Responses to the Reviewer’s comments

Comments by the two referees were very enlightening and their suggestions useful; we are grateful for their input. His/her careful reading of the manuscript and his/her good knowledge of the subject-matter allowed providing relevant suggestions and additions to the manuscript. We treat each point raised in detail and with great interest.

Note that the line numbers given in this response refer to the revised version of the manuscript in track changes mode.

Referee #1

General comments

Comment 1: Referee #1: P1L23 - The statement on “most of the arctic landscapes. . .” does not hold when you consider the vast landmass of Beringia
Authors: We agree and modified for: “As most of the glaciated arctic landscapes [...]”.

Comment 2: Referee #1: P2L1-2- Please check the references. Apparently, some references are mixed up (i.e. for Antarctica).
Authors: Modification made. Problem with the reference manager.

Comment 3: Referee #1: P2L25-27 - The structure of the sentences can be improved (avoid the parenthesis).
Authors: Modification made.

Comment 4: Referee #1: P3L11 - How far away is Pond Inlet? Can you mark it in Figure 1?
Authors: We agree and location point has been added to the map (figure 1). In the Regional Setting section (p. 3, line 13), we also added that the study site is located “... at about 80 km north-west of the community of Mittimatalik (Pond Inlet)”.

Comment 5: Referee #1: P4L17-18: Except for the massive ice samples I assume.
Authors: Part of the massive ice samples were also melted.
Comment 6:
Referee #1: P6L4 - Does VWC stand for volumetric water content? Please clarify.
Authors: We modified for “With a volumetric ice content ...”.

Comment 7:
Referee #1: P6L10 - Should read mm for long axes.
Authors: Modification made.

Comment 8:
Referee #1: P6L27-31: For a better overview, I suggest to add a table to the manuscript providing the basic statistics for δ18O, δD, d-excess (max, mean, min, sd), slope, intercept, number of samples for each type of ice/water.
Authors: The data is provided on NordicanaD and we prefer to keep it as it stands.

Comment 9:
Referee #1: P8L20: The slope of the C93 ice is below the GMWL, too. Are there any information on past (ice cores?) and modern slopes (LMWL of IAEA stations?) available for your study region?
Authors: The closest station of the IAEA network is Pond Inlet and it only has data for two years, from January 1990 and December 1992. In section 5.2 of the Discussion, the amount weighted mean δ18O for these two years is provided. These data are also plotted in figure 8b. We also added data and slope for Resolute Bay (n=59; 5 years) as the Pond Inlet has a rather small data (n=20, 2 years), which prevents the calculation of reliable slope (LMWL).
In Section 5.1 (Discussion), we compare our data to those obtained from cores sampled on the Barnes and Penny Ice Caps (p.8, lines 23-32).

Comment 10:
Referee #1: P8L25: Provide δ18O numbers for Barnes ice cap for comparison. In the cited paper no d-excess values of Barnes ice cap are given, so it’s not possible to compare your values.
Authors: The D-excess values of Barnes Ice Cap were provided by C. Zdanowicz and recently published in Lacelle et al., 2018 (Scientific Reports). We added citation to “Lacelle et al. 2018” to clarify this part.

Comment 11:
Referee #1: P9L2-7: Can you provide estimations on the elevation difference for the ice source compared to today with respect to the 3.5 to 4.5‰ in δ18O? Is there any indication of the age (i.e. more detailed than Late Pleistocene) of the studied buried glacier ice? Given the climate instability known from Greenland ice cores also abrupt climate changes may explain the additional 3.5 to 4.5‰ in δ18O.
Authors: The estimation on the elevation of the ice source were recently published in Lacelle et al., 2018
(Scientific Reports). There is no other indication of the age of the studied buried glacier ice. A fragment of poorly decomposed peat sampled in the overlying sediments was radiocarbon dated (p.9, 28-29). This surficial cover of mud and sand has been affected by cryoturbations as is indicated by the incorporation of this organic material. As regards to abrupt climate changes, we show a statistical argument for/against this in Lacelle et al., 2018 when we looked at variations in 18O for GISP2, Penny and Barnes Ice Caps. It is unlikely that we would have randomly sampled one of these short-lived 18O excursions.

Comment 12:

Referee #1: P14L21: Provide an URL for this dataset. Currently it isn’t possible to find it.
Authors: The dataset was being reviewed, but it is now available on NordicanaD with the DOI provided.

Comment 13:

Referee #1: Figure 1 - It would be good to add an additional map (or enlarge the second provided map) of the entire Bylot Island to show the study site in the regional context of Bylot Island and the other sites mentioned the regional setting section (Lancaster Sound, Navy Board Inlet, Eclipse Sound).
Authors: We agree. A general map of Bylot Island has been added to Figure 1.

Comment 14:

Referee #1: Figure 2 - What does the red star represent? Please clarify the meaning of the red dots in the left part (isotope and hydrochemistry samples?) and mark the position of the radiocarbon sample.
Authors: We agree. In the caption of figure 2, we added “The red star indicates the sampling location of the organic material and the red dots shows the sampling points for stable O-H isotope and hydrochemistry”.

Comment 15:

Referee #1: Figure 8a - It would be good to add d-excess to the figure (maybe replace δD by d- excess). Add the title for the upper x axis. δ18O needs superscript.
Authors: We agree, the figure 8a has been modified as suggested. We added the title for the upper axis and we replaced δD by the D-excess.
Referee #2

General comment

Comment 1:
Referee #2: Provide good arguments why you have measured major cations only and not anions? Both would be necessary to get a comprehensive understanding of the ion composition and water origin. What about standard parameters such as electrical conductivity and pH measurements?

The origin of the ice has already been established following the analysis of the physical properties (i.e. crystallography), the isotopic composition (dD-18O, D-excess) and the low cation content. We did not need further information to infer its origin. We mainly used the cation content for comparison with glacier ice and other type of ground ice (i.e. interstitial ice, ice wedge). The cation content only showed that the low cation content in the buried massive ice is statistically similar to that of the ice of glacier C93 and had slightly lower cation concentrations that the ice wedge sampled nearby the buried ice exposure. The cation content also allowed showing a strong contrasting profile between the buried ice and the overlying sediment.

We have not measure the conductivity, as it is a proxy for total ion content. We already measured the cation content of the massive ice. As for pH measurement, pH data is meaningless for ground ice samples because of exchange of meltwater with atmospheric CO2. The only way pH data would represent that of the ice is if the ice is melted in a glove box without a CO2 atmosphere; hence we would not call this “standard parameters”.

Comment 2:
Referee #2: The results are sometimes written in past tense and sometimes in present tense. Especially in 4.1 they are in past tense throughout and suddenly in 4.2 present tense pops up. Make sure you use one tense throughout.
Authors: We agree. This section has been reworked.

Comment 3:
Referee #2: The manuscript is rather short, which I personally like, but it contains more than 100 references although it is clearly not a review paper. The authors should find a way to consolidate and shorten the reference list a bit.
Authors: We agree. We shorten the reference list by removing 25 references.

Comment 4:
Referee #2: Sedimentological data is provided in figures 9 and 10. Since Figure 9 already provides information on gravel-sand-mud percentages and on skewness and sorting, Figure 10 does not add a lot of new information and can be removed. This would lead to a better balance of text vs. number of figures/tables.
Authors: We agree.
Comment 5:
Referee #2: All the original measurement data on stable isotopes, cation concentration, grain-size properties and crystallographic data as well as the calculated parameters such as slope, D-excess etc. should go into a table into the supplement of the paper or archived in PANGAEA before final publication of the manuscript.
Authors: The data is provided on NordicanaD.

Specific comments

Comment 1:
Referee #2: Title- “…Pleistocene-age glacier ice…” It would be easier to read the title (without changing the meaning) when you leave out the -age thing.
Authors: We prefer to keep the title as it stands.

Comment 2:
Referee #2: P1L18 - What about anions?
Authors: Please see response to comment #1 in Reviewer #2-General comments.

Comment 3:
Referee #2: P1L23 - “As most of the Arctic landscapes…” - Better "some" because several millions of km² (Beringia) in the Arctic have not been glaciated throughout the Quaternary.
Authors: We agree and modified for: “As most of the glaciated arctic landscapes […]”

Comment 4:
Referee #2: P2L1-2 - Please check the references. Apparently, some references are mixed up (i.e. for Antarctica).
Authors: Modification made. Problem the reference manager.

Comment 5:
Referee #2: P2L25-27 – Something is wrong with this sentence
Authors: Modification made.

Comment 6:
Referee #2: P3L5 – Suggested revision: “…the mountainous central section of the island forms a striking contrast…”
Authors: Suggestion accepted

Comment 7:
Referee #2: P3L19 – Clarification needed: “submerged beneath the sea”
Authors: We modified for “Following glacial retreat, the valley became partially submerged […] as a result of a marine transgression”.

Comment 8:
Referee #2: P4L4 – It would be better "Material and Methods" because you are also taking about the studied object and the samples that were taken.
Authors: Modification made.

Comment 9:
Referee #2: P4L17 – Clarification needed: “melted”
Authors: We modified for “All samples (n=80) were thawed in the field [...]”.

Comment 10:
Referee #2: P4L30 – Clarification needed: “describe”
Authors: We modified for “[...] was conducted to measure their crystal size and shape [...]”.

Comment 11:
Referee #2: P5L2-3 – Clarification needed: “Measurements of c-axis orientations of the crystals were not possible since the horizontal orientation of the ice samples could not be ascertained.”
Authors: We modified for “C-axis orientations of the crystals have not been measured since the horizontal orientation of the ice samples was not preserved following the sampling.”

Comment 12:
Referee #2: P6L1 – This abbreviation was not mentioned before.
Authors: We mentioned the three units (A, B, C) in Section 3 -Material and Methods (lines 13-14). It is mentioned that unit A refers to the massive ice body.

Comment 13:
Referee #2: P6L2 – Clarification needed: “VWC”.
Authors: We modified for “With a volumetric ice content [...]”.

Comment 14:
Referee #2: P6L10 – Clarification needed: “mm²”.
Authors: We modified for “mm”.

Comment 15:
Referee #2: P6L21 – Clarification needed: “The gas bubbles had an average circularity ratio of 0.89 ± 0.18 and a mean surface area of 0.13 ± 0.41 mm² respectively.”
Authors: We removed “respectively.”

Comment 16:
Referee #2: P6L23 – Clarification needed: “The dominant cations in the massive ice body were Ca²⁺, Na⁺ Mg²⁺, K⁺ and S; all with low abundances (<1.76 mg/L; Fig. 7).”
Authors: We modified for “Major cations in the massive ice body (i.e. Ca²⁺, Na⁺ Mg²⁺, K⁺ and S) all occurred in low concentrations (< 1.76 mg/L; Fig. 7).”

Comment 17:
Referee #2: P7L13 – Clarification needed “[...] showed a general fining upward trend”.
Authors: We modified for “were coarser at the base and finer near the top.”
Comment 18:
Referee #2: P7L17 – Clarification needed: “[...]were dated to 786 cal yr BP”.
Authors: We modified for “were dated to 885 ± 15 $^{14}$C yr BP (1164 cal yr BP; 1σ range: 1058-1204).”

Comment 19:
Referee #2: P8L1-6 – I suggest to incorporate the sentences of this introductory paragraph in the according sub-chapters 5.1 and 5.2. It looks a bit odd to have such an introductory paragraph in a paper. The first sentence is very similar to the first sentence of 5.1 and could be merged with that. The second sentence can be removed. The third sentence can easily go as first sentence in 5.1.
Authors: We agree with this comment. We moved this introductory paragraph to the beginning of section 5.1. The second sentence has been removed.

Comment 20:
Referee #2: P8L6-7 – Clarification needed: “The appearance and structure of buried massive ice are similar to those of englacial ice typically observed at the margin of glaciers, ice caps or ice sheet.”
Authors: We modified for “The appearance and structure of the buried massive ice body are similar to those of englacial ice typically observed at the margin of glaciers, ice caps or ice sheet.”

Comment 21:
Referee #2: P9L25 – Suggested revision: “large stagnant ice blocks could have been covered [...]”.
Authors: Suggestion accepted.

Comment 22:
Referee #2: P9L25 – Suggested revision: “[...] by glacigenic sediments accumulations at or near the ice margins [...]”.
Authors: Suggestion accepted.

Comment 23:
Referee #2: P9L25-29 – What about burial by supraglacial meltout till? I think this is the most common process of stagnant ice burial. Ice bodies just drown in their own sediment load during melt-out. At some point the sediment thickness exceeds the active layer depth and further melting stops.
Authors: We agree that melt-out of supraglacial till from the ice surface is a common process allowing burial and preservation of the ice. However, production supraglacial melt-out till requires in situ melting of a debris-rich glacier ice, typically basal ice, that will become buried by a thick, stable, insulating cover of sediment. The buried glacier described in this paper has a very low sediment content. In addition, in situ melting of basal ice usually produces a laminated to bedded diamicton consisting mainly of silt. This is not the case here. The sediment covering the ice consist of coarse sand and gravel that we interpreted as glaciofluvial ice-contact sediment. We suggest that the sediment characteristics rather indicates the burial of the ice occurred as meltwater streams deposited sediments in direct contact with glacier ice.
Comment 24:
Referee #2: P10L21 – Suggested revision: “Evidence that support the englacial origin of the massive ice are: [...]”.
Authors: Suggestion accepted.

Comment 25:
Referee #2: P10L22 – Clarification needed: “Bubble-rich ice, with small gas inclusions [...].
Authors: The meaning of “small” refers to the size of the gas inclusions, rather than the abundance.

Comment 26:
Referee #2: P10L27 – Suggested revision: “[...] the buried englacial ice isotopic composition is highly strongly depleted in heavy isotopes [...].”
Authors: Suggestion accepted.

Comment 27:
Referee #2: P10L29 – Suggested revision: “Although stable isotopes cannot yield information [...]”.
Authors: Suggestion accepted.
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Over the past decades, observations of buried glacier ice exposed in coastal bluffs and headwalls of retrogressive thaw slumps of the Arctic indicate that considerable amounts of late Pleistocene glacier ice survived the deglaciation and are still preserved in permafrost. In exposures, relict glacier ice and intrasedimental ice often coexist and look alike but their genesis is strikingly different. Identifying the origin of ground ice is required to model determine its spatial distribution and abundance, which is necessary to model the response of circumpolar permafrost regions to climate change. This paper aims to present a detailed description and report physical and infer the geochemical properties of glacier ice buried a massive ice body preserved in the permafrost of Bylot Island (Nunavut) as well as identify geomorphic processes that led to the burial and preservation of the ice. The massive ice exposure and core samples were described according to the cryostratigraphic approach, combining the analysis of permafrost cryofacies and cryostructures, ice crystallography, stable O–H isotopes and cation contents. The buried glacier ice consisted of clear to whitish in appearance with englacial ice having large crystals (cm) and small gas inclusions (mm) at crystal intersections, similar to observations of englacial ice facies commonly found on contemporary glaciers and ice sheets. However, the δ18O isotopic composition (-34.0 ± 0.4 ‰) of the buried massive ice differed markedly from lower than contemporary glacier ice and indicated was consistent with the late Pleistocene age of the ice in the Barnes Ice Cap. This ice predates the aggradation of the surrounding permafrost and can be used as an archive to infer paleo-environmental conditions at the study site. As most of the glaciated arctic landscapes are still strongly determined by their glacial legacy, the melting of these large ice bodies could lead to extensive slope failures and settlement of the ground surface, with significant impact on permafrost geosystem landscape dynamics, terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, and infrastructure.

1 Introduction

In the Arctic, extensive areas of ridged and hummocky moraines are underlain by buried glacier ice (Alexanderson et al., 2002; Dyke and Savelle, 2000; Kokelj et al., 2017; Smith, 2015; Solomatin, 1986). Massive-ice bodies within these landscapes are
import indicators of past glacial, hydrologic and hydrogeologic conditions and are used to reconstruct regional paleoenvironments and paleoclimates (Fritz et al., 2011; Jorgenson and Shur, 2008; Murton et al., 2005). Areas with buried glacier ice are also becoming increasingly vulnerable to climate warming (Kokelj et al., 2015, 2017; Segal et al., 2016). Glacier ice is the most common type of buried ice in permafrost and its occurrence was reported in Russia (Astakhov, 1986; Astakhov et al., 1996; Belova, 2008), the Canadian Arctic (Dallimore and Wolfe, 1988; French and Harry, 1990; Hyatt et al., 2003; St-Onge and McMartin, 1999), Alaska (Jorgenson and Shur, 2008; Kanevskiy et al., 2013), and Antarctica (Forman et al., 1999; Sugden et al., 1995; Swanger, 2017). Buried glacier ice has been commonly observed in the proglacial zone of contemporary glaciers and can be preserved in formerly glaciated areas (the paraglacial to periglacial zones) within large moraine belts, hummocky till and glaciofluvial deposits (Everest and Bradwell, 2003; Tonkin et al., 2016). In the Canadian Arctic, buried glacier ice has been mainly described reported in the western and central regions, especially in the Mackenzie Delta region (French and Harry, 1990), Tuktoyaktuk Coastlands (Murton et al., 2005), Herschel Island (Fritz et al., 2011), central Yukon (Lacelle et al., 2007), Banks Island (Lakeman and England, 2012) and Victoria Island (Dyke and Savelle, 2000; Lorrain and Demeur 1985). While the permafrost of the eastern Canadian Arctic is expected to contain remnants of Pleistocene ice sheets or glaciers, very few have been reported so far.

Distinguishing between buried glacier ice and other types of massive ground ice in the permafrost is usually based on cryostratigraphy combined with detailed studies of physical, geochemical and isotopic properties of the ice that may also include analyses of occluded gases (Cardyn et al., 2007; Fritz et al., 2011; Ingólfsson and Lokrantz, 2003). When classifying glacier ice facies, a distinction is made between englacial and basal ice facies (Fortier et al., 2012; Hubbard et al., 2009; Lawson, 1979; Lorrain et al., 1981). The englacial (firm-derived) ice facies is formed by the gradual snow compaction and recrystallization, a process called firnification, and has a low debris content (Benn and Evans, 2010). Basal ice has distinctive physical and chemical characteristics and has a much higher debris content than the overlying englacial ice as a result of subglacial processes operating at the glacier bed: regelation, glaciohydraulic supercooling accretion, net basal adfreezing, incorporation of ice and sediments by overriding ice during glacier advance, glacio-tectonics, ice lens aggradation and downward propagation of cold temperature in the sediment at the glacier bed (congelation) (Alley et al., 1998; Cook et al., 2006; Evans, 1989; Fortier et al., 2012; Hubbard and Sharp, 1995; Knight, 1997; Lawson, 1979; Sharp et al., 1994). Both types of glacier ice may experience burial but basal ice is probably the most common form of buried glacier ice according to reports from various permafrost regions (Belova et al., 2008; Fritz et al., 2011; Murton et al., 2005; St-Onge and McMartin, 1999).

The process of burial of glacier ice has been described by Shur (1988), Solomatin (1986), Harris and Murton (2005) and citations therein. Burial of glacier ice may occur as a result of (1) accumulation of fluvial, lacustrine, aeolian, or slope sediments on top of the ice; (2) glaciectonic processes or (32) formation of insulating blanket of supraglacial melt-out till (Lorrain et al., 2016) or (3) glaciectonic processes (Harris and Murton, J. B., 2005). With this the latter scenario, sediment-rich basal ice has a greater potential to persist in a buried state than englacial ice with little debris, or (2) glaciectonic processes (Harris
Buried glacier ice remains stable for a long period of time only if the soil temperature is below freezing, and the active layer thickness does not exceed a depth to the massive ice body (Shur, 1988).

In this study, we describe the occurrence of massive ice preserved in the permafrost of the Qarlikturvik Valley, southwestern Bylot Island (NU, Arctic Canada). We investigated the physical and geochemical properties of a recently exposed body of massive ice and compared them with those of other ice types in the region (snow, glacier ice, wedge ice, segregated ice) to infer its origin. A cryostratigraphic approach was used to delineate cryostratigraphic units on the basis of their cryostructures, physical properties, and thaw unconformities (French and Shur, 2010; Gilbert et al., 2016), combined with crystallography and geochemical analyses of the different ground-ice types. The origin of the massive ice is discussed.

2 Regional Setting

With ice-capped summits dominating the central highlands and glaciated valleys that extend near the coast, the mountainous central section of the island forms a striking contrast with the relatively flat coastal lowlands. The Byam Martin Mountains range (~1400 m a.s.l.) consists primarily of Archean-Aphebian crystalline igneous rocks and Proterozoic metasedimentary and metamorphic rocks (Jackson and Davidson, 1975). Klassen (1993) suggested that alpine glaciers, larger but similar in size to those present today, occupied Bylot Island during the late Wisconsinan. At the last glacial maximum (LGM), ice streams of the Laurentide Ice Sheet (LIS) flowed in adjacent marine channels (Lancaster Sound, Navy Board Inlet, and Eclipse Sound) and reached Bylot Island (De Angelis and Kleman, 2007; Dyke and Hooper, 2001). The study area is situated in the Qarlikturvik Valley (73°09’ N, 79°57’ W, 25 m a.s.l.) on southwest Bylot Island at about 80 km north-west of Mittimatalik (Pond Inlet) – Arctic Canada (Fig. 1). This valley was eroded through a Cretaceous-Tertiary sequence of poorly consolidated sandstone and shale (Jackson and Davidson, 1975–1987).

The Qarlikturvik Valley is a typical U-shaped glacial valley with surface sediments reflecting the complex history of the valley: presence of unconsolidated glacial, colluvial, alluvial, marine, aeolian and organic deposits dating back to the Late Pleistocene and Holocene (Allard, 1996; Fortier et al., 2006; Fortier and Allard, 2004). The valley comprises low-lying ice-wedge polygon terraces bordering a proglacial braided river running in a glaciofluvial outwash plain and forming a delta in Navy Board Inlet.

During the Holocene glaciers C-93 and C-79 retreated up-valley and today they are located about 14 km from the coast (Inland Waters Branch, 1969). Following glacial retreat, the valley became partially submerged beneath the sea between 11,335 cal yr BP to 6,020 cal yr BP as a result of a marine transgression according to Allard (Allard, 1996). Alternating layers of peat and aeolian sands and silts (~2-3 m) cover the glaciofluvial terraces of the valley, where an extensive network of syngenetic ice-wedge polygons have developed after 6000 cal yr BP (Fortier and Allard, 2004). Mounds of reworked till and ice-contact stratified sediments mark a former position of the glacier-front in the valley.
Bylot Island belongs to the Arctic Cordillera and the Northern Arctic terrestrial ecozones. The MAAT between 1971 and 2000 in Pond Inlet (NU, Canada) was $-15.1 \pm 5.1 ^\circ C$, increasing slightly to $-14.6 \pm 4.9 ^\circ C$ between the 1981 and 2010 (Environment Canada, 2015). No significant trends in precipitation have been observed over the last decades, with a mean annual precipitation of 189 mm, much of it falling as snow. Thawing and freezing indices averaged (1981-2010) 473 degree-days above 0°C and 5736.1 degree-days below 0°C, respectively (Environment Canada, 2015). Vegetation in the valley is typical of Arctic tundra environments and is largely determined by soil moisture and slope (Duclos et al., 2006). Wetlands occur in low-lying areas, commonly with low-centred polygons, and are typically dominated by grasses and sedges. Mesic tundra is found in areas characterized by better-drained soils (i.e. plateaus and hillslopes). The climatic and vegetation conditions determine the presence of continuous permafrost in the ice-free areas of Bylot Island. Locally, permafrost thickness >400 m has been detected from thermal measurements on nearby Somerset and Devon Islands (Smith and Burgess, 2002). Active layer thickness varies from ~ 1-m in drained unvegetated sands and gravels, to ~ 0.3-0.7 m in peaty and silty soils (Allard et al., 2016).

3 Material and Methods

A large body of massive ice was found exposed beneath ~ 1.7 m of sediments along the headwall of a thaw slump in the Qarlukturvik Valley, ~10 km from the terminus of C-93 and C-79 glaciers (Fig. 1). Since a great amount of slump material covered the ice, the exposure was cleaned and enlarged to allow a better description and sampling. The excavated section along the headwall of the slump attained a height exceeding 7 m and extended laterally over 10 m. The lower and lateral contacts of the massive ice have not been reached. The exposure was subdivided into three units, from bottom: A) Massive ice; B) Sand and gravel and C) Muddy sand diamicton overlaid by peat (Fig. 2). The thaw depths were measured with a steel probe at every 10 metres along a 150-metre transect that started at the upper headwall of the thaw slumps. Samples from the massive ice (unit A) were collected using an axe and a portable core-drill equipped with an 8-cm diamond carbide core barrel. Ice cores were extracted every 10 cm or less from depths ranging from one to three metres below the surface (Fig. 2) without reaching the bottom of the ice body. For comparison, modern glacier ice (englacial ice) was sampled from freshly collapsed ice blocks at the margin of glacier C-93 located a few kilometres up the valley (Fig. 1). Wedge ice, segregated ice and snow, were also sampled for geochemical analysis at the site located nearby (< 1 km) the massive ice exposure. Samples (n=5) from the sediments (units B and C) overlying the massive ice were collected and characterized. All samples (n=80) were melted-thawed in the field in sealed polyethylene bottles, shipped and stored in our laboratory for further analysis.

A cryostratigraphic approach was used to describe the massive-ice body and the overlying sediments (Fortier et al., 2012; French and Shur, 2010; Gilbert et al., 2016; Murton and French, 1994; Stephani et al., 2010). Cryostratigraphic units were delineated based on cryostructures and cryofacies. Cryofacies are bodies of frozen sediment that are visually distinct from adjacent frozen sediments based on their cryostructures, volumetric ice content, ice-crystal size and sediment texture.
Cryostructures refer to the shape, amount and distribution of ice within the frozen sediment. Gas inclusions visible within the ice and the deformation structures in the ice and sediments were also described (Hambrey and Lawson, 2000). To further investigate the cryostratigraphic characteristics of the massive ice body, all samples were observed under X-ray computed tomography (Siemens SOMATOM Sensation 64), a technique that allows visualizing and reconstructing the internal structure (2D and 3D) of permafrost samples at <1 mm resolution (Calmels et al., 2010; Dillon et al., 2008; Fortier et al., 2012). The complete CT scanning procedure used in this study is presented in supplementary material. Crystallographic analysis of the massive ice and modern glacier ice was conducted to describe and measure their crystal size and shape (surface area, long-axis and circularity ratio) as these parameters contain information about the conditions under which the ice was formed (French and Shur, 2010). The crystalline structure was investigated through thin sections of ice mounted on a glass slide under cross-polarized light. Thin sections were made by cutting the ice sample vertically and/or horizontally into thin slices (thickness: 0.2 to 0.4 mm) using the procedure outlined by Langway (1958). Measurements of Ce-axis orientations of the crystals were not possible and have not been measured since the horizontal orientation of the ice samples could not be ascertained and was not preserved following the sampling. Fiji image analysis software was used to measure the area, long axis, circularity ratio of each crystal (Schindelin et al., 2012). Differences in the crystal shape (area, long axis, circularity ratio) of horizontal and vertical thin sections were tested with the Mann-Whitney U test using R, which is a programming language and free software for data analysis and graphics (R Development Core Team, 2016).

The massive ice body, along with glacier C-93 ice, ice wedges, intrasedimental ice and snow, were analyzed for their geochemical and isotopic ($\delta^{18}$O, $\delta$D) composition, an approach that can shed light into the origin of ground ice (Fujino and Kato, 1978; Lacelle and Vasil’chuk, 2013). Sampling of the massive ice body was done at 10 cm vertical intervals or less, depending on the unit change; prior to sampling, at least 10 cm of the ice surface was removed with an ice axe. All samples were melted and filtered (0.45 µm diameter filter) prior to analyses. The concentration of major cations in the ice and snow (Al$_{tot}$, B, Ca$^{2+}$, Fe$_{tot}$, K$^+$, Mg, Mn$_{tot}$, Na$^+$, P, S, Si and Sr) was determined by inductively coupled plasma optical emission spectrometry (Vista Pro ICP-OES) at the University of Ottawa. Solutes are expressed in milligrams per litre and analytical reproducibility was ± 1%. The stable isotope ratios of oxygen ($^{18}$O/$^{16}$O) and hydrogen (D/H) were determined using a Los Gatos Research high-precision liquid water analyzer coupled to a CTC LC-PAL autosampler. The results are presented using the $\delta$-notation ($\delta^{18}$O and $\delta$D), where $\delta$ represents the parts per thousand differences for $^{18}$O/$^{16}$O or D/H in a sample with respect to Vienna Standard Mean Ocean Water (VSMOW). Analytical reproducibility for $\delta^{18}$O and $\delta$D was ± 0.3‰ and ± 1‰, respectively.

The origin of the sediment overlying the massive ice was inferred from particle-size distribution, the clasts and sand-size quartz grain morphoscopy, and the geochemical and isotopic ($\delta$D-$\delta^{18}$O) composition of pore water. Particle-size distributions were determined by dry sieving at $\frac{1}{2}$ φ intervals (size ranges -12 to 4 φ). The hydrometer method was used to determine the...
distribution of the finer particles smaller than 4 $\phi$ (ASTM Standard D422, 2007). Descriptive statistics (mean grain size, sorting, skewness) and Folk & Ward sediment classes were determined using the RYSGRAN package for R (Gilbert et al., 2014; R Development Core Team, 2016). Fifty in situ pebble- to cobble-sized clasts were randomly collected from the uppermost unit (Unit C). These clasts were analyzed for shape, roundness, and lithology using techniques described by Benn (2004).

Morphoscopic analyses of small quartz grains (0.5-1.0 mm) were conducted using a binocular microscope (Cailleux and Tricart, 1963). Additionally, the pore ice in the sediments was analyzed for soluble ions (major cations) and $\delta$D-$\delta^{18}$O composition following the method described above. A fragment of poorly decomposed peat sampled in unit B was radiocarbon dated by accelerator mass spectroscopy (AMS) (ULA-6505, Centre for Northern Studies, Université Laval). Radiocarbon age was calculated as −8033ln($F^{14}$C) and reported in $^{14}$C yr BP (BP=AD 1950) (Stuiver and Polach, 1977) and then corrected to calendar years (cal yr BP) using Calib 7.10 and the IntCal13 calibration curve (Reimer et al., 2013; Stuiver et al., 2017).

4 Results

4.1 Cryostratigraphy and properties of the massive ice body.

The exposed massive ice body (unit A) was > 10 m thick and had a clear to milky white appearance due to its high bubble content (Fig. 3a). With a volumetric ice content VWC near 100%, it refers to the “pure ice” cryofacies described by Murton and French (1994). Occasional thin bands of sediments (sands and gravels) with suspended and crustal cryostructures were cutting across the ice (Fig. 3b). These discrete and planar bands were < 2-cm thick, sub-parallel one to the other and showed a dip direction (21˚ to 31˚) downward the ice body in the southeast direction. Crystallographic analysis of thin sections of the massive ice under cross-polarized light showed that the crystals had mostly bluish colours, suggesting that the ice crystals had similar orientations (Fig. 4 and 5a). Coarse-grained ice crystals characterized the massive ice body: long axis average of 7.97 ± 2.97 mm$^2$ (3.13-16.58 mm); average surface area of 34.9 ± 25 mm$^2$ (5.8 and 153.5 mm$^2$); average circularity ratio of 0.65 ± 0.09, indicating the crystals were relatively rounded (Fig. 6). No significant differences in the shape properties (surface area, long axis, circularity ratio) were observed between the horizontal and vertical thin sections (Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon test, p>0.05), indicating that the ice crystals were nearly equiaxial. The glacier C-93 ice displayed ice crystals with varying colors (Fig. 4). The ice crystals were larger (average surface area of 125.29 ± 148 mm$^2$) than those of the massive ice body (Fig. 4 and 6). Glacier C-93 ice consists of relatively rounded crystals as their mean circularity ratio averaged 0.65 ± 0.01. The total volumetric content of gas inclusions varied from 2 to 10 % for both the massive ice and glacier C-93 ice, with bubbles being mostly located along grain boundaries (Fig. 5a). The massive ice body contained three types of gas inclusions: A) spherical bubbles; B) flattened disks and C) clusters of deformed and coalescent bubbles (Fig. 5b, c, d). The tiny gas bubbles had a mean surface area of 0.85 ± 1.04 mm$^2$ with circularity ratio averaging 0.89 ± 0.17. Gas bubbles observed in glacier C-93 were mostly spherical and small, with a few clusters of deformed coalescent bubbles. The gas bubbles had an average circularity ratio of 0.89 ± 0.18 and a mean surface area of 0.13 ± 0.41 mm$^2$, respectively.
The dominant cations in the massive ice body (i.e., Ca\(^{2+}\), Na\(^{+}\), Mg\(^{2+}\), K\(^{+}\) and S\(^{-}\)) all occurred in all with low concentrations abundances (mean < 1.76 mL; Fig. 7). The cation concentrations of glacier C-93 ice were very similar to those of the massive ice; whereas the ice wedge had slightly higher cation concentrations, with average concentrations ranging from 1.11 ± 0.18 mg/L for Mg\(^{2+}\), to 3.32 ± 0.44 mg/L for Ca\(^{2+}\). The δD-δ\(^{18}\)O composition of the massive ice, along with those from glacier C-93 and other types of ground ice present in the valley are shown in Fig. 8 (Fortier et al., 2018). The δ\(^{18}\)O composition of the massive ice had a narrow range (average δ\(^{18}\)O: -34.0 ± 0.4‰) with D-excess (d=δD - 8 δ\(^{18}\)O) averaging 6.6 ± 2.5‰. The δ\(^{18}\)O composition of the massive ice was much lower than that of the snow (average δ\(^{18}\)O: -30.4‰ ± 1.8‰), ice-wedge ice (average δ\(^{18}\)O: -25.6‰ ± 0.95) and glacier C-93 ice (average δ\(^{18}\)O: -25.0 ± 31.1‰). The DδO-D excess of snow, ice wedge, glacier C-93 and intrasedimental ice samples averages 8.9 ± 3.4‰; 9.3 ± 7.1‰, 5.2 ± 5.8‰ and -52.4 ± 31.4‰ respectively. In a δD-δ\(^{18}\)O diagram, the samples from the massive ice, glacier C-93, snow and ice wedges were distributed along linear regression slope values of 6.0 (R\(^{2}=0.44\)), 7.1 (R\(^{2}=0.95\)), 6.6 (R\(^{2}=0.96\)), and 5.2 (R\(^{2}=0.36\)), respectively.

4.2 Cryostratigraphy and properties of the overlying sediments

The massive ice body was covered by ~1.7 m of sediments. The thaw depths measured in late July (2013) ranges between 19 and 55 cm (mean: 30 ± 9 cm). A sharp, sub-planar and unconformable contact separated the ice from the overlying sediments (units B and C) along the exposed section (Fig 2). Unit B (~115 cm thick) directly overlaid the massive ice body and has an ice-poor sediment cryofacies with a structureless cryostructure, essentially made of pore ice. Unit B subdivided into three sub-units: B1: Coarse sandy gravel, B2: Sandy gravel, B3: Stratified gravelly sand. All sub-units were texturally similar, consisting mostly of sands and gravels, with silt- and clay-sized particles constituting < 3% of the sediment (Fig. 9 and 10). The grain size fraction > 32 mm was not included in profile distribution, but abundant cobbles were randomly observed within the bottom sub-units. Sediments were poorly sorted to very poorly sorted (sorting values ranging between 3 and 5) and were coarser at the base and finer near the top show a general fining upward trend [SC1][DF2](Figs. 9 and 10).

Sub-units B1 and B2 were both characterized by unstratified sandy gravel that became finer towards the uppermost sub-unit B3, which consists of stratified gravelly sand with thin sub-horizontal laminae (< 1 cm). Morphoscopic analysis of sub-unit B3 showed that quartz grains were mostly angular (70%) to sub-angular (smooth and polished, glazing grains: 25%). Rounded and frosted grains represented < 5% of the total sand fraction. Plants fragments located at the base of sub-unit B3 were dated to 786.88 ± 15 14C cal yr BP (1164 cal yr BP; 1σ range: 1058-1204); 1σ range: 746-883). The sand and gravel sequence of Unit B was sharply overlain by ~ 55 cm of an unstratified (massive) thawed diamicton, with abundant pebble- to cobble-sized clasts (Unit C; Fig. 2 and 9). The matrix (sandy silt) was very poorly sorted and the grain size distribution tended to be fine-skewed. Clasts had a wide range of shapes, with predominance in the sub-angular and sub-rounded classes (76%). Only about 24% of all clasts were rounded or angular. Gneiss was the dominant cobble type with an
average of 60% in the matrix whereas sedimentary and igneous rocks average 36% and 4% respectively. A thin, continuous and irregular layer of dark fibrous peat with roots (sub-unit C2) overlaid the diamicton.

Supernatant water samples (n=5) from the ice-poor sediments in Unit B showed markedly higher $\delta^{18}O$ and cation values compared to the underlying massive-ice body (Figs. 7 and 8a). In Unit B, the $\delta^{18}O$ values became progressively higher, from -25.7% to -15.4%, as we moved upward from the ice-sediment contact towards the surface (Fig. 8a). The cations content in the ice-poor sediment was 1 to 2 orders of magnitude higher than in the massive ice and also shifts to higher concentrations towards the surface (Fig. 7).

5 Discussion

5.1 Origin of the massive ice

The cryostratigraphic and crystallographic properties of the massive ice along with its isotopic and geochemical composition indicate that the exposed ice consists of relict Pleistocene englacial ice buried and preserved in the permafrost of Bylot Island. Table 1 summarizes the cryostratigraphic and crystallographic properties of different types of tabular massive ice described in the literature: buried glacier ice (basal and englacial), massive segregated-intrusive ice, and buried snowbanks. The appearance and structure of the buried massive ice body are similar to those of englacial ice typically observed at the margin of glaciers, ice caps or ice sheets. The buried massive ice body has a whitish appearance owing to its high concentration of gas inclusions. Coarse-bubbly ice is the most abundant type (90-95%) of englacial ice found in glaciers (Allen et al., 1960). Our results also show that the cross-sectional area of the crystals of the buried massive ice is smaller than that of neighbouring C-93 glacier ice, but there is no significant difference in their circularity ratio (Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon test, p=0.89). However, the difference in ice crystal size is not unforeseen since the ones from glacier ice can show variations on the order of a few millimetres to several centimetres in diameter (Gow, 1963; Romanovsky and Cailleux, 1970; Svensson et al., 2003; Thorsteinsson et al., 1997). Patterns of preferred crystal orientation combined with the occurrence of deformation features in the form of debris bands suggest that the ice has been subjected to long-continued shear stress caused by the motion of the glacier (Benn and Evans, 2010; Knight, 2013; Lawson, 1979). The debris bands cross-cutting the buried glacier ice are comparable to those observed in a zone of the terminus of Stagnation Glacier on Bylot Island, where basal sediments were transported to the glacier surface through shear planes (Moorman and Michel, 2000).

Cations and stable water isotopes measured in the buried massive ice also support its glacial origin. The low cation content in the buried massive ice is statistically similar to that of the ice of glacier C-93. Although a slope of 6.0 was calculated between $\delta D-\delta^{18}O$ of the buried ice, lower than the GMWL (slope =8; Craig, 1961), this was due to the small range of the data ($\delta^{18}O$: -34.4% to -33.4%) which prevented the calculation of a reliable regression slope. The $\delta D-\delta^{18}O$ values of the buried massive ice are similar to those of Pleistocene-age ice from the Barnes Ice Cap (median $\delta^{18}O$: -
This is supported by the average D-excess of 6.6‰ ± 2.5‰ for the buried massive ice, which is within the range of the values of Barnes Ice Cap (Lacelle et al. 2018) and glacier C-93 (5.2‰ ± 5.8‰) on Bylot Island. The average δ¹⁸O value of the buried massive ice (-34.0‰ ± 0.3‰) is much lower than that of the other ice types sampled in the study area (Fig. 8b). The δ¹⁸O values of the buried massive ice are also lower than in the ice of Penny Ice Cap from the last glacial period (δ¹⁸O ~ -31.3 ± 1‰; Fisher et al., 1998), but more alike in the range of the late Pleistocene ice of Barnes Ice Cap (Zdanowicz et al., 2002). The late Pleistocene δ¹⁸O values on Barnes Ice Cap were 6-10‰ lower than the expected δ¹⁸O [modern - last glacial maximum] and interpreted to be the product of two factors: 1) temperature effect: cold climate during the last glacial period that caused a δ¹⁸O shift of 6-7‰ at that latitude (Fisher and Alt, 1985); 2) elevation effect: ice sourced from higher elevation on Foxe Dome (~ 2200 - 2400 m) that caused an additional depletion in δ¹⁸O of local precipitation (Hooke and Clausen, 1982; Zdanowicz et al., 2002). Given that the δ¹⁸O values of the buried massive ice is ~ 10.5‰ lower than the amount weighted δ¹⁸O of precipitation at Pond Inlet (~ -23.9‰; IAEA/WMO, 2016), and that the cooler climate during the LGM accounts for 6-7‰ shift at the latitude of Bylot Island, the remaining 3.5-4.5‰ difference suggests that the ice was sourced from higher elevation. Klassen (1993) suggested that the alpine glaciers on Bylot Island were larger but did not change much in elevation during the late Pleistocene; however, the δ¹⁸O values of our buried ice require ice sourced from elevations in the 2150-2350 m range and as such was likely sourced from the Foxe Dome (Lacelle et al., 2018). Megascopic glacial lineations and streamlined landforms were mapped on the floor of Navy Board Inlet, Eclipse Sound and Lancaster Sound by De Angelis and Kleman (2007), and interpreted as a product of LIS ice streams. We proposed that the study area was most likely an area of confluence of LIS ice and local alpine glaciers during the LGM as an ice stream moved through Navy Board Inlet and onto south-western Bylot as proposed by Dyke and Hooper (2001).

### 5.2 Burial and preservation of late Pleistocene glacier ice in permafrost

The texture (sand and gravel), stratification, and poorly sorted nature of the sediments (unit B) directly overlying the buried glacier ice suggest a glaciofluvial ice-contact deposit (Boulton, 1972). Similar sediment characteristics were obtained by Fortier and Allard (2004) for glaciofluvial sands (angular grains: 75%) located a few kilometers away from the study site. The abundance of angular grains (70%) in unit B indicates little abrasion, which is consistent with a transport by glaciofluvial water where grains were carried over short distances allowing little wear. Furthermore, the sharp and unconformable contact between the buried glacier ice and the overlying sediment suggests that thermal erosion caused by sediment-laden workflow affected the top of the ice of unit A. The uppermost unit (C) is a diamicton, which has undergone reworking by non-glacial processes such as gravitational mass-wasting (e.g. debris flow and solifluction). In ice-contact environments, the sediment cover is subject to several cycles of subsidence and redeposition as the ice undergoes progressive and partial melting (Schomacker, 2008). The shape of the clasts found within this unit provides evidence that it has experienced active glacial transport, which
is also supported by the occurrence of erratic clasts (gneiss) derived from distal bedrock located several kilometres from the study site. To summarize, large stagnant ice blocks could have been covered by glacigenic sediments accumulations at or near the ice margins during the advance and stagnation of a glacier within the Qarlikturvik Valley. The burial of the ice occurred as meltwater streams deposited sediments in direct contact with glacier ice followed by the reworking and redeposition of supraglacial sediments, which formed a surficial cover of mud and sand, later affected by cryoturbations as is indicated by the incorporation of organic material dated at $885 \pm 15\text{ }^{14}\text{C}\text{ yr BP}$ ($1164\text{ cal yr BP; }1\sigma\text{ range: }1058-1204;4\sigma\text{ range: }746-883$).

A clear discontinuity in the $\Delta{\text{O}}$ and cations profiles is observed at the ice-sediment contact and in the overlying units (Figs. 7 and 8). Strong contrasting profiles between buried ice and the overlying sediment are related to different sources of water and freezing formation history. The supernatant water from the ground ice in the overlying sediments (units B and C) has much higher average $\Delta{\text{O}}$ values of $-17.6\%\pm5.4$. These values are comparable to $\Delta{\text{O}}$ values obtained from precipitation at Pond Inlet between 1990 and 1992 ($-23.8\%$; IAEA/WMO, 2016) and modern segregation ice which generally has $\Delta{\text{O}}$ values of $-18\text{ to }-22\%$ (Michel, 2011). The average concentrations of Ca, Na Mg and K in units B and C are 10-86 times greater than those in the buried glacier ice. The substantial increase observed in the cation content from the sediment layers can be attributed to the great amount of mineral dissolution before the freezing of the water (Lacelle and Vasil’chuk, 2013).

Large blocks of buried late Pleistocene glacier ice were left undisturbed for several millennia owing to cold and dry climatic conditions that favored permafrost aggradation following deglaciation. The deposition of a cover of coarse and well-drained sediment exceeding the average active layer thickness of the area has probably been the most important factor limiting the melting of the ice. Furthermore, plant colonization and the development of a continuous vegetation cover with organic accumulation have insulated the buried ice by reducing heat flow from the atmosphere to the permafrost during the summer and favoring heat loss during winter (French, 2010). The preservation potential of buried glacier ice on a millennial timescale following the glacial retreat depends on the complex interactions between climate, geomorphology, and the physical properties of the sediment cover. Between 1999 and 2016, ground thermal regime monitoring in an intact low-centered polygon nearby the study site showed maximum active layer depths varying between 0.3 and 0.7 m while the buried ice is located >1 m below the ground surface. While the properties of the sediment cover had positive feedback on the long-term preservation of the buried ice, thermal erosion and subsequent thaw slump activity were fundamental drivers of its degradation by exposing the ice and accelerating its melting (Kokelj et al., 2015; Lacelle et al., 2010; Segal et al., 2016).

6 Conclusion

This study confirms that the permafrost of Bylot Island contains remnants of Pleistocene glacier ice that survived the last deglaciation. Geomorphic and cryostratigraphic observations along with the crystallographic properties of the massive ice
suggest its englacial origin. Evidence in support of the englacial origin of the massive ice are the following: 1) Sharp and unconformable upper contact between the ice and the overlying glaciofluvial sediments; 2) Clear to whitish ice, with large crystals; 3) Bubble-rich ice, with small gas inclusions (~mm) mainly located at crystal junctions; 4) Occasional debris bands of sand and fine gravel cross-cutting older debris-free ice; 5) Geochemical similarities with contemporary glacier ice. The geochemical data show a clear discontinuity at the buried ice-sediment contact as well as the very low cation content similar to that of modern glacier ice. An origin of massive ice from a Pleistocene glaciation is suggested based on the isotope data: the buried englacial ice isotopic composition is highly strongly depleted in heavy isotopes, similarly to regional Pleistocene glacier ice. Glacier-derived permafrost contains ice that predates the aggradation of the permafrost and represents unique environmental archives to reconstruct paleo-environmental conditions at the study site. Although stable isotopes do not yield information on absolute ages, these data show that the glacier ice body was buried and preserved in the permafrost of Bylot Island for thousands of years. The sedimentological data and interpretations presented in this study demonstrate that the first phase in the burial of the ice involved glaciofluvial deposition directly on the ice, which was followed by mass wasting. Knowledge regarding the occurrence, origin, and preservation of buried glacier ice is of a great interest due to its potential impacts on the landscape stability upon melting. Since Bylot Island has experienced several periods of native and foreign Pleistocene glaciations and based on our findings, we propose that buried glacier ice is widespread and probably on adjacent Baffin Island. In a context of climate change, active layer deepening and increased activity of slope processes, such as active layer detachment slides, thaw slumping and thermo-erosional gullyling, will very likely expose buried glacier ice and initiate major landscape changes, with cascade effects on the ecosystems.
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Figure 1: Location of the study area within the Qarlikturvik Valley (valley of glaciers C-79 and C-93), Bylot Island, Nunavut, Canada. The red square shows the location of the massive ice exposure. Wedge ice, segregated ice and snow were also sampled within the area delineated by the red square. The yellow star indicates the sampling location of C-93 glacier ice. The thaw depths were measured with a steel probe at every 10 metres along a 150-metre transect.
Figure 2: A photograph and a schematic cross section showing generalized stratigraphy of the massive ice exposure and the overlying sediments. The lower and lateral contacts of the massive ice have not been reached. The thaw depths measured in late July (2013) at the headwall reaches 55 cm. The red star indicates the sampling location of the organic material and the red dots shows the sampling points for stable O-H isotope and hydrochemistry.

Figure 3: Photographs (left) and CT scans (right) of the massive ice body. A) Pure ice facies. The red-dotted line highlights one single crystal; B) Ice-poor sediment (sands and gravels) with suspended and crustal cryostructures forming a band in the massive ice.
Figure 4: Comparison between the massive ice body and modern glacier ice (glacier C-93, Bylot Island). The first column shows unprocessed photographs of the ice taken under plain light with surficial sediment inclusions highlighting the crystal boundaries. The red-dotted line highlights one crystal. The second column shows thin sections of ice sample viewed under direct cross-polarized light. The third column shows the microstructure (crystal boundaries) extracted from the thin section photograph.

Figure 5: A) A thin section of the massive ice viewed under cross-polarized light and a transverse cross-section from a scan showing the gas inclusions within the ice. (Air = black; Ice = dark grey). Photos to the right show patterns of gas inclusions; B) Small (sub-mm to mm) spherical bubbles (vertical bars are from measuring ruler of microscope stage); C) Small disks up to 6 mm in diameter; D) Coalescent bubbles and small disks all flattened in the same direction.
Figure 6: Boxplots comparing the distribution of ice crystal characteristics (area, long axis, circularity ratio) of horizontal thin-sections (H) and vertical thin-section (V) obtained from massive ice samples. C-93 represents data obtained from a sample of modern glacier ice sampled from glacier C-93.

Figure 7: Boxplots showing soluble cation concentration of the massive ice, ice wedge, glacier C-93 and intrasedimental ice sampled within the sediments layers covering the massive ice unit.
Figure 8: A) $\delta^{18}O$ and D-excess depth profiles including both the massive ice unit and the intrasedimental ice from the sediment cover; B) $\delta^{18}O$-$\delta D$ diagram of the massive ice and other types of ground ice (ice wedge, intrasedimental ice), snow and modern glacier ice (C-93) sampled on Bylot Island. The red dashed line represents the Global Meteoric Water Line (GMWL): $d=\delta D-8 \delta^{18}O+10$ (Dansgaard, 1964). Also shown are the $\delta^{18}O$ and $\delta D$ values of precipitation recorded at Pond Inlet (1990-1992) between 1990 and 1992 and Resolute Bay (1989-1993) (IAEA/WMO, 2016). LMWL = Local Meteoric Water Line for Resolute Bay, Nunavut ($\delta D = 7.8 \delta^{18}O + 5.33$) and Pond Inlet, Nunavut ($\delta D = 8.0 \delta^{18}O + 10.55$); IAEA/WMO, 2016).
Figure 9: Sedimentological data from the stratigraphic section. From left to right: A stratigraphic log showing the mean grain size of each unit, gravel-sand-mud percentages, skewness and sorting.
Table 1: Comparisons of the physical properties of different massive tabular ground ice found in the permafrost. References: (1) Pollard, 1990; (2) Yoshikawa, 1993; (3) Harry et al., 1988; (4) Gell, 1976; (5) Dallimore and Wolfe, 1988; (7) Gow, 1963; (8) Ingólfsson and Lokrantz, 2003; (9) Tison and Hubbard, 2000; (10) Sharp et al., 1994; (11) Sugden et al., 1995; (12) Murton et al., 2005; (13) Lacelle et al., 2009; (14) Pollard and Dallimore, 1988; (15) Petenko and Withworth, 1999.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ice type</th>
<th>General appearance</th>
<th>Texture</th>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Gas inclusions</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrasedimental ice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massive segregated-intrusive ice</td>
<td>Clear, Sediment-free to sediment-poor</td>
<td>Variable crystal size, but mostly medium to large grains (cm-scale)</td>
<td>Preferred near-vertical oriented c-axis ¹</td>
<td>Bubble-poor to bubble-rich Small (mm- to cm-scale) Elongated and tubular bubbles ¹ Trains of small spherical bubbles ¹ Inter- and intra-crystalline</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buried glacier ice (englacial)</td>
<td>Clear to milky white, Deformation structures ² Foliations of bubble-poor and bubble-rich ice</td>
<td>Wide range of crystal sizes (sub-mm to tens of cm) Mostly large grains (cm-scale) Equigranular Interlocked crystal boundaries</td>
<td>Random or preferred c-axis orientation ³</td>
<td>Bubble-poor to bubble-rich Located at crystal junctions Bubbles truncated at the ice-sediment contact</td>
<td>1, 7, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buried glacier ice (basal)</td>
<td>High sediment content, Debris laminations, Deformation structures ² Suspended pebbles and cobbles</td>
<td>Small grains (mm-scale) Ahnedral to subhedral</td>
<td>Weak to strongly oriented c-axis</td>
<td>Bubble-free to bubble-poor Small (μm to mm-scale) Flattened bubbles Bubbles truncated at the ice-sediment contact Located at crystal junctions</td>
<td>10, 11, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buried snowbank</td>
<td>Milky white to light brown, Loosely compacted structure, Bands of nearly horizontal pale brown ice Organic inclusions (e.g. twigs and leaf fragments)</td>
<td>Small grains (mm-scale) Crystal size area usually reaches a few mm² Subhedral to euhedral Equigranular</td>
<td>Random c-axis orientation</td>
<td>Bubble-rich Layers of bubbles and dispersed in the ice Small spherical bubbles (μm- to mm-scale) Elongated and tubular bubbles Vertically oriented bubbles</td>
<td>13, 14, 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Parallel to the heat flow direction, indicating that freezing is downward.
² Occurrences of debris bands, boudinage and pinch-and-swell structures, folding, thrust-faulting.
³ Depending on the position of the ice within the glacier or ice sheet at the time it becomes buried.