

AN ONLINE APPLICATION FOR ΔR CALCULATION

Ron W Reimer* • Paula J Reimer*

¹⁴CHRONO Centre for Climate, the Environment and Chronology, Queen's University Belfast, Belfast BT7 1NN, UK.

ABSTRACT. A regional offset (ΔR) from the marine radiocarbon calibration curve is widely used in calibration software (e.g. CALIB, OxCal) but often is not calculated correctly. While relatively straightforward for known-age samples, such as mollusks from museum collections or annually banded corals, it is more difficult to calculate ΔR and the uncertainty in ΔR for ¹⁴C dates on paired marine and terrestrial samples. Previous researchers have often utilized classical intercept methods that do not account for the full calibrated probability distribution function (pdf). Recently, Soulet (2015) provided R code for calculating reservoir ages using the pdfs, but did not address ΔR and the uncertainty in ΔR . We have developed an online application for performing these calculations for known-age, paired marine and terrestrial ¹⁴C dates and U-Th dated corals. This article briefly discusses methods that have been used for calculating ΔR and the uncertainty and describes the online program *deltar*, which is available free of charge.

KEYWORDS: calibration, ΔR calculation, marine reservoir corrections.

INTRODUCTION

The marine reservoir age, $R(t)$, is the difference between a marine radiocarbon age of a sample that derived its carbon from the marine reservoir in question and the atmospheric ¹⁴C age at the same time (t). A global marine surface mixed-layer calibration curve, Marine13 (Reimer et al. 2013), has been calculated for the Holocene using an ocean-atmospheric box model (Stuiver and Braziunas 1993) and the Northern Hemisphere tree-ring based portion of the calibration curve (currently IntCal13). From 10.5 to 13.9 cal kBP, the curve is composed of foraminifera and corals data and from 13.9 to 50 cal kBP the IntCal13 curve offset by 405 yr was used.

Regional differences from the global curve are handled in calibration by including an offset $\Delta R(t)$, although in practice this value is often assumed to be constant. Although $\Delta R(t)$, the time-dependent regional offset from the global marine curve, was clearly defined in Stuiver et al. (1986), there have been recent publications where calculations for samples with precisely known calendar age were made overly complicated and the results less precise (Alves et al. 2015; Faivre et al. 2015) by inappropriately using phase models in OxCal (Bronk Ramsey 2009). ΔR values calculated from independently dated samples, such as U-Th dated corals, have not always included the calendar age uncertainty (e.g. Toth et al. 2015). In addition, in more complex cases such as contemporaneous marine and terrestrial ¹⁴C samples, classical intercept methods have usually been used (cf. Southon et al. 1995; Reimer et al. 2002; Russell et al. 2011) which, because of “wiggles” in the calibration curve, provide poor estimates of the mean (e.g. Telford et al. 2004) and can either overestimate or, more often, underestimate the uncertainty.

We have developed an online application for calculating ΔR for surface mixed-layer marine samples with (a) known calendar age, (b) independently derived (normally distributed) calendar ages such as U-Th dated corals, and (c) contemporaneous marine and terrestrial ¹⁴C ages. The method uses the full calibrated probability distributions to calculate the confidence ranges of the offset between the unknown sample and the marine calibration curve, currently Marine13 (Reimer et al. 2013). The mean and standard deviation of the 68% and 95% confidence ranges is given for practical purposes for use in calibration software.

*Corresponding authors. Emails: r.reimer@qub.ac.uk; p.j.reimer@qub.ac.uk.

METHODS

For calibration purposes, the uncertainty of ΔR does not include the marine calibration curve uncertainty since this is included in the calculation of the calibrated probability distribution (Stuiver and Reimer 1989). While this is not critical for recent ΔR values where the marine curve uncertainty is small, using the uncertainty twice for calibration of samples from further back in time where the curve uncertainty is larger would inflate the calibrated age ranges significantly.

Except for the simple case of known-age samples, the calculations in *deltar* make use of a convolution integral. This is an integral of the pointwise product of two probability density functions (pdfs), as a function of the amount of overlap between the two, as one is shifted relative to the other and is itself a probability density function. We calculate ranges of 68 and 95% probability from it in the same way that ranges are calculated from calibration probability density functions.

Known Calendar Age, Pre-Bomb Surface Mixed-Layer Samples

Known age, pre-bomb marine surface samples such as mollusk shells or coral can be used to calculate $\Delta R(t)$ relatively simply using Equation 1:

$$\Delta R(t) = {}^{14}\text{C}_m - \text{Marine13C}(t) \quad (1)$$

where ${}^{14}\text{C}_m$ is the measured ${}^{14}\text{C}$ age of the known-age sample and $\text{Marine13C}(t)$ is the ${}^{14}\text{C}$ age of Marine13 at time t .

The *deltar* application intersects the known calendar year of collection/growth with the marine calibration curve and determines the corresponding ${}^{14}\text{C}$ age (reverse-calibrate). It then subtracts the reverse-calibrated age from the mean of the ${}^{14}\text{C}$ age of the marine sample as illustrated in Figure 1. The uncertainty of ΔR is the uncertainty of the marine sample ${}^{14}\text{C}$ measurement since the marine calibration curve uncertainty is included in the calibration process.

Independently Measured Calendar Ages

For marine samples such as corals that have a calendar age derived from radiometric measurements such as U-Th, the *deltar* application creates a normal distribution with the mean and




Figure 1 Illustration of ΔR and uncertainty calculation for samples with known age of collection or growth year (right) with resulting ΔR pdf and ranges on the left.




Figure 2 Illustration of ΔR and uncertainty calculation for samples with independently measured calendar age (e.g. U-Th) with resulting ΔR pdf and ranges on the left.

standard deviation of the U-Th calendar age BP (Figure 2). It then reverse-calibrates discrete points on that distribution using the marine calibration curve. A convolution integral is used to determine a confidence interval for the offset between the ^{14}C -dated marine sample and the uncalibrated probability density function of the U-Th age. Note that it is assumed that the U-Th calendar BP is corrected to 0 BP = AD 1950 rather than the year of measurement. Other type of measurements such as optically stimulated luminescence or varve counts could also be used as independent calendar ages if they can be approximated as normally distributed.

Contemporaneous Marine and Terrestrial Samples

Stuiver and Braziunas (1993) suggested calculating ΔR for contemporaneous (paired) marine and terrestrial material by intersecting with a combined marine and atmospheric calibration curve (i.e. marine vs. atmospheric ^{14}C age). This method was further developed to include the uncertainty in ΔR (Reimer et al. 2002) and has been used in a number of studies (Russell et al. 2011; Dewar et al. 2012). An alternative method calibrated the terrestrial ^{14}C age, then took the mean and standard deviation of the marine calibration curve ^{14}C ages for the calibrated age ranges and subtracted this from the marine sample ^{14}C age (Southon et al. 1995). Neither of these classical methods included the probability density function and therefore should be considered as approximations.

The *deltar* application does this as illustrated in Figure 3 by first calibrating the terrestrial ^{14}C age with the appropriate Northern or Southern Hemisphere calibration curve, currently IntCal13 and SHCal13 (Hogg et al. 2013), respectively. It then reverse-calibrates discrete points of the resulting pdf with the marine calibration curve. As for the case of U-Th ages, a convolution integral is used to determine a confidence interval for the offset between the ^{14}C -dated marine sample and the reverse-calibrated pdf of the atmospheric sample.

The resulting confidence interval will generally not be normally distributed. However, existing calibration programs are unable to handle non-normal distributions of ΔR , so the result will have to be approximated as a normal distribution. Note also that ^{14}C ages that impinge on the end of the calibration curves will produce spurious ΔR results. A comparison of ΔR and




Figure 3 Illustration of ΔR and uncertainty calculation for paired (contemporaneous) ^{14}C -dated samples with (right) with resulting ΔR pdf and ranges on the left.

Table 1 Comparison of ΔR and uncertainties recalculated using the classical intercept method as described in Dewar et al. (2012) using SHCal13 and Marine13 and calculated with *deltar*. The ΔR value calculated with *deltar* is taken as the midpoint of the 68% confidence interval.

Terrestrial (^{14}C BP)	Marine (^{14}C BP)	Classical method		Uncertainty
		ΔR (^{14}C yr)	ΔR (^{14}C yr)	
510 ± 40	820 ± 50	-118 ± 57	-92	66
685 ± 35	1291 ± 25	225 ± 71	236	46
2470 ± 60	3120 ± 60	324 ± 117	320	98
2540 ± 50	2930 ± 40	71 ± 105	71	87

uncertainties calculated using the classical intercept method and *deltar* for contemporaneous samples from South Africa (Dewar et al. 2012) is given in Table 1. While the differences in ΔR for these examples are not large (0–26 ^{14}C yr), the uncertainties are probably more realistic.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The *deltar* application calculates ΔR and the uncertainty for single samples. The uncertainty is more accurate than those provided by many other methods because it uses the full probability distribution functions rather than simple intercepts. The online program *deltar* is available free of charge at <http://calib.org/deltar>. For multiple contemporaneous samples, such as might occur in secure archaeological contexts, the standard error for predicted values has been proposed for determining the variability in ΔR (Russell et al. 2011) rather than using a simple standard deviation. For samples that are not strictly contemporaneous but come from within the same archaeological context, phase models in OxCal (Bronk Ramsey 2009) have been effectively used to calculate ΔR for samples from shell middens (Macario et al. 2015). In sedimentary sequences, $\Delta R(t)$ can be calculated with depositional models in OxCal (Bronk Ramsey et al. 2012). For calculating the reservoir age, R , the Bayesian program ResAge (Soulet et al. 2016) can be utilized.

REFERENCES

- Alves E, Macario K, Souza R, Pimenta A, Douka K, Oliveira F, Chanca I, Angulo R. 2015. Radiocarbon reservoir corrections on the Brazilian coast from pre-bomb marine shells. *Quaternary Geochronology* 29:30–5.
- Bronk Ramsey C. 2009. Bayesian analysis of radiocarbon dates. *Radiocarbon* 55(1):337–60.
- Bronk Ramsey C, Staff RA, Bryant CL, Brock F, Kitagawa H, van der Plicht J, Schlolaut G, Marshall MH, Brauer A, Lamb HF, Payne RL, Tarasov PE, Haraguchi T, Gotanda K, Yonenobu H, Yokoyama Y, Tada R, Nakagawa T. 2012. A complete terrestrial radiocarbon record for 11.2 to 52.8 kyr BP. *Science* 338(6105):370–4.
- Dewar G, Reimer PJ, Sealy J, Woodborne S. 2012. Late-Holocene marine radiocarbon reservoir correction (ΔR) for the west coast of South Africa. *The Holocene* 22(12):1481–9.
- Faivre S, Bakran-Petricioli T, Barešić J, Horvatinčić N. 2015. New data on marine radiocarbon reservoir effect in the eastern Adriatic based on pre-bomb marine organisms from the intertidal zone and shallow sea. *Radiocarbon* 57(4):527–38.
- Hogg AG, Hua Q, Blackwell PG, Niu M, Buck CE, Guilderson TP, Heaton TJ, Palmer JG, Reimer PJ, Reimer RW, Turney CSM, Zimmerman SRH. 2013. SHCal13 Southern Hemisphere calibration, 0–50,000 years cal BP. *Radiocarbon* 55(4):1889–903.
- Macario KD, Souza RCCL, Aguilera OA, Carvalho C, Oliveira FM, Alves EQ, Chanca IS, Silva EP, Douka K, Decco J, Trindade DC, Marques AN, Anjos RM, Pamplona FC. 2015. Marine reservoir effect on the Southeastern coast of Brazil: results from the Tarioba shellmound paired samples. *Journal of Environmental Radioactivity* 143:14–9.
- Reimer PJ, McCormac FG, Moore J, McCormick F, Murray EV. 2002. Marine radiocarbon reservoir corrections for the mid- to late Holocene in the eastern subpolar North Atlantic. *The Holocene* 12(2):129–35.
- Reimer PJ, Bard E, Bayliss A, Beck JW, Blackwell PG, Bronk Ramsey C, Buck CE, Cheng H, Lawrence Edwards R, Friedrich M, Grootes PM, Guilderson TP, Hafidason H, Hajdas I, Hatté C, Heaton TJ, Hoffmann DL, Hogg AG, Hughen KA, Kaiser KF, Kromer B, Manning SW, Niu M, Reimer RW, Richards DA, Scott EM, Southon JR, Staff RA, Turney CSM, van der Plicht J. 2013. IntCal13 and Marine13 radiocarbon age calibration curves, 0–50,000 years cal BP. *Radiocarbon* 55(4):1869–87.
- Russell N, Cook GT, Ascough PL, Scott EM, Dugmore AJ. 2011. Examining the inherent variability in ΔR : new methods of presenting ΔR values and implications for MRE studies. *Radiocarbon* 53(2):277–88.
- Soulet G. 2015. Methods and codes for reservoir-atmosphere ^{14}C age offset calculations. *Quaternary Geochronology* 29:97–103.
- Soulet G, Skinner LC, Beupré SR, Galy V. 2016. A note on reporting of reservoir ^{14}C disequilibria and age offsets. *Radiocarbon* 58(1):205–11.
- Southon JR, Rodman AO, True D. 1995. A comparison of marine and terrestrial radiocarbon ages from northern Chile. *Radiocarbon* 37(2):389–93.
- Stuiver M, Braziunas TF. 1993. Modeling atmospheric ^{14}C influences and ^{14}C ages of marine samples to 10,000 BC. *Radiocarbon* 35(1):137–89.
- Stuiver M, Reimer PJ. 1989. Histograms obtained from computerized radiocarbon age calibration. *Radiocarbon* (31):817–23.
- Stuiver M, Pearson GW, Braziunas T. 1986. Radiocarbon age calibration of marine samples back to 9000 cal yr BP. *Radiocarbon* 28(2B):980–1021.
- Telford RJ, Heegaard E, Birks HJB. 2004. The intercept is a poor estimate of a calibrated radiocarbon age. *The Holocene* (14):296–8.
- Toth LT, Aronson RB, Cheng H, Edwards RL. 2015. Holocene variability in the intensity of wind-gap upwelling in the tropical eastern Pacific. *Paleoceanography* 30:1113–31.