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5 S1. Governing equations and rheology calculations for the numerical models

We solve flow for incompressible Stokes fluid, under the Boussinesq approximation, assuming mass, momentum and energy conservation equations:

\[ \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial t} = 0 \]  
\[ \frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}}{\partial t} + \Delta \rho g_j = 0 \]  
\[ \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + u_i \frac{\partial T}{\partial x_i} - \kappa \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial x_i^2} = 0 \]

where \( u \) is the velocity, \( \sigma \) is the stress tensor, \( g \) is gravity, \( T \) is temperature, \( \kappa \) is the thermal diffusivity and \( \Delta \rho = -\alpha \rho_s \Delta T \) is the density difference due to temperature, with \( \alpha \) the coefficient of thermal expansion, \( \rho_s \) the reference (surface) mantle density and \( \Delta T \) the difference in temperature from the surface.

Viscosity is therefore the ratio of deviatoric stress to strain rate:

\[ \mu = \frac{\tau_{ij}}{2\dot{\varepsilon}_{ij}} = \frac{\sigma_{ij} + P\delta_{ij}}{2\dot{\varepsilon}_{ij}} \]  

where \( \tau \) is the deviatoric stress, \( \dot{\varepsilon} \) is the strain rate, \( P \) is the dynamic pressure and \( \delta_{ij} \) is the delta function. The viscosity is calculated in our models using:

\[ \mu = \left( \frac{1}{\mu_{diff}} + \frac{1}{\mu_{disl}} + \frac{1}{\mu_y} + \frac{1}{\mu_{Pie}} \right)^{-1} \]  

where \( \mu_{diff}, \mu_{disl}, \mu_y \) and \( \mu_{Pie} \) are the viscosities calculated using diffusion creep, dislocation creep, yielding mechanism and simplified Pierels creep, respectively. The viscosities derived from diffusion, dislocation and Pierels creep are calculated using the generalised equation:

\[ \mu_{diff, disl, Pie} = A \frac{1}{n} \exp \left( \frac{E + P_l V}{nRT_{ad}} \right) \dot{\varepsilon}_{ll}^{\frac{1-n}{n}} \]  
\[ P_l = \rho g D \]
temperature adjusted with an adiabatic gradient of 0.5°K/km in the upper mantle and 0.3°K/km in the lower mantle (Fowler, 2005). The yielding mechanism is calculated as:

\[ \mu_y = \frac{\tau_y}{2\dot{\varepsilon}_{II}} = \frac{\min(\tau_s + f_c P_l, \tau_{y\text{ max}})}{2\dot{\varepsilon}_{II}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (S1.8)

where \( \tau_y \) is the yield stress, \( \tau_s \) is the surface yield stress, \( f_c \) is the friction coefficient and \( \tau_{y\text{ max}} \) is the maximum yield stress.

The viscosity field is capped by both minimum and maximum values. The yielding viscosity is adjusted within the weak decoupling layer by applying a different friction coefficient:

\[ \mu_{y\text{ weak}} = \frac{\min(\tau_s + f_{c\text{ weak}} P_l, \tau_{y\text{ max}})}{2\dot{\varepsilon}_{II}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (S1.9)

The initial temperature field in the lithosphere is calculated using the half-space cooling equation from Turcotte and Schubert (2002):

\[ T = T_s + \Delta T \cdot \text{erf} \left( \frac{D}{2\sqrt{\kappa t_{\text{age}}}} \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (S1.10)

where \( T_s \) is the surface temperature and \( t_{\text{age}} \) is the age.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>UM (Reference) (a)</th>
<th>UM (modified self-consistent) (b)</th>
<th>LM (a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gravity</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>m · s⁻²</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal expansivity coefficient</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>K⁻¹</td>
<td>3.0 · 10⁻⁵</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal diffusivity</td>
<td>κ</td>
<td>m² · s⁻¹</td>
<td>10⁻⁶</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference (surface) density</td>
<td>ρₛ</td>
<td>kg · m⁻³</td>
<td>3300.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold, surface temperature</td>
<td>Tₛ</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>273.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot, mantle temperature</td>
<td>Tₘ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1573.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas constant</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>J · K⁻¹ · mol⁻¹</td>
<td>8.3145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum viscosity (Strong Lithosphere model)</td>
<td>𝜇ₘₚₓ</td>
<td>Pa · s</td>
<td>10²⁶</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum viscosity (Reference and all other models)</td>
<td>𝜇ₘᵟᵣ</td>
<td>Pa · s</td>
<td>10²⁵</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum viscosity</td>
<td>𝜇ₘᵲᵣ</td>
<td></td>
<td>10¹⁸</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diffusion Creep**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>UM (Reference) (a)</th>
<th>UM (modified self-consistent) (b)</th>
<th>LM (a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activation energy</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>J · mol⁻¹</td>
<td>300.0 · 10³</td>
<td>335.0 · 10³</td>
<td>200.0 · 10³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activation volume</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>m³ · mol⁻¹</td>
<td>4.0 · 10⁻⁶</td>
<td>5.0 · 10⁻⁶</td>
<td>1.5 · 10⁻⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-factor</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Pa⁻ⁿ · s⁻¹</td>
<td>3.0 · 10⁻¹¹</td>
<td>1.5 · 10⁻⁹</td>
<td>6.0 · 10⁻¹⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress exponent</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dislocation Creep (UM)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>UM (Reference) (a)</th>
<th>UM (modified self-consistent) (b)</th>
<th>LM (a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activation energy</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>J · mol⁻¹</td>
<td>540.0 · 10³</td>
<td>472.0 · 10³</td>
<td>300.0 · 10³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activation volume</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>m³ · mol⁻¹</td>
<td>12.0 · 10⁻⁶</td>
<td>11.0 · 10⁻⁶</td>
<td>2.0 · 10⁻⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-factor</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Pa⁻ⁿ · s⁻¹</td>
<td>5.0 · 10⁻¹⁶</td>
<td>1.34 · 10⁻¹⁷</td>
<td>10⁻⁴²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress exponent</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.472</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peierls Creep (UM)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>UM (Reference) (a)</th>
<th>UM (modified self-consistent) (b)</th>
<th>LM (a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activation energy</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>J · mol⁻¹</td>
<td>540.0 · 10³</td>
<td>540.0 · 10³</td>
<td>300.0 · 10³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activation volume</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>m³ · mol⁻¹</td>
<td>10.0 · 10⁻⁶</td>
<td>10.0 · 10⁻⁶</td>
<td>2.0 · 10⁻⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-factor</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Pa⁻ⁿ · s⁻¹</td>
<td>10⁻¹⁵⁰</td>
<td>10⁻¹⁴⁵</td>
<td>10⁻³⁰⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress exponent</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Yield Strength Law**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>UM (Reference) (a)</th>
<th>UM (modified self-consistent) (b)</th>
<th>LM (a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface yield strength</td>
<td>τₛ</td>
<td>MPa</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friction coefficient</td>
<td>fₖ</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friction coefficient (decoupling layer)</td>
<td>fₖₜₜₑᵃₜₑᵃ_PERSONAL_NAME</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum yield strength</td>
<td>τₘₚₓ</td>
<td>MPa</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table S1-1: Physical and rheological parameters of all models, following the model set-up used by Garel et al., 2014. (a) Activation parameters and stress exponent are consistent with experimental data on olivine (e.g., Karato and Wu, 1993; Hirth and Kohlstedt, 1995; Ranalli, 1995; Hirth and Kohlstedt, 2003; Korenaga and Karato, 2008). Lower mantle pre-factor value for dislocation and Peierls creep are set at a low value to ensure diffusion creep-controlled viscosity in the lower mantle (in accordance with eq. S1.5). (b) Upper mantle values for the modified self-consistent models were determined using optimisation method described in Maunder et al., 2016. See main text for further details.
S2. Illustration of the evolution of all models discussed in the main text

Figure S2-1: Viscosity field evolution at various times, similar to Fig. 3, for the long-plate case (top row of each model) and short-plate case (bottom row of each model) for all models. White contour marks the 1100 °C isotherm used as the outline of the lithosphere. The vertical and horizontal scales are identical and only part of the full model domain is shown. $t-t_{660}$ indicates the time since the initial interaction of the slab with the ULMB. Grey lines mark 220 km, 660 km (ULMB) and 1000 km depths.
Figure S2-1 (continued)
Combined weak asthenosphere and strong lithosphere (factor 2)

Combined weak asthenosphere and strong lithosphere (factor 10)

Figure S2-1 (continued)
Figure S2-1: Temporal evolution, similar to Fig. 4, of the long-plate case (full lines) and the short-plate case (dashed lines) for all models. t-t$_{660}$ indicates the time since the initial interaction of the slab with the ULMB. Panels show (from top left panel, along rows from top to bottom): (1) Velocity of the subducting plate (positive towards the upper plate, red) and the trench (positive away from the upper plate, yellow), measured at 2000 km distance from the initial subducting plate ridge (left hand boundary). (2) Displacement of the subducting plate (red) and the trench (yellow) relative to the initial condition. (3) Percent of plate convergence (calculated as the sum of trench retreat and plate displacement) achieved by trench retreat. (4) Upper-mantle slab pull and basal drag below the subducting plate, calculated as described in the main text. (5) Basal drag force from (4). (6) Ratio of basal drag to upper mantle slab pull force.
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**Figure S2-2 (continued)**
Figure S2-3 (a) Temporal evolution of parameters used for the calculation of basal drag (see main text for further details), for the long-plate reference model (left panels) and short-plate reference model (right panels). Top panel shows the velocities of the lithosphere (red line) and asthenosphere (blue line) (measured along the dashed and dotted lines in the bottom panel, respectively). Middle panel shows the magnitude of the viscosity of the asthenosphere (green line, measured along the dotted line in the bottom panel). Bottom panel shows a vertical profile (0-660 km depth) of the magnitude of the viscosity field. White lines mark the base of the lithosphere (1100°C isotherm) and asthenosphere (constant depth of 220 km). Parameters for the lithosphere were measured at 20 km depth (black dashed line) and parameters for the asthenosphere at 160 km depth (black dotted line). Time before the initial interaction of the slab with the ULMB, t660, is not shown in Fig. 4, 6 and 2.2 and shaded in this figure. (b) Location of the vertical profile location along which the quantities in (a) are measured (brown line), marked on an outline of the lithosphere at the initial condition of the long-plate reference model (magenta line) and the short-plate reference model (green line). The vertical and horizontal spatial scales are identical and only part of the full model domain is shown. Grey lines mark 220 km, 660 km (ULMB) and 1000 km depth.
S3. Cenozoic subduction zone parameters

We used GPlates (Müller et al., 2018) with the plate reconstruction of Müller et al. (2016) to make an updated compilation of the average velocities, average age at the trench and size of the subducting plates for major subduction zones through the Cenozoic (0-60 Ma). This was done for all trenches previously studied by Sdrolias and Müller (2006) who considered the Andean subduction zone, Central-North Farallon subduction systems, subduction below Alaska and the Aleutians, subduction below Japan-Kuriles-Kamchatka, subduction below Izu-Bonin-Marianas, below Tonga-Kermadec and below the Sunda-Banda arc. To these we added the subduction of the Philippine Sea plate and the final stages of the subduction of the Izanagi and Kula plates. In processing this database, we considered all the Pacific subduction systems (i.e. Alaska-Aleutians, Japan-Kuriles-Kamchatka, Izu-Bonin-Marianas and Tonga-Kermadec) as a single Pacific system.

The relevant trenches were identified by extracting the global subducted segments of all plate polygons in GPlates. All trenches were sampled at 50 km intervals, and the coordinates were output and then plotted to select those belonging to the major subducting plate systems listed above. For each selected system, age and velocities along the trench were plotted every 10 Myr to check that all data made sense, and to remove edge points where these were clearly anomalous from the rest of the trench (e.g. because of an anomalous age or convergence direction). We evaluated the point velocity of the subducting plate, of the overriding plate as well as convergence velocity and direction to select the segments to analyse. Maps showing the trench segments included in our analysis at each stage can be found in Fig. S3-1, where the sampling points along the trenches are also coloured according to the subducting plate absolute velocity (in the moving hotspot reference frame of O’Neill et al., 2005) and age. These maps illustrate the evolving set of subduction systems through the Cenozoic as well as the variability of age and velocity along each trench. Aside from some edge points, we excluded from our analysis the part of the South American trench at 40 and 50 Myr which was south of the Antarctic ridge and the Cocos subduction system at 20 Ma, because according to the plate motion model there is limited convergence along most of the trench at this time. Finally, we considered for our analysis the mean value of the velocities and trench age for each subducting system, and the standard variation of the mean value as the uncertainty.
There is some variation of both velocity and age along each trench, and each trench has a unique tectonic evolution. Nonetheless, the lack of a trend between velocity and size and the overall correlation between size and age are general features of the Cenozoic set of subduction zones, not dependent on including or excluding one or the other system, or on different definitions of each system, or on consideration of the total subducting plate velocity or only the normal component of velocity.

Figure S3-1: Evolution of velocities and ages along the trenches considered in the global analysis of Cenozoic subduction systems, in intervals of 10 Myr. 3 maps are shown for each time interval, displaying the trenches used for the analysis (left), absolute subducting plate velocity in hotspot reference frame (O’Neill et al., 2005; middle) and age at the trench (right). Grey lines represent other boundaries of the subducting plates. The background light grey shows present day global coastlines for reference. Data is based on Müller et al. (2016) and processed using GPlates and Cartopy (Met Office, 2015; Müller et al., 2018).
Figure S3-2: Velocity of subducting plates as a function of plate size. Plate size as typical length is calculated as the square root of the surface area of the plate. (a) Cenozoic dataset is based on plate reconstruction from Müller et al. (2016) and analysed using GPlates (Müller et al., 2018). Large markers indicate present day values from this reconstruction. (b) Present day velocities from Schellart et al. (2007) and Sdrolias and Müller (2006), as a function of plate size from Conrad and Hager (1999), same as shown in Fig. 1. All velocities are calculated in lower mantle (plume) reference frame (O’Neill et al., 2005).
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