formatted: Justified

Deleted: for the entire 70-year period, in addition to the 1954–2000 and 2000–2024 sub-periods (DGA, 2014; 2022). The mean annual mass balance within the 2000 glacier extent was -0.41 ± 0.33 m w.e. yr^{-1} over the full study period (1954–2024), -0.30 ± 0.47 m w.e. yr^{-1} from 1954–2000, and -0.60 ± 0.29 m w.e. yr^{-1} from 2000–2024 (Fig. 5). The mean annual mass balance within the 2019 glacier extent was -0.37 ± 0.33 m w.e. yr^{-1} over the full study period (1954–2024), -0.27 ± 0.47 m w.e. yr^{-1} from 1954–2000, and -0.54 ± 0.29 m w.e. yr^{-1} from 2000–2024 (Fig. 5).

Deleted: -

Deleted: ,

Deleted: however glacier loss was significant within both the 2000 and 2019 glacier areas from 1954–2024 and 2000–2024.





Figure 5: Mean annual specific mass balance [m w.e. yr⁻¹] for the Nevados de Chillán glacier complex across all subcomplexes and observation periods. Panels show results for the whole complex, Cerro Blanco subcomplex, Las Termas subcomplex, Puerto los Baños subcomplex, and Glaciar Nevado. Four epochs are shown where data are available: 1954–2000 (SRTM-IGM, blue), 2000–2018 (ASTER, red), 2000–2024 (UAV, green), and 2000–2025 (Pléiades, orange). UAV-derived estimates are available only for Cerro Blanco and Las Termas subcomplexes; the 1954–2000 estimate is available only at the whole-complex level due to the spatial extent of the 1975 glacier inventory. Error bars represent propagated uncertainty following Rolstad et al. (2009) and Hugonnet et al. (2022). Values within the range of measurement uncertainty (MB) < 1σ are not considered statistically significant.

In summary, mean annual specific mass balance accelerated significantly over time for both the Cerro Blanco and Las Termas subcomplexes, as well as for Glaciar Nevado. The 1954–2000 whole-complex mass balance signal was within measurement



Deleted:

Formatted: Font: 9 pt, Bold

Deleted: Box plot of mean annual glacier mass balance and whiskers showing error calculations for both the 2000 (blue) and 2019 (orange) glacier outlines.

Deleted: decreased

775 uncertainty, reflecting the lower accuracy of the IGM DEM baseline. The most robust signals of acceleration are the ASTER 2018 and Pléiades 2025 full-complex estimates, which agree closely, and the Las Termas 2018–2024 UAV-ASTER estimate, which has the tightest uncertainty of all short-period epochs and confirms post-2018 acceleration at that subcomplex.

4.4 Hydroclimatic Trends

780 We found that annual cumulative precipitation decreased by an average of -19.00 mm yr⁻¹ (p = 0.022) at the Diguillin meteorological station, and by -48.90 mm yr⁻¹ (p < 0.001) at the Las Trancas station over the full record (Fig. 6 D and E). The rate of decline accelerated markedly after 2000, with precipitation decreasing at -79.2 mm yr⁻¹ (p = 0.001) at Diguillin and -116.8 mm yr⁻¹ (p < 0.001) at Las Trancas. Segmented regression did not identify a statistically robust breakpoint in either precipitation series, indicating that the decline is better characterized as a continuous monotonic trend than an abrupt regime shift.

Deleted: Mass balance was negative but was smaller than the measurement uncertainty for the 1954-2000 study period, however, due to the lower resolution of historic elevation data. NMAD also exceeded the signal of glacier mass balance from 1954-2024 for the Las Termas subcomplex due to the relatively small signal of glacier loss.

Deleted: 22

Deleted: 2

Deleted: 8.85 x 10⁻³

Deleted: 4.86

Deleted: = 1.18 x 10⁻⁵

Deleted: from 1980-2020

Deleted: A

Deleted: B

Deleted: The year 2007 was identified as a change point in both time series, indicating a shift in the regional precipitation regime beginning that year (Fig. 6 A and B). Corroborating this point, the five lowest precipitation years occurred since 2007 for the Las Trancas station, while four of five occurred in 2007 or later for the Diguillin station. By contrast, the five highest precipitation years for both stations occurred before 2007. ¶





Figure 6: Sen's slope trend analysis of annual mean temperature (Tmin, Tmean, Tmax), cumulative precipitation, and cumulative streamflow at the Diguillín and Las Trancas meteorological stations. Trend lines are colored red (significant increase), blue (significant decrease), or grey dashed (non-significant). Pre- and post-2000 trends are shown as dashed lines where significant.



Deleted:

Deleted: Change-point and trend analysis of annual cumulative precipitation and streamflow and mean annual temperature at the Las Trancas and Diguillín meteorological stations. Annual cumulative precipitation decreased at both Diguillín and Las Trancas stations ($p < 0.05$).

815 Maximum, minimum, and mean temperature was analyzed for the Diguillín station alone (Fig. 6 A, B, C), since no temperature
data were available for Las Trancas. Average annual minimum daily temperatures increased by $0.029^{\circ}\text{C yr}^{-1}$ ($p < 0.001$) and
average annual mean daily temperatures increased by $0.023^{\circ}\text{C yr}^{-1}$ ($p < 0.001$) (Fig. 6 A and B). Average annual maximum
temperatures showed no significant trend over the full record, though post-2000 maximum temperatures increased at 0.086°C
820 yr^{-1} , approaching significance (Fig. 6 C). To assess whether hydroclimatic trends were better characterized by a sudden shift
or continuous monotonic change, we applied both the E-Divisive multiple changepoint algorithm (James and Matteson, 2015)
and segmented (piecewise linear) regression (Pilgrim, 2021). The E-Divisive method detects changes in the joint distribution
of multivariate time series using permutation testing, while segmented regression identifies the year at which the rate of change
accelerated most significantly. Neither method detected a statistically robust breakpoint in any series, confirming that the
observed hydroclimatic trends are better described as continuous monotonic acceleration rather than abrupt regime shifts.
825 Trend analysis therefore relies solely on Sen's slope and Mann-Kendall tests as described in Section 3.6. Streamflow was also
analyzed for Río Diguillín station, with cumulative annual streamflow decreasing by $-32.40 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ ($p=0.010$) over the full
time series. Analysis of post-2000 cumulative annual streamflow indicated dramatic reductions, with streamflow decreasing
by $-213.10 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ ($p = 0.001$), representing a $>550\%$ increase in the rate of streamflow decline.
Finally, we analyzed changes in summertime (JFM) temperature (Fig. 7), precipitation (Fig. 8), and streamflow (Fig. 9).
830 January, February, and March minimum daily temperatures all increased significantly over the full record ($+0.054$, $+0.054$,
and $+0.039^{\circ}\text{C yr}^{-1}$ respectively; all $p < 0.001$). Mean daily temperatures also increased significantly across all three months,
and maximum daily temperatures increased significantly in January ($+0.036^{\circ}\text{C yr}^{-1}$, $p = 0.019$) and March ($+0.038^{\circ}\text{C yr}^{-1}$, p
 $= 0.011$). Post-2000 warming rates accelerated substantially for January and March maximum and mean temperatures (January
Tmax: $+0.189^{\circ}\text{C yr}^{-1}$, $p = 0.007$; March Tmax: $+0.260^{\circ}\text{C yr}^{-1}$, $p = 0.019$), while post-2000 minimum temperature trends were
835 not significant for any month.

- Deleted: S
- Deleted: , maximum, minimum, and mean temperature was analyzed for the Diguillín station alone (Fig. 6 C, D, E)
- Deleted: = 4.45×10^{-4}
- Deleted: = 3.30×10^{-4}
- Deleted: D
- Deleted: E
- Moved down [1]: (Fig. 6. C)
- Moved (insertion) [1]
- Deleted: .
- Formatted: Superscript
- Deleted: Change points occurred in 1993 for mean and 1997 for minimum annual average temperatures. Unlike the precipitation series where nine out of ten of the lowest precipitation years have occurred since 2007, the five years with highest mean temperature were more spread throughout the time series (Fig. 6 D and E).
- Deleted: 20.53
- Deleted: 4
- Deleted: average
- Deleted: 232.90
- Deleted: 2.04×10^{-4}
- Deleted: 1000
- Deleted: The timeseries of annual average minimum, mean, and maximum air temperatures and streamflow, and annual cumulative precipitation, are shown above in Fig. 6.
- Deleted: Finally, we analyzed changes in summertime (DJF) temperature (Fig. 7), precipitation (Fig. 8), and streamflow (Fig. 9). December (Fig. 7 A and C) and January (Fig. 7 D and F) daily minimum and mean temperatures increased significantly over the study period. December daily minimum temperatures (Fig. 7 A) experienced a change point in 1995, while January (Fig. 7 D) and February (Fig. 7 G) minimum temperatures experienced a change point in 2001. Maximum daily January temperatures (Fig. 7 E) experienced a change point in 1983, while mean daily January (Fig. 7 F) and February (Fig. 7 I) temperatures experienced change points in 2004 and 2001, respectively. Post-2000 daily maximum (Fig. 7 E) and mean (Fig. 7 F) January temperatures increased significantly, compared to the full timeseries trend.
- Formatted: Font color: Text 1





Figure 7: Sen's slope trend analysis of monthly summertime (JFM) mean daily temperature at the Diguillín meteorological station. Trend lines are colored red (significant increase), blue (significant decrease), or grey dashed (non-significant). Pre- and post-2000 trends are shown as dashed lines where significant.

Summertime (JFM) precipitation trends were mixed between stations (Fig. 8). At Las Trancas, JFM cumulative precipitation declined significantly over the full record (-2.39 mm yr^{-1} , $p = 0.019$), suggesting a measurable drying signal in the ablation



Deleted:


Formatted: Justified

Deleted: Change-point and trend analysis of monthly summertime (DJF) mean annual temperature downstream of Nevados de Chillán.

Deleted:

885

season at the higher-elevation station nearest the glaciers. At Diguillín, the summertime trend was negative but did not reach the significance threshold used in this study (-1.37 mm yr^{-1} , $p = 0.076$). This contrasts with the stronger and significant annual precipitation decline at both stations, indicating that the drying signal is primarily concentrated in the accumulation season rather than the ablation season.




890

Figure 8: Sen's slope trend analysis of cumulative summertime (JFM) precipitation at the Las Trancas and Diguillín meteorological stations. Trend lines are colored blue (significant decrease) or grey dashed (non-significant). Pre- and post-2000 trends are shown as dashed lines where significant.

895

January streamflow decreased significantly over the full study period (Fig. 9 A), and post-2000 February and March streamflow also decreased significantly (February: $-0.211 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$, $p = 0.002$; March: $-0.117 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$, $p = 0.012$) (Fig. 9 B and C). February and March represent the months when seasonal snow has typically melted off, meaning that significant post-2000 decreases in streamflow during these months could be a result of decreased glacier melt.

Deleted: Interestingly, we find that summertime precipitation has not changed significantly over the study period, and no change points were detected (Fig. 8). This suggests that, while annual cumulative precipitation has decreased significantly, summertime precipitation has not, meaning that precipitation changes are greatest in the accumulation season rather than the ablation season.



Deleted:

Formatted: Justified

Deleted: Change-point and trend analysis of monthly summertime (DJF) cumulative precipitation downstream of Nevados de Chillán.

Deleted: December (Fig. 9 A) and January (Fig. 9 B) streamflow, on the other hand, have decreased significantly over the full study period, and post-2000 February streamflow has also decreased significantly (Fig. 9 C). February represents a month when all seasonal snow has typically melted off, meaning that significant post-2000 decreases in streamflow could be a result of decreased glacier melt. A change point was identified for December ... [25]




Figure 9: Sen's slope trend analysis of monthly summertime (JFM) mean daily streamflow at the Río Diguillín station. Trend lines are colored blue (significant decrease) or grey dashed (non-significant). Pre- and post-2000 trends are shown as dashed lines where significant.

Significant increases in post-2000 JFM maximum and mean temperatures (Fig. 7), and post-2000 decreases in February and March daily streamflow (Fig. 9 B and C), may be related to trends accelerating post-2000 glacier loss observed in this paper. Increasing summertime temperatures accelerate glacier melt and are reflected in our increasingly negative glacier MB calculations. The decrease in post-2000 February and March streamflow (Fig. 9 B and C) could indicate that the glaciers on Nevados de Chillán passed peak water, meaning that despite their increasing rate of glacier mass loss over time, post-2000 streamflow contributions have decreased (Huss and Hock, 2018). However, an in-situ or modeling analysis of glacier melt contributions would be necessary to confirm this attribution, as declining streamflow is likely also attributable to seasonal precipitation trends.

5 Discussion

5.1 Findings and Implications

This study reports a negative MB trend on average across the study period across the entire Nevados de Chillán complex. For the full complex, mass loss accelerated from -0.19 ± 0.31 m w.e. yr⁻¹ from 1954–2000 to -0.51 ± 0.17 m w.e. yr⁻¹ from 2000–2025 (Pléiades), corroborated by the ASTER 2018 estimate of -0.51 ± 0.01 m w.e. yr⁻¹ for 2000–2018. While these results provide the first geodetic MB study of the full Nevados de Chillán complex, previous work by the DGA reports the mass balance of Glaciar Nevado from 2021–2022 and 2023–2024 (DGA 2022; 2024). Our multi-decadal trends are substantially smaller in magnitude than short-term estimates reported by the DGA for 2021–2022 and 2023–2024, which were derived from four ablation stakes and partial (40–60%) glacier UAV LiDAR coverage. The DGA's single-year measurements suggest extreme annual losses (~ 8 m w.e. in 2021–2022 and ~ 7 m in 2023–2024), whereas their LiDAR estimates ranged from pronounced thinning (-5.37 m) to near-zero balance ($+0.02$ m), the latter likely reflecting an above-average snowfall year. In

Formatted: Justified

Formatted: Line spacing: single

Deleted: Change-point and trend analysis of monthly summertime (DJF) cumulative streamflow downstream of Nevados de Chillán. ...

Deleted: January daily

Deleted: (Fig. 7 E)

Deleted: (Fig. 7 F)

Deleted: both

Deleted: mass-balance

Deleted: C

Deleted: An

Deleted: however

Formatted: Justified

Deleted: mass-balance

Deleted: For the glaciers surveyed by UAV, we observed a significant increase in glacier loss rate for the Cerro Blanco and Las Termas subcomplexes from 2000–2024 compared to 1954–2000.

Deleted: mass-balance

Deleted: calculations

Deleted: for

Deleted: These

Deleted:

970 this case, the larger magnitude of the DGA's values likely stems from differences in temporal scale (single-year vs. this study's multi-decadal analysis), spatial coverage (40-60% versus full glacier coverage), and limitations of spatial interpolation of point-scale measurements, whereas our record captures multi-decadal averages over the full complex. Here, we observed localized thinning of -40 to -60 m from 2000–2024 (Fig. 3), confirming that multi-meter annual losses can occur but do not represent long-term trends. Overall, the results from our complex-wide long-term glacier analysis are more consistent with regional geodetic studies across the southern Andes, suggesting that Nevados de Chillán's glaciers are responding in line with broader regional patterns.

975 Regional-scale geodetic glacier MB studies generally align more closely with our findings at Nevados de Chillán than the short-term DGA analyses described above. The Nevados de Chillán complex is included in broader studies conducted by Dussailant et al. (2019), Braun et al. (2019), Zemp et al. (2019), and Hugonnet et al. (2021). Dussailant et al. (2019) measured a mass balance ranging from -0.31 ± 0.19 m w.e. yr⁻¹ in the Central Andes and -0.57 ± 0.22 m w.e. yr⁻¹ in Northern Patagonia, between 2000–18, with Nevados de Chillán located near the transition from the Central Andes to Northern Patagonia. We measured a mass balance of -0.51 ± 0.01 m w.e. yr⁻¹ for Nevados de Chillán over the same period, indicating strong agreement between our studies. Braun et al. (2019) reported mass balance of just -0.05 ± 0.09 m w.e. yr⁻¹ over 2000–2011/15 for the Chilean Lakes District (~35–42°S) (well below our results for 2000–2018), also encompassing the study area, whereas Zemp et al. (2019) reported the most negative mass balance of -1.18 ± 0.38 m w.e. yr⁻¹ for 2006–2016 over the Southern Andes (more than double our 2000–2018 measurement). Hugonnet et al. (2021) calculate a geodetic mass balance estimate of -0.67 ± 0.15 m w.e. yr⁻¹ for the Southern Andes from 2000–2019, which is nearest to our post-2000 mass balance calculations for the Nevados de Chillán complex (-0.51 ± 0.17 m w.e. yr⁻¹ from 2000–2025 and -0.51 ± 0.01 m w.e. yr⁻¹ from 2000–2018). Nevados de Chillán lies within the study areas of these regional assessments, and our mass balance estimates are generally consistent with the ranges reported at the regional scale, despite differences in temporal coverage, glacier extent, and methodology—including whether area change is considered. The measurement uncertainties of these studies are large relative to the magnitude of change, thus having multiple studies with different methods becomes important as it identifies a consensus view of rates of glacier change. The results presented in this paper and others highlight the strong spatial variability of glacier mass balance in the Andes, emphasizing that local studies like ours are essential for accurately constraining basin- and glacier-scale changes. Mountain-to-mountain variability, differences in observational methods, and temporal coverage all significantly influence mass balance estimates, making site-specific analyses critical for understanding glacier response and for informing local hydrological management. Long-term local geodetic records such as the one presented here remain comparatively rare in the Andes, despite the critical importance of glacier meltwater for downstream water security. Regional-scale studies necessarily aggregate across heterogeneous glacierized environments, masking the sub-complex spatial variability evident at Nevados de Chillán where volcanic geothermal forcing, eruption-driven debris deposition, and aspect-controlled solar radiation create local mass loss patterns that can diverge substantially from regional means. Site-specific long-term records are

Deleted: T

Deleted: -

Deleted: mass-balance

Deleted: 20

Deleted: Zemp et al. (2019), and

Deleted: -

Deleted: ,

Deleted: -

Deleted: Andes

Deleted:

Deleted: se

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

therefore essential both for understanding the local drivers of glacier change and for informing the water resource management decisions of downstream communities who depend on meltwater from these glaciers.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Though spatially and temporally heterogeneous, south-central Chile is experiencing both warming and drying trends on average as indicated by detailed analyses performed by Schumacher et al. (2020) and Lagos-Zúñiga et al. (2024) and supported by the analyses herein. The trends observed for the Las Trancas and Diguillín stations are in line with precipitation decreases and temperature increases observed in previous studies. For example, Martínez-Retureta et al. (2021) found similar trends from 1976–2016 in the Muco basin to the south of the study area. Climate change, in addition to the negative Pacific Decadal Oscillation phase and the El Niño phase, are all shown to contribute to the observed warming and drying trends (Boisier et al., 2016; Cordero et al., 2024; Garreaud et al., 2017). In particular, the Central-Andes Mega Drought caused accelerated decreases in mean annual precipitation (Boisier et al., 2016). Caro et al. (2024) found that climate presents higher explanatory power than topographic variables in the Andes, with precipitation exerting the strongest control on glacier mass balance. We found that annual cumulative precipitation decreased significantly at both stations over the full record (Diguillín: -19.0 mm yr^{-1} , $p = 0.022$; Las Trancas: -48.9 mm yr^{-1} , $p < 0.001$), with the rate of decline accelerating markedly after 2000 (Diguillín: -79.2 mm yr^{-1} ; Las Trancas: $-116.8 \text{ mm yr}^{-1}$).

Deleted: find

Deleted: 5

Deleted: ; 2024

Deleted: 5

Deleted: geographic

Deleted: While our finding that annual cumulative precipitation is decreasing echoes previous studies, our conclusion that summertime precipitation has not changed significantly (Fig. 8) disagrees with previous work (Garreaud et al., 2020; Rubio-Alvarez and McPhee, 2010). ...

Deleted: annual

Deleted: maximum

Deleted: annual

Deleted: and

Deleted: minimum, mean, and

Deleted: D-I

Deleted: mean and

Deleted: February

Deleted: H-I

Average minimum and mean temperatures were shown to increase significantly for the Diguillín station near Nevados de Chillán (Fig. 7), while trends in average monthly maximum temperatures were not significant (Fig. 6). We found that January, February, and March maximum, minimum, and mean monthly temperatures are increasing substantially for the station nearest to Nevados de Chillán over the full study period (Fig. 7). Post-2000 maximum and mean monthly temperature increases have accelerated in January for both stations and in March for Diguillín station (Fig. 7 D, G, and I). Caro et al. (2024) also found that temperature increases have accelerated in recent years compared to historic temperature regimes, though over a different period than our analysis, finding that mean annual temperatures increased by 0.3°C from 2010–2014, compared to 1979–2014 (Caro et al., 2024). In addition to a shift in precipitation from snowfall to rainfall, extreme droughts are increasing in south-central Chile (Poveda et al., 2020).

Deleted: C

Deleted: and

Deleted: 7

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Deleted: January and February

Deleted: D-I)

The analysis herein indicated that streamflow decreased over the full study period (Fig. 6 F), with significant reductions in post-2000 February and March streamflow and annual cumulative discharge (Fig. 9 B, and C, Fig. 6 F). This decline is consistent with the glaciers on Nevados de Chillán having passed peak water, meaning that meltwater contributions are now decreasing despite accelerated mass loss (Huss and Hock, 2018). Although rising summertime (JFM) temperatures (Fig. 7) have increased the rate of vertical melt (m w.e. yr^{-1}), the glaciers have lost substantial surface area and total ice volume, so a faster rate of thinning is occurring over a much smaller ice reservoir. As a result, the total volume of melt available for runoff decreases, even while the calculated mass balance becomes more negative. McCarthy et al. (2022) and Ragettli et al. (2016) found that Juncal and Maipo catchments in central Chile, which contribute water to Santiago, have passed peak water. A

1070 similar in-situ or modeling analysis of glacier melt contributions for our study area would be necessary to confirm that streamflow reductions are attributable to glacier mass loss, as opposed to other hydrological inputs, but our findings suggest that glacier retreat has progressed to a stage where declining ice volume has begun to reduce relative meltwater contributions to streamflow.

Deleted: n

1075 Another potential attribution for glacier mass patterns on Nevados de Chillán is volcanic activity. It is yet unknown whether ice-lava interaction and/or the impact of thin deposition of volcanic tephra decreasing the albedo of glacier surface have impacted glacier melt on the Nevados de Chillán complex. Volcanic activity on the Las Termas subcomplex increased dramatically from 2016-2019 (Global Volcanism Program, 2022). More recently, from June-October 2022, over 1,000 explosive volcanic events were reported from the Nicanor crater on the Las Termas subcomplex (Servicio Nacional de Geología y Minería, 2025; Global Volcanism Program, 2022). Some of these events triggered pyroclastic flows and avalanches, as well as substantial debris deposition on glacier surfaces (Lizama et al., 2025). Debris cover is a rapidly developing area of glacier research—in the case of thin and/or discontinuous debris, ablation typically increases due to the lower albedo of debris (rock, sand, dust, or ash) compared to snow and ice (Brock et al., 2007). The decreased albedo causes an increase in the ratio of radiation absorbed to reflected, causing an increase in glacier surface melt (Rivera et al., 2006; Wigmore and Mark, 2017; Rounce et al., 2021; Rossini et al., 2023). Given the similar flow topography of pyroclastic and lahar deposits, and debris-covered glaciers, it is difficult to tell from remote imagery whether some glaciers on the Las Termas subcomplex are now debris-covered or have disappeared altogether. Future work should be done to determine the extent of debris cover on Nevados de Chillán and the impact on glacier mass balance.

Deleted: ; Bisset et al., 2022

1090 5.2 Limitations and Assumptions

Formatted: Justified

1095 The availability of glacier outlines for 1975, 2000, and 2019 provided three reference datasets for mass balance calculation. For 1954-based epochs, mean glacier area was computed as the arithmetic mean of the 1975 (DGA, 2011) start area and the 2000 (DGA, 2014) end area following the time-weighted mean area approach of Cogley et al. (2011), as the 1975 inventory represents the closest available approximation to the 1954 ice extent. For 2000-based epochs, the arithmetic mean of the 2000 (DGA, 2014) and 2019 (DGA, 2022) areas was used. While these inventories provide the best available approximation of glacier area for each epoch, they do not capture continuous area change over time, meaning that mean annual mass balance estimates remain reliant primarily on vertical ice thinning measurements. Future studies would benefit from exploring glacier mass balance on finer time resolutions to isolate the impacts of volcanic eruptions, tectonic uplift, anthropogenic climate change, and regional climate variability on interannual glacier mass balance.

Deleted: O

Deleted: ne limitation of the work herein was the use of two glacier polygon datasets, corresponding to the years 2000 and 2019. In the absence of area estimates corresponding to each year within the study period, we estimated geodetic mass balance using 2000 and 2019 glacier areas. Glacier mass balance calculations herein were thus reliant on vertical ice thinning measurements rather than glacier area change. As a result, mean annual glacier mass balance estimates were conservative for 1954-2000, as glacier area likely decreased substantially over the study period, while our use of the year 2000 glacier outlines assumed a constant glacier area. We produced 2000-2024 annual mass balance estimates with both the 2000 and 2019 areas, thus providing a range of likely values. For years after 2019, mean annual mass balance estimates were conservative as they do not consider recent glacier area loss. While this study provides valuable insight into retreat rates, future studies would benefit from exploring glacier mass balance on finer time resolutions to isolate the impacts of volcanic eruptions, tectonic uplift, anthropogenic climate change, and regional climate variability on interannual glacier mass balance.

1100 The reliance on five DEMs to reconstruct 71 years of glacier mass balance does not illuminate interannual fluctuations (Rabatel et al., 2017). Thus, our calculation of mean annual mass balance from total estimated mass balance should be used with caution

Deleted: just three

Deleted: 0

(Rabatel et al., 2017). This approach, however, is widely accepted for geodetic mass balance estimates of mountain glaciers, given the scarcity of DEM products for these regions (e.g. Fariás-Barahona et al., 2019). Similar studies show high agreement between geodetic measurements from remotely sensed DEMs and in-situ MB measurements (Beraud et al., 2023). Thus, remotely sensed DEMs provide an excellent option to compute glacier-wide mass balance in the absence of detailed in-situ measurements.

While differencing DEMs enabled the calculation of glacier mass balance, estimating geodetic mass balance relied on the established estimation of mean glacier density of 850 kg m⁻³, rather than accounting for variations in density across glacier area and time (Huss, 2013; Fariás-Barahona et al., 2019). However, Huss (2013) indicated that errors inherent to ice density assumptions decrease with longer-scale geodetic studies. In the case of this study, our 70-year analysis period far exceeds the suggestion by Huss (2013) of >5-10 years to reduce mean glacier density estimation error.

Another limitation of this study is that only the western/southwestern glaciers were surveyed in 2024 with the UAV campaign, due to logistical and weather limitations. The addition of the Pléiades 2025 DEM addresses this limitation for full-complex mass balance from 2000–2025, providing coverage of all 28 inventoried glaciers. However, UAV-derived subcomplex-level estimates for 2000–2024 remain available for only 11 of the 28 inventoried glaciers. Mass balance from 1954–2000 and 2000–2024 was only compared for these 11 glaciers for the sake of consistency, whereas complex-wide mass balance was computed for 1954–2000, 2000–2018, and 2000–2025.

The existing studies on Nevados de Chillán exclusively focus on the clean-ice, failing to account for the presence of debris cover which is evident on the complex, and is likely due to both rock slides and eruptions from the Las Termas subcomplex depositing volcanic ash, tephra, and other debris on the glacier surfaces (Zenteno et al., 2008; Caro, 2014). Frequent eruption events make it particularly difficult to distinguish pyroclastic and lahar deposits from debris covered glaciers. Due to the difficulty in accurately delineating current debris covered glacier extent, in addition to the difficulty of distinguishing snow patches from glacier ice, we did not estimate current glacier extent. By relying on the 2019 glacier outline as our most recent glacier area, we likely overestimated post-2019 glacier area, resulting in a conservative estimate of recent glacier mass loss. Additionally, this geodetic mass balance approach measures the ground surface height within the 2000 and 2019 glacier boundaries without accounting for debris thickness, meaning that results may underestimate glacier loss where the actual glacier surface is covered by debris.

An additional limitation of this study is due to the active volcanic and tectonic activity on Nevados de Chillán, as it pertains to our comparison of DEMs. First, in 2010 an 8.8 moment magnitude [M_w] earthquake in the neighboring region of Maule caused plate subsidence in the Chilean central valley, and uplift in the Andes Mountain range of up to 20 cm, from 33 to 40°S (Li et al., 2017). In effect, our 2018, 2024, and 2025 DEMs are subject to additional uncertainty after co-registration due to possible

Deleted: mass-balance

Deleted: 2

Deleted: While we computed mass balance for all inventoried glaciers on Nevados de Chillán between 1954-2000, we were only able to provide mass balance for 11 of the 28 inventoried glaciers post-2000.

Deleted: -

Deleted: -

Deleted: only

Deleted: -

Deleted: 4

Deleted: By relying on the 2019 glacier outline as our most recent glacier area, we likely underestimated glacier area closer to initial DEM date (i.e. 2000-2019) and overestimated recent (i.e. post-2019) glacier area. Additionally, this geodetic mass balance approach does not remove debris thickness from glacier surface height estimation and instead just measures the ground surface height within 2000 and 2019 glacier boundaries, respectively. As a result, the results presented herein may underestimate glacier loss in cases where the actual glacier surface is covered by debris.

Deleted: 2024 DEMs with 2000 and 1954

Deleted: 2024

Deleted: UAV

Deleted: is

1185 uplift of the Nevados de Chillán volcanic complex. Given that a strong glacier melt signal was measured post-2000 in this
study, the effect of tectonic uplift on our DEMs would imply that we may underestimate recent glacier melt. Additionally,
1190 studying the most recent active period of Nevados de Chillán from January 2016-2023, Lizama et al. (2025) reported that there
was a period of either no change or slight topographic subsidence during the first three years of the eruption, with a maximum
subsidence of 0.8 cm yr^{-1} measured. This period was followed by significant uplift from 2019-2022, with stations ranging from
a total observed vertical displacement of $\sim 5\text{--}25 \text{ cm}$ (Lizama et al., 2025). This recent uplift was attributed to increased magma
flow from a deeper to a shallower reservoir (Lizama et al., 2025). Importantly, this implies that surface elevation presented in
our post-2000 DEMs may further underestimate glacier surface elevation decrease. To summarize, both earthquake and
volcanic activity in the study area has likely resulted in a net uplift of between $\sim 0\text{--}45 \text{ cm}$ in Nevados de Chillán's topography
since the year 2000.

1195 Although the assumptions discussed above introduce some uncertainty, because tectonic uplift and supraglacial debris
deposition likely contributed to increases in surface elevation, the reported estimates of mean glacier loss should be considered
conservative, potentially underrepresenting the true extent of glacier volume loss. This finding highlights the challenging
nature of applying glacier mass balance analyses to glacierized volcanic environments. These settings are rarely considered in
1200 the existing literature, emphasizing both the novelty of this study and the need for further research focused on glaciers in
volcanic regions.

6 Conclusion

This study provides the first long-term geodetic mass balance record for the glaciers of the Nevados de Chillán volcanic
complex in south-central Chile, directly addressing the need to quantify how glacier mass loss has evolved in this region. Our
1205 71-year record shows that glaciers across the complex have experienced sustained and accelerating mass loss since 1954, with
greater losses on the Cerro Blanco subcomplex than on Las Termas. From 1954–2000, the full complex lost ice at a mean rate
of $-0.19 \pm 0.31 \text{ m w.e. yr}^{-1}$, within the range of measurement uncertainty. Losses intensified significantly after 2000, reaching
 $-0.51 \pm 0.17 \text{ m w.e. yr}^{-1}$ from 2000–2025 (Pléiades), corroborated by the ASTER 2018 estimate of $-0.51 \pm 0.01 \text{ m w.e. yr}^{-1}$
for 2000–2018. From 2000–2024, the Cerro Blanco subcomplex lost mass at $-0.59 \pm 0.13 \text{ m w.e. yr}^{-1}$ and Las Termas at -0.47
1210 $\pm 0.16 \text{ m w.e. yr}^{-1}$, with Las Termas showing statistically significant acceleration from 2018–2024 ($-0.55 \pm 0.06 \text{ m w.e. yr}^{-1}$),
illustrating that recent glacier retreat is not uniform across the complex and that glacier loss has accelerated since 2000.

By establishing the magnitude and spatial variability of glacier mass loss at Nevados de Chillán, the work herein provides a
benchmark against which future change can be assessed and offers a necessary foundation for understanding downstream
1215 implications. This study found that declining summertime streamflow coincided with accelerated glacier loss, however,
quantifying the contribution of glacier melt to river discharge remains a key task for future studies. Our results clarify the rate

Deleted: between 2000-2024

Deleted: 2024

Deleted: post-2000

Deleted: 2024

Deleted: UAV

Deleted: loss

Deleted: glaciated

Formatted: Justified

Deleted: 0

Deleted: $-0.20 \pm 0.47 \text{ m w.e. yr}^{-1}$, and losses intensified after 2000. From 1954-2024 we observed a mean annual mass balance of $-0.41 (-0.37) \pm 0.33 \text{ m w.e. yr}^{-1}$ for the Cerro Blanco subcomplex, versus $-0.13 (-0.16) \pm 0.18 \text{ m w.e. yr}^{-1}$ for the Las Termas subcomplex, within the 2000 (2019) glacier outlines,

1230 at which glacier volume is disappearing on Nevados de Chillán—supplying critical data to support water management and
drought mitigation efforts.

Code and Data availability

The data and code utilized in this paper can be found at <https://github.com/millie-spencer/Seven-Decades-Glacier-Loss-Nevados-Chillan> and are hosted at: DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.21419070](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21419070).

1235 Author contribution

MS, RC, EM, and AF designed the fieldwork plan. MS and RC carried out the fieldwork and processed the UAV images. AF provided the IGM DEM and advised research methodology. [JB obtained the Pléiades DEM under the Chilean Transparency Act. PM advised on hydroclimate analysis. MS developed model code and performed DEM analysis with assistance from ET.](#) MS produced the figures and prepared the manuscript with contributions from all co-authors.

1240 Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgments

Thank you to my mentors at the University of Colorado, Boulder, Universidad de Chile, Universidad de Concepción, and Universidad Católica de la Santísima Concepción for hosting me over the past years.

1245 Financial Support

1250 This research was funded by the National Science Foundation International Research Experience for Students Program (award #1954140); the Consortium of Universities for the Advancement of Hydrologic Science, Inc. (CUAHSI) Pathfinder Fellowship; the Fulbright Chile Science Initiative; the University of Colorado, Boulder George R. Aiken Graduate Fellowship, Mabel Duncan Award, and Graduate and Professional Student Government Travel Grant; Agencia Nacional de Investigación (ANID)-FONDECYT 1201429, 1252044, and ANID-ANILLO 210080.

Appendix A:


Formatted: Justified

Deleted: <https://github.com/millie-spencer/Glacier-DEM-coregistration-and-MB>


Deleted: 10.5281/zenodo.17664874

Deleted: and ET

Deleted: UAV DEM of Cerro Blanco co-registration to SRTM DEM result




Appendix B: UAV DEM of Las Termas co-registration t... [26]



1275

Appendix B: Spearman rank correlation between glacier-scale mean elevation change (Δh) and topographic variables (mean elevation, slope, and aspect) across all epochs and subcomplexes. Bar height shows Spearman R^2 ; no correlations reached statistical significance ($p > 0.05$ in all cases). Results suggest topographic variables are weak predictors of glacier mass loss at Nevados de Chillán, consistent with dominant volcanic and radiation forcing at this complex.



1280


Appendix C: Global and Local Moran's I analysis of spatial autocorrelation in glacier elevation change (Δh) across all epochs. Global Moran's I values (range 0.72–0.96, $p = 0.001$ in all cases) confirm significant positive spatial autocorrelation across all epochs. Local Moran's I (LISA) maps show the spatial distribution of significant clusters: high-high (HH, red) indicates high mass loss surrounded by high mass loss; low-low (LL, blue) indicates low mass loss surrounded by low mass loss; low-high (LH) and high-low (HL) indicate spatial outliers. Non-significant pixels are shown in grey.

1285

Deleted: 1 ... [27]

Deleted: D


Deleted: Influence of elevation, slope, and aspect on glacier loss





Deleted:


Deleted: E


Deleted: Global Moran's I test of spatial autocorrelation




















References

- Aguayo, R., Maussion, F., Schuster, L., Schaefer, M., Caro, A., Schmitt, P., Mackay, J., Ultee, L., Leon-Muñoz, J., and Aguayo, M.: Unravelling the sources of uncertainty in glacier runoff projections in the Patagonian Andes (40–56° S), *The Cryosphere*, 18, 5383–5406, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-18-5383-2024>, 2024.
- Ayala, Á., Farias-Barahona, D., Huss, M., Pellicciotti, F., McPhee, J., and Farinotti, D.: Glacier runoff variations since 1955 in the Maipo River basin, in the semiarid Andes of central Chile, *The Cryosphere*, 14, 2005–2027, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-14-2005-2020>, 2020.

Deleted: [28]

Deleted: [29]

- Aguayo, R., Maussion, F., Schuster, L., Schaefer, M., Caro, A., Schmitt, P., ... & Aguayo, M. (2024, April). Unravelling the sources of uncertainty in glacier runoff in the Patagonian Andes (40–56° S). In EGU General Assembly Conference Abstracts (p. 9831).
- Alvarez-Garretón, C., Mendoza, P. A., Boisier, J. P., Addor, N., Galleguillos, M., Zambrano-Bigiarini, M., Lara, A., Puelma, C., Cortes, G., Garreaud, R., McPhee, J., and Ayala, A.: The CAMELS-CL dataset: Catchment attributes and meteorology for large-sample studies – Chile dataset, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 22, 5817–5846, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-22-5817-2018>, 2018.
- Ayala, A., Farias-Barahona, D., Huss, M., Pellicciotti, F., McPhee, J., & Farinotti, D. (2020). Glacier runoff variations since 1955 in the Maipo River basin, in the semiarid Andes of central Chile. *The Cryosphere*, 14(6), 2005–2027.
- Ayala, A., Pellicciotti, F., MacDonell, S., McPhee, J., and Burlando, P.: Modelling the hydrological response of debris-free and debris-covered glaciers to present climatic conditions in the semiarid Andes of central Chile, *Hydrol. Process.*, 30, 4036–4058, <https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.10971>, 2016.
- Barria, I., Caro, A., Montecinos, A., and Leiva, C.: Simulation of long-term changes of the equilibrium line altitude in the central Chilean Andes derived from atmospheric variables during the 1958–2018 period, *Front. Environ. Sci.*, 7, 161, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2019.00161>, 2019.
- Beck, H. E., Van Dijk, A. I. J. M., Levizzani, V., Schellekens, J., Miralles, D. G., Martens, B., and De Roo, A.: MSWEP: 3-hourly 0.25° global gridded precipitation (1979–2015) by merging gauge, satellite, and reanalysis data, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 21, 589–615, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-21-589-2017>, 2017.
- Bellisario, A., Ferrando, F., and Janke, J.: Water resources in Chile: The critical relation between glaciers and mining for sustainable water management, *Investig. Geogr.*, 46, 3, <https://doi.org/10.5354/0719-5370.2013.30288>, 2013.
- Beraud, L., Cusicanqui, D., Rabatel, A., Brun, F., Vincent, C. and Six, D.: Glacier-wide seasonal and annual geodetic mass balances from Pléiades stereo images: application to the Glacier d'Argentières, French Alps, *J. Glaciol.*, 69(275), pp. 525–537, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jog.2022.79>
- Bobadilla, A., Stehr, A., and Toro, N.: Evaluation of climate-change impacts on the temporal and spatial behaviour of drought in south-central Chile, *Hydrol. Sci. J.*, 69, 165–184, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2023.2288217>, 2024.
- Boisier, J. P., Rondanelli, R., Garreaud, R. D., and Muñoz, F.: Anthropogenic and natural contributions to the southeast Pacific precipitation decline and recent megadrought in central Chile, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 43, 413–421, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL067265>, 2016.
- Braun, M. H., Malz, P., Sommer, C., Farias-Barahona, D., Sauter, T., Casassa, G., Soruco, A., and Seehaus, T.: Constraining glacier elevation and mass changes in South America, *Nat. Clim. Change*, 9, 130–136, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0375-7>, 2019.
- Brock, B., Rivera, A., Casassa, G., Bown, F., & Acuña, C. (2007). The surface energy balance of an active ice-covered volcano: Villarrica Volcano, southern Chile. *Annals of Glaciology*, 45, 104–114.
- termas de Chillán, Imprenta Universitaria, Santiago de Chile, 1948.
- Caro, A., Vivero, S., Farias-Barahona, D., Burger, F., Seeha...

Formatted: Heading 1

Formatted: Justified

1635 Ayala, A., Pellicciotti, F., MacDonell, S., McPhee, J., and Burlando, P.: Modelling the hydrological response of debris-free and debris-covered glaciers to present climatic conditions in the semiarid Andes of central Chile, *Hydrol. Process.*, 30, 4036–4058, <https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.10971>, 2016.

Barria, I., Caro, A., Montecinos, A., and Leiva, C.: Simulation of long-term changes of the equilibrium line altitude in the central Chilean Andes derived from atmospheric variables during the 1958–2018 period, *Front. Environ. Sci.*, 7, 161, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2019.00161>, 2019.

1640 Bellisario, A., Ferrando, F., and Janke, J.: Water resources in Chile: The critical relation between glaciers and mining for sustainable water management, *Investig. Geogr.*, 46, 3, <https://doi.org/10.5354/0719-5370.2013.30288>, 2013.

Beraud, L., Cusicanqui, D., Rabatel, A., Brun, F., Vincent, C., and Six, D.: Glacier-wide seasonal and annual geodetic mass balances from Pléiades stereo images: application to the Glacier d'Argentiére, French Alps, *J. Glaciol.*, 69, 525–537, <https://doi.org/10.1017/jog.2022.79>, 2023.

1645 Berthier, E., Lebreton, J., Fontannaz, D., Hosford, S., Belart, J. M. C., Brun, F., Andreassen, L. M., Menounos, B., and Blondel, C.: The Pléiades Glacier Observatory: high-resolution digital elevation models and ortho-imagery to monitor glacier change, *The Cryosphere*, 18, 5551–5571, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-18-5551-2024>, 2024.

Beyer, R. A., Alexandrov, O., and McMichael, S.: The Ames Stereo Pipeline: NASA's open source software for deriving and processing terrain data, *Earth Space Sci.*, 5, 537–548, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018EA000409>, 2018.

1650 Bobadilla, A., Stehr, A., and Toro, N.: Evaluation of climate-change impacts on the temporal and spatial behaviour of drought in south-central Chile, *Hydrol. Sci. J.*, 69, 165–184, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2023.2288217>, 2024.

Boisier, J. P., Rondanelli, R., Garreaud, R. D., and Muñoz, F.: Anthropogenic and natural contributions to the southeast Pacific precipitation decline and recent megadrought in central Chile, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 43, 413–421, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL067265>, 2016.

1655 Braun, M. H., Malz, P., Sommer, C., Fariás-Barahona, D., Sauter, T., Casassa, G., Soruco, A., and Seehaus, T.: Constraining glacier elevation and mass changes in South America, *Nat. Clim. Change*, 9, 130–136, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0375-7>, 2019.

Brock, B., Rivera, A., Casassa, G., Bown, F., and Acuña, C.: The surface energy balance of an active ice-covered volcano: Villarrica Volcano, southern Chile, *Ann. Glaciol.*, 45, 104–114, <https://doi.org/10.3189/172756407782282372>, 2007.

1660 Burkey, J.: Mann-Kendall Tau-b with Sen's Method (enhanced), MATLAB Central File Exchange [code], <https://www.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/11190-mann-kendall-tau-b-with-sen-s-method-enhanced> (last access: 17 July 2026), 2006.

Caro, A., Vivero, S., Fariás-Barahona, D., Burger, F., Seehaus, T., Schaefer, M., Rivera, A., and Braun, M. H.: Hydrological response of Andean catchments to recent glacier mass loss, *The Cryosphere*, 18, 2487–2507, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-18-2487-2024>, 2024.

1665 Caro, D. A.: Estudios glaciológicos en los Nevados de Chillán, Undergraduate thesis, Univ. de Chile, Santiago, https://repositorio.uchile.cl/bitstream/handle/2250/116536/caro_d.pdf (last access: 1 June 2025), 2014.

- 1670 Carrasco-Escaff, T., Rojas, M., Garreaud, R. D., Bozkurt, D., and Schaefer, M.: Climatic control of the surface mass balance of the Patagonian Icefields, *The Cryosphere*, 17, 1127–1149, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-17-1127-2023>, 2023.
- Cogley, J. G.: Geodetic and direct mass-balance measurements: Comparison and joint analysis, *Ann. Glaciol.*, 50, 96–100, <https://doi.org/10.3189/172756409787769744>, 2009.
- Cogley, J. G., Hock, R., Rasmussen, L. A., Arendt, A. A., Bauder, A., Braithwaite, R. J., Jansson, P., Kaser, G., Möller, M., Nicholson, L., and Zemp, M.: Glossary of Glacier Mass Balance and Related Terms, IHP-VII Technical Documents in Hydrology No. 86, IACS Contribution No. 2, UNESCO-IHP, Paris, 114 pp., 2011.
- 1675 Cordero, R. R., Feron, S., Damiani, A., Carrasco, J., Karas, C., Wang, C., Kraamwinkel, C. T., and Beaulieu, A.: Extreme fire weather in Chile driven by climate change and El Niño–Southern Oscillation (ENSO), *Sci. Rep.*, 14, 1974, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-50381-9>, 2024.
- DGA: Variaciones recientes de glaciares en Chile, según principales zonas glaciológicas, Dirección General de Aguas, Santiago, Chile, <https://repositoriodirplan.mop.gob.cl/biblioteca/handle/20.500.12140/218274> (last access: 1 June 2025), 2011.
- 1680 DGA: Inventario público de glaciares de Chile, Ministerio de Obras Públicas de Chile, Santiago, 2014.
- DGA: Monitoreo de detalle del glaciar noroeste del complejo volcánico Nevados de Chillán, 2020–2021, Región de Ñuble, Ministerio de Obras Públicas, Dirección General de Aguas, Unidad de Glaciología y Nieves, Santiago, S.I.T. 519, <https://repositoriodirplan.mop.gob.cl/biblioteca/server/api/core/bitstreams/b254c269-1c27-4142-a150-9ad7c30e8cf3/content> (last access: 1 June 2025), 2022.
- 1685 DGA: Reporte de Balance de Masa del Glaciar Noroeste del Complejo Volcánico Nevados de Chillán, Región de Ñuble, Macrozona Sur, 2023–2024, Ministerio de Obras Públicas, Dirección General de Aguas, Unidad de Glaciología y Nieves, Santiago, S.I.T. 501, <https://repositoriodirplan.mop.gob.cl/biblioteca/server/api/core/bitstreams/c865a005-3241-4213-a36d-9386b3accb96/content> (last access: 1 June 2025), 2024.
- 1690 Dixon, H. J., Murphy, M. D., Sparks, R. S. J., Chávez, R., Naranjo, J. A., Dunkley, P. N., Young, S. R., Gilbert, J. S., Pringle, M. S., and Harmon, R. S.: The geology of Nevados de Chillán volcano, Chile, *Rev. Geol. Chile*, 26, 227–253, <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0716-02081999000200006>, 1999.
- Dussaillant, I., Berthier, E., Brun, F., Masiokas, M., Hugonnet, R., Favier, V., Rabatel, A., Pitte, P., and Ruiz, L.: Two decades of glacier mass loss along the Andes, *Nat. Geosci.*, 12, 802–808, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-019-0432-5>, 2019.
- 1695 Farias-Barahona, D., Vivero, S., Casassa, G., Schaefer, M., Burger, F., Seehaus, T., Iribarren-Anacona, P., Escobar, F., and Braun, M. H.: Geodetic mass balances and area changes of Echaurren Norte Glacier (Central Andes, Chile) between 1955 and 2015, *Remote Sens.*, 11, 260, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs11030260>, 2019.
- Farias-Barahona, D., Ayala, Á., Bravo, C., Vivero, S., Seehaus, T., Vijay, S., Schaefer, M., Buglio, F., Casassa, G., and Braun, M. H.: 60 years of glacier elevation and mass changes in the Maipo River Basin, central Andes of Chile, *Remote Sens.*, 12, 1658, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs12101658>, 2020.
- 1700 Frazier, A. and Singh, K. (Eds.): *Fundamentals of Capturing and Processing Drone Imagery and Data*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, ISBN 9780367431903, 2021.

- Garreaud, R. D., Alvarez-Garretón, C., Barichivich, J., Boisier, J. P., Christie, D., Galleguillos, M., Le Quesne, C., McPhee, J., and Zambrano-Bigiarini, M.: The 2010–2015 megadrought in central Chile: Impacts on regional hydroclimate and vegetation, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 21, 6307–6327, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-21-6307-2017>, 2017.
- 1705 Garreaud, R. D., Boisier, J. P., Alvarez-Garretón, C., Barichivich, J., Christie, D., LeQuesne, C., McPhee, J., and Zambrano-Bigiarini, M.: The Central Chile Mega Drought (2010–2018): A climate dynamics perspective, *Int. J. Climatol.*, 40, 421–439, <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.6219>, 2020.
- Girod, L., Nuth, C., Kääb, A., McNabb, R., and Galland, O.: MMASTER: Improved ASTER DEMs for Elevation Change Monitoring, *Remote Sens.*, 9, 704, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs9070704>, 2017.
- 1710 Global Volcanism Program: Report on Nevados de Chillán (Chile) — December 2022, Smithsonian Institution, *Bull. Global Volcanism Network*, 47, <https://doi.org/10.5479/si.GVP.BGVN202212-357070>, 2022.
- Hugonnet, R., McNabb, R., Berthier, E., Menounos, B., Nuth, C., Girod, L., Farinotti, D., Huss, M., Dussailant, I., Brun, F., and Kääb, 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.
- 1715 Hugonnet, R., Brun, F., Berthier, E., Dehecq, A., Mannerfelt, E. S., Eckert, N., and Farinotti, D.: Uncertainty analysis of digital elevation models by spatial inference from stable terrain, *IEEE J. Sel. Topics Appl. Earth Observ. Remote Sens.*, 15, 6456–6472, <https://doi.org/10.1109/JSTARS.2022.3188922>, 2022.
- Huss, M.: Density assumptions for converting geodetic glacier volume change to mass change, *The Cryosphere*, 7, 877–887, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-7-877-2013>, 2013.
- 1720 Huss, M. and Hock, R.: A new model for global glacier change and sea-level rise, *Front. Earth Sci.*, 3, 54, <https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2015.00054>, 2015.
- Huss, M. and Hock, R.: Global-scale hydrological response to future glacier mass loss, *Nat. Clim. Change*, 8, 135–140, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-017-0049-x>, 2018.
- Hutchinson, M. F.: A new procedure for gridding elevation and stream line data with automatic removal of spurious pits, *J. Hydrol.*, 106, 211–232, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1694\(89\)90073-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1694(89)90073-5), 1989.
- 1725 Immerzeel, W. W., Lutz, A. F., Andrade, M., Bahl, A., Biemans, H., Bolch, T., Hyde, S., Brumby, S., Davies, B. J., Elmore, A. C., Emmer, A., Feng, M., Fernández, A., Haritashya, U., Kargel, J. S., Koppes, M., Kraaijenbrink, P. D. A., Kulkarni, A. V., Mayewski, P. A., Nepal, S., Pacheco, P., Painter, T. H., Pellicciotti, F., Rajaram, H., Rupper, S., Sinisalo, A., Shrestha, A. B., Viviroli, D., Wada, Y., Xiao, C., Yao, T., and Baillie, J. E. M.: Importance and vulnerability of the world's water towers, *Nature*, 577, 364–369, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1822-y>, 2020.
- James, N. A. and Matteson, D. S.: ecp: An R Package for Nonparametric Multiple Change Point Analysis of Multivariate Data, *J. Stat. Softw.*, 62, 1–25, <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v062.i07>, 2015.
- 1735 Kaufmann, V., Seier, G., Sulzer, W., Wecht, M., Liu, Q., Lauk, G., and Maurer, M.: Rock glacier monitoring using aerial photographs: conventional vs. UAV-based mapping — a comparative study, *Int. Arch. Photogramm. Remote Sens. Spatial Inf. Sci.*, XLII-1, 239–246, <https://doi.org/10.5194/isprs-archives-XLII-1-239-2018>, 2018.
- Kendall, M. G.: Rank Correlation Methods, Charles Griffin, London, 1948.

- Lagos-Zúñiga, M., Balmaceda-Huarte, R., Regoto, P., Torrez, L., Olmo, M., Lyra, A., Pareja-Quispe, D., and Bettolli, M. L.: Extreme indices of temperature and precipitation in South America: Trends and intercomparison of regional climate models, *Clim. Dyn.*, 59, 3319–3336, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-022-06598-2>, 2022.
- 1740 Lagos-Zúñiga, M., Mendoza, P. A., Campos, D., and Rondanelli, R.: Trends in seasonal precipitation extremes and associated temperatures along continental Chile, *Clim. Dyn.*, 62, 4205–4222, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-024-07127-z>, 2024.
- Li, S., Moreno, M., Bedford, J., Rosenau, M., Heidbach, O., Melnick, D., and Oncken, O.: Postseismic uplift of the Andes following the 2010 Maule earthquake: Implications for mantle rheology, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 44, 1768–1776, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL071995>, 2017.
- 1745 Mann, H. B.: Nonparametric tests against trend, *Econometrica*, 13, 245–259, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1907187>, 1945.
- Mark, B. G., Baraer, M., Fernandez, A., Immerzeel, W., Moore, R. D., and Weingartner, R.: Glaciers as water resources, in: *The High-Mountain Cryosphere: Environmental Changes and Human Risks*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 184–203, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107588653.011>, 2015.
- 1750 Martínez-Retureta, R., Aguayo, M., Abreu, N. J., Stehr, A., Duran-Llacer, I., Rodríguez-López, L., Sauvage, S., and Sánchez-Pérez, J.-M.: Estimation of the climate change impact on the hydrological balance in basins of south-central Chile, *Water*, 13, 794, <https://doi.org/10.3390/w13060794>, 2021.
- Matteson, D. S. and James, N. A.: A nonparametric approach for multiple change point analysis of multivariate data, *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, 109, 334–345, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2013.849605>, 2014.
- 1755 McCarthy, M., Meier, F., Fatichi, S., Stocker, B. D., Shaw, T. E., Miles, E., Dussailant, I., and Pellicciotti, F.: Glacier contributions to river discharge during the current Chilean megadrought, *Earth's Future*, 10, e2022EF002852, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022EF002852>, 2022.
- Mejias, A., McPhee, J., Mahmoud, H., Fariás-Barahona, D., Kinnard, C., MacDonell, S., Montserrat, S., Somos-Valenzuela, M., and Fernandez, A.: Multidecadal estimation of hydrological contribution and glacier mass balance in the semi-arid Andes based on physically based modeling and geodetic mass balance, *Front. Earth Sci.*, 13, 1517081, <https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2025.1517081>, 2025.
- 1760 Naranjo, J. A., Gilbert, J. S., and Sparks, R. S. J.: *Geología del Complejo Volcánico Nevados de Chillán, Región del Biobío*, Servicio Nacional de Geología y Minería, Carta Geológica de Chile, Serie Geología Básica, escala 1:50,000, Santiago, 2008.
- Nolin, A. W., Phillippe, J., Jefferson, A., and Lewis, S. L.: Present-day and future contributions of glacier runoff to summertime flows in a Pacific Northwest watershed: implications for water resources, *Water Resour. Res.*, 46, W12509, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009WR008968>, 2010.
- 1765 Novoa Lizama, C., Remy, D., Baez, J. C., Oyarzun, A., Bonvalot, S., and Hooper, A.: Modeling magma recharge dynamics during the 2016 Nevados de Chillán eruption: An interacting two-chamber system evidenced by petrology and geodesy, *J. Volcanol. Geotherm. Res.*, 458, 108253, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvolgeores.2024.108253>, 2025.
- 1770 Nuth, C. and Kääb, A.: Co-registration and bias corrections of satellite elevation data sets for quantifying glacier thickness change, *The Cryosphere*, 5, 271–290, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-5-271-2011>, 2011.

- Over, J.-S. R., Ritchie, A. C., Kranenburg, C. J., Brown, J. A., Buscombe, D. D., Noble, T., Sherwood, C. R., Warrick, J. A., and Wernette, P. A.: Processing coastal imagery with Agisoft Metashape Professional Edition, version 1.6, U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2021–1039, <https://doi.org/10.3133/ofr20211039>, 2021.
- 1775 Owen, L. A., Thackray, G., Anderson, R. S., Briner, J., Kaufman, D., Roe, G., Pfeffer, W., and Yi, C.: Integrated research on mountain glaciers: current status, priorities and future prospects, *Geomorphology*, 103, 158–171, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2008.04.019>, 2009.
- Philippi, R.: Exkursion nach den Bädern und dem Neuen Vulkan von Chillan in Chile, im Spätsommer 1862 gemacht, *Petermanns Geogr. Mitt.*, 1863, 241–257.
- 1780 Pilgrim, C.: piecewise-regression (aka segmented regression) in Python, *J. Open Source Softw.*, 6, 3859, <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.03859>, 2021.
- Poveda, G., Espinoza, J. C., Zuluaga, M. D., Solman, S. A., Garreaud, R., and van Oevelen, P. J.: High impact weather events in the Andes, *Front. Earth Sci.*, 8, 162, <https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2020.00162>, 2020.
- 1785 Rabatel, A., Sirguey, P., Drolon, V., Maisongrande, P., Arnaud, Y., Berthier, E., Davaze, L., Dedieu, J.-P., and Dumont, M.: Annual and seasonal glacier-wide surface mass balance quantified from changes in glacier surface state: a review on existing methods using optical satellite imagery, *Remote Sens.*, 9, 507, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs9050507>, 2017.
- Ragettli, S. and Pellicciotti, F.: Calibration of a physically based, spatially distributed hydrological model in a glacierized basin: On the use of knowledge from glaciometeorological processes to constrain model parameters, *Water Resour. Res.*, 48, W03509, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011WR010559>, 2012.
- 1790 Ragettli, S., Immerzeel, W. W., and Pellicciotti, F.: Contrasting climate change impact on river flows from high-altitude catchments in the Himalayan and Andes Mountains, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 113, 9222–9227, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1606526113>, 2016.
- Rivera, A., Bown, F., Mella, R., Wendt, J., Casassa, G., Acuña, C., Rignot, E., Clavero, J., and Brock, B.: Ice volumetric changes on active volcanoes in southern Chile, *Ann. Glaciol.*, 43, 111–122, <https://doi.org/10.3189/172756406781811970>, 2006.
- 1795 Rolstad, C., Haug, T., and Denby, B.: Spatially integrated geodetic glacier mass balance and its uncertainty based on geostatistical analysis: application to the western Svartisen ice cap, Norway, *J. Glaciol.*, 55, 666–680, <https://doi.org/10.3189/002214309789470950>, 2009.
- 1800 Rossini, M., Garzonio, R., Panigada, C., Tagliabue, G., Bramati, G., Vezzoli, G., Cogliati, S., Colombo, R., and Di Mauro, B.: Mapping Surface Features of an Alpine Glacier through Multispectral and Thermal Drone Surveys, *Remote Sens.*, 15, 3429, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs15133429>, 2023.
- Rounce, D. R., Hock, R., McNabb, R. W., Millan, R., Sommer, C., Braun, M. H., Malz, P., Maussion, F., Mougnot, J., Seehaus, T. C., and Shean, D. E.: Distributed Global Debris Thickness Estimates Reveal Debris Significantly Impacts Glacier Mass Balance, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 48, e2020GL091311, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL091311>, 2021.
- 1805 Rubio-Álvarez, E. and McPhee, J.: Patterns of spatial and temporal variability in streamflow records in south central Chile in the period 1952–2003, *Water Resour. Res.*, 46, W05514, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009WR007982>, 2010.

- Sarricolea, P., Herrera-Ossandon, M., and Meseguer-Ruiz, Ó.: Climatic regionalisation of continental Chile, *J. Maps*, 13, 66–73, <https://doi.org/10.1080/17445647.2016.1259592>, 2017.
- Schaefer, M., Machguth, H., Falvey, M., Casassa, G., and Rignot, E.: Quantifying mass balance processes on the Southern Patagonia Icefield, *The Cryosphere*, 9, 25–35, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-9-25-2015>, 2015.
- 1810 Schumacher, V., Justino, F., Fernández, A., Meseguer-Ruiz, O., Sarricolea, P., Comin, A., Peroni Venancio, L., and Althoff, D.: Comparison between observations and gridded data sets over complex terrain in the Chilean Andes: Precipitation and temperature, *Int. J. Climatol.*, 40, 5266–5288, <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.6518>, 2020.
- Schuster, L., Rounce, D. R., and Maussion, F.: Glacier projections sensitivity to temperature-index model choices and calibration strategies, *Ann. Glaciol.*, 64, 293–308, <https://doi.org/10.1017/aog.2023.57>, 2023.
- 1815 Sen, P. K.: Estimates of the regression coefficient based on Kendall's tau, *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, 63, 1379–1389, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1968.10480934>, 1968.
- Servicio Nacional de Geología y Minería: Complejo Volcánico Nevados de Chillán, Red Nacional de Vigilancia Volcánica, <https://rnvv.sernageomin.cl/complejo-volcanico-nevados-de-chillan/> (last access: 1 June 2025), 2025.
- 1820 Shean, D. E., Alexandrov, O., Moratto, Z. M., Smith, B. E., Joughin, I. R., Porter, C., and Morin, P.: An automated, open-source pipeline for mass production of digital elevation models (DEMs) from very-high-resolution commercial stereo satellite imagery, *ISPRS J. Photogramm. Remote Sens.*, 116, 101–117, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isprsjprs.2016.03.012>, 2016.
- Shean, D., Bhushan, S., Lilien, D., Knuth, F., Schwat, E., Meyer, J., Sharp, M., and Hu, M.: dshean/demcoreg: v1.1.1 Compatibility and doc improvements, Zenodo [code], <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7730376>, 2023.
- 1825 Ultee, L., Coats, S., and Mackay, J.: Glacial runoff buffers droughts through the 21st century, *Earth Syst. Dynam.*, 13, 935–959, <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-13-935-2022>, 2022.
- USGS EROS Archive: Digital Elevation – Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (SRTM) 1 Arc-Second Global, U.S. Geological Survey [data set], <https://doi.org/10.5066/F7PR7TFT>, 2018.
- 1830 Valdés-Pineda, R., Pizarro, R., García-Chevesich, P., Valdés, J. B., Olivares, C., Vera, M., Balocchi, F., Pérez, F., Vallejos, C., Fuentes, R., Abarza, A., and Helwig, B.: Water governance in Chile: Availability, management and climate change, *J. Hydrol.*, 519, 2538–2567, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2014.04.016>, 2014.
- Webb, M. J., Winter, J. M., Spera, S. A., Chipman, J. W., and Osterberg, E. C.: Water, agriculture, and climate dynamics in central Chile's Aconcagua River Basin, *Phys. Geogr.*, 42, 395–415, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02723646.2020.1790719>, 2020.
- 1835 Westoby, M. J., Brasington, J., Glasser, N. F., Hambrey, M. J., and Reynolds, J. M.: 'Structure-from-Motion' photogrammetry: A low-cost, effective tool for geoscience applications, *Geomorphology*, 179, 300–314, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2012.08.021>, 2012.
- Wigmore, O. and Mark, B.: Monitoring tropical debris-covered glacier dynamics from high-resolution unmanned aerial vehicle photogrammetry, Cordillera Blanca, Peru, *The Cryosphere*, 11, 2463–2480, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-11-2463-2017>, 2017.

1840 Wigmore, O. and Molotch, N. P.: Weekly high-resolution multi-spectral and thermal uncrewed-aerial-system mapping of an alpine catchment during summer snowmelt, Niwot Ridge, Colorado, Earth Syst. Sci. Data, 15, 1733–1747, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-15-1733-2023>, 2023.

xDEM Contributors: xDEM, Zenodo [code], <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11492983>, 2024.

1845 Zemp, M., Frey, H., Gärtner-Roer, I., Nussbaumer, S. U., Hoelzle, M., Paul, F., Haeberli, W., Denzinger, F., Ahlström, A. P., Anderson, B., Bajracharya, S., Baroni, C., Braun, L. N., Cáceres, B. E., Casassa, G., Cobos, G., Dávila, L. R., Delgado Granados, H., Demuth, M. N., Espizua, L., Fischer, A., Fujita, K., Gadek, B., Ghazanfar, A., Hagen, J. O., Holmlund, P., Karimi, N., Li, Z., Pelto, M., Pitte, P., Popovnin, V. V., Portocarrero, C. A., Prinz, R., Sangewar, C. V., Severskiy, I., Sigurðsson, O., Soruco, A., Usabaliev, R., and Vincent, C.: Historically unprecedented global glacier decline in the early 21st century, J. Glaciol., 61, 745–762, <https://doi.org/10.3189/2015JoG15J017>, 2015.

1850 Zemp, M., Huss, M., Thibert, E., Eckert, N., McNabb, R., Huber, J., Barandun, M., Machguth, H., Nussbaumer, S. U., Gärtner-Roer, I., Thomson, L., Paul, F., Maussion, F., Dussaillant, I., Berthier, E., and Hock, R.: Global glacier mass changes and their contributions to sea-level rise from 1961 to 2016, Nature, 568, 382–386, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1071-0>, 2019.

Zenteno, P.: Variaciones recientes de los glaciares en la zona centro sur de Chile y su relación con los cambios climáticos y la actividad volcánica, Undergraduate thesis, Universidad de Chile, Facultad de Arquitectura y Urbanismo, Santiago, <https://doi.org/10.13140/2.1.1618.1442>, 2008.

1855 ▲

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Justified

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman)

Page 8: [1] Deleted	Millie Spencer	7/16/26 12:39:00 PM
Page 11: [2] Formatted	Millie Spencer	6/16/26 11:11:00 AM
Font: (Default) +Headings (Times New Roman), 10 pt		
Page 11: [3] Deleted	Millie Spencer	7/16/26 3:14:00 PM
Page 11: [4] Deleted	Millie Spencer	6/1/26 7:28:00 PM
Page 11: [5] Deleted	Millie Spencer	7/2/26 12:05:00 PM
Page 11: [6] Formatted	Millie Spencer	6/3/26 3:18:00 PM
Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt		
Page 11: [7] Formatted	Millie Spencer	6/3/26 3:18:00 PM
Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt		
Page 11: [8] Formatted	Millie Spencer	6/3/26 3:18:00 PM
Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt, Subscript		
Page 11: [9] Formatted	Millie Spencer	6/3/26 3:18:00 PM
Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt		
Page 11: [10] Formatted	Millie Spencer	6/3/26 3:18:00 PM
Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt, Subscript		
Page 11: [11] Formatted	Millie Spencer	6/3/26 3:18:00 PM
Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt		
Page 11: [12] Formatted	Millie Spencer	6/3/26 3:18:00 PM
Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt		
Page 11: [13] Formatted	Millie Spencer	6/3/26 3:18:00 PM
Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt		
Page 11: [14] Formatted	Millie Spencer	6/3/26 3:18:00 PM
Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt		
Page 11: [15] Formatted	Millie Spencer	6/3/26 3:18:00 PM
Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt		
Page 11: [16] Formatted	Millie Spencer	6/3/26 3:18:00 PM
Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt		
Page 12: [17] Formatted	Millie Spencer	6/3/26 3:18:00 PM
Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt		
Page 12: [17] Formatted	Millie Spencer	6/3/26 3:18:00 PM
Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt		
Page 12: [18] Formatted	Millie Spencer	6/3/26 3:18:00 PM

Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt, Subscript

▲ **Page 12: [18] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/3/26 3:18:00 PM**

Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt, Subscript

▲ **Page 12: [19] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [19] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [19] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [19] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [19] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [19] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [19] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [19] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [19] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [19] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [19] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [19] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [19] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [19] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [19] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [19] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [19] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [20] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [20] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [20] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [20] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [20] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [20] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [20] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [20] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [20] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [20] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [20] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [20] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [20] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [20] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [20] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [20] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [20] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [20] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [21] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/3/26 3:18:00 PM**

Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [21] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/3/26 3:18:00 PM**

Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [21] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/3/26 3:18:00 PM**

Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [21] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/3/26 3:18:00 PM**

Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [21] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/3/26 3:18:00 PM**

Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [21] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/3/26 3:18:00 PM**

Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [21] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/3/26 3:18:00 PM**

Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [21] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/3/26 3:18:00 PM**

Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [21] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/3/26 3:18:00 PM**

Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [21] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/3/26 3:18:00 PM**

Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [21] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/3/26 3:18:00 PM**

Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [22] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [22] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [22] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [22] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [22] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [22] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [22] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [22] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [22] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [22] Formatted** **Millie Spencer** **6/16/26 11:11:00 AM**

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [22] Formatted** Millie Spencer 6/16/26 11:11:00 AM

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [22] Formatted** Millie Spencer 6/16/26 11:11:00 AM

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [22] Formatted** Millie Spencer 6/16/26 11:11:00 AM

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [22] Formatted** Millie Spencer 6/16/26 11:11:00 AM

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [22] Formatted** Millie Spencer 6/16/26 11:11:00 AM

Font: 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [23] Formatted** Millie Spencer 6/3/26 3:18:00 PM

Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [23] Formatted** Millie Spencer 6/3/26 3:18:00 PM

Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [23] Formatted** Millie Spencer 6/3/26 3:18:00 PM

Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [23] Formatted** Millie Spencer 6/3/26 3:18:00 PM

Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [23] Formatted** Millie Spencer 6/3/26 3:18:00 PM

Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt

▲ **Page 12: [24] Deleted** Millie Spencer 7/2/26 12:14:00 PM

▼
▲

Page 12: [24] Deleted Millie Spencer 7/2/26 12:14:00 PM

▼
▲

Page 25: [25] Deleted Millie Spencer 7/2/26 2:18:00 PM

▼
▲

Page 32: [26] Deleted Millie Spencer 6/10/26 2:34:00 PM

▼
▲

Page 34: [27] Deleted Millie Spencer 6/10/26 2:34:00 PM

▼
▲

Page 42: [28] Deleted Millie Spencer 6/10/26 2:31:00 PM

▼
▲

Page 42: [29] Deleted Millie Spencer 7/2/26 3:27:00 PM

