





Author Correction: Elevated shallow water salinity in the deglacial Indian Ocean was sourced from the deep

Correction to: *Nature Geoscience*
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-025-01756-7>,
published online 6 August 2025.

<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-026-01973-8>

Published online: 10 April 2026

Ryan H. Glaubke, Elisabeth L. Sikes , Sindia M. Sosdian , Natalie E. Umling, Aidan Starr, Paola L. Moffa-Sanchez  & Matthew W. Schmidt 

In the version of the article initially published, Fig. 3 displayed reconstructed temperature and salinity values alongside contours of water mass density. The salinity values were intentionally corrected for continental ice volume to isolate the local salinity signal from whole-ocean changes. However, because of this correction, the water mass densities that might be inferred from this plot are underestimated during glacial and deglacial intervals.

To address this, we restored the whole-ocean salinity signal for Fig. 3 by scaling the change (estimated to be -1.4 PSU) to global sea level following the approach described in ref. 31 (Roberts, J. et al. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1511252113> (2016)). Additionally, pore water estimates of glacial deep ocean salinity previously included for context have been replaced with benthic foraminiferal estimates from ref. 31, because they leverage the same geochemical and statistical methods employed here and are therefore more directly comparable.

Correspondingly, the Fig. 3 caption and associated text have been updated to reflect these changes. References to “absolute salinity” in the main text and Fig. 2 caption have also been clarified to distinguish ice volume-corrected (local) salinity from absolute salinity.

Importantly, these corrections affect only Fig. 3. They do not affect our analysis of the magnitude or timing of the local high salinity event, nor its correspondence with water mass age changes—all of which underpin our main conclusions. The figure and text have been updated in the HTML and PDF versions of the article.













© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Limited 2026

Publisher Correction: Increasing river sediment concentration and flux across the pan-Arctic

Correction to: *Nature Geoscience*
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-026-01960-z>,
published online 13 April 2026.

<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-026-01983-6>

Published online: 23 April 2026

Shang Tian , Dongfeng Li , Ting Zhang , James W. McClelland , Irina Overeem , Stuart N. Lane , Robert G. M. Spencer , Ellen Wohl, Anmeng Sha, Yi Zhao , Chiyuan Miao , Munan Ning , Li Yuan  & Jinren Ni 

In the version of this article initially published, there was an error in Fig. 3a, where a stray term “37%” appeared in the middle of the plot, and an error in Fig. 4, where the label now reading “Fire area per 10,000 km²” appeared originally as “RTS area....” The figures have been amended in the HTML and PDF versions of the article.

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Limited 2026

Addendum: Sea-level rise at the end of the last deglaciation dominated by North American ice sheets

Addendum to: *Nature Geoscience*

<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-025-01806-0>,
published online 9 October 2025.

<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-026-01970-x>

Published online: 7 April 2026

Udita Mukherjee , Lael Vetter , Glenn A. Milne, Lev Tarasov,
Elena Steponaitis, Niamh Cahill , Benoit S. Lecavalier, Brad E. Rosenheim  &
Torbjörn E. Törnqvist 

Peter U. Clark has drawn our attention to the paper by Cuzzone et al. (2016) which, building on earlier work such as Carlson et al. (2008), came to a comparable conclusion about the meltwater partitioning between the North American and Antarctic ice sheets during the early Holocene. We have now added these references to recognize this previous work. We note that these studies used an ice area-to-volume scaling approach, based on ice-margin chronologies, that has not been validated for glacial cycle (i.e., transient) contexts. In comparison, our focus was on geophysical model estimates of meltwater volumes, and those calculated in our paper are derived from ice sheet model reconstructions. To reflect this previous work and more explicitly emphasize our focus on geophysical models, we have revised the final sentence in our abstract from “Our results call for a major revision of the deglacial ice history with implications for...” to “Our results call for a major revision of GIA-based reconstructions of North American deglaciation, with implications for” We have also added the following sentence to the fifth paragraph of the section “Data-model comparison and meltwater partitioning”: “Our results are also compatible with ice volume changes inferred via ice-margin reconstructions and an area-to-volume scaling relationship (Carlson et al. Rapid early Holocene deglaciation of the Laurentide ice sheet. *Nat. Geosci.* **1**, 620–624 (2008); Cuzzone et al. Final deglaciation of the Scandinavian Ice Sheet and implications for the Holocene global sea-level budget. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* **448**, 34–41(2016)).” The changes are made in the HTML and PDF versions of the article.

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Limited 2026