

Dear Editor,

During proofreading I discovered that I made 4 mistakes:

- (1) I made a mistake in calculating the averages and ranges of the accepted data after implementing the suggestions from the associate editor Fred Jourdan. In the first version of the proofs I used in the abstract (p1, line 11-12) “four samples range from: 2.55-2.69”, it should be “five samples range from 2.57-2.69”. It is a small change, but I think it is good to rectify this. The same error is made in the conclusion (p14, line 74): “Five subaerial samples of the Upper Lava formation from Christiani Island do have a significantly older $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$ ages (average 2.56 \pm 0.17) than was previously assumed. Five of the ages are in the time interval of 2.69-2.55Ma (average 2.63 \pm 0.05),” should be modified to “Six subaerial samples of the Upper Lava formation from Christiani Island do have a significantly older $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$ ages (average 2.56 \pm 0.17 Ma (1sd)) than was previously assumed. Five of the ages are in the time interval of 2.57-2.69 Ma (average 2.63 \pm 0.05 Ma, 1sd),”
- (2) On page 11, line 5, this text does not correspond to the figure and is from an older version of the manuscript: “Figure 6A shows the LOI versus $^{40}\text{Ar}^*$ and age. The samples can be divided into three groups based on LOI and amphibole presence: (1) LOI between 0.4 wt % and 0.8 wt %, no amphibole; (2) LOI between 1.0 wt %–1.4 wt %, no amphibole; and (3) one sample (CH18-15) that contains amphibole with an LOI 1.5 wt %” and should be changed to: “Figure 6 shows the LOI versus $^{40}\text{Ar}^*$ and age. The lowest $^{40}\text{Ar}^*$ and largest age errors are observed in the two samples that contain amphibole.”
- (3) It was pointed out to me that I did not consistently use the name Christiana and Christiani. Christiana is the name for the group of three islands (e.g. Christiana Islands or Archipelago), but the island I took the samples from is named Christiani. I modified this in the proofs, but this was not in all places accepted.
- (4) In the third line of the discussion (p8-L39) I refer to the wrong sample number: CH18-05 should be CH18-15.

I hope it is possible to make these small changes, which do not change the results and conclusions of this paper.

Sincerely yours,



Pieter Vroon