Quaternary International 352 (2014) 124-134

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

# Quaternary International

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/quaint

# ESR dating of Pleistocene mammals and marine shells from the coastal plain of Rio Grande do Sul state, southern Brazil



Renato P. Lopes <sup>a,\*</sup>, Angela Kinoshita <sup>b</sup>, Oswaldo Baffa <sup>c</sup>, Ana Maria Graciano Figueiredo <sup>d</sup>, Sérgio Rebello Dillenburg <sup>a</sup>, Cesar Leandro Schultz <sup>a</sup>, Jamil Corrêa Pereira <sup>e</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), Programa de Pós-graduação em Geociências, Avenida Bento Gonçalves 9500, Agronomia, Porto Alegre CEP 91540-000, RS, Brazil

<sup>b</sup> Universidade Sagrado Coração (USC), PRPPG, Biologia Oral, Rua Irmã Arminda 10-50, Campus Universitário, Bauru CEP 17011-160, SP, Brazil

<sup>c</sup> Universidade de São Paulo, Departamento de Física, Faculdade de Filosofia, Ciências e Letras de Ribeirão Preto (USP-FFLCRP), Avenida dos Bandeirantes 3.900, Ribeirão Preto, São Paulo CEP 14040-901, SP, Brazil

<sup>d</sup> Instituto de Pesquisas Energéticas e Nucleares (IPEN), Avenida Lineu Prestes 2242, Cidade Universitária, São Paulo CEP 05508-000, SP, Brazil

<sup>e</sup> Museu Coronel Tancredo Fernandes de Mello, Rua Barão do Rio Branco 467, Santa Vitória do Palmar CEP 96230-000, RS, Brazil

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Available online 2 August 2013

# ABSTRACT

The Coastal Plain of Rio Grande do Sul state (CPRS), in southern Brazil, encompasses four barrier-lagoon depositional systems formed by marine highstands during the Quaternary, but the ages of the Pleistocene systems older than ~125 ka are not precisely known due to the lack of numerical dates. In order to refine the chronology of these deposits, several fossils of terrestrial mammals collected in the fluvial facies of the Lagoon System III and fossil shells from the marine facies of the Barrier System II, exposed in the southern sector of the CPRS, were subject to dating by electron spin resonance (ESR). The ages of the mammalian remains range from  $90 \pm 10$  to  $43 \pm 3$  ka, thus representing the last glacial cycle (MIS 4 and 3). The mean EU age of the shells is  $224 \pm 24.6$  ka, but this value is considered younger than the 'real' age because of excessive Uranium uptake observed among the younger shells. An estimated mean age of some 235–238 ka would agree with other ESR and TL ages obtained for fossils and sediments collected from beds overlying the shells, and would be consistent with the sea-level highstand at the early MIS 7 (substage 7e). The presence of bivalves and foraminifers that indicate ocean temperatures higher than at present seems to corroborate this estimate, given that MIS 7e was characterized by hypsithermal conditions.

© 2013 Elsevier Ltd and INQUA. All rights reserved.

# 1. Introduction

In recent years, Electron Spin Resonance (ESR) has been used for dating speleothems, travertines, marine organisms, terrestrial megafauna and archaeological remains (Grün, 1989; Rink, 1997; Kinoshita et al., 2008; Blackwell et al., 2010; Kerber et al., 2011). The physical basis of the ESR method is the measurement of the concentration of unpaired electrons by ESR spectroscopy. Electrons trapped in defects of the lattice of solid materials are produced by ionizing radiation emitted by radioactive elements (mainly <sup>238</sup>U, <sup>232</sup>Th and <sup>40</sup>K) present in the surrounding sediments and within the sample being dated; and from cosmic rays. The total dose of natural radiation is called equivalent dose ( $D_e$ ) and is proportional to the age. By measuring the concentration of unpaired electrons trapped in the material and the dose rate from the environment and radioactive elements in the material itself, the age can be calculated. The internal dose rate depends on the way in which the radioactive elements were incorporated by the sample. Thus some theoretical models for uranium uptake have been developed and implemented in a computational algorithm.

In the Early uptake (EU) model it is assumed that uranium incorporation occurs in a short time relative to age and remains constant (Bischoff and Rosenbauer, 1981). This model corresponds to a closed system and provides the minimum age of samples. In the Linear Uptake model, the absorption of Uranium occurs at a



Abbreviations: LGP-E, Laboratório de Geologia e Paleontologia (Notoungulata); LGP-G, Laboratório de Geologia e Paleontologia (Proboscidea).

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author.

*E-mail addresses:* paleonto\_furg@yahoo.com.br, jollyroger1@gmail.com (R.P. Lopes), angelamitie@gmail.com (A. Kinoshita), baffa@ffclrp.usp.br (O. Baffa), anamaria@ipen.br (A.M.G. Figueiredo), sergio.dillenburg@ufrgs.br (S.R. Dillenburg), cesar.schultz@ufrgs.br (C.L. Schultz), jamil\_pereira@terra.com.br (J.C. Pereira).

<sup>1040-6182/\$ –</sup> see front matter @ 2013 Elsevier Ltd and INQUA. All rights reserved. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2013.07.020

constant rate (Ikeya, 1993). These models were implemented in the ROSY (Brennan et al., 1999) and DATA (Grün, 2009a) software for tooth dating. In the ROSY software, there is another option, the Combination Uptake model, in which it is possible to calculate the ages with different combinations of the EU and LU for enamel and dentine. The Recent Uptake (RU) provides a maximum age since it is assumed that the Uranium present in the tissues was recently incorporated (Blackwell and Schwarcz, 1993). When U-series is used coupled to ESR, the uptake history can be determined by solving the equation proposed by Grün et al. (1988). This methodology has been applied successfully in several problematic dating (Grün, 2009b; Falguères et al., 2010; Duval et al., 2011, 2012) and it becomes increasingly important as the ages increases and the difference between the ages obtained by models above mentioned are very large, thus justifying the resources needed to perform this method.

ESR has been employed for dating Quaternary fossils of mammals, human remains, mainly using tooth enamel, and shells of both marine and terrestrial molluscs (Molodkov, 1988, 1993; Engin et al., 2006; Kinoshita et al., 2006). This method is useful for Quaternary fossils because it can determine ages older than the maximum limit of <sup>14</sup>C (about 50,000 years) its upper limit is dependant on the saturation of defects and signal stability in older samples and on the thermal stability of the defects (Ikeya and Ohmura, 1981; Radtke et al., 1985; Shimokawa et al., 1992; Schellmann and Radtke, 1997).

The coastal plain of Rio Grande do Sul state (CPRS, Fig. 1), in southern Brazil, is a geomorphological unit formed by successive marine transgressions correlated to glacial cycles of the Quaternary; the exact ages of the depositional systems, however, are mostly unknown. The only ages published so far were obtained for sediments from the northern and central sectors of the CPRS using thermoluminescence (TL) (Poupeau et al., 1988; Buchmann and Tomazelli, 2003), and shells, peat and mammalian remains from the southern sector using <sup>14</sup>C and ESR (Forti Esteves, 1974; Buchmann et al., 1998; Caron, 2007; Lopes et al., 2010; Lima et al., 2013).

Two major problems concerning the ages of the Pleistocene units of the CPRS are the predominance of sandy deposits mostly reworked by aeolian activity and/or covered by younger sediments, and the absence of fossil materials with good stratigraphic control. Although Holocene shells and peat are found in or near the presentday shoreline, Pleistocene materials in their original stratigraphic setting are scarce. The only deposit known so far that contains such materials is Chuí Creek, located in the southern sector of the CPRS. Lopes et al. (2010) published seven ESR ages from mammalian remains from the continental shelf (dated between  $\sim$ 650 and 18 ka) and four from the banks of Chuí Creek, with ages between 226 and 34 ka. Although these ages were useful for refining the stratigraphy, paleobiogeography and paleo sea-level curves for the CPRS, additional dating on fossils from Chuí Creek are necessary in order to establish more robust interpretations. Here are presented new results on dating of other mammalian fossils from the creek and from marine shells collected from a stratigraphic interval that outcrops below the mammalian remains.

# 2. Geological setting

The study area encompasses the Chuí Creek, located in the southernmost part of the CPRS (Fig. 1A); in this area only three of the four barrier-lagoon depositional systems that form the CPRS are preserved (Fig. 1B). The creek flows over a plain that is part of the Lagoon III depositional system, located between the Pleistocene barriers II and III; each barrier was formed in response to a marine transgression correlated to an interglacial epoch. While the age of



**Fig. 1.** A) Location of Chuí Creek, in the southernmost Rio Grande do Sul state, a rectangle indicates the area where the fossils were collected. Dashed lines indicate boundaries between the depositional systems: a) Lagoon II; b) Barrier II; c) Lagoon III; d) Barrier III; e) Lagoon IV and f) Barrier IV; B) West-East transect (modified from Tomazelli and Villwock, 2005) of the coastal plain in the area where Chuí Creek is located (indicated by arrow).

the Barrier System III was found to be correlated to the ~125 ka marine transgression (MIS 5), according to TL dates (Poupeau et al., 1988; Buchmann and Tomazelli, 2003), the age of the Barrier System II was considered to be of some 325 thousand years, by correlation with the oxygen isotopic curves of Imbrie et al. (1984) (Villwock and Tomazelli, 1995; Tomazelli et al., 2000). The Barrier-Lagoon System IV comprises the present coastline and was formed by the marine transgression around ~6 ka (Caron, 2007; Lima et al., 2013).

The Chuí Creek is the most studied Pleistocene fossiliferous locality of the CPRS. It flows parallel to the coastline in an NE–SW direction, which changes to NW–SE near the town of Chuí following the Chuí faulting zone. Prior to the 1960s, the creek was a shallow stream surrounded by wetlands, but it was further excavated in 1963 for agricultural purposes. During the excavations, a stratum containing remains of extinct mammals was exposed (Paula Couto and Cunha, 1965). The fossiliferous interval has been extensively studied in the last 10 years and has provided several new records of extinct mammals, besides information on past environments and climate conditions in the area (Lopes et al., 2009, 2011, 2013; Pereira et al., 2012; Lopes, 2013).

Closs and Forti (1971) reported the presence of several species of marine molluscs in the creek, but did not correlate these remains with any specific stratigraphic interval. Thus, this material probably consisted of shell remains scattered on the creek bed due to erosion of the banks, as can be seen today. Recently, four outcrops containing concentrations of marine shells were discovered in their original stratigraphic position, exposed at the base of the banks of the creek (Lopes and Simone, 2012).

The total height of the banks is of some 4.5 m (Fig. 2A, B). The lowermost layer is composed of well-selected, quartz sand with small amounts of biogenic carbonate, heavy minerals and micas, contains ichnofossils Ophiomorpha nodosa and Rosselia sp., shell concentrations (Fig. 2C) and exhibits parallel and cross stratifications, thus indicating a shallow marine environment (upper shoreface). Some 2 m of this layer remain above the creek bed, and although the total thickness is vet unknown, it measures more than 4 m. based on soundings with hand auger. In the first survey of the stratigraphy of Chuí Creek, Soliani (1973) considered the marine sediments to be part of the "Chuí Formation" of Delaney (1965), while the overlying mammal-bearing stratum has been assigned to a new unit he called "Santa Vitória Formation". The reviews on the geology and stratigraphy of the CPRS in the 1980s led to the replacement of the lithostratigraphic units by chronostratigraphic units (barrier-lagoon depositional systems) formed by associations of facies (Tomazelli and Villwock, 2005). Following the new scheme, the marine sediments exposed along the banks of the creek are part of the marine facies of the Barrier System II.

After the marine highstand, sea-level retreated and the uppermost part of the marine facies was occupied by paleosoils, fluvial systems and possibly small lakes that constitute the Lagoon System III. The contact between the marine facies and the overlying terrestrial environment is gradual, except in places where ancient fluvial streams eroded the marine sediments. These fluvial facies contain remains of Pleistocene terrestrial mammals, mostly fragmented and isolated, indicating intense erosion and reworking after the fossilization (Lopes, 2009; Lopes et al., 2009). The fossiliferous bed measures between 1.0 and 1.5 m in thickness, and is composed of silty sand with root traces and iron oxide concentrations; at some points of the banks a ~40 cm-thick caliche horizon consisting of nodules and rhizocretions is found at its upper part. Above the fossiliferous bed the amount of silt increases and vertebrate remains disappear. The silty layer measures some 1 m in thickness, and is covered by a  $\sim$  50–70 cm-thick layer of organic matter-rich sand and clay of Holocene age, indicated by the presence of paleoindian remains (Schmitz et al., 1997).

#### 3. Material and methods

#### 3.1. Fossil teeth

Six teeth of extinct mammals, three of the notoungulate *Toxodon* and three of the proboscidean *Notiomastodon* (*=Stegomastodon*)

were selected for dating. All remains have been collected from the fossiliferous level in the banks of Chuí Creek, near the town of Santa Vitória do Palmar, and belonged to the paleontological collection of the Universidade Federal do Rio Grande (FURG). Three samples of the surrounding sedimentary matrix containing the fossils were also collected. Considering that the sediments containing mammalian remains are rather homogeneous, composed mostly of siliciclastic sand deposited and reworked by fluvial systems. Because the area is isolated from other fluvial systems since the Barrier II was formed, it is considered here that the fossil-bearing layer did not receive sediment contributions from external sources that could affect the results. A humidity of 10% was used to calculate the cosmic ray attenuation. This water content was estimated considering that the fossils are most of the time located above the water table (except during winter, when large floods can cover the fossiliferous horizon from periods of hours to a few days), and the beds above the shells are rather impermeable. The fossils are also too deep beneath the surface to be reached by plant roots, thus the only humidity that could usually affect the fossil remains comes from precipitation, but this reaches only the first few centimeters of the banks.

Between 2.2 g and 5 g of enamel and dentine were extracted from the specimens by mechanical drilling; enamel was separated from dentine using the thermal expansion technique. The samples were immersed in liquid nitrogen for a few minutes and then warmed to room temperature; this procedure was repeated a few times until enamel was detached from dentine due to differences in thermal expansion between these two materials. The enamel was then etched in a 1:10 HCl solution for 2 min to remove a thin surface layer (approximately 100  $\mu$ m in thickness). The etched enamel was manually powdered until obtaining a fine (about 500  $\mu$ m in diameter) powder which was then divided in 200 mg samples for irradiation with additive doses using a radioactive source with known energy (<sup>60</sup>Co). The final dose of each aliquot was obtained in a single step, with the same dose rate, to increase the ESR signal. ESR spectrum was recorded in a JEOL FA-200 X-band spectrometer with the following acquisition parameters: central field 344 mT, scan width 10 mT, scan time 1min, modulation amplitude 0.1 mT, microwave power 2 mW, time constant 100 ms. The amplitude peak–peak at  $g_{\perp}$  was used to construct the dose response curves. The dose-response curve was adjusted using one single saturation exponential function (Ikeya, 1993):

$$I = I_0 \left\{ 1 - e^{-\left[\frac{(D-D_e)}{D_0}\right]} \right\}$$
(1)

where  $I_0$  is the signal intensity of the saturation signal, D the additive dose and  $D_0$  is the dose at saturation, using instrumental weighing  $(1/l^2)$  (Grün and Brumby, 1994; Skinner, 2000). Neutron activation analysis (NAA) was used to obtain the concentration of  $^{238}$ U,  $^{232}$ Th and  $^{40}$ K in enamel, dentin and sediments. Once the  $D_{\rm e}$ was obtained, the ages of the samples were calculated using one of the softwares available. Although DATA (Grün, 2009a) has incorporated the most recent beta attenuation factor, the software ROSY (Brennan et al., 1999) allows combinations of uptake models for dentine and enamel and was used in this work. Due to differences on porosities, the combination uptake (CU) was set as EU for dentine and LU for enamel is the best choice. This option is in accordance with U-concentration maps obtained by ICPMS that show that U-migration through the external enamel surface is very small when compared to the bulk of the uranium that migrated internally through the dentine into the enamel (Grün et al., 2008).



Fig. 2. A) panoramic view of the creek. B) stratigraphic sequence exposed along the banks of the creek, with indication of the position of the fossils. C) marine shells outcropping at the base of the left bank; on the insert, one specimen of Amiantis purpuratus.

#### 3.2. Fossil shells

Shells were collected from three outcrops exposed at the banks of Chuí Creek (M001, M002 and M004). The three concentrations are at the same stratigraphic horizon, and seem to have been accumulated by a storm event, thus are considered as a single assemblage. Today, the concentrations are positioned at the level of the creek, thus are permanently saturated in water. Shell remains consisted mostly of bivalves, with few gastropods (Lopes and Simone, 2012). One major concern regarding the suitability of these shells for dating is the fact that most of the bivalves are disarticulated. Schellmann and Radtke (1997) considered that only well-preserved, articulated (in living position) bivalves are useful for dates, but the only articulated specimens from Chuí Creek are six *Corbula caribaea*, a taxon that is too small to provide reliable results using ESR.

One sample of the sedimentary matrix surrounding the shells was collected from each outcrop; the sediments samples are homogeneous, consisting of well-selected, rounded mature siliciclastic sand. The presence of articulated bivalves and ostracod



**Fig. 3.** (A) ESR spectrum of fossil shell irradiated with dose of 400Gy. The spectrum is composed and the signal of CO<sub>2</sub> radical ( $g_{\perp} = 2.0018$  and  $g_{//} = 1.9973$ ) is present. (B) Dose response curve (DRC) built by double integration of signal OF sample no.1 from outcrop M001. The fitting parameters are  $D_e = 95 \pm 7$  Gy,  $I_0 = 0.77 \pm 0.11$  and  $D_0 = 770 \pm 160$  Gy.

carapaces indicates that the shells have not undergone reworking before being collected.

The dating of reworked shells could give a wide range of ages due to time-averaging (e.g. redeposition of older shells together with much younger material). As an attempt to minimize these problems, the taxon selected for dating was the bivalve Amiantis purpuratus, because it is abundant in all outcrops and is a shallowliving species, thus the probability of survival of the shells of dead individuals for more than  $10^3$  years is low, as pointed by studies of the rate of mechanical and chemical destruction of shells in marine habitats (Flessa and Kowalewski, 1994). Because of the higher rate of shell destruction in shallow areas, it is expected that wellpreserved shells of taxa that inhabit these areas represent material that was quickly buried shortly after the individuals have died. Thus, the use of A. purpuratus would in theory avoid large uncertainties that could result from the larger time-averaging of species that inhabit deeper areas of the continental shelf, where chemical and mechanical destruction rates are lower (Flessa and Kowalewski, 1994). Besides, considering that the assemblage seems to have been formed by a short-termed depositional event and that the shells were covered by marine sediments and were not disturbed until the creek was excavated, they are probably reliable indicators of the time of deposition of the marine facies. The use of a single taxon would also exclude variations related to interspecific physical differences, as pointed by other studies (Shimokawa et al., 1992; Brumby and Yoshida, 1994).

Five pristine, similar-sized and well-preserved (without signs of abrasion and/or bioerosion), disarticulated valves of A. purpuratus from each outcrop were selected for dating. The samples were subject to etching in a 1:10 HCl solution for 1 min for removal of the surface layers of the shells (Table 1). After drving, the shells were manually powdered with agate mortar and pestle; the sediment samples were also manually disaggregated. The resulting powder (<0.5 mm) was separated in subsamples and irradiated with additive doses up to 550Gy using a radioactive source with known energy (<sup>60</sup>Co). Aliquots from the fifteen shells and sediment samples from each outcrop were subject to Neutron Activation Analysis (NAA) to determine <sup>238</sup>U, <sup>232</sup>Th and <sup>40</sup>K concentrations The ESR spectra of subsamples were recorded using an X-band (9.5 GHz) JEOL FA-200 spectrometer. The acquisition parameters were: center field 338 mT, sweep width 1.5 mT, scan time 1 min, modulation frequency 100 kHz, modulation width 0.025 mT, time constant 100 ms, microwave power 1 mW. The value of the double integration signal was associated to the additive dose for obtaining the dose-response curve. As performed in the fossil teeth experiment, the doseresponse curve was adjusted using the Equation (1) using instrumental weighing  $(1/I^2)$  (Grün and Brumby, 1994; Skinner, 2000).

Table 1	
Thickness of the shell samples before	and after the acid etching.

Outcrop	Sample	Before etching	After etching
M001	1	2.0 mm	1.4 mm
	2	1.4 mm	1.2 mm
	3	1.4 mm	1.2 mm
	4	1.2 mm	1.0 mm
	5	1.1 mm	0.7 mm
M002	1	2.2 mm	1.6 mm
	2	1.3 mm	1.0 mm
	3	1.1 mm	0.6 mm
	4	1.0 mm	0.7 mm
	5	1.3 mm	0.7 mm
M004	1	1.4 mm	1.0 mm
	2	1.1 mm	0.9 mm
	3	2.0 mm	1.6 mm
	4	1.2 mm	0.8 mm
	5	1.5 mm	1.2 mm

# 4. Results and discussion

### 4.1. Mammalian remains

In South America there are few Pleistocene fossil localities with both good stratigraphic control and numerical ages for the associated fossils. This had hampered the biostratigraphic correlations that have been based mostly on the Stage/Ages defined from the fossil beds of the Pampean region of Argentina (Cione and Tonni, 1999; Lopes, 2013; Lopes and Buchmann, 2010). The reworked nature of most fossiliferous units of fluvial origins indicate that numerical dates on fossil remains rather than on sediments from such deposits is the most reliable way of establishing biostratigraphic correlations.

Table 2 lists concentration of <sup>238</sup>U, <sup>252</sup>Th and <sup>40</sup>K in enamel, dentin and sediments. Table 3 lists the Equivalent Dose ( $D_e$ ), early uptake (EU), linear uptake (LU) and combined uptake (CU) of the fossil teeth. The value of 190 µGy/year was found for cosmic radiation after corrections of latitude and longitude, altitude (Prescott and Hutton, 1994). The water content of the sediment was considered 10%, values of <sup>234</sup>U/<sup>238</sup>U = 1.20 ± 0.20,  $\alpha_{eff} = 0.13 \pm 0.02$ 

 Table 2

 <sup>238</sup>U, <sup>232</sup>Th and <sup>40</sup>K contents (in ppm) of tooth enamel, dentin and sediments.

Sample	Enamel				Dentine	
	U (ppm)	Th (ppm)	K (%)	U (ppm)	Th (ppm)	K (%)
LGP-G0001 LGP-G0036 LGP-G0037 LGP-E0038 LGP-E0040	$\begin{array}{c} 1.00 \pm 0.03 \\ 2.68 \pm 0.08 \\ 1.72 \pm 0.05 \\ 1.68 \pm 0.05 \\ 1.36 \pm 0.04 \end{array}$	n.d. n.d. n.d. n.d. n.d.	n.d. n.d. n.d. n.d. n.d.	$\begin{array}{c} 82 \pm 4 \\ 104 \pm 5 \\ 150 \pm 8 \\ 109 \pm 6 \\ 118 \pm 6 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.082 \pm 0.005 \\ < 0.01 \\ < 0.01 \\ < 0.01 \\ < 0.01 \\ < 0.01 \end{array}$	<0.075 <0.075 <0.075 <0.075 <0.075
LGP-E0053	$\textbf{3.91} \pm \textbf{0.11}$	n.d.	n.d.	$155\pm8$	<0.01	< 0.075
Sediment 1 Sediment 2 Sediment 3	$2.2 \pm 0.$ $1.70 \pm 0.$ $2.2 \pm 0.$	1 3.03 09 3.23 1 2.90	$5 \pm 0.09$ $5 \pm 0.07$ $0 \pm 0.09$	0.63 0.60 0.64	$\begin{array}{c} \pm \ 0.09 \\ \pm \ 0.07 \\ \pm \ 0.07 \end{array}$	

#### Table 3

Equivalent Dose ( $D_e$ ), early uptake (EU), linear uptake (LU) and combined uptake (CU) ages (in thousands of years) of the fossil teeth.

Sample	D <sub>e</sub> (Gy)	EU	LU	CU
LGP-G0001	$39\pm3$	$42\pm3$	$50\pm4$	$48 \pm 4$
LGP-G0036	$90\pm10$	$67\pm9$	$90 \pm 10$	$90 \pm 10$
LGP-G0037	$54\pm 8$	$47\pm 6$	$60\pm9$	$57\pm8$
LGP-E0038	$100\pm20$	$45\pm8$	$70\pm10$	$48\pm9$
LGP-E0040	$130\pm20$	$64\pm 8$	$90\pm10$	$70\pm10$
LGP-E0053	$102\pm7$	$38\pm3$	$59\pm4$	$43\pm3$

Although some obtained ages are older than most of the previously published ages, they are in agreement with others presented by Lopes et al. (2010). These CU ages are also consistent with ages obtained for large mammal fossils from the Touro Passo Formation in the western Rio Grande do Sul state (Kerber et al., 2011), thus reinforcing the biostratigraphic correlation between both areas and also with those from the Sopas Formation of Uruguay (Ubilla et al., 2009).

The new ages, together with the results previously published by Lopes et al. (2010), also help to refine the chronology of the formation of the fossil mammalian assemblage from Chuí Creek. The ages indicate that most of the fossils represent the time interval between the end of MIS 5 and MIS 3 (roughly between 90 and 30 ka); the only specimen dated so far older than this interval is the aforementioned 226 ka-old tooth of *Toxodon*, which represents MIS 7 (Fig. 4). These results in part fill the ~180 thousand years gap between the oldest fossil dated of  $226 \pm 35$  ka and the next older of  $42 \pm 3$  ka from Chuí Creek (Lopes et al., 2010). The relative absence of specimens older than 80 ka may be a result of successive reworking and destruction of the fossils from this location by fluvial action (Lopes, 2009; Lopes et al., 2009). The sedimentary record exposed along the banks of the creek shows evidences of humid and dry phases, linked to climate oscillations; it is likely that older fossils have a lower chance of being preserved because of successive reworking by episodes of fluvial reactivation. The co-occurrence in the same stratigraphic interval of fossils with such age variation corroborates the existence of several episodes of burial-exhumation-redeposition of most of the remains and associated sediments (Lopes, 2009).

The identification of the time interval during which these animals lived in southern Brazil may help to identify the causes that led to their disappearance in this area. Most of the specimens are chronocorrelated to intervals of milder climates, mostly the MIS 3 interstadial (Fig. 4), a relatively warm interval marked by warm (and cold) pulses in both hemispheres caused by Dansgaard-Oeschger (and Heinrich) events (EPICA Community Members, 2006; Rabassa and Ponce, 2013). This pattern suggests that the late Pleistocene climatic oscillations affected the faunal dynamics of the large mammal community that inhabited the area. Several studies have pointed that the interval between  $\sim$  50 and  $\sim$  18 ka in south and southeastern Brazil and the Argentinean Pampas was marked by intercalated drv/humid and cold/warm conditions, followed by very dry conditions during the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM), between  $\sim$  25 and  $\sim$  11 ka (Ledru, 1993; Behling and Lichte, 1997; Turcq et al., 1997; Carignano, 1999; Iriondo, 1999). Other geological records show that during the pre-LGM interval the environmental changes in southern Brazil were also influenced by insolation-driven millennial-scale oscillations that occurred in the Northern Hemisphere and affected the patterns of precipitation (Cruz jr et al., 2005; Wang et al., 2007).

#### 4.2. Shells

Fig. 3 shows the dose response curve for sample 1 from outcrop M001. The equivalent dose ( $D_e$ ) was determined by fitting with exponential function (Ikeya, 1993) (Equation (1)).



Fig. 4. Correlation of the marine isotope stages (MIS) and oxygen isotope curve (=ice volume) from Atlantic Ocean core samples (Lisiecki and Raymo, 2009) with the ages of the mammalian remains (black circles) and EU/LU ages of the shells (triangles) from the Chuí Creek. Open circles indicate the ages of mammalian fossils from the continental shelf (Lopes et al., 2010).

Table 4 lists the concentration of <sup>238</sup>U, <sup>232</sup>Th and <sup>40</sup>K of shells and sediments that were used to convert  $D_e$  in ages using the software DATA (Grün, 2009a). The value of 116 µGy/year was found for cosmic radiation after corrections of latitude and longitude, altitude (~7 m a.s.l) and depth (~4.5 m). The water content of the sediment was considered 100%, because the water table is at the same level of the shells since the creek was excavated in the early 1960s. Also for the age calculations the values of  $^{234}$ U/ $^{238}$ U = 1.20 ± 0.20,  $\alpha_{\rm eff} = 0.10 \pm 0.02$  and density = 2.71 ± 0.02 g/cm<sup>-3</sup> were adopted following the literature (Blackwell et al., 2010).

#### Table 4

<sup>238</sup> U, '	<sup>232</sup> Th and	<sup>40</sup> K	content	of	shells	and	sediment	sampl	les
---------------------	-----------------------	-----------------	---------	----	--------	-----	----------	-------	-----

Outcrop	Sample	U (ppm)	Th (ppm)	K (%)
M001	1	$\textbf{0.28} \pm \textbf{0.02}$	<0.01	< 0.075
	2	$\textbf{0.47} \pm \textbf{0.02}$	<0.01	< 0.075
	3	$0.55\pm0.03$	<0.01	< 0.075
	4	$1.35\pm0.03$	<0.01	< 0.075
	5	$1.07\pm0.03$	<0.01	< 0.075
	Sediment	$0.39\pm0.02$	$1.31 \pm 0.1$	$0.91 \pm 0.07$
M002	1	$1.91 \pm 0.04$	<0.01	< 0.075
	2	$0.47 \pm 0.02$	< 0.01	< 0.075
	3	$1.73 \pm 0.05$	< 0.01	< 0.075
	4	$1.34\pm0.05$	< 0.01	< 0.075
	5	$0.55\pm0.08$	< 0.01	< 0.075
	Sediment	$0.41\pm0.04$	$1.60\pm0.1$	$\textbf{0.82} \pm \textbf{0.2}$
M004	1	$1.45 \pm 0.06$	<0.01	< 0.075
	2	$1.47 \pm 0.06$	<0.01	< 0.075
	3	$1.23\pm0.04$	< 0.01	< 0.075
	4	$1.21 \pm 0.08$	< 0.01	< 0.075
	5	$1.37\pm0.05$	<0.01	< 0.075
	Sediment	$0.5\pm0.1$	$\textbf{1.4} \pm \textbf{0.2}$	$\textbf{0.9} \pm \textbf{0.3}$

The calculated early uptake (EU) and linear uptake (LU) ages for the shells are listed in Table 5. Because the oldest dated tooth from the fluvial facies above the marine sediments was dated of  $226 \pm 35$  ka (Lopes et al., 2010), it was expected that all shells were older than this; the results however, show a wide variation. The ages obtained through the EU model range from  $140 \pm 40$  ka to  $430 \pm 30$  ka; the average ages are  $266 \pm 30$  ka for the shells from M001,  $222 \pm 26$  ka for M002, and  $184 \pm 18$  ka for M004. The mean EU age for the fifteen specimens is of  $224 \pm 24.6$  ka and corresponds to the average of the minimum age of shells (Ikeya, 1993; Blackwell, 1995). The LU ages range from  $570 \pm 20$  ka to  $230 \pm 30$  ka, with a mean value of  $340 \pm 31$  ka.

#### Table 5

Accumulated dose, early and linear uptake ages (in thousands of years) of the fossil shells.

Outcrop	Sample	De	Age (E.U.)	Age (L.U.)
M001	1	$95\pm7$	$430\pm30$	$570\pm20$
	2	$75\pm7$	$280\pm30$	$390\pm20$
	3	$90\pm10$	$300\pm30$	$440\pm20$
	4	$67\pm17$	$140\pm40$	$230\pm40$
	5	$73\pm9$	$180\pm20$	$280\pm20$
	Mean		$266\pm30$	$296\pm24$
M002	1	$97\pm8$	$150\pm10$	$250\pm20$
	2	$84\pm9$	$300\pm30$	$440\pm40$
	3	$79\pm12$	$140\pm20$	$230\pm30$
	4	$90\pm11$	$180\pm20$	$300\pm40$
	5	$104\pm14$	$340\pm50$	$500\pm70$
	Mean		$222\pm26$	$344\pm40$
M004	1	$92\pm13$	$170\pm20$	$280\pm40$
	2	$87\pm8$	$170\pm20$	$270\pm20$
	3	$89\pm10$	$190\pm20$	$300\pm30$
	4	$91\pm 5$	$190 \pm 10$	$310\pm20$
	5	$104\pm11$	$200\pm20$	$320\pm34$
	Mean		$184\pm18$	$\textbf{382} \pm \textbf{28.8}$
Total mean a	ige		$224\pm24.6$	$340\pm31.0$



Fig. 5. Relationships between uranium concentration and EU/LU ages of the shell samples.

Differences of approximately 120 ka between EU and LU models due to uranium uptake modeling were also observed by Schellmann and Radtke (1999), indicating how sensitive this information can be to the age obtained, thus the results shall be considered as minimum ages, unless it is assumed that the enrichment has occurred shortly after the burial of the material (Radtke et al., 1985). Because Early Holocene shells already display uranium concentrations equivalent to those found in shells from the Last or Penultimate Interglacial, the most reliable ages are those obtained by the EU model (Schellmann and Radtke, 1997, 1999, 2000). The amount of uranium found in the fifteen shells was relatively low, ranging from 0.28 to 1.91 ppm (1.09 ppm on average), thus suggesting that the U-uptake occurred shortly after the shells were deposited; recent shells exhibit uranium concentrations around 0.2 ppm (Schellmann and Radtke, 1999). Nevertheless, the specimens with higher U-concentrations are also the ones that exhibit the younger ages (Fig. 5); as already mentioned, EU ages are the youngest possible (Blackwell, 1995). The coupled ESR-US method provides results of age independently of uranium uptake, but as in this study the US determination was not available, so the entire discussion here is based on the EU ages, taking into account that these are probably younger than the 'real' ages of the samples.

The U-uptake may be related to the thickness (higher concentrations are usually found in thinner shells), the type of surrounding matrix (higher in sandy sediments) and the mobility of the interstitial water (Shimokawa et al., 1992). The sedimentary matrix in which the shells are embedded is composed of fine sand; the shells themselves were progressively buried beneath a  $\sim$ 4.5 m thick sedimentary cover, and although it is not clear how much the water table varied since their burial, it is probable that they remained below the water table until the creek was excavated in the early 1960s. Today, the shells are at the mean level of the creek, constantly saturated in water (Fig. 2D).

On the other hand, some shells exhibit very low uranium concentrations, and conversely are the ones with older ages. This pattern needs further investigation, but may indicate that these shells were reworked from older deposits or that there was some diagenetic alteration on these specimens, which interfered in the uranium uptake. Considering that the assemblage is composed mostly of shallow-living molluscs accumulated in the upper shoreface, with many specimens well-preserved, including small and fragile juveniles, it seems unlikely that the large age discrepancies represent time-averaging, because the shells would not have withstood the mechanical destruction for such a long time in this high-energy environment (Flessa and Kowalewski, 1994). Large time-averagings are expected to be found in transgressive lag deposits that are formed on the shelf during marine transgressions, as those found in the continental shelf today (Figueiredo, 1975).

The ages of the shells reinforce the interpretation that the marine facies of the Barrier II is older than 226-thousand years, based on a tooth from the overlying fossiliferous bed (Lopes et al., 2010). Despite of the large ages difference of the shells, the results seem consistent with TL ages obtained for marine sediments collected about 1 m above the shells (Lopes, unpublished data). Given the time interval indicated by the EU (~224  $\pm$  24.6 ka) and the LU (~340  $\pm$  31 ka) models, and that the EU ages are the youngest possible, these shall be considered younger than the 'real' ages due to excessive U-uptake. An estimated age closer to ~234-238 ka, therefore within the error margin of the EU model, seems reasonable and also agrees with the interglacial peak of the marine isotope substage 7e, according to oxygen isotope curves for the Atlantic (Lisiecki and Raymo, 2009, Fig. 4). The interval between  $\sim$  238 and 234 ka, within the substage 7e, is considered a hypsithermal, marked by warmer ocean temperatures than at present in the southern Atlantic (Robinson et al., 2002; Becquey and Gersonde, 2002, 2003). The shell assemblage from Chuí Creek also points to oceanographic conditions warmer than at present, indicated by the presence of the bivalves Anadara brasiliana, Anomalocardia brasiliana, Chione cancellata and Chione paphia, which today are found living only in areas of the Brazilian coast to the north of Rio Grande do Sul state, and also by foraminifers found together with the shells (Lopes and Bonetti, 2012; Lopes et al., 2012).

Kanfoush et al. (2002) and Becquey and Gersonde (2002, 2003) reconstructed past oceanographic conditions from the Atlantic sector of the Southern Ocean and concluded that the early phases of the last four interglacials were hypsithermals, characterized by higher temperatures in comparison to the present. Thus, the presence of warm-water bivalves in the coastal waters of southern Brazil around ~234–238 ka seems consistent with the hypsithermal recorded at the beginning of MIS 7 (substage 7e). A hypsithermal was also identified during the late MIS 7 (substage 7a) around 200 ka, which would fall within the lower error margin of the EU ages; nevertheless, one tooth of *Notiomastodon* from the continental shelf dated as of 207  $\pm$  28 ka (Lopes et al., 2010) indicates that sea-level had already retreated around 200 ka.

On the other hand, an LU age around  $\sim$  340 ka would not be consistent with a sea-level highstand, considering that at this time sea-level was more than 120 m below the present due to the glacial maximum of MIS 10 (Rohling et al., 1998). Nevertheless, an age closer to  $\sim$  325 ka, within the lower error margin, would be consistent with the marine transgression of MIS 9.

#### 4.3. Stratigraphic implications

The ages presented here increase the available ages for the deposits of the CPRS (Table 6), and help refine the sea-level curves for the coast of Rio Grande do Sul state presented by Lopes et al. (2010) (Fig. 6). Because of the scarcity of datable indicators of past sea-levels, mainly for the Pleistocene deposits, the exact timing of the sea-level highstands that formed the barrier-lagoon depositional systems have been mostly unknown. Based on the oxygen curves of Imbrie et al. (1984), Villwock and Tomazelli (1995) correlated the

Barrier-Lagoon System II with the marine highstand of MIS 9, while the ages presented here suggest instead that the Barrier System II was formed by the marine transgression correlated to MIS 7. That leaves open the question of whether the oldest system (Barrier-Lagoon I) is correlated to MIS 9 or if it may represent an even older marine highstand.

Table 6	
---------	--

Available ages for the Pleistocene-Holocene depositional systems of the CPRS.

960SedimentsTL SedimentsBarrier IV IL Barrier IV Poupeau et al., 19881222SedimentsTL Barrier IV Buchmann et al., 19982567SedimentsTL Barrier IV Barrier IV Poupeau et al., 19882560SedimentsTL Barrier IV Poupeau et al., 19883833SedimentsTL Barrier IV Poupeau et al., 19883833SedimentsTL Barrier IV Poupeau et al., 19884330 $\pm 60$ Shells $^{14}C$ Lagoon IV Caron, 2007IV Pourpeau et al., 19885045Shells $^{14}C$ Lagoon IV (agon IV) Exposed Barrier III Lagoon IV Lima et al., 201310,160Peat fossisIAC Peat fossis17,000 $\pm 340$ Shells fossisIAC Continental fossis34,000 $\pm 7000$ MammalianESR fossis34,000 $\pm 7000$ MammalianESR fossis34,000 $\pm 7000$ MammalianESR fossis48,000 $\pm 0000$ MammalianESR fossis48,000 $\pm 0000$ MammalianESR fossis7,000 $\pm 0000$ MammalianESR fossis48,000 $\pm 0000$ MammalianESR fossis7,000 $\pm 0000$ Mammali	Ages (years BP)	Material	Method	Unit	Author
1222SedimentsTL PeatBarrier IV Lagoon IV Buchmann et al., 19882470 $\pm$ 60Peat14C Lagoon IVBarrier IV Poupeau et al., 19882567SedimentsTL Barrier IVBarrier IV Poupeau et al., 19883833SedimentsTL Barrier IVBarrier IV Poupeau et al., 19883833SedimentsTL Barrier IVBorgeau et al., 19884330 $\pm$ 60Shells $^{14}$ C Lagoon IVBuchmann et al., 19985045Shells $^{14}$ C Lagoon IVBuchmann et al., 19815045Shells $^{14}$ C Lagoon IVCaron, 20076820Shells $^{14}$ C Lagoon IVCaron, 20076820Shells $^{14}$ C ContinentalGarrier II Figueiredo, 1975 shelf17,000 $\pm$ 340Shells $^{14}$ C fossilsContinental shelf18,000 $\pm$ 3000MammalianESR fossilsContinental shelf34,000 $\pm$ 7000Mammalian fossilsESR Lagoon III Lopes et al., 2010 fossils-38,000Peat $^{14}$ C fossilsLagoon III Lopes et al., 2010 fossils-38,000Peat $^{14}$ C fossilsLagoon III Lopes et al., 2011 fossils-38,000Pate fossilsIagoon III Lopes et al., 2012 fossils-38,000Pate fossilsIagoon III Lagoon III-44,000MammalianESR Lagoon IIILagoon III This paper fossils-57,000 $\pm$ 8000MammalianESR fossilsLagoon III Lagoon III	960	Sediments	TL	Barrier IV	Poupeau et al., 1988
2470Peat14CLagoon IVBuchmann et al., 19982567SedimentsTLBarrier IVPoupeau et al., 19883250SedimentsTLBarrier IVPoupeau et al., 19883250SedimentsTLBarrier IVPoupeau et al., 1988333SedimentsTLBarrier IVPoupeau et al., 19884300Shells $^{14}$ CLagoon IVBuchmann et al., 19984300Shells $^{14}$ CLagoon IVBuchmann et al., 20135045Shells $^{14}$ CLagoon IVBuchmann et al., 201316,250Shells $^{14}$ CLagoon IVLima et al., 201316,250Shells $^{14}$ CContinentalFigueiredo, 19755045Shells $^{14}$ CContinentalLopes et al., 201016,2501670Shells $^{14}$ CContinentalFigueiredo, 197516,2501670Shells $^{14}$ CContinentalFigueiredo, 197534,0002000MammalianESRLagoon IIILopes et al., 20107530Shells $^{14}$ CContinentalFigueiredo, 197534,0002000MammalianESRLagoon IIILopes et al., 20107530Shells $^{14}$ CLagoon IIILopes et al., 20107530MammalianESRLagoon IIILopes et al., 201334,0002000MammalianESRLagoon IIIInis paper7530ShellsIfLagoon IIILopes et al., 201	1222	Sediments	TL	Barrier IV	Poupeau et al., 1988
2567SedimentsTLBarrier IVPoupeau et al., 19882667SedimentsTLBarrier IVPoupeau et al., 19883250SedimentsTLBarrier IVPoupeau et al., 19883833SedimentsTLBarrier IVPoupeau et al., 19884330 $\pm$ 60Shells $^{14}$ CLagoon IVPoupeau et al., 19884320 $\pm$ 110Shells $^{14}$ CLagoon IVCaron, 20076820Shells $^{14}$ CLagoon IVCaron, 20076820Shells $^{14}$ CLagoon IVLima et al., 201310,160Peat $^{14}$ CLagoon IVLima et al., 201310,150Shells $^{14}$ CLagoon IVLima et al., 201316,250 $\pm$ 1670Shells $^{14}$ CContinentalFigueiredo, 197534,000 $\pm$ 3000MammalianESRContinentalLopes et al., 2010 $530,000$ Shells $^{14}$ CContinentalLopes et al., 2010 $5031s$ TossilsLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010 $5031s$ TossilsLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010 $50300$ MammalianESRLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010 $6531s$ Sa000Peat $^{14}$ CLagoon IIILopes et al., 201342,000 $\pm$ 0000MammalianESRLagoon IIIThis paper $6531s$ FossilsLagoon IIIThis paper $7,000 \pm$ 8000MammalianESRLagoon IIIThis paper $6531s$ FossilsLagoon II	$2470\pm60$	Peat	14C	Lagoon IV	Buchmann et al., 1998
2667SedimentsTL SedimentsBarrier IV Poupeau et al., 1988 Barrier IV Poupeau et al., 1988 Barrier IV Poupeau et al., 1988 Barrier IV Poupeau et al., 1988 H2C Lagoon IV Buchmann et al., 1998 H2C Shells $^{14}{\rm C}$ Lagoon IV Buchmann et al., 1998 Barrier IV Buchmann et al., 1998 Barrier IV Buchmann et al., 1998 Barrier IV Buchmann et al., 1998 Barrier III Lima et al., 2013 Caron, 20076820Shells $^{14}{\rm C}$ Lagoon IV Barrier III Lima et al., 2013 Lina et al., 2013 Lina et al., 2013 IGASO ± 1670Shells $^{14}{\rm C}$ Lagoon IV Barrier III Lima et al., 2013 Lima et al., 2013 Shelf16,250 ± 1670 ShellsShells $^{14}{\rm C}$ Continental fossitsContinental ShelfFigueiredo, 1975 shelf17,000 ± 340 ShellsShells $^{14}{\rm C}$ Continental fossitsContinental shelfLopes et al., 2010 fossits34,000 ± 7000 Abdou ± 2000Mammalian fossitsESR Lagoon III Lagoon III Lopes et al., 2010 fossitsLagoon III lopes et al., 2010 fossits34,000 ± 2000 Abdou ± 3000Mammalian fossitsESR Lagoon III Lagoon III Lopes et al., 2010 fossits42,000 ± 3000 fossitsMammalian fossitsESR Lagoon III Lagoon III Lopes et al., 2013 this paper fossits48,000 ± 4000 fossitsMammalian fossitsESR Lagoon III this paper fossits70,000 ± 10,000 fossitsMammalian fossitsESR Lagoon III this paper fossits70,000 ± 10,000 fossitsMammalian fossitsESR 	2567	Sediments	TL	Barrier IV	Poupeau et al., 1988
3250SedimentsTL sedimentsBarrier IV Barrier IV Poupeau et al., 19883833SedimentsTL station of the second seco	2667	Sediments	TL	Barrier IV	Poupeau et al., 1988
3833SedimentsTL barrier IVBarrier IV Poupeau et al., 19884330 $\pm$ 60Shells ${}^{14}C$ Lagoon IVLagoon IV Buchmann et al., 19984320 $\pm$ 110Shells ${}^{14}C$ Lagoon IVLagoon IV Buchmann et al., 19985045Shells ${}^{14}C$ Lagoon IVLagoon IV Lima et al., 20135750 $\pm$ 750Shells ${}^{14}C$ Lagoon IVLima et al., 201310,160Peat ${}^{14}C$ ContinentalFigueiredo, 1975 shelf17,000 $\pm$ 340Shells ${}^{14}C$ fossilsContinental shelfFigueiredo, 1975 shelf18,000 $\pm$ 3000Marmalian fossilsESR fossilsContinental shelfFigueiredo, 1975 shelf34,000 $\pm$ 7000Marmalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon III Lopes et al., 2010 fossilsLopes et al., 2010 fossils38,000 $\pm$ 2000Marmalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon III Lopes et al., 2011 Lopes et al., 20122,260 $\pm$ 1400Shells ${}^{14}C$ fossilsLagoon III Lopes et al., 2013 Lopes et al., 201348,000 $\pm$ 4000Marmalian fossilsESR Lagoon III fossilsLagoon III this paper fossils70,000 $\pm$ 10,000Marmalian fossilsESR Lagoon IIILagoon III This paper fossils70,000 $\pm$ 10,000Marmalian fossilsLagoon III this paper fossilsLagoon III this paper tossils70,000 $\pm$ 10,000Marmalian fossilsLagoon III this paper fossilsLagoon III this paper et al., 19	3250	Sediments	TL	Barrier IV	Poupeau et al., 1988
4330 $\pm$ 60Shells ${}^{14}$ CLagoon IVPoupeau et al., 19884920 $\pm$ 110Shells ${}^{14}$ CLagoon IVCaron, 20075750750Shells ${}^{14}$ CLagoon IVCaron, 20076820Shells ${}^{14}$ CLagoon IVLima et al., 201310,160Peat ${}^{14}$ CLagoon IVLima et al., 201316,250 $\pm$ 1670Shells ${}^{14}$ CContinentalFigueiredo, 197517,000 $\pm$ 340Shells ${}^{14}$ CContinentalFigueiredo, 1975>30,000Shells ${}^{14}$ CContinentalFigueiredo, 1975>34,000 $\pm$ 7000MarmalianESRContinentalFigueiredo, 197534,000 $\pm$ 7000MarmalianESRLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010fossilsfossilsfossilsfossilsfossils38,000Peat ${}^{14}$ CLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010fossilsfossilsfossilsfossilsfossils42,200 $\pm$ 3000MarmalianESRLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010fossilsfossilsfossilsfossilsfossils48,000 $\pm$ 000MarmalianESRLagoon IIILipse et al., 201343,000 $\pm$ 10,000MarmalianESRLagoon IIIThis paperfossilsfossilsfossilsfossilsfossils48,000 $\pm$ 9000MarmalianESRLagoon IIIThis paperfossilsfossilsfossilsfossilsfossils <t< td=""><td>3833</td><td>Sediments</td><td>TL</td><td>Barrier IV</td><td>Poupeau et al., 1988</td></t<>	3833	Sediments	TL	Barrier IV	Poupeau et al., 1988
4220 $\pm$ 110Shells $^{14}$ CLagoon IVBuchmann et al., 19985045Shells $^{14}$ CLagoon IVForti Esteves, 19745750 $\pm$ 750Shells $^{14}$ CLagoon IVCaron, 20076820Shells $^{14}$ CLagoon IVLima et al., 20136870Shells $^{14}$ CBarrier IIILima et al., 201310,160Peat $^{14}$ CContinentalFigueiredo, 197511,000 $\pm$ 340Shells $^{14}$ CContinentalFigueiredo, 197518,000 $\pm$ 3000MarmalianESRContinentalFigueiredo, 1975>30,000Shells $^{14}$ CContinentalFigueiredo, 1975>34,000 $\pm$ 7000MarmalianESRLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010fossilsfossilsfossilsfossilsshelf34,000 $\pm$ 2000MarmalianESRLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010fossilsfossilsfossilsfossilsfossils42,000 $\pm$ 3000MarmalianESRLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010fossilsfossilsfossilsfossilsfossils42,000 $\pm$ 3000MarmalianESRLagoon IIILime et al., 201343,000 $\pm$ 4000MarmalianESRLagoon IIIThis paperfossilsfossilsfossilsfossilsfossils70,000 $\pm$ 10,000MarmalianESRLagoon IIIThis paperfossilsfossilsfossilsfossilsfossils74,840Sedim	$4330\pm60$	Shells	<sup>14</sup> C	Lagoon IV	Poupeau et al., 1988
5045Shells ${}^{14}C$ Lagoon IVForti Esteves, 19745750Shells ${}^{14}C$ Lagoon IVLima et al., 20136820Shells ${}^{14}C$ Lagoon IVLima et al., 201310,160Peat ${}^{14}C$ ContinentalFigueiredo, 197516,250 $\pm$ 1670Shells ${}^{14}C$ ContinentalFigueiredo, 197517,000 $\pm$ 340Shells ${}^{14}C$ ContinentalLopes et al., 2010 $50000$ MammalianESRContinentalLopes et al., 2010 $50000$ Shells ${}^{14}C$ ContinentalLopes et al., 2010 $530,000$ Shells ${}^{14}C$ ContinentalLopes et al., 2010 $530,000$ MammalianESRLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010 $530,000$ Peat ${}^{14}C$ Lagoon IIILopes et al., 2010 $530,000$ Peat ${}^{14}C$ Lagoon IIILopes et al., 2010 $6ssils$ fossilsLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010 $42,000 \pm 3000$ MammalianESRLagoon IIILopes et al., 2013 $43,000 \pm 0000$ MammalianESRLagoon IIILima et al., 2013 $44,000 \pm 9000$ MammalianESRLagoon IIIThis paper $fossils$ ${}^{14}C$ Lagoon IIIThis paper $fossils$ ${}^{14}C$ </td <td><math display="block">4920\pm110</math></td> <td>Shells</td> <td><sup>14</sup>C</td> <td>Lagoon IV</td> <td>Buchmann et al., 1998</td>	$4920\pm110$	Shells	<sup>14</sup> C	Lagoon IV	Buchmann et al., 1998
5750Shells ${}^{14}C$ Lagoon IVCaron, 20076820Shells ${}^{14}C$ Lagoon IVLima et al., 201310,160Peat ${}^{14}C$ Lagoon IVLima et al., 201316,250 $\pm$ 1670Shells ${}^{14}C$ ContinentalFigueiredo, 197517,000 $\pm$ 340Shells ${}^{14}C$ ContinentalLima et al., 201318,000 $\pm$ 3000MammalianESRContinentalLopes et al., 2010530,000Shells ${}^{14}C$ ContinentalLopes et al., 2010530,000Shells ${}^{14}C$ Lagoon IIILopes et al., 2010fossilsfossilsfossilsfossilsfossils34,000 $\pm$ 2000MammalianESRLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010fossilsfossilsfossilsfossilsfossils24,2000 $\pm$ 3000MammalianESRLagoon IIILopes et al., 201342,000 $\pm$ 3000MammalianESRLagoon IIILopes et al., 201343,000 $\pm$ 4000MammalianESRLagoon IIIThis paperfossilsfossilsfossilsfossilsfossils57,000 $\pm$ 8000MammalianESRLagoon IIIThis paperfossilsfossilsfossilsfossilsfossils70,000 $\pm$ 10,000MammalianESRLagoon IIIThis paperfossilsfossilsfossilsfossilsfossils70,000 $\pm$ 10,000MammalianESRLagoon IIIThis paperfossils </td <td>5045</td> <td>Shells</td> <td><sup>14</sup>C</td> <td>Lagoon IV</td> <td>Forti Esteves, 1974</td>	5045	Shells	<sup>14</sup> C	Lagoon IV	Forti Esteves, 1974
6820 6870Shells ${}^{14}$ C Lagoon IVLima et al., 2013 Lagoon IVLima et al., 2013 Lagoon IV10,160Peat ${}^{14}$ C ShellsBarrier III Figueiredo, 1975 shelfContinental Figueiredo, 1975 shelf17,000 $\pm$ 340Shells ${}^{14}$ C CossilsContinental shelfLopes et al., 2010 shelf18,000 $\pm$ 3000Mammalian fossilsESR shelfContinental shelfLopes et al., 2010 shelf34,000 $\pm$ 7000Mammalian fossilsESR shelfLagoon III Lopes et al., 2010 fossilsLopes et al., 2010 fossils38,000 $\pm$ 2000Mammalian fossilsESR tagoon IIILopes et al., 2010 fossilsLopes et al., 2010 fossils>38,000 $\pm$ 2000Mammalian fossilsESR tagoon IIILopes et al., 2010 topes et al., 2010 fossils42,260 $\pm$ 1400Shells ${}^{14}$ C fossilsLagoon III tagoon IIILopes et al., 2013 tagoon III43,000 $\pm$ 3000Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon III tagoon IIILopes et al., 2013 tagoon III44,000 $\pm$ 4000 fossilsMammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon III tagoon IIIThis paper fossils70,000 $\pm$ 10,000Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon III tagoon IIIThis paper fossils70,000 $\pm$ 10,000Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon III tagoon IIIThis paper fossils74,840SedimentsTL fossilsBarrier III fossilsPoupeau et al., 1988 <br< td=""><td><math display="block">5750\pm750</math></td><td>Shells</td><td><sup>14</sup>C</td><td>Lagoon IV</td><td>Caron, 2007</td></br<>	$5750\pm750$	Shells	<sup>14</sup> C	Lagoon IV	Caron, 2007
6870Shells ${}^{14}C$ Lagoon IVLima et al., 201310,160Peat ${}^{14}C$ Barrier IIILima et al., 201316,250 $\pm$ 1670Shells ${}^{14}C$ ContinentalFigueiredo, 197516,250 $\pm$ 3000MammalianESRContinentalLopes et al., 2010>30,000Shells ${}^{14}C$ ContinentalLopes et al., 2010>30,000Shells ${}^{14}C$ ContinentalLopes et al., 2010 $530,000 \pm 7000$ MammalianESRLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010 $538,000 \pm 2000$ MammalianESRLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010 $538,000 \pm 2000$ MammalianESRLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010 $538,000 \pm 2000$ MammalianESRLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010 $75315$ fossilsLagoon IIILopes et al., 2013Lagoon III $42,260 \pm 1400$ Shells ${}^{14}C$ Lagoon IIILopes et al., 2013 $43,000 \pm 3000$ MammalianESRLagoon IIIThis paperfossilsfossilsLagoon IIIThis paper $70,000 \pm 3000$ MammalianESRLagoon IIIThis paperfossilsfossilsLagoon IIIThis paper $70,000 \pm 10,000$ MammalianESRLagoon IIIThis paperfossilsTLBarrier IIIPoupeauet al., 1988 $85,075$ SedimentsTLBarrier IIIPoupeau $et al., 1988Solod \pm 28,000MammalianESRContinenta$	6820	Shells	<sup>14</sup> C	Lagoon IV	Lima et al., 2013
10,160Peat ${}^{14}C$ Barrier IIILima et al., 201316,250 $\pm$ 1670Shells ${}^{14}C$ ContinentalFigueiredo, 197517,000 $\pm$ 340Shells ${}^{14}C$ ContinentalFigueiredo, 197518,000 $\pm$ 3000MammalianESRContinentalLopes et al., 2010>30,000Shells ${}^{14}C$ ContinentalFigueiredo, 197534,000 $\pm$ 7000MammalianESRLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010fossilsfossilsfossilsLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010238,000 $\pm$ 2000MammalianESRLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010fossilsfossilsLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010Lopes et al., 2010242,000 $\pm$ 3000MammalianESRLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010fossilsfossilsLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010Lopes et al., 201042,000 $\pm$ 3000MammalianESRLagoon IIIThis paperfossilsfossilsLagoon IIIThis paperfossilsfossilsContinentalLopes et al., 2010fossils </td <td>6870</td> <td>Shells</td> <td><sup>14</sup>C</td> <td>Lagoon IV</td> <td>Lima et al., 2013</td>	6870	Shells	<sup>14</sup> C	Lagoon IV	Lima et al., 2013
16,250 $\pm$ 1670Shells ${}^{14}C$ Continental Figueiredo, 1975 shelf17,000 $\pm$ 340Shells ${}^{14}C$ Continental Lopes et al., 2010 fossils18,000 $\pm$ 3000Mammalian ESR fossilsContinental Lopes et al., 2010 shelf>30,000Shells ${}^{14}C$ Continental Figueiredo, 1975 shelf34,000 $\pm$ 7000Mammalian ESR fossilsLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010 fossils38,000 $\pm$ 2000Mammalian ESR fossilsLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010 fossils>38,000Peat ${}^{14}C$ Lagoon IIILopes et al., 2010 fossils42,200 $\pm$ 3000Mammalian ESR fossilsLagoon IIILopes et al., 2013 Lagoon III42,200 $\pm$ 3000Mammalian ESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper fossils48,000 $\pm$ 4000Mammalian ESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper fossils57,000 $\pm$ 8000Mammalian ESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper fossils70,000 $\pm$ 10,000Mammalian ESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper fossils74,840SedimentsTLBarrier IIIPoupeau et al., 198885,075SedimentsTLBarrier IIIPoupeau et al., 198886,440SedimentsTLBarrier IIIPoupeau et al., 1988109,000 $\pm$ 7,5SedimentsTLBarrier IIIPoupeau et al., 1988165,000 $\pm$ 28,000Mammalian ESR fossilsContinental ShelfLopes et al., 2010 fossils164,000 $\pm$ 28,000Mammalian ESR<	10,160	Peat	<sup>14</sup> C	Barrier III	Lima et al., 2013
17,000 $\pm$ 340Shells ${}^{14}$ CContinental shelfFigueiredo, 1975 shelf18,000 $\pm$ 3000Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsContinental shelfLopes et al., 2010 shelf34,000 $\pm$ 7000Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon III Lopes et al., 2010 fossilsLopes et al., 2010 fossils38,000 $\pm$ 2000Mammalian fossilsESR fassilsLagoon III Lopes et al., 2010 fossilsLopes et al., 2010 fossils> 38,000 $\pm$ 2000Mammalian fossilsESR fassilsLagoon III Lopes et al., 2010 fossilsLagoon III topes et al., 201142,260 $\pm$ 1400Shells ${}^{14}$ C fossilsLagoon III tan et al., 2013Lagoon III this paper fossils42,260 $\pm$ 1400Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon III this paper fossilsThis paper fossils48,000 $\pm$ 4000Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon III this paper fossilsThis paper fossils70,000 $\pm$ 10,000Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon III this paper fossilsThis paper fossils74,840Sediments fossilsTL sarrier III poupeau et al., 1988Poupeau et al., 198885,075Sediments fossilsTL fossilsBarrier III sarrier III poupeau et al., 1988109,000 $\pm$ 7,5Sediments fossilsTL fossilsBarrier III sarrier III poupeau et al., 1988109,000 $\pm$ 28,000Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsContinental shelf </td <td><math display="block">\textbf{16,250} \pm \textbf{1670}</math></td> <td>Shells</td> <td><sup>14</sup>C</td> <td>Continental shelf</td> <td>Figueiredo, 1975</td>	$\textbf{16,250} \pm \textbf{1670}$	Shells	<sup>14</sup> C	Continental shelf	Figueiredo, 1975
shelfShelf18,000 $\pm$ 3000MammalianESR fossilsContinental shelfLopes et al., 2010 shelf34,000 $\pm$ 7000MammalianESR fossilsLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010 fossils38,000 $\pm$ 2000MammalianESR fossilsLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010 fossils> 38,000Peat14CLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010 fossils> 28,000Peat14CLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010 fossils42,200 $\pm$ 1400Shells14CLagoon IIILopes et al., 2013 Lopes et al., 201343,000 $\pm$ 3000MammalianESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper fossils48,000 $\pm$ 4000MammalianESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper fossils70,000 $\pm$ 10,000MammalianESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper fossils70,000 $\pm$ 10,000MammalianESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper fossils74,840SedimentsTL fossilsBarrier IIIPoupeau et al., 198886,440SedimentsTL fossilsBarrier IIIPoupeau et al., 1988109,000 $\pm$ 7,5SedimentsTL fossilsBarrier III fossilsPoupeau et al., 2010 fossils146,000 $\pm$ 28,000MammalianESR fossilsContinental fossilsLopes et al., 2010 shelf109,000 $\pm$ 7,5SedimentsTL fossilsBarrier III fossilsPoupeau et al., 1988207,000 $\pm$ 28,000MammalianESR fossils	$\textbf{17,000} \pm \textbf{340}$	Shells	<sup>14</sup> C	Continental	Figueiredo, 1975
	$18000 \pm 3000$	Məmməliən	FSR	shelf Continental	Lopes et al. 2010
>30,000Shells $^{14}$ CContinental shelfFigueiredo, 1975 shelf34,000 $\pm$ 7000Mammalian fossilsESR 	10,000 ± 3000	fossils	LOIC	shelf	2010 et ul., 2010
$34,000 \pm 7000$ Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010 $38,000 \pm 2000$ Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010 $>38,000 \pm 2000$ Peat $^{14}$ CLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010 $42,000 \pm 3000$ Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010 $42,260 \pm 1400$ Shells $^{14}$ CLagoon IIILopes et al., 2013 $43,000 \pm 3000$ Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper $48,000 \pm 4000$ Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper $48,000 \pm 9000$ Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper $7,000 \pm 8000$ Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper $70,000 \pm 10,000$ Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper $74,840$ SedimentsTL seriesBarrier III poupeau et al., 1988Poupeau et al., 1988 $86,440$ SedimentsTL fossilsBarrier III surfactPoupeau et al., 1988 $109,000 \pm 7,5$ SedimentsTL fossilsBarrier III surfactPoupeau et al., 2010 shelf $109,000 \pm 28,000$ Mammalian fossilsESR shelfContinental Lopes et al., 2010 shelf $224 \pm 24.6$ ShellsESR ShellsContinental Lopes et al., 2010 fossils $224 \pm 24.6$ ShellsESR fossilsContinental Lopes et al.,	>30,000	Shells	<sup>14</sup> C	Continental shelf	Figueiredo, 1975
$38,000 \pm 2000$ MammalianESR fossilsLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010> $38,000 \pm 2000$ Peat $^{14}$ CLagoon III?Buchmann et al., 1998 $42,000 \pm 3000$ MammalianESRLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010 $42,000 \pm 3000$ MammalianESRLagoon IIILima et al., 2013 $43,000 \pm 3000$ MammalianESRLagoon IIIThis paper $655ils$ fossilsFLagoon IIIThis paper $48,000 \pm 4000$ MammalianESRLagoon IIIThis paper $655ils$ FLagoon IIIThis paperfossils $7,000 \pm 4000$ MammalianESRLagoon IIIThis paper $65sils$ FLagoon IIIThis paperfossils $70,000 \pm 10,000$ MammalianESRLagoon IIIThis paper $65sils$ FSedimentsTLBarrier IIIPoupeau $et al., 1988$ SedimentsTLBarrier IIIPoupeau $et al., 1988$ SedimentsTLBarrier IIIPoupeau $et al., 1988$ Soolo $\pm 7,5$ SedimentsTLBarrier IIIBuchmann $146,000 \pm 9000$ MammalianESRContinentalLopes et al., 2010 $65sils$ SisSSoolo shelfContinentalLopes et al., 2010 $207,000 \pm 28,000$ MammalianESRContinentalLopes et al., 2010 $65sils$ ShellsESRBarrier IIThis paper $224 \pm 24.6$ ShellsESRContinent	$\textbf{34,000} \pm \textbf{7000}$	Mammalian fossils	ESR	Lagoon III	Lopes et al., 2010
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\textbf{38,000} \pm \textbf{2000}$	Mammalian fossils	ESR	Lagoon III	Lopes et al., 2010
$42,000 \pm 3000$ MammalianESR fossilsLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010 $42,260 \pm 1400$ Shells $^{14}$ CLagoon IVLima et al., 2013 $43,000 \pm 3000$ MammalianESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper $48,000 \pm 4000$ MammalianESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper $48,000 \pm 4000$ MammalianESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper $57,000 \pm 9000$ MammalianESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper $57,000 \pm 8000$ MammalianESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper $70,000 \pm 10,000$ MammalianESR 	>38,000	Peat	<sup>14</sup> C	Lagoon III?	Buchmann et al., 1998
103818 42,260 $\pm$ 1400Shells $^{14}$ CLagoon IVLima et al., 201343,000 $\pm$ 3000MammalianESRLagoon IIIThis paper658318658318Lagoon IIIThis paper48,000 $\pm$ 9000MammalianESRLagoon IIIThis paper65831870,000 $\pm$ 9000MammalianESRLagoon IIIThis paper70,000 $\pm$ 10,000MammalianESRLagoon IIIThis paper70,000 $\pm$ 10,000MammalianESRLagoon IIIThis paper65831874,840SedimentsTLBarrier IIIPoupeau et al., 198885,075SedimentsTLBarrier IIIPoupeau et al., 198886,440SedimentsTLBarrier IIIPoupeau et al., 1988109,000 $\pm$ 7,5SedimentsTLBarrier IIIPoupeau et al., 1988109,000 $\pm$ 7,5SedimentsTLBarrier IIIBuchmann and Tomazelli, 2003146,000 $\pm$ 9000MammalianESR fossilsContinental shelfLopes et al., 2010 shelf207,000 $\pm$ 28,000MammalianESR fossilsContinental shelfLopes et al., 2010 shelf224 $\pm$ 24.6ShellsESR fossilsBarrier IIThis paper Lopes et al., 2010 fossils428,000 $\pm$ 30,000MammalianESR fossilsContinental shelfLopes et al., 2010 shelf424,000 $\pm$ 50,000MammalianESR fossilsContinental shelfLopes et al., 2010 shelf428,000 $\pm$ 30,00	$\textbf{42,000} \pm \textbf{3000}$	Mammalian	ESR	Lagoon III	Lopes et al., 2010
42,200 $\pm$ 1400Site is fossilsC C Lagoon IVEnd et al., 201343,000 $\pm$ 3000Mammalian ESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper48,000 $\pm$ 4000Mammalian ESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper48,000 $\pm$ 9000Mammalian ESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper57,000 $\pm$ 8000Mammalian ESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper70,000 $\pm$ 10,000Mammalian ESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper70,000 $\pm$ 10,000Mammalian ESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper74,840SedimentsTLBarrier III Poupeau et al., 1988Poupeau et al., 198885,075SedimentsTLBarrier III Poupeau et al., 1988Poupeau et al., 1988109,000 $\pm$ 7,5SedimentsTLBarrier III poupeau et al., 1988Poupeau et al., 1988109,000 $\pm$ 7,5SedimentsTLBarrier III poupeau et al., 1988Lopes et al., 2010 fossils146,000 $\pm$ 9000Mammalian ESR fossilsContinental shelfLopes et al., 2010 shelf207,000 $\pm$ 28,000Mammalian ESR fossilsContinental shelfLopes et al., 2010 shelf224 $\pm$ 24.6ShellsESR fossilsBarrier II spaperThis paper226,000 $\pm$ 30,000Mammalian ESR fossilsContinental shelfLopes et al., 2010 shelf428,000 $\pm$ 30,000Mammalian ESR fossilsContinental shelfLopes et al., 2010 shelf428,000 $\pm$ 100,000Mammalian ESR fossi	42.260 + 1400	Challe	140	Lagoon W	Lima et al. 2012
1000 $\pm$ 2000Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper48,000 $\pm$ 4000Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper57,000 $\pm$ 8000Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper70,000 $\pm$ 10,000Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper70,000 $\pm$ 10,000Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper90,000 $\pm$ 10,000Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper74,840SedimentsTL fossilsBarrier III Poupeau et al., 1988Poupeau et al., 198885,075SedimentsTL fossilsBarrier III poupeau et al., 1988Poupeau et al., 1988109,000 $\pm$ 7,5SedimentsTL fossilsBarrier III suchmann and Tomazelli, 2003146,000 $\pm$ 9000Mammalian fossilsESR shelfContinental shelfLopes et al., 2010 shelf207,000 $\pm$ 28,000Mammalian fossilsESR shelfContinental Lopes et al., 2010 fossilsLopes et al., 2010 shelf224 $\pm$ 24.6ShellsESR scilsBarrier II spaper Lagoon III Lopes et al., 2010 fossilsLopes et al., 2010 shelf428,000 $\pm$ 30,000Mammalian fossilsESR scilsContinental shelfLopes et al., 2010 shelf424,000 $\pm$ 65,000Mammalian fossilsESR scilsContinental shelfLopes et al., 2010 shelf428,000 $\pm$ 100,000 <td><math>42,280 \pm 1400</math> <math>43.000 \pm 3000</math></td> <td>Mammalian</td> <td>ESR</td> <td>Lagoon III</td> <td>This paper</td>	$42,280 \pm 1400$ $43.000 \pm 3000$	Mammalian	ESR	Lagoon III	This paper
48,000 $\pm$ 4000Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper48,000 $\pm$ 9000Mammalian fossilsESR 	13,000 ± 0000	fossils	Don	Lugoon m	inio puper
48,000 $\pm$ 9000Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper57,000 $\pm$ 8000Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper70,000 $\pm$ 10,000Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper90,000 $\pm$ 10,000Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper90,000 $\pm$ 10,000Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper74,840SedimentsTLBarrier IIIPoupeau et al., 198885,075SedimentsTLBarrier IIIPoupeau et al., 198886,440SedimentsTLBarrier IIIPoupeau et al., 1988109,000 $\pm$ 7,5SedimentsTLBarrier IIIBuchmann and Tomazelli, 2003146,000 $\pm$ 9000MammalianESR fossilsContinental shelfLopes et al., 2010 shelf165,000 $\pm$ 28,000MammalianESR fossilsContinental shelfLopes et al., 2010 shelf224 $\pm$ 24.6ShellsESR fossilsBarrier II spaperThis paper Lagoon III226,000 $\pm$ 35,000MammalianESR fossilsContinental shelfLopes et al., 2010 shelf428,000 $\pm$ 30,000MammalianESR fossilsContinental shelfLopes et al., 2010 shelf464,000 $\pm$ 65,000MammalianESR fossilsContinental shelfLopes et al., 2010 shelf650,000 $\pm$ 100,000MammalianESR fossilsContinental shelfL	$\textbf{48,000} \pm \textbf{4000}$	Mammalian fossils	ESR	Lagoon III	This paper
$57,000 \pm 8000$ Mammalian fossilsESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper $70,000 \pm 10,000$ Mammalian fossilsESR 	$\textbf{48,000} \pm \textbf{9000}$	Mammalian fossils	ESR	Lagoon III	This paper
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\textbf{57,000} \pm \textbf{8000}$	Mammalian fossils	ESR	Lagoon III	This paper
90,000 $\pm$ 10,000MammalianESR fossilsLagoon IIIThis paper74,840SedimentsTLBarrier IIIPoupeau et al., 198885,075SedimentsTLBarrier IIIPoupeau et al., 198886,440SedimentsTLBarrier IIIPoupeau et al., 1988109,000 $\pm$ 7,5SedimentsTLBarrier IIIBuchmann and Tomazelli, 2003146,000 $\pm$ 9000MammalianESR fossilsContinentalLopes et al., 2010 	$\textbf{70,000} \pm \textbf{10,000}$	Mammalian fossils	ESR	Lagoon III	This paper
74,840SedimentsTLBarrier IIIPoupeau et al., 198885,075SedimentsTLBarrier IIIPoupeau et al., 198886,440SedimentsTLBarrier IIIPoupeau et al., 1988109,000 $\pm$ 7,5SedimentsTLBarrier IIIPoupeau 	$\textbf{90,000} \pm \textbf{10,000}$	Mammalian	ESR	Lagoon III	This paper
85,075SedimentsTLBarrier IIIPoupeau et al., 198886,440SedimentsTLBarrier IIIPoupeau et al., 1988109,000 $\pm$ 7,5SedimentsTLBarrier IIIPoupeau et al., 1988109,000 $\pm$ 7,5SedimentsTLBarrier IIIBuchmann and Tomazelli, 2003146,000 $\pm$ 9000MarmalianESRContinental shelfLopes et al., 2010 shelf165,000 $\pm$ 28,000MarmalianESRContinental shelfLopes et al., 2010 shelf207,000 $\pm$ 28,000MarmalianESRContinental shelfLopes et al., 2010 shelf224 $\pm$ 24.6ShellsESRBarrier IIThis paper Lagoon III226,000 $\pm$ 35,000MarmalianESRContinental shelf428,000 $\pm$ 30,000MarmalianESRContinental shelf464,000 $\pm$ 65,000MarmalianESRContinental shelfLopes et al., 2010 shelf650,000 $\pm$ 100,000MarmalianESRContinental shelfLopes et al., 2010 shelf	74,840	Sediments	TL	Barrier III	Poupeau et al. 1988
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	85.075	Sediments	TL	Barrier III	Poupeau
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	,				et al., 1988
$109,000 \pm 7,5$ SedimentsTLBarrier IIIBuchmann and Tomazelli, 2003 $146,000 \pm 9000$ MammalianESRContinentalLopes et al., 2010 shelf $165,000 \pm 28,000$ MammalianESRContinentalLopes et al., 2010 shelf $207,000 \pm 28,000$ MammalianESRContinentalLopes et al., 2010 	86,440	Sediments	TL	Barrier III	Poupeau et al. 1988
and Tomazelli, 2003146,000 $\pm$ 9000Mammalian ESR fossilsContinental Lopes et al., 2010 shelf165,000 $\pm$ 28,000Mammalian ESR fossilsContinental Lopes et al., 2010 	$109{,}000\pm7{,}5$	Sediments	TL	Barrier III	Buchmann
	146,000 ± 9000	Mammalian	ESR	Continental	and Tomazelli, 2003 Lopes et al., 2010
	$165.000 \pm 28.000$	fossils Mammalian	ESR	shelf Continental	Lopes et al., 2010
$ \begin{array}{c} 207,000 \pm 28,000 & \text{Mammalian ESR} & \text{Continental Lopes et al., 2010} \\ \text{fossils} & \text{shelf} & \text{shelf} \\ 224 \pm 24.6 & \text{Shells} & \text{ESR} & \text{Barrier II} & \text{This paper} \\ 226,000 \pm 35,000 & \text{Mammalian ESR} & \text{Lagoon III} & \text{Lopes et al., 2010} \\ \text{fossils} & \text{shelf} & \text{continental Lopes et al., 2010} \\ 428,000 \pm 30,000 & \text{Mammalian ESR} & \text{Continental Lopes et al., 2010} \\ \text{fossils} & \text{shelf} & \text{shelf} & \text{continental Lopes et al., 2010} \\ \text{fossils} & \text{shelf} & \text{continental Lopes et al., 2010} \\ \text{fossils} & \text{shelf} & \text{continental Lopes et al., 2010} \\ \text{fossils} & \text{shelf} & \text{continental Lopes et al., 2010} \\ \text{fossils} & \text{shelf} & \text{continental Lopes et al., 2010} \\ \text{fossils} & \text{shelf} & \text{continental Lopes et al., 2010} \\ \text{fossils} & \text{shelf} & \text{continental Lopes et al., 2010} \\ \text{fossils} & \text{shelf} & \text{continental Lopes et al., 2010} \\ \text{fossils} & \text{shelf} & \text{continental Lopes et al., 2010} \\ \text{fossils} & \text{shelf} & \text{continental Lopes et al., 2010} \\ \end{array}$	207.000 + 20.000	fossils	FCD	shelf	
$224 \pm 24.6$ ShellsESRBarrier IIThis paper $226,000 \pm 35,000$ MammalianESRLagoon IIILopes et al., 2010fossilsfossilsshelf $428,000 \pm 30,000$ MammalianESRContinentalLopes et al., 2010fossilsshelf $464,000 \pm 65,000$ MammalianESRContinentalLopes et al., 2010fossilsshelf $650,000 \pm 100,000$ MammalianESRContinentalLopes et al., 2010fossilsshelf	207,000 ± 28,000	fossils	ESK	shelf	Lopes et al., 2010
$\begin{array}{c} 226,000 \pm 35,000 \\ 428,000 \pm 30,000 \\ 428,000 \pm 30,000 \\ 464,000 \pm 65,000 \\ 650,000 \pm 100,000 \\ 650,000 \\ 100,000 \\ 650,000 \\ 100,000 \\ 650,000 \\ 100,000 \\ 650,000 \\ 100,000 \\ 650,000 \\ 100,000 \\ 650,000 \\ 100,000 \\ 650,000 \\ 100$	$224 \pm 24.6$	Shells	ESR	Barrier II	This paper
$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 428,000 \pm 30,000 & Mammalian ESR \\ 650,000 \pm 65,000 & Mammalian ESR \\ 650,000 \pm 100,000 & Mammalian ESR \\ fossils & SR \\ for the set all, 2010 \\ shelf \\ for the set all \\ for t$	226,000 ± 35,000	Mammalian fossils	ESR	Lagoon III	Lopes et al., 2010
$\begin{array}{cccc} 464,000\pm 65,000 & Mammalian ESR \\ 650,000\pm 100,000 & Mammalian ESR \\ fossils & fossils & fossils & fossils & fossils & fossils & for the set of $	$\textbf{428,000} \pm \textbf{30,000}$	Mammalian fossils	ESR	Continental shelf	Lopes et al., 2010
$\begin{array}{ccc} & \text{SHEII} \\ 650,000 \pm 100,000 & \text{Mammalian ESR} \\ & \text{fossils} & \text{shelf} \end{array}$	$\textbf{464,000} \pm \textbf{65,000}$	Mammalian fossils	ESR	Continental shalf	Lopes et al., 2010
	$650,\!000\pm100,\!000$	Mammalian fossils	ESR	Continental shelf	Lopes et al., 2010



**Fig. 6.** Simplified scheme of sea level oscillations in southern Brazil between Late Miocene and Holocene. Oscillations older than 400 ka are indicated by ostracode assemblages from drilling cores (Carreño et al., 1999), while the three last highstands are represented by geomorphological features and fossils (Villwock and Tomazelli, 1995; Caron, 2007 and this paper). The dashed lines indicate inferred oscillations (from Rohling et al., 1998); open circles indicate mammalian fossils from the continental shelf dated by ESR (modified from Lopes et al., 2010).

The ~125 ka-old marine transgression that formed the Barrier System III, correlated to MIS 5 and called Cananéia Transgression or Penultimate Transgression, is relatively well documented along the Brazilian coast (Bittencourt et al., 1983; Suguio et al., 1986), but deposits formed by older transgressions are scarce. In the north-eastern Brazilian coast, several raised marine terraces of a unit called Barra de Tabatinga Formation have yielded TL and optical stimulated luminescence (OSL) ages of ~210–220 thousand years (Barreto et al., 2002; Suguio et al., 2011). The similar ages suggest that the Barrier System II and the Barra de Tabatinga Formation have been formed by the same transgressive event. The presence of chronocorrelated transgressive marine deposits in two distant areas (more than 3000 km from each other) indicates that there are probably other similar deposits along the Brazilian coast that have not yet been identified due to lack of numerical dates.

#### 5. Conclusions

The new ESR dates confirm a Late Pleistocene age for most of the mammalian remains found in Chuí Creek and their correlation with similar faunas found in deposits from Northern Uruguay and Western Rio Grande do Sul state. These new results help to put this assemblage in a more precise time interval, which should contribute to biostratigraphic correlations with other localities and for the assessment of the causes that led to the disappearance of the large mammals in the area. One hypothesis is that the progressive increase in aridity after  $\sim$  34 ky BP, correlated to the LGM, may have played a role in their (pseudo)extinction. These ages will also help to reconstruct and understand the evolution of the terrestrial environments in the southern CPRS during the late Quaternary.

The mean EU age of ~224 ka obtained from the fossil shells seem to be in agreement with other unpublished dates and provide an estimate for the timing of the marine transgression that formed the Barrier System II. These results indicate a Late Middle Pleistocene age; considering that 224 ka is the youngest possible age, and that the younger shells are probably younger than the 'real' age due to excessive Uranium uptake, an estimated age of ~234–238 ka for the shells seems closer to the 'real' ages and would be consistent with the marine highstand during early MIS 7 (substage 7e). This time interval was characterized by higher ocean temperatures, related to the hypsithermal phase at the beginning of the interglacial; such conditions are indicated by the presence in the fossil assemblage of bivalves that today live only in warmer areas to the north of Rio Grande do Sul state. Although the LU values suggest a mean age of  $340 \pm 31$  ka for the shells, the higher reliability of the EU model and the correlation with other yet unpublished ages suggest that the EU values are closer to the real ages than the LU values.

These results help to refine and improve the knowledge regarding the chronostratigraphy and sea-level variations for the Coastal Plain of Rio Grande do Sul state, showing that the maximum amplitude of the marine highstand that formed the Barrier System II was reached around 230 ka. The ages also indicate chronological correlation of this depositional system with other marine deposits from northeastern Brazil. This correlation among two distant areas indicates that other depositional systems formed by this marine transgression are likely to be found in other parts of the Brazilian coast. ESR dates on shells, in conjunction with other methods and datable materials, are a potential tool for refining the chronology of the middle to late Quaternary deposits along the Brazilian coast.

#### Acknowledgements

This work was funded by CNPq, (PhD fellowship for R. P. Lopes and research assistantship to O. Baffa) and partial financial support from FAPESP and CAPES.

#### References

- Barreto, A.M.F., Bezerra, F.H.R., Sguio, K., Tatumi, S.H., Yee, M., Paiva, R.P., Munita, C.S., 2002. Late Pleistocene marine terrace deposits in Northeastern Brazil: sea-level change and tectonic implications. Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology 179, 57–69.Becquey, S., Gersonde, R., 2002. Past hydrographic and climatic changes in the
- Becquey, S., Gersonde, R., 2002. Past hydrographic and climatic changes in the Subantarctic Zone of the South Atlantic – the Pleistocene record from ODP Site 1090. Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Paleoecology 182, 221–239.
- Becquey, S., Gersonde, R., 2003. A 0.55-Ma paleotemperature record from the Subantarctic zone: implications for Antarctic circumpolar current development. Paleoceanography 18 (1), 1014. http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2000PA000576.
- Behling, H., Lichte, M., 1997. Evidence of dry and cold climatic conditions at glacial times in tropical southeastern Brazil. Quaternary Research 48, 348–358.
- Bischoff, J.L., Rosenbauer, R.J., 1981. Uranium-series dating of bones and carbonate deposits of the caune de l'Arago at Tautavel. In: Lumley, H., Labeyrie, J. (Eds.), Absolute Dating and Isotope Analysis in Prehistory – Methods and Limits, Pré Tirage. CNRS, Paris, pp. 327–349.
- Bittencourt, A.C.S.P., Martin, L., Dominguez, J.M.L., Ferreira, Y.A., 1983. Evolução paleogeográfica quaternária da costa sul do Estado de Alagoas. Revista Brasileira de Geociências 13 (2), 93–97.
- Blackwell, B.A., 1995. Electron spin resonance dating. In: Rutter, N.W., Catto, N.R. (Eds.), Dating Methods for Quaternary Deposits. Geological Association of Canada, Geotext 2, pp. 209–268.
- Blackwell, B.A., Schwarcz, H.P., 1993. ESR isochron dating for teeth: a brief demonstration in solving the external dose calculation problem. Applied Radiation and Isotopes 44 (1–2), 243–252.

- Blackwell, B.A.B., Gong, J.J.J., Skinner, A.R., Blais-Stevens, A., Nelson, R.E., Blickstein, J.I.B., 2010. ESR dating Pleistocene barnacles from BC and Maine: a new method for tracking sea level change. Health Physics 98 (2), 417–426.
- Brennan, B., Rink, W., Rule, E., Schwarcz, H., Prestwich, W., 1999. The ROSY ESR dating program. Ancient TL 17, 9.
- Brumby, S., Yoshida, H., 1994. ESR dating of mollusc shell: investigations with modern shell of four species. Quaternary Geochronology 13, 157–162.
- Buchmann, F.S.C., Tomazelli, L.J., 2003. Relict nearshore shoals of Rio Grande do Sul, southern Brazil: origin and effects on nearby modern beaches. Journal of Coastal Research 35, 318–322.
- Buchmann, F.S.C., Barbosa, V.P., Villwock, J.A., 1998. Sedimentologia e paleoecologia durante o máximo trangressivo holocênico na Lagoa Mirim, RS, Brasil. Acta Geologica Leopoldensia 21 (46/47), 21–26.
- Carignano, C.A., 1999. Late Pleistocene to recent climate change in Córdoba Province, Argentina: geomorphological evidence. Quaternary International 57/58, 117–134.
- Caron, F., 2007. Depósitos sedimentares associados à desembocadura do Arroio Chuí Planície Costeira do Rio Grande do Sul e suas relações com as variações do nível do mar durante o Holoceno. Programa de Pós-Graduação em Geociências, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, p. 81. M.Sc. dissertation.
- Carreño, A.L., Coimbra, J.C., Carmo, D.A., 1999. Late Cenozoic sea level changes evidenced by ostracodes in the Pelotas Basin, southernmost Brazil. Marine Micropaleontology 37, 117–129.
- Cione, A.L., Tonni, E.P., 1999. Biostratigraphy and chronological scale of upper-most Cenozoic in the Pampean Area, Argentina. In: Rabassa, J., Salemme, M. (Eds.), 1999. Quaternary of South America and Antarctic Peninsula, vol. 12. A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, pp. 23–51.
- Closs, D.L., Forti, I.R.S., 1971. Quaternary molluscs from the Santa Vitória do Palmar County. Iheringia, (Série Geologia) 4, 19–58.
- Cruz Jr., F.W., Burns, S.J., Karmann, I., Sharp, W.D., Vuille, M., Cardoso, A.O., Ferrari, J.A., Dias, P.L.S., Viana Jr., O., 2005. Insolation-driven changes in atmospheric circulation over the past 116,000 years in subtropical Brazil. Nature 434, 63–66. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature03365.
- Delaney, P.J.V., 1965. Fisiografia e Geologia de Superfície da Planície Costeira do Rio Grande do Sul, vol. 6. Publicação Especial da Escola de Geologia, UFRGS, Porto Alegre, p. 105.
- Duval, M., Aubert, M., Hellstrom, J., Grün, R., 2011. High resolution LA-ICP-MS mapping of U and Th isotopes in an early Pleistocene equid tooth from Fuente Nueva-3 (Orce, Andalusia, Spain). Quaternary Geochronology 6 (5), 458–467.
- Duval, M., Falguères, C., Bahain, J.-J., 2012. Age of the oldest hominin settlements in Spain: Contribution of the combined U-series/ESR dating method applied to fossil teeth. Quaternary Geochronology 10 (0), 412–417.
- Engin, B., Kapan-Yesilyurt, S., Taner, G., Demirtas, H., Eken, M., 2006. ESR dating of Soma (Manisa, West Anatolia – Turkey) fossil gastropoda shells. Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research B243, 397–406.
- EPICA Community Members, 2006. One-to-one coupling of glacial climate variability in Greenland and Antarctica. Nature 444, 195–198.
- Falguères, C., Bahain, J.-J., Duval, M., Shao, Q., Han, F., Lebon, M., Mercier, N., Perez-Gonzalez, A., Dolo, J.-M., Garcia, T., 2010. A 300–600 ka ESR/U-series chronology of Acheulian sites in Western Europe. Quaternary International 223-224, 293–298.
- Figueiredo Jr., A.G., 1975. Geologia dos depósitos calcários biodetríticos da Plataforma Continental do Rio Grande do Sul. Programa de Pós-Graduação em Geociências, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, p. 72. M.Sc. dissertation.
- Flessa, K.W., Kowalewski, M., 1994. Shell survival and time-averaging in nearshore and shelf environment: estimates from the radiocarbon literature. Lethaia 27, 153–165.
- Forti Esteves, I.R., 1974. Bioestratigrafia e paleoecologia (Mollusca) do Quaternário da Planície Costeira do Rio Grande do Sul (Brasil). Congresso Brasileiro de Geologia, 28, Porto Alegre, 1974. Livro de Resumos v.3, pp. 133–147.
- Grün, R., 1989. Electron spin resonance (ESR) dating. Quaternary International 1, 65–109.
- Grün, R., 2009a. The DATA program for the calculation of ESR age estimates on tooth enamel. Quaternary Geochronology 4 (3), 231–232.
- Grün, R., 2009b. The relevance of parametric U-uptake models in ESR age calculations. Radiation Measurements 44 (5–6), 472–476.
- Grün, R., Brumby, S., 1994. The assessment of errors in past radiation doses extrapolated from ESR/TL dose-response data. Radiation Measurements 23 (2– 3), 307–315.
- Grün, R., Schwarcz, H.P., Chadam, J., 1988. ESR dating of tooth enamel: coupled correction for U-uptake and U-series disequilibrium. International Journal of Radiation Applications and Instrumentation Part D Nuclear Tracks and Radiation Measurements 14 (1–2), 237–241.
- Grün, R., Aubert, M., Joannes-Boyau, R., Moncel, M.-H., 2008. High resolution analysis of uranium and thorium concentration as well as U-series isotope distributions in a Neanderthal tooth from Payre (Ardèche, France) using laser ablation ICP-MS. Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta 72 (21), 5278–5290.
- Ikeya, M., 1993. New Applications of Electron Paramagnetic Resonance. Dating, Dosimetry and Microscopy. Scientific World, New Jersey, p. 500.
- Ikeya, M., Ohmura, K., 1981. Dating of fossil shells with electron spin resonance. Journal of Geology 89, 247–251.
- Imbrie, J., Hays, J., Martinson, D., McIntyre, A., Mix, A., Morley, J., Pisias, N., Pell, W., Schackleton, N., 1984. The orbital theory of Pleistocene climate: support from a

revised chronology of the Marine <sup>18</sup>O record. In: Berger, A., Imbrie, J., Hays, H., Kukla, G., Saltzman, B. (Eds.), Milankovitch and Climate, Part I. Dordrecht. D. Reidel Publishing, pp. 269–305.

- Iriondo, M., 1999. Climatic changes in the South American Plains: records of a continental-scale oscillation. Quaternary International 57/58, 93–112.
- Kanfoush, S.L., Hodell, D.A., Charles, C.D., Janecek, T.R., Rack, F.R., 2002. Comparison of ice-rafted debris and physical properties in ODP site 1094 (South Atlantic) with the Vostok ice core over the last four climatic cycles. Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology 182, 329–349.
- Kerber, L., Kinoshita, A., José, F.A., Figueiredo, A.M.G., Oliveira, E.V., Baffa, O., 2011. Electron Spin Resonance dating of the southern Brazilian Pleistocene mammals from Touro Passo Formation, and remarks on the geochronology, fauna and palaeoenvironments. Quaternary International 245 (2), 201–208.
- Kinoshita, A., Figuty, L., Baffa, O., 2006. Electron spin resonance dating of shells from the sambaqui (shell mound) Capelinha, São Paulo, Brazil. Brazilian Journal of Physics 36 (1A), 93–96.
- Kinoshita, A., Figueiredo, A.M.G., Felice, G.D., Lage, M.C.S.M., Guidon, N., Baffa, O., 2008. Electron spin resonance dating of human teeth from Toca da Santa shelter of São Raimundo Nonato, Piauí, Brazil. Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research B266. 635–639.
- Ledru, M.-P., 1993. Late Quaternary environmental and climatic changes in central Brazil. Quaternary Research 39, 90–98.
- Lima, L.G., Dillenburg, S.R., Medeanic, S., Barboza, E.G., Rosa, M.L.C.C., Tomazelli, L.J., Dehnhardt, B.A., Caron, F., 2013. Sea-level rise and sediment budget controlling the evolution of a transgressive barrier in southern Brazil. Journal of South American Earth Sciences 42, 27–38. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsames.2012.07.002.
- Lisiecki, L.E., Raymo, M.E., 2009. Diachronous benthic δ<sup>18</sup>O responses during Late Pleistocene terminations. Paleoceanography 24, PA3210. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1029/2009PA001732.
- Lopes, R.P., 2009. Alterações post mortem (pseudopaleopatologias) em fósseis de mamíferos pleitocênicos do estado do Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil. Programa de Pós-Graduação em Geociências, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, p. 120. M.Sc. dissertation.
- Lopes, R.P., 2013. Biostratigraphy of the Pleistocene fossiliferous deposits of southern Brazilian coastal area. Journal of Mammalian Evolution 20, 69–82. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10914-011-9173-y.
- Lopes, R.P., Buchmann, F.S.C., 2010. Pleistocene mammals from the southern Brazilian continental shelf. Journal of South American Earth Sciences 31, 17–27. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsames.2010.11.003.
- Lopes, R.P., Simone, L.R.L., 2012. New fossil records of Pleistocene marine molluscs in southern Brazil. Revista Brasileira de Paleontologia 15 (1), 49–56. http:// dx.doi.org/10.4072/rbp.2012.1.04.
- Lopes, R.P., Bonetti, C., 2012. Foraminíferos em sedimentos pleistocênicos no sul da Planície Costeira do Rio Grande do Sul. In: Paleo 2012, p. 26. São João do Polêsine, Livro de Resumos.
- Lopes, R.P., Buchmann, F.S.C., Caron, F., Itusarry, M.E.G., 2009. Barrancas fossilíferas do Arroio Chuí, RS - Importante megafauna pleistocênica no extremo sul do Brasil. In: Winge, M., Schobbenhaus, C., Berbert-Born, M., Queiroz, E.T., Campos, D.A., Souza, C.R.G., Fernandes, A.C.S. (Eds.), 2009. Sítios Geológicos e Paleontológicos do Brasil, vol. 2. CPRM, Brasília, pp. 355–362.
- Lopes, R.P., Oliveira, L.C., Figueiredo, A.M.G., Kinoshita, A., Baffa, O., Buchmann, F.S.C., 2010. ESR dating of Pleistocene mammal teeth and its implications for the biostratigraphy and geological evolution of the coastal plain, Rio Grande do Sul, southern Brazil. Quaternary International 212 (2), 213–222. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2009.09.018.
- Lopes, R.P., Dillenburg, S.R., Schultz, C.L., 2011. Geological and environmental evolution of Lagoon System III in the southernmost coastal plain of Rio Grande do Sul state. In: Xiii Congresso Da Associação Brasileira De Estudos Do Quaternário Abequa/lii Encontro Do Quaternário Sulamericano. http://dx.doi.org/10.4072/ rbp.2012.1.04. Resumos Expandidos.
- Lopes, R.P., Ribeiro, A.M., Dillenburg, S.R., Schultz, C.L., 2013. Late middle to Late Pleistocene paleoecology and paleoenvironments in the coastal plain of Rio Grande do Sul State, Southern Brazil, from stable isotopes in fossils of *Toxodon* and *Stegomastodon*. Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology 369, 385–394. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.palaeo.2012.10.042.
- Lopes, R.P., Rebello, R.P., Dillenburg, S.R., Schultz, C.L., Simone, L.R.L., Kinoshita, A., Baffa, O., Figueiredo, A.M.G., Pereira, J.C., 2012. Significado paleo-ambiental e cronoestratigráfico da assembleia de moluscos do Arroio Chuí, Pleistoceno médio, Rio Grande do Sul. In: Paleo 2012, p. 27. São João do Polêsine, Livro de Resumos.
- Molodkov, A., 1988. ESR dating of Quaternary shells: recent advances. Quaternary Science Reviews 7, 477–484.
- Molodkov, A., 1993. ESR dating of non-marine fossil shells. Applied Radiation and Isotopes 44 (1–2), 145–148.
- Paula Couto, C., Cunha, F.L.S., 1965. Nota preliminar sobre o reconhecimento geopaleontológico do Rio Grande do Sul. Boletim da Divisão de Geologia e Mineralogia, DNPM 40, 49–50.
- Pereira, J.C., Lopes, R.P., Kerber, L., 2012. New remains of Late Pleistocene mammals from the Chuí creek, southern Brazil. Revista Brasileira de Paleontologia 15 (2), 228–239. http://dx.doi.org/10.4072/rbp.2012.2.10.
- Poupeau, G., Soliani Jr., E., Rivera, A., Loss, E.L., Vasconcellos, M.B.A., 1988. Datação por termoluminescência de alguns depósitos arenosos costeiros do último ciclo climático, no nordeste do Rio Grande do Sul. Pesquisas 21, 25–47.
- Prescott, J.R., Hutton, J.T., 1994. Cosmic ray contributions to dose rates for luminescence and ESR dating: large depths and long-term time variations. Radiation Measurements 23 (2–3), 497–500.

- Rabassa, J., Ponce, J.F., 2013. The Heinrich and Dansgaard-Oeschger climatic events during Marine Isotopic Stage 3: searching for appropriate times for human colonization of the Americas. Quaternary International 299, 94–105. http:// dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2013.04.023.
- Radtke, U., Mangini, A., Grün, R., 1985. ESR dating of marine fossil shells. Nuclear Tracks 10 (4–6), 879–884.
- Rink, W.J., 1997. Electron Spin Resonance (ESR) dating and ESR applications in Quaternary science and archaeometry. Radiation Measurements 27 (5–6), 975–1025.
- Robinson, L.F., Henderson, G.M., Slowey, N.C., 2002. U-Th dating of marine isotope stage 7 in Bahamas slope sediments. Earth and Planetary Science Letters 196, 175–187.
- Rohling, E.J., Fenton, M., Jorisson, F.J., Bertrand, P., Ganssen, G., Caulet, J.P., 1998. Magnitudes of sea-level lowstands of the past 500,000 years. Nature 394, 162–165.
- Schellmann, G., Radtke, U., 1997. Electron spin resonance (ESR) techniques applied to mollusc shells from South America (Chile, Argentina) and implications for palaeo sea-level curve. Ouaternary Science Reviews 16, 465–475.
- Schellmann, G., Radtke, U., 1999. Problems encountered in the determination of dose and dose rate in ESR dating of mollusc shells. Quaternary Science Reviews 18, 1515–1527.
- Schellmann, G., Radtke, U., 2000. ESR dating of stratigraphically well-constrained marine terraces along the Patagonian Atlantic coast (Argentina). Quaternary International 68/71, 271–273.
- Schmitz, P.I., Girelli, M., Rosa, A.O., 1997. Pesquisas arqueológicas em Santa Vitória do Palmar, RS. In: Schmitz, P.I. (Ed.), Arqueologia Do Rio Grande Do Sul, Brasil. Instituto Anchietano de Pesquisas-UNISINOS, São Leopoldo, p. 95. Documentos 07.
- Shimokawa, K., Imai, N., Nakazzato, H., Mizuno, K., 1992. ESR dating of fossil shells in the Middle to Upper Pleistocene strata in Japan. Quaternary Science Reviews 11, 219–224.
- Skinner, A.R., 2000. ESR dating: is it still an 'experimental' technique? Applied Radiation and Isotopes 52 (5), 1311–1316.

- Soliani Jr., E., 1973. Geologia da região de Santa Vitória do Palmar, RS, e a posição estratigráfica dos fósseis de mamíferos pleistocênicos. Programa de Pós-Graduação em Geociências, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, p. 88. M.Sc. dissertation.
- Suguio, K., Martin, L., Flexor, J.M., Azevedo, A.E.G., 1986. The Quaternary Sedimentary Deposits of in the States of Paraná and Santa Catarina Coastal Plains. In: Quaternary of South America and Antarctic Peninsula, 4. AA Balkema, Rotterdam, pp. 3–25.
- Suguio, K., Bezerra, F.H.R., Barreto, A.M.F., 2011. Luminescence dated Late Pleistocene wave-built terraces in northeastern Brazil. Anais da Academia Brasileira de Ciências 83 (3), 907–920.
- Tomazelli, L.J., Villwock, J.A., 2005. Mapeamento geológico de planícies costeiras: o exemplo da costa do Rio Grande do Sul. Gravel 3, 109–115.
- Tomazelli, L.J., Dillenburg, S.R., Villwock, J.A., 2000. Late Quaternary geological history of Rio Grande do Sul coastal plain, southern Brazil. Revista Brasileira de Geociências 30 (3), 474–476.
- Turcq, B., Pressinotti, M.M.N., Martin, L., 1997. Paleohydrology and paleoclimate of the past 33,000 years at the Tamanduá River, Central Brazil. Quaternary Research 47 (3), 284–294.
- Ubilla, M., Perea, D., Rinderknecht, A., Corona, A., 2009. Pleistocene mammals from Uruguay: biostratigraphic, biogeographic and environmental connotations. In: Ribeiro, A.M., Bauermann, S.G., Scherer, C.S. (Eds.), Quaternário Do Rio Grande Do Sul – Integrando Conhecimentos. Sociedade Brasileira de Paleontologia, pp. 217–230. Monografias.
- Villwock, J.A., Tomazelli, L.J., 1995. Geologia Costeira do Rio Grande do Sul. Notas Técnicas 8, 1–45.
- Wang, X., Auler, A.S., Edwards, R.L., Cheng, H., Ito, E., Wang, Y., Kong, X., Solheid, M., 2007. Millennial-scale precipitation changes in southern Brazil over the past 90,000 years. Geophysical Research Letters 34, L23701. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1029/2007GL031149.