

## **Towards a physical kinetic model for feldspar OSL-thermochronometry**

B. GURALNIK<sup>1</sup>, M. JAIN<sup>2</sup>, N.D. BROWN<sup>3</sup>, G.E. KING<sup>4</sup>,  
R. LAMBERT<sup>5</sup>, R. CHEN<sup>6</sup>, S.W.S. MCKEEVER<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Wageningen University, The Netherlands

<sup>2</sup>Danish Technical University (Risø Campus), Denmark

<sup>3</sup>University of California, Los Angeles, USA

<sup>4</sup>University of Bern, Switzerland

<sup>5</sup>University of Lausanne, Switzerland

<sup>6</sup>Tel Aviv University, Israel

<sup>7</sup>Oklahoma State University, USA

Optically Stimulated Luminescence (OSL) dating, arguably the latest arrival on the low-temperature thermochronometry scene [1], exploits the low thermal stabilities of electron traps occurring in natural minerals ( $E_a \sim 1\text{--}2$  eV, equivalent to  $\sim 100\text{--}200$  kJ/mol), to infer the very recent ( $<0.5$  Ma) passage of rocks through the shallowest ( $<100$  °C) subsurface geotherms [2]. Despite initial hopes that the new technique would utilise the predominantly first-order charge traffic in quartz [1], later studies have shown that bedrock quartz OSL is characteristically dim, exhibits large sensitivity changes, and is frequently contaminated by feldspar emissions [3], thus advocating a methodological shift to the brighter and more reproducible OSL signals from bedrock feldspar [4-7].

The strikingly non-linear response of feldspar OSL to ionising radiation and isothermal storage can be successfully modelled in a variety of seemingly appropriate ways [4]. Here, we take a critical look at two of our former approaches, including general-order kinetics [5], and the band-tail excitation model [6-7]. We present new experimental data that highlight weaknesses in these models, and promote the excited-state tunnelling model [4; 8-9], which captures progressively more features of the feldspar OSL signal via a set of physically-meaningful kinetic parameters.

[1] Herman et al. (2010) *EPSL* 297, 183–189.

[2] King et al. (2016) *Chem. Geol.* 446, 3–17.

[3] Guralnik et al. (2015) *Quat. Geochronol.* 25, 37–48.

[4] Guralnik et al. (2015) *Radiat. Meas.* 81, 224–231.

[5] Guralnik et al. (2015) *EPSL* 423, 232–243.

[6] King et al. (2016) *Quat. Geochronol.* 33, 76–87.

[7] King et al. (2016) *Science* 353, 800–804.

[8] Jain et al. (2012). *J. Phys. Cond. Matt.* 24, 385402.

[9] Jain et al. (2015). *Radiat. Meas.* 81, 242–250.