frontiers in Earth Science

CORRECTION
published: 21 June 2019
doi: 10.3389/feart.2019.00161

Corrigendum: A Stratigraphic Approach to Inferring Depositional Ages From Detrital Geochronology Data

Samuel A. Johnstone[1]*, *Theresa M. Schwartz*[2] and *Christopher S. Holm-Denoma*[3]

[1] Geoscience and Environmental Change Science Center, U.S. Geological Survey, Denver, CO, United States, [2] Department of Geology and Geological Engineering, Colorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, United States, [3] Geology, Geophysics, and Geochemistry Science Center, U.S. Geological Survey, Denver, CO, United States

Keywords: detrital age, geochronology, detrital zircon, maximum depositional age, Bayesian statistics

OPEN ACCESS

Edited and reviewed by:
Brian W. Romans,
Virginia Tech, United States

***Correspondence:**
Samuel A. Johnstone
sjohnstone@usgs.gov

Specialty section:
This article was submitted to Sedimentology, Stratigraphy and Diagenesis, a section of the journal Frontiers in Earth Science

Received: *03 June 2019*
Accepted: *05 June 2019*
Published: *21 June 2019*

Citation:
Johnstone SA, Schwartz TM and Holm-Denoma CS (2019) Corrigendum: A Stratigraphic Approach to Inferring Depositional Ages From Detrital Geochronology Data. Front. Earth Sci. 7:161. doi: 10.3389/feart.2019.00161

A Corrigendum on

A Stratigraphic Approach to Inferring Depositional Ages From Detrital Geochronology Data
by Johnstone, S. A., Schwartz, T. M., and Holm-Denoma, C. S. (2019). Front. Earth Sci. 7:57. doi: 10.3389/feart.2019.00057

In the original article, there was a mistake in the published legend for **Figures 2** and **3**. An indexing error in the computation of the sum in Equation (7) resulted in the labels on values of k_c being off by 1. What was originally labeled $k_c = 2$ should have been labeled $k_c = 1$, what was labeled $k_c = 3$ should have been labeled $k_c = 2$, and so on. The corrected figures and captions appear below.

There was also an error in the text of the original article related to the above-mentioned errors in the figure legends. This impacted the text in one place. A correction has been made to section 2.2, The Search for the Youngest Grain, paragraph 5, following Equation 7:

In cases where these youngest grains make up 1% or less of all dateable minerals, we would only expect to date three of the same grains 95% of the time if we were to date around 630 grains (**Figures 2** and **3**).

The authors apologize for this error and state that this does not change the scientific conclusions of the article in any way. The original article has been updated.



FIGURE 2 | Probabilities of dating enough grains from the youngest constituent to compute an MDA, given that k_C grains are required to compute an MDA and that the grains belonging to the youngest age component constituents a fraction f of all dateable grains (Equation 7). The three panels show probability contours for $k_C = 1$, 2, and 3.



FIGURE 3 | How many grains should be dated to be 95% confident that we would date at least k_C grains from the youngest source of grains? The solid lines provide this recommendation as a function of f, the fraction of dateable mineral grains from the youngest source. In practice, it is unlikely that this quantity can be known. The dashed lines represent specific recommendations for if $f = 10$, 5, and 1%. In 95% of cases where you date ~60, ~120, and ~630 grains, at least 3 grains will be dated from sources that contributed 10, 5, and 1% of all the dateable minerals.