# **AGU** PUBLICATIONS

Geophysical Research Letters
Supporting Information for
Marine Ice Cliff Instability Mitigated by Slow Removal of Ice Shelves
Fiona Clerc <sup>1</sup> , Brent M. Minchew <sup>2</sup> , Mark D. Behn <sup>3</sup>
<sup>1</sup> MIT-WHOI Joint Program in Oceanography/Applied Ocean Science & Engineering, Cambridge MA
<sup>2</sup> Department of Earth, Atmospheric and Planetary Sciences, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge MA
<sup>3</sup> Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Boston College, Chestnut Hill MA
Contents of this file
Text S1 to S2
Figures S1 to S4
Additional Supporting Information (Files uploaded separately)
Caption for Movie S1

#### 16 Text S1. Methods

#### 17 S1.1 Failure modes

We assume a tensile brittle-ductile strain rate of  $4 \times 10^{-7}$  1/s (dashed red line, 18 19 Figure 1a), constrained experimentally and scaled to a Glen's flow law parameter of A =  $10^{25}$  s<sup>-1</sup> Pa<sup>-3</sup> and grain size of d ~ 1 mm (Schulson & Duval, 2009). Uncertainties in the 20 21 tensile brittle-ductile strain rate associated with the prescribed material properties of ice 22 affect our critical height estimates. We explore these effects in Figure 4, Section 4 of the 23 main text, Figure S4, and Section 2.5 of the supplement. 24 Previous parametrizations of cliff failure which presume failure involves 25 Coulombic faulting (Bassis & Walker, 2012; DeConto & Pollard, 2016) are characterized 26 by the Mohr-Coulomb failure criterion, and depend on the assumed coefficient of internal friction ( $\mu$ ). Bassis and Walker (2012) use  $\mu = 0$  to obtain a constant yield stress of  $\tau_{\text{yield}} =$ 27 28 1 MPa, equal to the cohesion of ice. This assumption follows from the observed lack of 29 tall marine-terminating ice cliffs supported by shallow water depths. Within the context 30 of buttressing ice shelf removal over finite timescales, glacier termini represent the static 31 end-member case; previously tall cliffs may have deformed viscously to reach flotation 32 (hence the dearth of observation of such cliffs). Additionally, the material properties (i.e., 33 coefficient of internal friction and tensile strength) of intact ice are different from the 34 damaged ice found at glacier termini, motivating our choice of a non-zero coefficient of 35 friction. The coefficient of kinetic friction observed from sliding ice blocks against each 36 other may range from 0.15 to 0.76 and depend on both temperature and sliding velocity 37 (Schulson & Fortt, 2012). We use an intermediate value of  $\mu = 0.5$ . While this value is

38 poorly constrained, our conclusion that the Tensile regime controls the initiation of cliff

failure (instead of the Thermal Softening or Coulombic regimes) means varying μ would
not affect our results.

41

42

# **S1.2** Rheology and material properties

43 We assume ice is incompressible and adopt a Maxwell viscoelastic rheology for 44 ice, described by the constitutive relation relating the deviatoric stress ( $\tau_{ij}$ ) and strain-rate 45 ( $\dot{\epsilon}_{ij}$ ) tensors (Eq. 1).

$$\dot{\epsilon}_{ij} = \frac{1}{2G}\dot{\tau}_{ij} + A\tau_e^{n-1}\tau_{ij} \tag{1}$$

Here  $\tau_e$  is the effective deviatoric stress (the square root of the second invariant of the 47 48 deviatoric stress tensor). We can calculate the effective strain rates from the deviatoric stresses and the stressing rate, which is set by the transition time  $\Delta t$  ( $\dot{\tau}_{ij} \approx \Delta \tau_{ij} / \Delta t$ ). 49 Using a shear modulus G = 2 GPa, we approximate the rheology of a Burgers viscoelastic 50 51 material with a shear modulus of 3.8 GPa. While the Burgers element better models the 52 viscoelastic rheology of ice, the Maxwell model is a valid approximation over timescales 53 ( $\Delta t$ ) longer than 0.04 days (Gudmundsson, 2011). We set the Glen law pre-exponential parameter to A =  $1.2 \times 10^{-25}$  s<sup>-1</sup> Pa<sup>-3</sup> (corresponding to a temperature T = -20°C; Cuffey & 54 55 Paterson, 2010). We consider cases with both Newtonian and non-Newtonian rheologies. 56 For the non-Newtonian case, we set the stress exponent n=3. For the Newtonian case, we prescribe an average effective deviatoric stress ( $\tau_e$ ) to obtain a constant effective viscosity 57  $(\eta_{eff} = [2A (\tau_e^{ave})^{n-1}]^{-1})$ . With these approximations and assumptions, the constitutive 58 59 relation becomes:

$$\dot{\epsilon}_{ij} \approx \frac{1}{2G} \frac{\Delta \tau_{ij}}{\Delta t} + A \tau_e^{n-1} \tau_{ij} = \frac{1}{2\eta_{eff}} \left[ \left( \frac{t_R}{\Delta t} \right) \Delta \tau_{ij} + \tau_{ij} \right]$$
(2)

If we assume an effective deviatoric stress of 220 kPa (the average stress  $\tau_e^{ave}$  for a subaerial cliff height of 100 m), we obtain an effective viscosity of  $\eta_{eff} = 9 \times 10^{13}$  Pa·s. The effective viscosity scales with the subaerial cliff height. We assume temperature is constant throughout the ice cliff, and test values of A corresponding to a range of plausible temperatures from -35 to -3°C (Cuffey & Paterson, 2010). We set the densities of the ice and water to 900 and 1000 kg/m<sup>3</sup>, respectively.

67

60

#### 68 S1.3 Numerical method

69 We consider two ice geometries in which we either keep the ice thickness (H) 70 constant at 1000 m (Figures S1 & S2) or assume the cliff is at flotation such that the total 71 ice thickness (H) and water depth (D) increase with the subaerial cliff height (h) (Figures 72 **3 & S3; Movie S1**). The horizontal domain size is 3000 m. Numerical tests show that 73 increasing this horizontal distance does not affect stresses and strain rates in the zone of 74 interest (within 500 m of the cliff face), thus excluding edge effects near the left 75 boundary. We impose a no-slip boundary condition on the left boundary (where the ice 76 cliff is attached to the remainder of the ice sheet). We impose a free-slip boundary 77 condition on the bottom of the ice block. Over the length of each transition we run 50 78 timesteps, set the vertical grid size by dividing the subaerial cliff height by 50, and use a 79 horizontal grid size of 20 m.



code that solves the momentum and continuity equations for the velocity and pressure
fields. We use the stresses and strain rates from the model runs to determine if and where
the ice reaches our failure criteria within each of the deformation regimes shown in
Figure 1a. We emphasize that our models examine only the viscoelastic deformation
leading up to the (inferred) onset of plastic failure; future work is required to simulate
deformation after plastic failure.

88 In the numerical model, we retain the geometry of the analytical solution (Figure 89 **1b,c**). We set up the ice cliff on the left-hand side of the domain, with a total ice 90 thickness H. On the right-hand side, we initially mirror the ice cliff to simulate the 91 buttressing ice shelf. The "shelf" is thinned linearly to an air/water interface, over a 92 transition time ( $\Delta$  t), and is replaced by water beneath the shelf and by air above it. At the 93 end of the transition time, the ice shelf is completely replaced by a water layer of height 94 D, and by an air layer exposing a subaerial cliff of height h. The model is run over a 95 range of prescribed subaerial cliff heights (h) and transition times ( $\Delta t$ ) over which the 96 buttressing ice shelf is removed.

97

98 Text S2. Results

### 99 S2.1 Analytical scaling

We derive an analytical scaling from a simplified one-dimensional model of stresses and strain rates along the cliff face. We take the depth (y) as positive downward, where y = 0 at the top of the cliff. We take compressive stresses as negative. We assume the geometry described in the main text (see **Figure 1b,c**).

We first consider the "final" stresses acting on the cliff face once the buttressing ice shelf is fully removed (**Figure 1c**). The final vertical stress arises from the overburden of the ice cliff (of total thickness H):

$$107 \qquad \qquad \sigma_{yy}(y) = -\rho_i g y \tag{3}$$

108 The final horizontal stress arises from the hydrostatic pressure of the water 109 (extending from sea-level at y = h to the ground at y = H):

110  
$$\sigma_{xx}(y) = \begin{cases} 0, & 0 < y \le h \\ -\rho_w g(y-h), & h < y < H \end{cases}$$
(4)

111 We assume there are no additional stresses present (as the basal boundary 112 condition is free-slip), meaning the vertical stress ( $\sigma_{yy}$ ) is the most compressive ( $\sigma_1$ ) and 113 the horizontal stress ( $\sigma_{xx}$ ) is the least compressive ( $\sigma_3$ ). The confinement ratio ( $R = \sigma_3/\sigma_1$ ) 114 gives the local mode of deformation, which is Tensile in the sub-aerial portion of the cliff

115 (y < h) as there  $\sigma_3 = \sigma_{xx} = 0$ . We also determine the final vertical deviatoric stress:

$$\tau_{yy}(y) = \frac{\sigma_{yy}(y) - \sigma_{xx}(y)}{2}$$
$$= \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{2}\rho_i gy, & 0 < y \le h \\ -\frac{1}{2}[\rho_i gy - \rho_w g(y - h)], & h < y < H \end{cases}$$
(5)

117 As we assume the cliff is initially fully buttressed by an ice shelf, the initial 118 deviatoric stress is zero, and the rate of change of the deviatoric stress is approximately 119 the final deviatoric stress divided by the ice-shelf removal time:

$$\dot{\tau}_{yy} \approx \frac{\Delta \tau_{yy}}{\Delta t} \approx \frac{\tau_{yy}}{\Delta t} \tag{6}$$

121 We determine effective strain rates from deviatoric stresses, assuming a linear 122 Maxwell rheology (Eq. 2). We evaluate the strain rates at sea-level (y = h), where the 123 cliff is most likely to fail, as the local strain rate is maximized and the mode of

124 deformation is in the weak Tensile regime.

$$\dot{\epsilon}_{e}\Big|_{y=h} = ||\dot{\epsilon}_{yy}||\Big|_{y=h} = \frac{1}{2G}||\dot{\tau}_{yy}||\Big|_{y=h} + A(\tau_{e}^{ave})^{n-1}||\tau_{yy}||\Big|_{y=h} = \frac{\rho_{i}gh}{2} \left[\frac{1}{2G\Delta t} + A(\tau_{e}^{ave})^{n-1}\right]$$
(7)

126

129

125

127 Here  $\tau_e^{ave}$  is the depth-averaged effective stress and determines the effective

128 viscosity (see section 1.2).

$$\tau_{e}^{ave} = \frac{1}{H} \int_{0}^{H} ||\tau_{yy}|| dy$$
  
=  $\frac{1}{H} \left[ \int_{0}^{h} \frac{1}{2} [\rho_{i}gy] dy + \int_{h}^{H} \frac{1}{2} [\rho_{i}gy - \rho_{w}g(y-h)] dy \right]$   
=  $\frac{g}{4} \left[ (\rho_{i} - \rho_{w})H + \rho_{w}h \left(2 - \frac{h}{H}\right) \right]$  (8)

We find the critical height ( $h^*$ ) above which tensile fractures initiate (green lines in **Figure 4**) by equating the tensile brittle-ductile strain rate to the local deviatoric strain rate. To determine the tensile brittle-ductile strain rate ( $\dot{\epsilon}^{tens}_{BDT}$ ) we employ the parametrization of Schulson and Duval (2009), which depends on the fracture toughness (K<sub>Ic</sub>), the grain size (d), the ratio of the crack length to the grain size ( $\lambda = 3.7$ ; Lee &

135 Schulson, 1988), and Glen's flow-law parameter.

$$\dot{\epsilon}_{BDT}^{tens} = \dot{\epsilon}_e \Big|_{y=h^*} \frac{AK_{Ic}^n}{(\lambda d)^{n/2}} = \frac{\rho_i gh^*}{2} \left\{ \frac{1}{2G\Delta t} + A \left[ \frac{g}{4} \left[ (\rho_i - \rho_w)H + \rho_w h^* \left(2 - \frac{h^*}{H}\right) \right] \right]^{n-1} \right\}$$
(9)

137 In the viscous limit,  $\Delta t \gg t_R$ , the elastic term disappears and we obtain a critical 138 height independent of the transition time or flow-law parameter:

$$\frac{K_{Ic}^{n}}{(\lambda d)^{n/2}} = \frac{\rho_{i}gh^{*}}{2} \left\{ \left[ \frac{g}{4} \left[ (\rho_{i} - \rho_{w})H + \rho_{w}h^{*} \left(2 - \frac{h^{*}}{H}\right) \right] \right]^{n-1} \right\}$$
(10)

- 140
- 141 S2.2 Numerical simulations

142 We find that throughout the ice cliff, effective strain rates increase over the length 143 of the transition time ( $\Delta t$ ) and are greatest at the end of the transition (this timestep is 144 shown in **Figure 3**). Strain rates are generally greatest near the cliff face, at sea-level 145 (Figure 3; top row). The entire cliff is pulled horizontally into the ocean as the 146 buttressing ice shelf is removed, deviatoric stresses are horizontally tensile. Regions of 147 the cliff at subaerial heights are under net tension (R < 0.01, green in Figure 3; middle 148 row), while regions near sea-level are under low confinement corresponding to the 149 Coulombic failure regime (grayscale in **Figure 3**; middle row). For a coefficient of 150 friction  $\mu = 0.5$ , the Thermal Softening regime dominates much of the submarine ice cliff 151 (purple in Figure 3; middle row).

By mapping the modes of deformation onto the ice cliff, we can determine the associated critical strain rate for each region (red lines in **Figure 1a**) and subtract this value from the local strain rate (**Figure 3**; bottom row). We predict failure initiates in regions where this difference is positive (orange). As the tensile brittle-ductile strain rate is much lower than either the compressive brittle-ductile strain rate necessary for Coulombic faulting or the thermal softening critical strain rate, failure always initiates in the unconfined subaerial cliff, near sea-level, in agreement with the analytical prediction.

159 Consequently, for a given subaerial cliff height, repeating the numerical experiments with 160 different water depths does not change our failure prediction. Similarly, imposing a no-161 slip basal boundary condition locally increases stresses and strain rates at the base of the 162 cliff, but not enough to overcome the critical strain rate required for large-scale failure 163 within the Thermal Softening deformation regime; our prediction of Tensile failure near 164 sea-level is unaffected (see section S2.5).

For small cliff heights and fast transition times, strain rates are highest closest to the cliff face, suggesting failure initiates with the sloughing off of thin sheets of the subaerial ice. For larger cliff heights, critical strain rates are reached further to the interior of the ice sheet, potentially detaching larger blocks.

Following the onset of Tensile failure, cliffs higher than 540 m undergo plastic deformation. This deformation is potentially dominated by the Thermal Softening deformation mode as the majority of the submarine cliff is under high confinement due to hydrostatic horizontal stresses (purple zone in middle row of **Figure 3**). However, the manner in which these regimes interact and the mode of subsequent deformation remain unclear, and may not necessarily expose the taller cliff faces that would initiate runaway cliff collapse.

176

#### 177 S2.3 Evolution of numerical strain rates through time

We further used our numerical models to examine the time-dependent trends of maximum stresses and maximum strain rates within ice cliffs of different subaerial heights and transition times (**Figure S1**). In **Figure S1a,b**, we show the maximum strain rate within regions of the ice cliff undergoing extension (green zone in middle row of

182 Figure 3), at a given time step. Strain rates are initially near-zero and increase sharply at 183 the onset of the transition period. Strain rates then follow an approximately exponential 184 increase until the supporting cliff is fully removed  $(t/\Delta t = 1)$ . Strain rates are highest at 185 the penultimate timestep  $(t/\Delta t = .98)$ , when a very thin ice shelf presses against the cliff, 186 inducing locally high strain rates. The onset of brittle Tensile failure is predicted when 187 the maximum local strain rate exceeds the tensile brittle-ductile strain rate (red bar. 188 Figure S1a,b). Due to their high critical strain rates, we find no scenario in which failure 189 initiates within the Coulombic or Thermal Softening regimes. 190 For a constant subaerial cliff height (see **Figure S1a** for h=100 m), the effect of 191 changing the transition time depends on whether we are in the viscous or elastic limit of 192 Maxwell viscoelasticity. Within the elastic limit ( $\Delta t < 1$  hour or 0.04 days), increasing the 193 transition time leads to a proportional decrease in strain rate. As we run the model with 194 increasing transition times, approaching the viscous limit ( $\Delta t > 6$  days), we find strain 195 rates from different runs converge (compare light and dark blue lines in Figure S1a) and 196 become independent of the assumed transition time. Moreover, after the end of each 197 transition, all strain rates converge to a final, constant strain rate seemingly controlled by 198 the cliff geometry. Newtonian and non-Newtonian runs behave similarly, especially in 199 the elastic limit where viscosity is negligible. We find the strain rates within a 100-m cliff 200 only reach the tensile brittle-ductile strain rate if the transition time is less than one hour 201 (0.04 days; an order of magnitude less than the Maxwell relaxation time,  $t_R \sim 0.6$  days). 202 Effective deviatoric stresses increase steadily through time and are independent of the 203 transition time (Figure S1c), as these stresses are primarily controlled by cliff geometry.

204	Increasing the subaerial cliff height, while keeping the transition time fixed, will
205	increase strain rates and stresses ( <b>Figure S1b,d</b> ). For $\Delta t = 0.6$ days, the maximum cliff
206	height before the Tensile failure criterion is reached lies between 200 and 500 m. If we
207	were to shorten the transition time, the maximum cliff height (before the onset of tensile
208	fractures) would decrease accordingly. However, if we apply the Mohr-Coulomb failure
209	criterion and assume a yield stress of 1 MPa (red bar in Figure S1c,d), any cliff greater
210	than ~300 m would fail regardless of transition time. This again implies that different
211	failure criteria make different predictions regarding the conditions under which failure
212	originates.
213	Finally, we note that the Newtonian and non-Newtonian runs (compare dashed
214	and solid lines in <b>Figure S1</b> ) generally agree. Most importantly, the maximum strain rate

within a given run (which predicts whether or not the cliff fails) is consistent over a range

of cliff heights and transition times. This supports our analytical scaling (which employs

a Newtonian rheology) and its implications towards cliff failure in nature, as presented in

215

216

217

218

section 4 of the main text.



219

220 *Figure S1*: Evolution through (normalized) time of the maximum strain rates (a,b) and 221 stresses (c,d) within an ice cliff, for different numerical runs. In the left column, the 222 transition time ( $\Delta t$ ) is varied while the subaerial cliff height (h) is fixed at 100 m. In the 223 right column, the cliff height varies while the transition time is fixed at 0.6 days. Both 224 Newtonian runs (dashed lines) and non-Newtonian runs (solid lines) are shown. The top 225 row shows the maximum strain rate within the ice cliff, relative to a critical strain rate; 226 the red bar shows a tensile brittle-ductile strain rate of  $4 \times 10^{-7}$  1/s. The bottom row shows 227 the maximum effective stress; the red bar shows a yield stress of 1 MPa. The total ice 228 thickness (H) is kept constant at 1000 m (cliffs of subaerial height h = 1000 m are 229 "*dry*").

230

#### 231 S2.4 Numerical vs. analytical failure predictions

232 We next compare the deformation mode calculated by the numerical and 233 analytical models as a function of cliff height and transition time. The maximum strain 234 rates from our numerical runs and our analytical solution predict tensile brittle failure 235 occurs in ice cliffs of similar subaerial height and transition time (Figure S2a). 236 Numerical simulations predicting tensile brittle failure (black circles) are characterized by 237 high cliff heights or rapid transition times. Under these conditions, the corresponding 238 analytical strain rate exceeds the tensile brittle-ductile strain rate (red background color in 239 Figure S2a). For lower cliff heights and longer transition times, both solutions predict 240 the cliff deforms ductilely (white circles and blue background color in **Figure S2a**). Both 241 models agree the brittle-ductile transition occurs under similar conditions, within the 242 subaerial cliff height/transition time parameter space, with one exception. The numerical run for a 100-m cliff formed over  $6 \times 10^{-3}$  days predicts brittle failure while the analytical 243 244 solution predicts ductile flow, likely a consequence of the simplifications made in 245 deriving the analytical scaling. The offset between the numerical and analytical strain 246 rates appears systematic (Figure S2b). From the numerical runs, 100-m cliffs may be 247 predicted to fail over timescales  $\Delta t < 0.02$  days instead of the  $\Delta t < 0.003$  days predicted 248 analytically. This timescale remains under an hour and does not change our conclusions. 249 Finally, both approaches indicate deformation is tensile, as their respective maximum 250 strain rates are comparable and follow a similar dependence on transition time (Figure 251 S2b) and subaerial cliff height (Figure S2c).



252

**Figure S2**: a) Analytically derived maximum local strain rates at sea-level (y = h), as a function of sub-aerial cliff height (h) and transition time ( $\Delta t$ ). The total ice thickness (H)

255 is set as 1000 m (instead of at flotation, as in **Figure 4**). The solid green line is the

location of the tensile brittle-ductile strain rate  $(4 \times 10^{-7} \text{ l/s})$ , for  $A = 1.2 \times 10^{-25} \text{ s}^{-1} Pa^{-3}$ .

257 The yellow line is the Maxwell relaxation time. Numerical runs are plotted as circles and

- are shaded black if any point within the cliff meets the criteria for tensile brittle fracture.
- b) Comparison of analytically- and numerically-derived maximum strain rates versus

260 *transition time, through a constant* h = 100 m. c) *Strain rates versus cliff height, through* 261 *a constant*  $\Delta t = 0.6 \text{ days.}$ 

- 262
- 263

## S2.5 Comparison with previous studies

264 We compare our critical cliff height predictions with those made for static cliffs found at glacier termini. The Bassis and Walker (2012) formulation (corrected for a 265 266 factor of 2 by Ultee and Bassis (2016)) predicts shear failure occurs above a critical 267 height of 440 m for a dry cliff free of pre-existing cracks, and a yield stress of 1 MPa. 268 This height falls within our predicted range (170–710 m). However, we emphasize that 269 while our different solutions make similar predictions concerning the critical cliff height 270 (over long timescales), they represent different physical phenomena (i.e., the initiation of 271 tensile cracks versus Coulombic shear failure). Ma et al. (2017) find that imposing a no-272 slip basal boundary condition leads to shear failure as described above. However, in our 273 model we find the associated increase in strain rate is localized near the base of the cliff, 274 where high confinement suppresses failure (Figure S3). While the strain rate field in 275 Figure S3 (top row) differs slightly near the base of the cliff compared to the free-slip 276 case (Figure 3), the failure predictions (bottom rows) remain essentially the same. Thus, 277 even with a no-slip basal boundary condition, failure is still found to occur higher in the 278 cliff where strain rates are not strongly affected by the basal boundary condition.



279

280 *Figure S3*: Results of numerical simulations for three different ice cliffs at the end of 281 their respective transitions, for a no-slip basal boundary condition (compare to Figure 282 3). From left to right, the cliffs have subaerial heights of 100 m, 100 m, and 600 m, and transition times of 0.6,  $6 \times 10^{-4}$ , and 0.6 days, respectively. The top row shows effective 283 284 strain rates within the cliff face (the color map is centered around the tensile brittleductile strain rate). The middle row shows the confinement ratio (R), color-coded by the 285 286 3 deformation regimes: Thermal Softening (purple), Coulombic (gray), or Tensile 287 (green). The bottom row shows the difference between the local strain rates and the

288 critical strain rate (defined separately for each deformation regime as in **Figure 1a**).

*Failure is predicted to initiate in the positive (red) zones.* 

291	Additionally, Parizek et al. (2019) conducted a numerical analysis of a static cliff
292	and applied the Tensile and Coulombic strain rate failure criterion. They conclude that
293	subaerial cliffs higher than ~200 m fail by "slumping", as both the Tensile and
294	Coulombic-faulting criteria are met (using a fracture toughness of 50 kPa $m^{1/2}$ and crack
295	half-length of 50 mm). We reiterate that the initiation of tensile fractures would precede
296	compressive Coulombic failure, changing the strain rate field. Given their choice of
297	parameters, these tensile fractures would initiate in subaerial cliffs higher than 60 m
298	(Figure S4). If we were to suspend tensile failure in the viscous limit of our model, using
299	a fracture toughness of 80–120 kPa $m^{1/2}$ and grain sizes of 1–8 mm, we would predict
300	compressive Coulombic failure only occurs in subaerial cliffs higher than 1200 – 5100 m.
301	The discrepancy between our results and those of Parizek et al. (2019) arises largely from
302	their use of a 50 mm characteristic crack half-length (more appropriate for fractured
303	calving fronts), whereas we use crack half-lengths related to the grain size (more
304	appropriate for undamaged ice).



305

Figure S4: Critical subaerial cliff heights for the initiation of failure, within space of selected ice material properties. a) Critical cliff height above which strain rates near sealevel exceed the tensile brittle-ductile transition and tensile fractures may initiate, as a function of fracture toughness and crack half-length. b) Critical cliff height above which strain rates near sea-level exceed the compressive brittle-ductile threshold required for the formation of a Coulombic fault.

312 *Movie S1:* Results of 2-D numerical simulations for three different ice cliffs (as in Figure

313 3 of main text) through time (indicated in top right corner). From left to right, the cliffs

have subaerial heights of 100 m, 100 m, and 600 m, and transition times of 0.6,  $6 \times 10^{-4}$ ,

- and 0.6 days, respectively. The total ice thickness is set such that the cliff is at flotation
- 316 (note the 600 m case extends to 6 km and is truncated here) the grounding line and
- 317 edge of the cliff is at x = 0. The top row shows effective strain rates within the cliff face.
- 318 The color map is centered around the tensile brittle-ductile strain rate of  $4 \times 10^{-7}$  1/s
- 319 (Schulson & Duval, 2009). The red solid and dashed lines show the location of the
- 320 surface and base of the buttressing ice shelf. The middle row shows the confinement ratio
- 321 *(R), color-coded by the 3 deformation regimes: Thermal Softening (purple), Coulombic*
- 322 (gray), or Tensile (green). The bottom row shows the difference between the local strain
- 323 rates and the critical strain rate (defined separately for each deformation regime as in
- 324 *Figure 1a*). Failure is predicted to initiate in the positive (red) zone.