

Sample description

A1. Wolframite from Sweden (Bagge), Rwanda (Sewa), France (MTM), and China (YGX-2107, YGX-2113)

Wolframite sample Bagge was collected from the Baggetorp deposit near Tjällmo in the southwestern part of the Bergslagen region, south central Sweden. This mine was shut down after the Second World War due to the drop in tungsten and fluorite price (Khavari, 2018). The age of this mineralization is not known. The regional geological development provides the following age constraints: The rocks of the Bergslagen ore province formed during the Svecofennian orogeny and were intruded along the western and southern margin of this province by rocks of the Transscandinavian Granite-Porphyry Belt (Ohlsson, 1979). There are three main periods of magmatic activity in the Svecofennian domain: Early Svecofennian (1.85-1.89 Ga) volcano sedimentary supracrustal units, Early Svecofennian (1.85-1.89 Ga) plutonic bodies, and Late Svecofennian (ca. 1.80-1.78 Ga) granites (Andersson et al., 2006). These events in part overlap with magmatic events in the Transscandinavian Granite-Porphyry Belt, which includes geochemically distinctive 1.82-1.75 Ga and 1.73-1.65 Ga old magmatic rocks (Andersson et al., 2004). Within the Bergslagen ore province there are several granite-related tungsten deposits, among which the Yxsjöberg tungsten-skarn deposit is the most important one. Romer and Öhlander (1994) obtained a U-Pb titanite age of 1789 ± 2 Ma (2σ) for the Yxsjöberg deposit using isotope dilution thermal ionization mass spectrometry (ID-TIMS). There are numerous rare element pegmatites in the southern part of the Bergslagen ore province, most importantly ca. 1.80-1.82 Ga old NYF (Niobium-Yttrium-Fluorine) pegmatites and ca. 1.80-1.75 Ga old LCT (Lithium-Cesium-Tantalum) pegmatites (Romer and Smeds, 1997). Skrupetorp, the LCT-type pegmatite closest to the Baggetorp pegmatite, yields a U-Pb columbite age of 1786 ± 1 Ma (2σ) (Romer and Smeds, 1997). The ages of the Yxsjöberg tungsten deposit and the Skrupetorp pegmatite possibly give the best expectation values for the age of the Baggetorp pegmatite.

Sample Sewa is a ferberitic wolframite, and the exact location of Sewa is unknown, but it probably originates from Rwanda.

Sample MTM originates from Les Montmins, a granite-related hydrothermal W ± Sn deposits in the French Massif Central. Wolframite from this location had been studied by Harlaux et al. (2018a; 2018b) for U-Pb age and fluid inclusions. MTM wolframite has a very large range of U contents and the crystallization age constrained by ID-TIMS is 334.4 ± 1.7 Ma (2σ , MSWD = 3.6) (Harlaux et al., 2018a). Luo et al. (2019) used the water vapor-assisted LA-ICP-MS U-Pb dating method and obtained a lower intercept age of 333.3 ± 1.0 Ma in the Tera-Wasserburg diagram.

Wolframite samples YGX-2107 and YGX-2113 were collected from the Yaogangxian tungsten deposit, Hunan Province, South China. Both samples are hübneritic wolframite. The Yaogangxian tungsten deposit is one of the numerous W deposits in the Nanling metallogenic belt. In this region, W mineralization commonly occurs within the granites and/or extends into the Paleozoic wall rocks. Fluid inclusion studies demonstrate that the area was affected by several mineralization events (e.g., Legros et al. 2020). Isotopic dating of ore and gangue minerals, including $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$ dating of muscovite and, Re-Os dating of molybdenite, and U-Pb dating of hydrothermal zircon, cassiterite, and wolframite suggest that W mineralization and multiple overprints of the mineralization occurred between 170 Ma and 133 Ma (e.g., Wang et al., 2008; Wang et al., 2009; Hu et al., 2012; Wang and Ren, 2018; Deng et al., 2019; Legros et al., 2020). The Yaogangxian deposit is a granite-related vein-type W deposit (Peng et al., 2006; Zhao et al., 2017). The granites had been dated between 170.7 ± 1.5 Ma and 152.7 ± 1.8 Ma by zircon U-Pb dating (Che et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2009; Li et al., 2011; Dong et al., 2014). Recently, Deng et al. (2019) dated the wolframite from Yaogangxian deposit by LA-ICP-MS, using a non-matrix-matched water-vapor assisted method, and distinguished

43 early and late wolframite domains. The two texturally defined domains yielded U-Pb ages of 159.1 ± 2.0 Ma (2σ ;
44 MSWD=0.7) and 153.7 ± 0.7 Ma (2σ ; MSWD=0.5), respectively.

45

46 **A2. Wolframite from Jiangxi province (XHS16, DP-12), south China**

47 Wolframite sample XHS16 is from the Xihuashan tungsten deposit, which is a vein-type deposit genetically
48 associated with the Xihuashan granite pluton that is located in the Nanling metallogenic belt, southeastern China.
49 Magmatic rocks in this region typically are 180 Ma to 150 Ma old (Sun, 2006; Zhou et al., 2006; Li et al., 2007;
50 Wang et al., 2011; Li et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2017) and, thus, tungsten mineralization related to these rocks should
51 fall in a similar age range (Mao et al., 2007; Hua et al., 2008; Guo et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2011; Mao et al., 2013).
52 Wang et al. (2011) reported a Re–Os isochron age of 157.0 ± 2.5 Ma (2σ) for molybdenite intergrown with wolframite
53 in the oldest generation of the Xihuashan pluton. This age is in good agreement with the LA-ICP-MS U–Pb zircon
54 age of 155.7 ± 2.2 Ma (2σ).

55 Wolframite sample DP-12 is from the Dangping tungsten deposit in the Nanling region. Magmatic rocks in this
56 region dominantly include Yanshanian granitic complexes (Zhang et al., 2012). Zhang et al. (2012) that yield U-Pb
57 zircon ages of 180.8 Ma to 154.9 Ma, i.e., which falls in the same age range as the 180 Ma to 150 Ma Xihuashan
58 granitic complex (Sun, 2006; Zhou et al., 2006; Li et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2011; Li et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2017).

59

60

61 **A3. Ferbrite from Portugal (Panasqueira) and the United Kingdom (Cornwall)**

62 The Panasqueira W–Sn–Cu ore deposit, one of the largest tungsten deposits in Western Europe, is located in the
63 Variscan Central Iberian Zone (CIZ) in north-central Portugal. Several generations of voluminous granitoids intruded
64 the CIZ during the late stages of the Variscan orogeny (320–280 Ma), The Panasqueira mineralization is genetically
65 associated with the greisen cupola of one of these granites, the Panasqueira granite, that is exposed in the deepest
66 part of the mine (Foxford et al. 2000; Jacques et al., 2015; Carocci et al., 2018). The age of the Panasqueira deposit
67 is not well known. From the regional context, it should be younger than ca. 320 Ma, i.e., the older generation of post-
68 kinematic granites, and older than 288 Ma, i.e., the age of last-stage muscovite (Snee et al., 1988).

69 The ferberite sample named Cornwall was collected from a tin and copper deposit associated with the
70 Tregonning-Godolphin Granite that formed during the late stages of the Variscan orogeny (Neymark et al., 2018;
71 Smith et al., 2019; Moscati and Neymark, 2020). The granitic plutons of the Cornubian Batholith were intruded from
72 ~ 295 to 270 Ma (Smith et al., 2019; Moscati and Neymark, 2020). Neymark et al. (2018) reported the U-Pb age of
73 a cassiterite sample from a deposit related to the Tregonning granite to be 283.2 ± 1.8 Ma, which agrees with the age
74 range known for Cornubian granites of the Cornubian ore field (Smith et al., 2019).

75

76 **A4. Hübnerite from the United States (HTD, SHM)**

77 The hübnerite sample HTD is from the Hamme Tungsten District, which includes a series of steeply dipping
78 quartz wolframite veins in the Piedmont of North Carolina, United States (Foose et al., 1980). The tungsten-bearing
79 quartz veins are concentrated along the western contact between the Vance County granite and late Precambrian to
80 early Paleozoic slates and phyllite (Foose et al., 1980). Granitic rocks similar to the Vance County pluton yielded
81 Rb-Sr and U-Pb ages ranging from 520 to 620 Ma (Fullagar, 1971; Glover and Sinha, 1973). Foose et al. (1980)
82 demonstrated that the Hamme Tungsten District had experienced at least two episodes of folding and shearing. The
83 entire area has been overprinted by the 300-280 Ma Alleghenian orogeny.

84 The hübnerite sample SHM was collected from the Sweet Home Mine located in the Alma mining district on
85 the eastern slope of central Colorado's Mosquito Range. The deposit originally has been mined for silver, but is best
86 known for its gem-quality rhodochrosite. Late stage hübnerite forms blade-crystals that are intergrown with quartz
87 Similar rhodochrosite-hübnerite veins are spatially related with Teritary porphyry-type molybdenum mineralization,
88 including the nearby world-class deposits of Climax and Henderson (Seedorff and Einaudi, 2004; Lüders et al., 2009).
89 Romer and Lüders (2006) analyzed three Sweet Home Mine hübnerite fragments from a single crystal and reported
90 a $^{206}\text{Pb}/^{238}\text{U}$ age of 25.7 ± 0.3 Ma, which is consistent with the $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$ ages from sericite ranging from 26.1 ± 0.1
91 and 25.5 ± 0.1 Ma (Barbá et al. 2005).

92

93 References

- 94 1. K. E. Barbá, E. P. Nelson, D. Misantoni, M. W. Hitzman, P. W. Layer, *In: Rhoden HN, Steininger RC and Vikre*
95 *PG (eds) Geol Soc Nevada Symp*, 2005, 698–708.
- 96 2. E. Carocci, C. Marignac, M. Cathelineau, F. Pinto, L. Truche, *In Proceedings of the 24th Réunion des Sciences*
97 *de la Terre, Lille, France, 22–26 October 2018*, 439.
- 98 3. X. D. Che, R. C. Wang, W. L. Zhang, J. C. Zhu, J. J. Lu, L. Xie, A. P. Yu, *Bull. Mineral. Petrol. Geochem.*, 2009,
99 **28**, 467 (In Chinese).
- 100 4. X. D. Deng, T. Luo, J. W. Li, Z. C. Hu, *Chem. Geol.*, 2019, **515**, 94–104.
- 101 5. S. Dong, X. Bi, R. Hu, Y. Chen, *Acta Petrol. Sin.*, 2014, **30**, 2749–2765 (In Chinese with English abstract).
- 102 6. M. P. Foose, J. F. Slack, T. Casadevall, *Econ. Geol.*, 1980, **75**, 515–522.
- 103 7. K. A. Foxford, R. Nicholson, D. A. Polya, R. P. B. Hebblethwaite, *J. Struct. Geol.*, 2000, **22**, 1065–1086.
- 104 8. P. D. Fullagar, *Geol. Soc. America Bull.*, 1971, **82**, 2845–2862.
- 105 9. L. Glover, A. K. Sinha, *Am. Jour. Sci.*, 1973, **273**, 234–251.
- 106 10. C. Guo, J. Mao, Bierlein, F.; Z. Chen, Y. Chen, C. Li, Z. Zeng, *Ore Geol. Rev.*, 2011, **43**, 26–39.
- 107 11. R. Z. Hu, W. F. Wei, X. W. Bi, J. T. Peng, Y. Q. Qi, L. Y. Wu, Y. W. Chen, *Lithos*, 2012, **150**, 111–118.
- 108 12. R. M. Hua,; W. L. Zhang, G. L. Li, Y. Q. Hu, X. D. Wang, *Geol. J. China Univ.*, 2008, **14**, 527–538 (In Chinese
109 with English abstract).
- 110 13. M. Harlaux, J. Mercadier, C. Marignac, C. Peiffert, C. Cloquet, M. Cuney, *Chem. Geol.*, 2018b, **479**, 58–85.
- 111 14. M. Harlaux, R. L. Romer, J. Mercadier, C. Morlot, C. Marignac, M. Cuney, *Miner. Deposita*, 2018a, **53**, 21–51.
112
- 113 15. D. Jacques, R. Vieira, P. Muchez, M. Sintubin, *Geotect. Res.*, 2015, **97**, 53–55.
- 114 16. P. Khavari, *Luleå University of Technology*, 2018, 6–15.
- 115 17. H. Legros, M. Harlaux, J. Mercadier, R. L. Romer, M. Poujol, A. Camacho, C. Marignac, M. Cuney, R. C.
116 Wang, N. Charles, M. Y. Lespinasse, *Ore Geol. Rev.* 2020, **117**, 103302.
- 117 18. S. T. Li, J. B. Wang, X. Y. Zhu, Y. L. Wang, Y. Hang, N. N. Guo, *Geol. Explor.*, 2011, **47**, 143–150.
- 118 19. Q. L. Li, X. H. Li, Z. W. Lan, C. L. Guo, Y. N. Yang, Y. Liu, G. Q. Tang, *Contrib. Mineral. Petrol.*, 2013, **166**,
119 65–80.
- 120 20. X. H. Li, W. X. Li, Z. X. Li, *Chin. Sci. Bull.*, 2007, **52**, 1873–1885.
- 121 21. T. Luo, X. D. Deng, J. W. Li, Z. C. Hu, W. Zhang, Y. S. Liu, J. F. Zhang, *J. Anal. At. Spectrom.*, 2019, **34**, 1439–
122 1446.
- 123 22. V. Lüders, R. L. Romer, H. A. Gilg, R. J. Bodnar, T. Pettke, D. Misantoni, *Miner. Deposita*, 2009, **44**, 415–434.
124
- 125 23. J. W. Mao, H. Cheng, P. Franco, *Mineral Deposits*. 2013, **48**, 267–294 (In Chinese with English abstract).

- 126 24. J. W. Mao, G. Q. Xie, C. L. Guo, Y. C. Chen, *Acta Petrol. Sin.*, 2007, **23**, 2329–2338 (In Chinese with English
127 abstract).
- 128 25. R. J. Moscati, L. A. Neymark, *Miner. Deposita*, 2020, **55**, 1–20.
- 129 26. L. A. Neymark, C. S. Holm-Denoma, R. J. Moscati, *Chem. Geol.*, 2018, **483**, 410–425.
- 130 27. L. G. Ohlsson, *Miner. Deposita*, 1979, **74**, 1012–1034.
- 131 28. J. Peng, M. F. Zhou, R. Hu, N. Shen, S. Yuan, X. Bi, A. Du, W. Qu, *Miner. Deposita*, 2006, **41**, 661–669.
- 132 29. R. L. Romer, V. Lüders, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, 2006, **70**, 4725–4733.
- 133 30. R. L. Romer, B. Öhlander, *GFF*, 1994, **116**, 161–166.
- 134 31. R. L. Romer, S. A. Smeds, *Precamb. Res.*, 1997, **82**, 85–99.
- 135 32. E. Seedorff, M. T. Einaudi, *Econ. Geol.*, 2004, **99**, 3–37.
- 136 33. W. D. Smith, J. R. Darling, D. S. Bullen, S. Lasalle, I. Pereira, H. Moreira, C. J. Allen, S. Tapster, *Lithos*, 2019,
137 **336**, 14–26.
- 138 34. L. W. Snee, J. F. Sutter, W. C. Kelly, *Econ. Geol.*, 1988, **83**, 335–354.
- 139 35. T. Sun, *Geol. Bull. China*, 2006, **25**, 232–235 (in Chinese with English abstract).
- 140 36. X. Wang, M. Ren, *Ore Geol. Rev.*, 2018, **101**, 453–467.
- 141 37. Y. Wang, R. Pei, J. Li, W. Qu, L. Li, H. Wang, A. Du, *Acta Geol. Sin.-English Edition*, 2008, **82**, 820–825.
- 142 38. D. H. Wang, H. Q. Li, Y. Qin, Y. P. Mei, Z. H. Chen, W. J. Qu, Y. B. Wang, H. Cai, D. H. Gong, X. P. He,
143 *Rock and Mineral Analysis*, 2009, **28**, 201–208 (In Chinese with English abstract).
- 144 39. F. Y. Wang, C. Y. Li, M. X. Ling, H. Zhang, Y. L. Sun, W. D. Sun, *Resource Geol.*, 2011, **61**, 414–423.
- 145 40. Y. Zhang, J. H. Yang, J. Y. Chen, H. Wang, Y. X. Xiang, *Lithos*, 2017, **278–281**, 166–180.
- 146 41. W. L. Zhang, R. M. Hua, R. C. Wang, L. Xie, X. D. Che, *Mineral Deposits*, 2012, **31**, 633–634 (In Chinese with
147 English abstract).
- 148 42. W. W. Zhao, M. F. Zhou, Y. H. M. Li, Z. Zhao, J. F. Gao, *J. Asian Earth Sci.*, 2017, **137**, 109–140.
- 149 43. X. M. Zhou, T. Sun, W. Z. Shen, L. S. Shu, Y. L. Niu, *Episodes*, 2006, **29**, 26–21.