

Supporting Information

Burgess et al. 10.1073/pnas.1317692111

SI Text

The calculated weighed mean $^{206}\text{Pb}/^{238}\text{U}$ dates from this study are younger than dates on the same ash beds published in ref. 1 by up to 0.2% (Table S1 and Fig. S2). This difference is 7–9 times the uncertainty associated with each weighted mean date. Here we explore possible explanations. To eliminate any potential issues with sample heterogeneity, we used the same mineral separates that were analyzed for ref. 1 and chose morphologically similar, high aspect ratio zircons. Both studies yield a similar distribution of single grain dates with an approximately normal distribution of errors [mean square of weighted deviates (MSWD) $\cong 1$] when the few outliers interpreted to be the result of inheritance ($n = 10/61$) are excluded, and it is assumed that chemical abrasion effectively eliminates Pb loss in most cases. We consider it unlikely that the younger weighted mean dates seen in this work are the result of a selection bias or systematic Pb loss in multiple populations of zircon.

The data for ref. 1 were acquired in 2006, in the early stages of the EARTHTIME initiative. Since that time, there have been significant changes in the way U-Pb data are acquired and reduced at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and in other laboratories. These changes include the following. (i) New values for the isotopic compositions and purity of U and Pb standards used to calibrate the EARTHTIME tracer solution and new algorithms to determine this composition, which improves the accuracy of the solution calibration relative to the MITIL calibration by ref. 2 and used in ref. 1. The new calibration reflects the ~ 5 permil change in the $^{238}\text{U}/^{235}\text{U}$ values for CRM112a determined by ref. 3, which leads overall to a decrease in a single $^{206}\text{Pb}/^{238}\text{U}$ date of $\sim 0.05\%$. (ii) As a result of tracer calibration, we refined the $^{18}\text{O}/^{16}\text{O}$ ratio used for UO_2 measurements, which results in a value $\sim 2.5\%$ greater than that used to reduce the data in ref. 1 and a 0.025% decrease (~ 60 ka) in a typical

single-grain $^{206}\text{Pb}/^{238}\text{U}$ date. (iii) Refined estimates of the isotopic composition and dispersion in the laboratory blank, which includes additional measurements and a revised algorithm to calculate composition, indicate that the composition used in ref. 1 was not as accurate as the values used in this study and that the uncertainties were underestimated. For example, applying the composition and uncertainty used by ref. 1 to data from bed 25 generated for this study results in an increase of the weighted mean $^{206}\text{Pb}/^{238}\text{Pb}$ date by 35 ka, with a 27% decrease in analytical uncertainty. (iv) New algorithms were used for point by point interference correction on masses 201–205. (v) Point by point fractionation corrections for Pb were used using the EARTHTIME 202-205-233-238 tracer rather than application of a single value for α -Pb based on long-term monitoring of National Bureau of Standards 981, 982, and synthetic zircon solutions with ET535 added, which was done in ref. 1. We suggest that the fractionation correction used in this study likely reduces scatter in $^{206}\text{Pb}/^{238}\text{U}$ dates caused by assuming a constant value and uncertainty. (vi) New algorithms were used for determining and propagating uncertainties into a weighted mean date (4, 5). The dates in ref. 1 cannot simply be recalculated to independently incorporate one or all of the above changes, and thus the relative effects of each cannot be evaluated.

The nonlinear difference between dates also suggests that the subjectivity of data reduction and other factors such as the response of zircon to chemical abrasion and/or subtle, unaccounted for interference corrections, may play a role. Application of these improvements yield significantly improved accuracy and precision on the weighted mean and interpolated dates (Fig. S2 and Table S2). This improvement is particularly evident for bed 33, on which no mean was calculated by ref. 1 due to excess scatter, which is likely due to residual Pb-loss (Fig. S2).

1. Shen SZ, et al. (2011) Calibrating the end-Permian mass extinction. *Science* 334(6061): 1367–1372.
2. Schoene B, Crowley JL, Condon DJ, Schmitz MD, Bowring SA (2006) Reassessing the uranium decay constants for geochronology using ID-TIMS U–Pb data. *Geochim Cosmochim Acta* 70(2):426–445.
3. Condon DJ, McLean N, Noble SR, Bowring SA (2010) Isotopic composition ($^{238}\text{U}/^{235}\text{U}$) of some commonly used uranium reference materials. *Geochim Cosmochim Acta* 74 (24):7127–7143.
4. McLean N, Bowring J, Bowring S (2011) An algorithm for U-Pb isotope dilution data reduction and uncertainty propagation. *Geochem Geophys Geosyst* 12(6):1–26.
5. Bowring JF, McLean NM, Bowring SA (2011) Engineering cyber infrastructure for U-Pb geochronology: Tripoli and U-Pb_Redux. *Geochem Geophys Geosyst* 12(6): 1–19.

Table S1. Difference in $^{206}\text{Pb}/^{238}\text{U}$ weighted mean dates for Meishan ash beds from this study and from ref. 1

Sample	Shen et al. 2011	<i>n</i> ; MSWD	Mya*	<i>n</i> ; MSWD	Δ Date (Mya)
Bed 22-MZ96 (-4.3)	252.50 ± 0.11	(8; 0.8)	$252.104 \pm 0.060/0.28$	(12, 0.50)	0.49 ± 0.125
Bed 25-MBE0203	252.28 ± 0.08	(13; 1.9)	$251.941 \pm 0.037/0.28$	(16; 1.3)	0.34 ± 0.088
Bed 28-MBE0205	252.10 ± 0.06	(7; 1.4)	$251.880 \pm 0.031/0.28$	(13; 0.76)	0.22 ± 0.067
Bed 33-MD99-33u	No age interpretation	Not applicable	$251.583 \pm 0.086/0.29$	(9, 0.86)	None

*Uncertainty reported is 2σ internal (analytical)/external. External uncertainty includes uncertainty associated with tracer calibration and ^{238}U decay constant. Uncertainty on differences is added in quadrature from 2σ analytical uncertainty on dated beds.

1. Condon DJ, McLean N, Noble SR, Bowring SA (2010) Isotopic composition ($^{238}\text{U}/^{235}\text{U}$) of some commonly used uranium reference materials. *Geochim Cosmochim Acta* 74:7127–7143.

