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HIGHLIGHTS

- Discrepancy between quartz SAR-OSL ages obtained on fine and coarse grains.
- Dose response curve adequately fitted by a sum of two saturating exponentials.
- Isothermal decay fitted by a single exponential.
- Clear dependency between the saturation characteristics (D0) and the quartz grain size.
- No correlation between the 2 D0 value and the maximum attainable accurate equivalent dose.
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ABSTRACT

There are two major problems commonly encountered when applying Optically Stimulated Luminescence (OSL) dating in the high dose range: (i) age discrepancy between different grain sizes, and (ii) age underestimation. A marked and systematic discrepancy between fine-grain (4–11 μm) and coarse-grain (63–90 μm) quartz single aliquot regeneration protocol (SAR) ages has been reported previously for Romanian and Serbian loess >40 ka (D0 of ~100 Gy), generally with fine-grain ages underestimating the depositional age. In this paper, we show a similar age pattern for two grain size fractions from Chinese loess, thus pointing to a potential worldwide phenomenon. While age underestimation is often attributed to signal saturation problems, this is not the case for fine grain material, which saturates at higher doses than coarse grains, yet begins to underestimate true ages earlier. Here we examine the dose response curves of quartz from different sedimentary contexts around the world, using a range of grain sizes (diameters of 4–11 μm, 11–30 μm, 35–50 μm, 63–90 μm, 90–125 μm, 125–180 μm, and 180–250 μm). All dose response curves can be adequately described by a sum of two saturating exponential functions, whose saturation characteristics (D0 values) are clearly anticorrelated with grain diameter (φ) through an inverse square root relationship, D0 = A/√φ, where A is a scaling factor. While the mechanism behind this grain-size dependency of saturation characteristics still needs to be understood, our results show that the observation of an extended SAR laboratory dose response curve does not necessarily enable high doses to be recorded accurately, or provide a corresponding extended age range.

© 2017 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).
1. Introduction

A series of investigations carried out using the SAR measurement procedure (Murray and Wintle, 2003) on the quartz OSL signal from different grain sizes extracted from Romanian (Timar-Gabor et al., 2011, 2012; Timar-Gabor and Wintle, 2013; Constantin et al., 2014) and Serbian (Timar-Gabor et al., 2015) loess yielded intriguing results. The optical ages obtained on fine-sand sized quartz grains (63–90 μm) were reported to be systematically higher than those for silt-sized quartz grains (4–11 μm) for ages > 40 ka. It is important to note that, for all previously investigated samples with equivalent doses higher than ~100–200 Gy, the equivalent doses obtained on coarse quartz were systematically higher than for the finer material; this is unexpected when considering that the natural dose rate to fine grains should be somewhat higher than that to coarser grains (mainly because of the alpha dose rate contribution to silt-sized grains), and implies that the cause of the discrepancy resides in the equivalent dose measurements. It is also important to note that for younger ages (with equivalent doses lying in the more linear part of the dose response curves) agreement has been found between the fine and coarse grain quartz ages (Constantin et al., 2015; Timar-Gabor et al., 2015). Other OSL studies carried out independently on fine- and coarse-grains have reported underestimations for both grain sizes for older ages (Roberts, 2008). For example, for Serbian loess fine quartz (4–11 μm) OSL ages appear accurate back to about 50–60 ka (corresponding to a D<sub>e</sub> of ~180 Gy), while for sediment older than this, the technique (SAR protocol) shows clear age underestimation (Stevens et al., 2011). Using quartz grains of 45–63 μm Lai (2010) reported underestimated for Luochuan loess in China for ages higher than about 70 ka. Using 63–90 μm quartz, Buylaert et al. (2008) suggested that one should be careful when dating Chinese loess samples with SAR on sand-sized quartz for which the D<sub>e</sub> values exceed 120 Gy (~40 ka).

Different saturation characteristics for the fine and coarse quartz fractions extracted from loess have also been reported before, with the fine grains showing higher saturation characteristics (see Constantin et al. (2012); Timar-Gabor et al. (2012, 2015)). This behaviour was found to be characteristic of other sedimentary contexts as well, such as the Paleolithic sequence at an archaeological site in Northeastern Romania (Trandafir et al., 2015). This is particularly intriguing when juxtaposed with the fact that under-estimation of age commences earlier in the fine fraction, than in the coarse. Also, it is noteworthy that the saturation characteristics that we have obtained before for both the fine and the coarse quartz fraction are very similar to the values reported elsewhere in the literature, regardless of location (see Timar-Gabor et al. (2012)). The existence of a ‘standardized’ dose response curve has been shown for both post-IR OSL from polynemal fine grains and OSL from chemically-purified coarse-grained quartz (Roberts and Duller, 2004).

Another standardized dose response curve has been previoulsy obtained for 38–63 μm quartz chemically extracted from samples of loess from China, North America, North Africa and Europe by Lai et al. (2007), while for the same grain size Long et al. (2010) obtained a standardized dose response curve for sediments of lacustrine origin. However, these studies did not consider the dose response region where the signals approach saturation. Assuming an exponentially saturating growth of the signal where the luminescence intensity at dose D is a function of the maximum luminescence intensity, the radiation dose, and a characteristic dose D<sub>c</sub> (a parameter that describes how rapidly the signal reaches saturation), Wintle and Murray (2006) recommended 2 × D<sub>c</sub> (~86% of full saturation) as an upper limit for determining meaningful equivalent doses. However, their recommendation was based only on concerns regarding precision; for higher natural doses any uncertainty in the natural luminescence signal would result in a large and asymmetric uncertainty in the interpolated equivalent dose.

While the maximum measurable equivalent dose is of course limited by saturation of the laboratory dose response, in general the reported underestimation in the previously mentioned studies was not associated with a proximity of natural signals to the laboratory saturation level for any of the grain sizes used. Also, as reported by Wintle and Murray (2006) when higher doses (e.g. above 125 Gy) are employed to construct the dose–response curve, an additional linear component can occur. This component has since been shown to be the early expression of at least a second saturating exponential function (Murray et al., 2007; Lowick et al., 2010; Timar-Gabor et al., 2012).

To summarise, the dose at which age underestimation becomes significant cannot be easily generalised based on existing data; this limit depends not only on the laboratory saturation characteristics and the dose rate, but also on the grain size used for dating.

In this work we investigate the saturation characteristics of the SAR dose response curve constructed using fast-component quartz OSL from various grain sizes from different sedimentary contexts and locations around the world, in order to assess whether there is a potential dependence between saturation characteristics and the grain size, with the ultimate aim of gaining more knowledge on the maximum dose which can be accurately determined using the OSL signal from quartz.

2. Samples, instrumentation and measurement protocol

Experiments presented in the current study have been conducted on archived quartz separates of different grain sizes from our previous investigations as well as newly processed samples. Samples of quartz extracted from loess are as follows. Samples coded as MV were collected from the Mircea Voda loess-paleosol section in Dobrogea, Romania (Timar et al., 2010; Timar-Gabor et al., 2011). CAC is the code for samples from the section at Caciulatiest in southern Romania (Constantin et al., 2012). MST is the laboratory code used at the Mostistea section from the Romanian Plain (Vasiliniuc et al., 2011; Timar-Gabor et al., 2012). CST samples were taken from Costineşti section near the Black Sea shore (Timar-Gabor and Wintle, 2013; Constantin et al., 2014), samples coded as LCA come from Lunca section in South Western Romania (Constantin et al., 2015), samples coded as ORL are quartz extracts from Serbian loess (Timar-Gabor et al., 2015), samples coded with XF come from Xifeng section in the Chinese loess plateau (Hao et al., 2012, 2015) (see details in the supplementary material), while sample coded as RUH comes from Ruhama desert loess section in Israel (Wieder et al., 2008). In addition, samples with an origin other than loess were investigated. Sample coded as M#6 is quartz extracted from a carbonate eolianite from Eivissa (see del Valle et al., 2016 for the geological context), sample S1 is eolian sand from the Danube Delta (Preoteasa et al., 2016). Also, samples of marine sediments from the Eemian site at Sula in Russia (Murray et al., 2007), a sample of sand from Gammelmarke in southern Jutland (Murray and Funder, 2003) and sand from Skagen (Murray et al., 2015), both in Denmark, and a sample of sand from Zwolle, Netherlands (Buylaert et al., 2008, 2012) have been included in the analysis. Samples of grain size larger than 35 μm have been obtained by sieving while for grains smaller than 30 μm settling using Stokes’ law was used. Hydrofluoric acid was used for etching grains larger than 63 μm while for the smaller grain sizes hydrofluorosilicic acid was employed. Continuous wave optically stimulated luminescence (CW-OSL) measurements on quartz were made on Risas TL/OSL DA-20 readers (Thomsen et al., 2006) in Cluj-Napoca, Romania, and at DTU...
Nutech/Nordic Laboratory for Luminescence Dating (Aarhus University) located on DTU Risø campus (Denmark). Blue light emitting diodes (LEDs) emitting at 470 ± 30 nm were used for stimulation and luminescence signals were observed through a 7.5 mm thick Hoya U-340 UV filter. Grain sizes of 4–11 µm and 11–30 µm were deposited on aluminium disks while the 35–50 µm and coarser fractions were mounted on stainless steel disks. Irradiations were carried out using a 90Sr–90Y beta source. The dose rate was calibrated for fine grains deposited on aluminium disks and coarse grains on stainless steel disks using fine (4–11 µm) and coarse (180–250 µm) calibration quartz (Hansen et al., 2015). The OSL signal was collected in time intervals of 0.154 s. All samples have been analysed using the SAR procedure (Murray and Wintle, 2000, 2003). The OSL signal used for analysis was that obtained for the first 0.308 s of the decay curve minus a background derived from the signal measured between 2.464 and 3.080 s; these integration intervals were used in our previous studies. In our protocol, natural and regenerated signals were measured after a preheat of 10 s at 220 °C; the corresponding OSL responses to a test dose (17 Gy) were measured after a cutheat (ramp heating) to 180 °C. The value of the test dose (17 Gy) was kept constant through all measurements for all grain sizes of quartz in order to facilitate the direct comparison of the dose response curves. A high-temperature bleach was performed by stimulating with the blue diodes for 40 s at 280 °C (Murray and Wintle, 2003).

3. Results and discussion

3.1. The age discrepancy

In order to illustrate the problems of age discrepancy and age underestimation Fig. 1 shows a comparison between the ages previously obtained using fine (4–11 µm) and coarse (63–90 µm) quartz from three representative loess paleosol sequences in Romania and Serbia (Costinesti-Constantin et al., 2014; Timar-Gabor and Wintle, 2013; Lunca-Constantin et al., 2015; Orlovat-Timar-Gabor et al., 2015) and from the representative Xifeng section in China. Details on Xifeng section and the chronology presented are given in the supplementary material.

The OSL chronologies using our SAR protocol applied to different grain-sizes of quartz are consistent up to equivalent doses of approximately 100 Gy (equivalent to OSL ages of <40 ka). For loess samples with equivalent doses beyond approximately 100 Gy, the OSL ages on fine quartz underestimate those yielded by coarse
quartz and the degree of underestimation increases with age.

3.1.1. Thermal stability of the signal

One of the possible causes for age underestimation in luminescence dating is the thermal loss of the signal during its build-up (Christodoulides et al., 1971). Although thermal instability is typically addressed through routine preheat plateau tests, the thermal lifetime of the target OSL dosimetric trap used for dating is seldom explicitly determined. Isothermal luminescence decay experiments were carried out in order to quantify the thermal stability of the dosimetric trap for samples of different grain sizes from Costînesti. After an initial bleaching, each aliquot was irradiated with 170 Gy and isothermally stored at elevated temperatures (200, 220, 240 °C) for various holding times (up to $10^5$ s at 200 °C), followed by OSL signal readout using the SAR-OSL protocol. The OSL response to a test dose of 17 Gy was used for sensitivity correction.

The time-evolution of the normalized OSL signal $L(t)$ (a.u.) at a temperature $T$ (K) is illustrated in Fig. 2 and was found to be best described by a single decaying exponential function of the form:

$$L(t) = L_{\text{max}} \exp\left(-s \exp\left(-\frac{E}{k_B T}\right) t\right)$$

(1)

where $L_{\text{max}}$ is the initial sensitivity-corrected OSL light sum, $E$ (eV) and $s$ (s$^{-1}$) are the Arrhenius parameters (activation energy and frequency factor, respectively), $k_B$ (eV K$^{-1}$) is Boltzmann’s constant and $t$ (s) is the holding time at temperature $T$. Trap lifetime was derived using the equation:

$$\tau = s^{-1} \exp\left(E/(k_BT)\right)$$

(2)

Different kinetic parameters were obtained for the fine and coarse grain quartz, but our results fall in the range of previous studies (see Table 1 for a summary).

Trap lifetimes for both investigated samples are well beyond the age of interest for dating purposes: ~230 Ma for fine quartz and ~15 Ga for coarse quartz. Consequently, our data are not consistent with the hypothesis that the observed age discrepancy between the two grain sizes is a result of thermal instability of the signal.

3.1.2. Dose response curves

Considering a sample with $N$ electron traps, irradiated with a dose rate $r = D/t$, ignoring thermal drainage (as justified in the previous section), the total number of traps filled at time $t$ is:

$$n = N \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{D}{r t}\right)\right)$$

(3)

where $p$ is the probability per unit dose for a population of traps being filled (Durrani et al., 1977). Thus, for a certain dose:

$$n (D) = N \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{p D}{t}\right)\right)$$

(4)

Assuming that the probability of a trapped electron recombining to give a luminescence photon is independent of dose, this dependence results in single exponential growth of the signal often reported in OSL dating studies:

$$L (D) = L_{\text{max}} \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{D}{D_0}\right)\right)$$

(5)

As such, $D_0$ values can be interpreted as the inverse value of the probability of a population of traps being filled per unit dose. The higher the $D_0$ values, the higher the dose at which saturation occurs and the smaller the fraction of traps filled per unit dose.

Our previous studies have shown however that, in the high dose range the dose response curves of quartz cannot be fitted satisfactorily by a single saturating exponential and a sum of two such functions has to be used (Timar-Gabor et al., 2012).
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Sample type</th>
<th>Natural/Lab irradiated</th>
<th>Grain size (μm)</th>
<th>Fitting function</th>
<th>E (eV)</th>
<th>log₁₀S (S in s⁻¹)</th>
<th>Lifetime at 20 °C (Ma)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smith et al., 1990.</td>
<td>Sediment Oxfordshire</td>
<td>Lab irradiated</td>
<td>either 90–125 or 125–180 ≈100</td>
<td>Sum of 2 exp (second component is negligible)</td>
<td>1.84 ± 0.07</td>
<td>15.3 ± 0.7</td>
<td>-600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntley et al., 1996.</td>
<td>Sand from beach dunes, Australia</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Sum of 4 exp (contributions of 20, 40, 49 and 1%)</td>
<td>1.39 ± 0.27</td>
<td>12 ± 3</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wintle and Murray, 1998.</td>
<td>Aeolian sand, Australia</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>90–125</td>
<td>Sum of 2 exp (contribution of &gt;99 and &lt;1%)</td>
<td>1.55 ± 0.07</td>
<td>12.9 ± 0.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li and Chen, 2001.</td>
<td>Alluvial sediment Hong Kong</td>
<td>Lab irradiated</td>
<td>125–180</td>
<td>Sum of 2 exp</td>
<td>1.65 ± 0.01</td>
<td>13.4 ± 0.1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singarayer and Bailey, 2003.</td>
<td>Various sedim. samples</td>
<td>Lab irradiated</td>
<td>either 90–125 or 125–180</td>
<td>Sum of 5 exp * LM-OSL</td>
<td>1.82 ± 0.05</td>
<td>14.1 ± 0.5</td>
<td>4700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lai and Fan, 2013.</td>
<td>Loess, China</td>
<td>Lab irradiated</td>
<td>45–63</td>
<td>Sum of 2 exp (parameters not mentioned)</td>
<td>1.75 ± 0.15</td>
<td>13.4 ± 1.5</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This study</td>
<td>Loess, Romania</td>
<td>Lab irradiated</td>
<td>4–11</td>
<td>1 exp</td>
<td>1.68 ± 0.03</td>
<td>13.0 ± 0.3</td>
<td>-230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63–90</td>
<td>1 exp</td>
<td>1.97 ± 0.03</td>
<td>16.2 ± 0.3</td>
<td>-14,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For these particular aliquots the ratio between the amplitude of the two components ($L_{1\text{max}}/L_{2\text{max}}$) ranges between 0.5 and 1 for both grain sizes; the $D_0$ values for the two exponentials for the 4–11 μm grains and for the 63–90 μm are given in Table 2 for samples from 3 sections, CST, MV and XF. It is also important to note that the two fitted $D_0$ values for each curve differ by an order of magnitude and so it is unlikely that these components are fitting artifacts (Istotov and Vyvenko, 1999). It is also interesting to note that the dose response curves of the two grain sizes overlap up to doses of about 100 Gy. As mentioned, ages obtained for the two grain sizes are in good agreement up to about this level of equivalent dose. There is a degree of scatter among the values obtained for a given grain size, which is to be expected due to the different origins of quartz. However, the values for a particular grain size are markedly different from those of the other grain size no matter what sample is investigated; this can be seen from Fig. 4, which compares different aliquots of quartz of 4–11 μm and 63–90 μm grains.

3.2. Dose response curves of various grain sizes of quartz from different geological contexts

We have also investigated the dose response curves of different grain sizes of quartz of different origins. For all the coarse ($>35$ μm) grain measurements, the grains were mounted on stainless steel disks and the same dose rate has been used (no significant change in dose rates for grains $>40$ μm expected; Armitage and Bailey, 2005). For the 11–30 μm grains deposited on aluminum disks the same dose rate as determined for 4–11 μm grains was used. Based

\[ L(D) = L_{1\text{max}}(1 - \exp(-D/D_{01})) + L_{2\text{max}}(1 - \exp(-D/D_{02})) \]  

(6)

While the physical meaning of the two components is yet unknown, the $D_{01}$ and $D_{02}$ values obtained for fine grains are markedly different from $D_{01}$ and $D_{02}$ of coarse grain material (Timar-Gabor et al., 2012; Hansen et al., 2015).

Fig. 3 presents a comparison of SAR dose response curves for fine and coarse quartz from two sections in Romania and for loess from Xifeng. It appears that these Chinese loess coarse grains also reach saturation at lower doses than the corresponding fine grains. However, coarse grains from Romanian and Chinese loess follow the same trend, as do the fine grains. For the coarse grains, the regenerated signal reaches 86% of saturation level (equivalent to the 2 $D_0$ limit for a single saturating exponential growth) for doses of $\sim350$ Gy, whereas for the 4–11 μm quartz the regenerated signals do not reach 86% of saturation until $\sim2000$ Gy.

![Fig. 3. Representative SAR dose response curves for fine (4–11 μm) and coarse (63–90 μm) quartz from Romanian loess and Chinese loess.](image-url)
on the observations of Armitage and Bailey (2005) this might be a slight underestimation, but the bias is less than ~4% and unlikely to be of significance in these experiments. The results are summarised in Fig. 4, and a clear trend of increasing saturation dose with decreasing grain size can be seen.

In order to quantify this dependence, the average $D_0$ values for multiple aliquots of different grain sizes were first calculated. Dose response curves were constructed using a minimum of 10 points up to at least 2500 Gy (grains >63 μm); for finer material dose response curves were constructed up to at least 5000 Gy. These very high doses were necessary since the choice of the maximum dose point used to construct the dose response curve influences the values of the parameters obtained if the dose response curve is not constructed up to full saturation (Fig. 5). It can be seen that the values obtained for the fitting parameters depend on the maximum dose until the dose response curve reaches full saturation, when the $D_0$ values also reach a plateau.

A total of 99 aliquots of different grain sizes were used, the relevant information being presented in Table 3. Each aliquot considered in the analysis successfully passed recycling (Murray and Wintle, 2003) and IR depletion ratio tests (Duller, 2003).

The average obtained $D_0$ values (Gy) are plotted against the average grain diameter $\varphi$ (m) in Fig. 6. The linear trend observed in Fig. 6 on a log-log scale translates to a power-law dependency, in which the exponent of the power function is determined by the slope and the scaling factor by the intercept. Independent and unconstrained fits of the $D_{01}$ and $D_{02}$ datasets using $D_{0x} = A / \sqrt{\varphi}$, yielded identical (within error) best-fit exponents of $B = -0.49 \pm 0.07$ for $D_{01}$ and $B = -0.52 \pm 0.06$ for $D_{02}$. Since in both cases, the regressed exponents are consistent with a square root relationship, namely $D_{0x} = A/\sqrt{\varphi}$. Consequently, each of the datasets was refitted with a fixed $B = -0.5$, to obtain only the scaling factor $A$ with units of $(\text{Gy m}^{-0.5})$. These fits (Fig. 6) yielded best-fit values of $A_{01} = 0.46 \pm 0.03$ Gy m$^{-0.5}$ and $A_{02} = 4.4 \pm 0.3$ Gy m$^{-0.5}$, which are separated by a factor of ~10 (corresponding to a typical $D_{02}/D_{01}$ ratio).

Reports of a dependence of saturation characteristics upon grain size have, to the best of our knowledge, not been documented in the literature, and an underlying physical mechanism (i.e. the increase of characteristic dose, and the decrease in trap filling probability, with decreasing grain size) remains yet unknown.

Investigations of TL emission as function of particle size have been performed on LiF (Burlin et al., 1969) and Al$_2$O$_3$:C (Akselrod et al., 1993). In their studies, a decrease in the luminescence intensity is reported with decreasing grain size. On the other hand, in the case of nanoparticles, generally an increase in the TL output is reported as the particle size is decreased (see as an example Chen et al., 1997 for ZnS nanoparticles). As the particles become smaller the surface/volume ratio increases and so does the importance of surface defects. By comparing the OSL output (absolute number of counts) for a certain dose for fine (4–11 μm) and coarse (63–90 μm) grains, the fine grains of sedimentary quartz have, in general, higher light output per unit mass than coarse grains. However, examination of the existence of a trend between the light levels obtained for a certain dose per unit mass and grain size is not possible from the available dataset. Further investigations will aim at obtaining a better understanding of the role of surface defects in OSL production and any related dose dependence.
4. Conclusions

The good agreement of the ages obtained using different grain sizes of quartz in the low dose range increases our confidence in the accuracy of the SAR-OSL ages for samples with equivalent doses of about 100 Gy or less, as further confirmed by comparison with independent age control provided through tephrochronology (Constantin et al., 2012; Anechitei-Deacu et al., 2014) or radiocarbon dating (Trandafir et al., 2015). On the other hand, the age discrepancy of SAR-OSL ages previously reported for Romanian and Serbian loess for ages beyond ~40 ka (equivalent doses >~100 Gy) was also found to be characteristic of Chinese loess. It is thus believed that this is potentially a global phenomenon, affecting previously-obtained chronologies worldwide, and further increasing concerns for the accuracy of silt-sized SAR-OSL ages in this high dose range.

We have shown that underestimation of the fine grains ages cannot be attributed to thermal instability of the signal, but is more likely related to a hitherto unknown dose dependent phenomenon.

The overlap observed between the SAR laboratory dose response curves of quartz of different grains from different geological contexts as well as of different grain sizes up to 100 Gy confirm the validity of the standardized dose response curve concept (Roberts and Duller, 2004; Li et al., 2015) for the linear region of the dose response curve.

However, with regard to the dose level at which saturation is reached, we find that the saturation characteristics (D0 values) are related to grain diameter via an inverse square root relationship of the form \( D_0 = A/\sqrt{\varphi} \), in which the characteristic dose increases for smaller grain sizes. Based on this observation, together with the underestimation generally reported for smaller grain sizes, we suggest that, at least for quartz samples that display a dose response curve that is described by a sum of two saturating exponential functions, it is not possible at present to provide a limit for dating in terms of values of the D0 of either component.
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Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grain diameter (µm)</th>
<th>Number of aliquots used</th>
<th>Sample type</th>
<th>( D_{01} ) (Gy)</th>
<th>( D_{02} ) (Gy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4–11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14 aliquots Romanian loess (MV, CAC, CST, MST, LCA)</td>
<td>151 ± 5</td>
<td>1411 ± 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 aliquots Serbian loess (ORL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 aliquots Ruhama Israeli desert loess (RUH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 aliquots eolianite from Eivissa (M#6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 aliquots loess Xifeng, China (XF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Romanian loess (CST)</td>
<td>129 ± 8</td>
<td>1197 ± 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Romanian loess (MV)</td>
<td>82 ± 6</td>
<td>901 ± 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63–90</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15 aliquots Romanian loess (MV, CAC, CST, MST, LCA)</td>
<td>44 ± 2</td>
<td>452 ± 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 aliquots eolianite from Eivissa (M#6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 aliquots loess Xifeng, China (XF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90–125</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1 aliquot Romanian loess (CAC)</td>
<td>36 ± 3</td>
<td>363 ± 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 aliquots eolianite from Eivissa (M#6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 aliquots Ruhama Israeli desert loess (RUH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 aliquots sand from the Danube delta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 aliquots sand from Gammelmarke in southern Jutland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125–180</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 aliquot Romanian loess (CAC)</td>
<td>37 ± 3</td>
<td>361 ± 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 aliquot sand from Skagen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 aliquots eolianite from Eivissa (M#6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 aliquots sand from the Danube delta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 aliquots sand from Zwolle, Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 aliquots marine sediments from the Eemian site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180–250</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 aliquots eolianite from Eivissa (M#6)</td>
<td>41 ± 4</td>
<td>305 ± 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 aliquots sand from Zwolle, Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 aliquots sand from Skagen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 aliquots marine sediments from the Eemian site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 6. Variation of saturation characteristics (D0 parameters) as function of grains size. Please note the log-log scale.
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