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Fig. S1. Exposure age variation between five different CRONUS production rate scaling schemes. Exposure ages from the Tibetan Plateau and the Northern Hemisphere palaeo-ice sheet glacial boulder datasets were calculated using five different scaling schemes in the CRONUS online calculator (Balco et al., 2008) and they are plotted against the equivalent CRONUS Lm exposure ages used in this study. The inset in the left panel shows the full dataset for the Tibetan Plateau. For description of the different scaling schemes, see Balco et al. (2008). The exposure ages of the Tibetan Plateau boulders vary significantly more between the various scaling schemes than the palaeo-ice sheet boulders (reflecting a lack of production rate calibration sites on the Tibetan Plateau). Changing the employed production rate scaling scheme (Lm) to another alters the individual exposure ages of the Tibetan Plateau boulders significantly, in particular the old exposure ages. However, the large-scale pattern of the exposure age dataset does not change dramatically, and our conclusions are valid for all five production rate scaling schemes. For exposure age data, see Supplementary Dataset.
Fig. S2. Assumed deglaciation ages for exposure age inaccuracy quantification of the palaeo-ice sheet dataset. The deglaciation ages for the Laurentide ice sheet (LIS) are based on reconstructions presented by Dyke et al. (2003) and Kleman et al. (2010). The deglaciation ages for the British Irish (BIIS) and Fennoscandian ice sheet (FIS) are based on the reconstruction presented by Gyllencreutz et al. (2007a). For sample-specific assumed deglaciation ages, see Supplementary Dataset.
Fig. S3. Palaeo-ice sheet boulder exposure age inaccuracy, defined as $^{10}$Be apparent exposure age minus corresponding reconstructed deglaciation age (cf. Fig. S2; Dyke et al., 2003; Gyllencreutz et al., 2007a,b; Kleman et al., 2010), divided between the Laurentide and the European ice sheet areas. (a) Exposure age inaccuracy of individual boulders from the Laurentide palaeo-ice sheet area divided into 5 ka bins (horizontal axis). (b) Exposure age inaccuracy of multiple-boulder group ($\geq$ 2 boulders per group) minimum, mean, and maximum exposure ages from the Laurentide palaeo-ice sheet area shown as median and interquartile range. (c) Exposure age inaccuracy of individual boulders from the European palaeo-ice sheet area divided into 5 ka bins. (d) Exposure age inaccuracy of multiple-boulder group minimum, mean, and maximum exposure ages from the European palaeo-ice sheet area shown as median and interquartile range. The chronologies of all deglaciation reconstructions (Dyke et al., 2003; Kleman et al., 2010; Gyllencreutz et al., 2007a,b) are based primarily on radiocarbon dates. However, while the European deglaciation age database includes cosmogenic exposure ages the Laurentide deglaciation age database does not include any cosmogenic exposure ages. Hence, the Laurentide deglaciation reconstructions offer more independent deglaciation ages for comparison with the apparent exposure ages. The quantified inaccuracy of the Laurentide and European palaeo-ice sheet boulder exposure age datasets are largely similar, with low percentages of boulders in glacially modified areas having exposure ages more than 10 ka older than the corresponding deglaciation reconstruction ages (3% and 5%, respectively).
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Fig. S4. Number of dated discrete glacial deposits (vertical axis) where 1 to 18 individual boulders (horizontal axis) were sampled for each discrete glacial deposit. (a) Boulders from the Tibetan Plateau. (b) Boulders from the Palaeo-ice sheet areas. The ages from a large majority of all cosmogenic exposure dated discrete glacial deposits are based on 1-5 dated boulders. For data and grouping of boulders, see Supplementary Dataset.

Fig. S5. Monte Carlo simulation of boulder apparent exposure ages of Tibetan Plateau multiple-boulder glacial deposits. (a) Flow chart of the prior exposure simulation. (b) Flow chart of the incomplete exposure simulation. (c) Time-dependent boulder exhumation curve adopted for all boulders in the incomplete exposure simulation.
Exposure age simulations

In the Monte Carlo simulations of prior exposure and incomplete exposure, the apparent exposure age is calculated for multiples of all Tibetan Plateau boulder groups (Fig. S4a). Randomised factors regarding the geological history of the boulders yield various $^{10}$Be concentrations and apparent exposure ages.

Production of $^{10}$Be occurs by high-energy spallation and muon interaction (Granger and Smith, 2000; Gosse and Phillips, 2001) with a production rate $P_d$ (atoms g$^{-1}$ yr$^{-1}$) at the depth $d$ (cm) below the surface:

$$P_d = f_s P_0 e^{-\rho_d d} + f_m P_0 (m_1 e^{-\rho_d L1} + m_2 e^{-\rho_d L2} + m_3 e^{-\rho_d L3})$$

where the first term represents the production rate due to spallation (Lal, 1991) and the second term represents the production rate due to muon interaction (Granger and Smith, 2000). The coefficients $f_s$ and $f_m$ are the spallogenic and muogenic fractions (dimensionless), respectively, of the surface production rate $P_0 (d = 0)$, with $f_s = 0.988$ and $f_m = 0.012$ based on average surface production rates of the measured Tibetan Plateau boulders (CRONUS muon and St spallation production rates; see Supplementary Dataset). The coefficient $\rho$ is the mean density (g cm$^{-3}$) of the shielding material, here 2.7 g cm$^{-3}$ for bedrock, and $\Lambda$ is the attenuation length (g cm$^{-2}$) for spallogenic production, here 160 g cm$^{-2}$ (cf. Gosse and Phillips, 2001; Balco et al., 2008). The coefficients $m_1 = 0.76$, $m_2 = 0.11$, and $m_3 = 0.13$ are dimensionless coefficients based on the approximation of sub-surface muogenic production presented by Granger and Smith (2000) with scaling of the sea level high latitude factors using an atmospheric depth difference of 400 g cm$^{-2}$ (corresponding to altitudes of c. 4000 m a.s.l.) and the attenuation lengths $L1 = 738.6$ g cm$^{-2}$, $L2 = 2688$ g cm$^{-2}$, and $L3 = 4360$ g cm$^{-2}$ (Granger and Smith, 2000).

The apparent exposure age $A$ (yr) of a sample, assuming no shielding from cosmic rays, is based on Lal (1991):

$$A = \ln (1 - N \lambda / P_0) / -\lambda$$

where $N$ is the sample $^{10}$Be concentration (atoms g$^{-1}$), $\lambda$ is the $^{10}$Be decay constant (yr$^{-1}$) with a value of 4.997 x 10$^{-7}$ (Chmeleff et al., 2010; Korschinek et al., 2010), and $P_0$ is the surface production rate (atoms g$^{-1}$ yr$^{-1}$).

Prior exposure model

In the prior exposure model, each boulder group is assigned a random duration of prior exposure $T_{pri}$ (yr) between zero and a maximum value, and a random deglacial age $T_{degl}$ (yr) between 0 and 250 ka. Each individual sample is assigned a random depth beneath the bedrock surface $d_{pri}$ (cm) between zero and a maximum depth.

The inherited $^{10}$Be concentration $N_{inh}$ (atoms g$^{-1}$) at the time of glacial erosion and deposition is based on Lal (1991):

$$N_{inh} = P_d / \lambda (1 - e^{-T_{degl}})$$

where $P_d$ is given by the depth $d_{pri}$ and Eq. (1), and $T$ is given by $T_{degl}$.

$^{10}$Be concentration in a sample at the time of reaching the surface $N_{exh}$ (atoms g$^{-1}$) is calculated by summing the inherited $^{10}$Be production and decay for the exhumation duration using time steps $\Delta t$:

$$N_{exh} = \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma T_{exh}} P_d \Delta t - N_{inh} (1 - e^{-\Delta t})$$

where $\Delta t$ is 50 yr, production rate $P_d$ is given by Eq. (1) and with the time-dependent depth $d$ derived from $d_{degl}$ and Eq. (5). The last term of Eq. (6) represents $^{10}$Be decay.

The $^{10}$Be concentration in a sample at the time of reaching the surface is converted to an apparent exposure age $A_{exh}$ (yr) based on Eq. (2) with $N$ based on Eq. (6). Because the $^{10}$Be concentration $N_{exh}$ is a product of the surface production rate $P_0$ (Eq. 1 and 6), the value of $P_0$ does not influence the acquired apparent exposure age $A_{exh}$. Thus, the apparent exposure age acquired due to prior exposure varies only with the random duration of prior exposure and the random sample depth beneath the surface.

The apparent exposure age of the sampled boulder $T_A$ (yr) is calculated by summarising the inherited apparent exposure age and the deglaciation age:

$$T_A = A_{inh} + T_{degl}$$

Incomplete exposure model

In the incomplete exposure model all boulders are shielded by and exhumed from till with a specific time-dependent exponential exhumation rate $dx/dt$ (cm yr$^{-1}$):

$$dx/dt = ae^{-bT}$$

where $t$ is time elapsed since deglaciation (yr) and with the coefficients $a = 1.1 \times 10^{-2}$ (cm yr$^{-1}$) and $b = 10.4$ (yr$^{-1}$). The values of $a$ and $b$ were chosen to produce exposure age patterns similar to the measured exposure age pattern of the Tibetan Plateau dataset and they yield a maximum of 10.9 m of overburden removal and boulder exhumation after 450 ka (Fig. S5c). Each boulder group is assigned a random deglaciation age $T_{degl}$ (yr) between 0 and 450 ka and each individual boulder has been exhumed/shielded over an exhumation duration $T_{exh}$ (yr) based on a randomized boulder depth at deglaciation $d_{degl}$ (cm); constrained by $T_{degl}$ and Eq. (5).
The apparent exposure age of the sampled boulder $T_A$ \( \text{(yr)} \) is calculated by summarising the time elapsed since exhumation and the sub-surface apparent exposure age:

$$T_A = T_{\text{degl}} - T_{\text{exh}} + A_{\text{exh}} \quad (7)$$

Prior/incomplete exposure model

In the combined prior and incomplete exposure model the $^{10}$Be concentration in a boulder when it becomes exhumed $N_{ie}$ \( \text{(atoms g}^{-1}) \) is calculated by summarising the prior exposure and the post-depositional exhumation components:

$$N_{ie} = N_{\text{inh}} e^{-\lambda T} + N_{\text{exh}} \quad (8)$$

where $N_{\text{inh}}$ is given by Eq. (3) and subject to decay during the duration $T$ given by the exhumation duration $T_{\text{exh}}$, and $N_{\text{exh}}$ is given by Eq. (6).

The $^{10}$Be concentration in a sample at the time of reaching the surface is converted to an apparent exposure age $A_{ie}$ \( \text{(yr)} \) based on Eq. (2) with $N$ based on Eq. (8).

The apparent exposure age of the sampled boulder $T_A$ \( \text{(yr)} \) is calculated by summarising the inheritance/exhumation component and the time elapsed since exhumation:

$$T_A = A_{ie} + T_{\text{degl}} - T_{\text{exh}} \quad (9)$$

Fig. S6. Measured Tibetan Plateau exposure ages (vertical axis) from multiple-boulder group (≥2 boulders per group) shown against group minimum and maximum exposure age (horizontal axis). A majority of the measured exposure ages fall towards the younger part of the exposure age envelope (cf. Owen et al., 2008).

Fig. S7. Tibetan Plateau bedrock surface exposure ages. (a) Location of the bedrock surfaces. (b) Bedrock surface apparent exposure ages (Lal et al., 2003; Kong et al., 2007). The bedrock surfaces have been collected primarily in areas lacking evidence of former glaciation, thus aiming at quantifying surface erosion rates. For exposure age data, see Supplementary Dataset.
Fig. S8. Simulated exposure ages for the prior exposure model adopting a maximum duration of prior exposure increasing linearly with deglaciation age, from 0 ka (at deglaciation age 0 ka) to 400 ka (at deglaciation age 250 ka), and a maximum prior sample depth of 2 m. (a) Simulated individual exposure ages. (b) Simulated boulder group exposure age spread shown as group standard deviation (median and interquartile range) for bins with bin edges at 10, 20, 50, 100, and 200 ka. The grey areas show the interquartile range of the measured data for comparison. Even with the maximum duration of prior exposure and maximum prior sample depth set to favourable values for high inheritance, the simulated exposure ages have lower age spread than the measured data.
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