Discrete absolute dating

if not reported, 3.4% ($^{14}$C), 9.1% (OSL), 13.1% (TL) relative $1\sigma$

Surface age = 0 ka BP: uncertainty due to bottom age analytics and difficulty in defining surface level

Indirect dating based on discrete absolute ages

topmost (bottommost) of target under(over)lying stratigraphic unit: 10% relative $1\sigma$

general mean (bulk) age of under(over)lying unit: 20% relative $1\sigma$

assumed equal to regional dated markers: 30% relative $1\sigma$

Continuous age model (e.g., polynomial, bayesian)

reported $1\sigma$ uncertainty envelope

if not reported, uncertainty is the quadrature of the uncertainties of bracketing dated levels

not supported by absolute dating: ±6 kyr absolute $1\sigma$

supported by absolute dating: ±3 kyr absolute $1\sigma$

Correlation (MS, $\delta^{18}$O)

correlation to regionally defined loess-paleosol chronology: ±9 kyr absolute $1\sigma$

Correlation (pedostratigraphy, applies only to loess)

polar ice cores are correlated to the AICC2012 and GICC05 chronologies for Antarctic and Greenland cores, respectively: uncertainty as reported in these reference chronologies