

# 1 Photoperiod and temperature interactively drive spring phenology in multiple species

2 Flynn, Wolkovich

3 *The Arnold Arboretum of Harvard University*

4 Understanding the sensitivity of forest plants at the species level to abiotic drivers of plant phenology  
5 is critical for developing predictions of community composition, changes in community composition  
6 resulting from climate change, and resulting alterations to ecosystem-level properties such as carbon  
7 sequestration. While observational studies of long-term trends are essential for understanding how  
8 climate affects timing of phenological events, experimental manipulations are necessary to disentangle  
9 otherwise covarying environmental factors and directly assess species- and individual-level responses to  
10 climate change factors. Observational studies have additionally known difficulties in teasing out plant  
11 responses to climate, with responses expected to be based on one or several major cues plant receive  
12 from the fall to spring: chilling temperatures, photoperiod and spring forcing temperatures. For a  
13 handful of well-studied temperate woody species these cues appear to be interactive, meaning  
14 predictions of plant responses to climate change will be complex and non-linear [1]. Other work  
15 however has suggested many species may be dominated by one of the three possible cues [2], with a  
16 tradeoff between photoperiod and forcing temperature sensitivities, making some species responses  
17 simple to predict. However, range of responses across species within a forest community to winter  
18 chilling temperatures, photoperiod, and spring forcing temperatures have received relatively limited  
19 attention. Given the wide range of budburst and leafout across temperate woody species [3], these  
20 species differences may be crucial in scaling up to ecosystem-level responses. Here we present results  
21 from an experimental manipulation of spring forcing temperatures, photoperiod, and intensity of  
22 winter chilling with dormant clippings of 28 woody plant species from forest communities at two  
23 latitudes (42.5°N and 46°N). We show photoperiod sensitivity is common across northeastern woody  
24 plants and phenological sensitivity to photoperiod and temperature appears largely coordinated across  
25 species (i.e., species highly sensitive to temperature were also highly sensitive to photoperiod), with  
26 greater sensitivity of budburst and leafout to temperature than to photoperiod. Winter chilling exerts  
27 a large role in driving advances in spring phenology, for both budburst and leafout stages, yet  
28 surprisingly more intense chilling at 1.5°C resulted in less pronounced effects than at 4°C. Latitude of  
29 origin exerted surprisingly small effects on sensitivity to abiotic factors in driving spring phenology,  
30 indicating that local adaptation—at least across 4° of latitude—may not necessarily constrain woody  
31 plant responses to climate change. Shrub and small tree species were less sensitive to changing  
32 temperatures or photoperiod, but consistently earlier in their phenology. These results indicate that

**under warming conditions, communities could shift to a more canopy-tree dominated system.**

Woody plant spring phenology drives global carbon cycles and local ecosystem properties, from the length of the growing season to energy balance between land and atmosphere. The crucial role that phenology plays in these ecosystem processes, and the indications that plant and animal phenology are advancing as rapidly as 2.3°C per decade (Menzel 2006) have led to increased attention to

While observational studies of long-term trends are essential for understanding how climate affects timing of phenological events, experimental manipulations can disentangle otherwise covarying environmental factors and directly assess species- and individual-level responses to climate change factors.

Knowing species-specific sensitivities of temperate plant phenology to chilling and forcing alone can predict regional-scale phenology [4]. Substantial variation exists at the species level in the magnitude of the temporal advance of spring phenology (Primack 2009), such that the presence of species highly sensitive to temperature change can strongly drive community-level phenology [5].

Early phenological events such as bud swelling and budburst are challenging to study from remote sensing, requiring experimental work at the individual level.

Timing of spring phenology is critical for understanding net ecosystem assimilation at the forest scale, as maximizing the length of the growing season and minimizing risk of tissue loss due to early spring freezing depends on accurate timing of budburst and leafout [6].

For temperate trees, species can be limited at their northern range by inability to develop mature fruit in a given growing season, while limited at their southern range by inability to break dormancy due to insufficient chilling [7]. Thus phenology can drive range limits.

To what extent do winter chilling requirements act as additional conservative strategy to avoid damage from early spring freezing?

Do populations at northern sites, with more severe winters and shorter winter daylength, exhibit more conservative phenological strategies?

Photoperiod has long been known to be a critical driver of the onset of endormancy, in combination with cooling temperatures [8]. However, the role of photoperiod in determining the breaking of dormancy has been debated, with various authors finding that the strength of daylength as a driver may depend on phenological stage, species and location [9] [10]. Photoperiod and winter chilling can interact, as long as photoperiod enhances cell growth, compensating for a lack of chilling during the endodormancy phase [11] [12] [13]. In the few experimental studies that have directly manipulated both forcing temperature and photoperiod, photoperiod has been shown to act in

A literature review (see Supplemental Materials) shows that at most four species have been examined for photoperiod and temperature cues in a manipulative study to date.

Different phenological stages may be driven by different environmental cues. The period between budburst and leafout is critical for leaf development, as this is a period when plants are highly sensitive to damage from early frosts ADD CITES. Thus we carried out our tests for both budburst and leafout. We predicted that budburst would be generally less predictable than leafout.

## Results

Temperature and photoperiod individually and interactively determined timing of leaf-out, with the strongest effects of temperature in short-day conditions. We found photoperiod sensitivity was common and strong across all of the woody plants studies, consistently reducing time to phenological responses for each species, across sites of origin.

For the 28 species studied, sensitivity to temperature and photoperiod cues for leaf-out times varied substantially, and—in contrast to our hypotheses [that we set up in the intro]—co-varied overall. The coordinated response to warming temperatures and longer photoperiod was consistent with overall pace of phenological events; earlier-leaving out species (namely the shrubs *Spiraea alba*, *Viburnum cassanoides*, and *Vaccinium myrtilloides*) exhibited relatively limited advances to either warming or longer days, while later leafing-out species showed ability to advance their phenology by in response to both warming and longer days. Thus, no trade-off was observed between photoperiod-cued and temperature-cued species, but rather species exhibit coordinated responses to both environmental factors (Fig. 1). Of the other species, *Fagus grandifolia* exhibits relatively limited response to warming but substantial photoperiod sensitivity, while *Rhamnus frangula* shows relatively limited response to photoperiod but substantial warming sensitivity; if only a small subset of species including these two had been included in the study, it might have been concluded that a tradeoff between photoperiod sensitivity and warming sensitivity would exist.

While both photoperiod and temperature cues were important for driving woody plant phenology, responses to chilling were also substantial. Budburst day was accelerated most by the chilling treatments. Tables 1 and 2 summarizes hierarchical mixed-effects model analysis of day of budburst and leaf-out, with negative values indicate earlier day of experiment for each event. Overall the 5°C experimental warming resulted in 6.8 days earlier budburst and 21.9 days earlier leafout. Such advance was delayed by the each chilling treatment, as indicated by the positive coefficient for the temperature x chilling interactions. Latitude of origin (Site) overall

had little direct effect on budburst or leaf-out, but populations from the northern site tended to exhibit slower budburst and leaf-out, with a more rapid budburst and leafout in response to the chilling treatments (indicated by negative coefficients for site x chilling treatments).

Warming, photoperiod, and chilling individually and interactively acted to drive budburst and leafout earlier across species. The strength of the acceleration in budburst due to both warming and photoperiod were similar, but the acceleration of leafout due to warming exceeded that of photoperiod for both phenological stages. Surprisingly, site of origin exerted limited effect on either budburst or leafout across species.

## Effect of chilling

The cuttings were harvested in late January 2015, and thus experienced substantial natural chilling by the time they were harvested. Using weather station data from the Harvard Forest and St. Hippolyte site, chilling hours (below 7.2°C), Utah Model chill portions (hours below 7.2°C and between 0°C and 7.2°C) and Dynamic Model [14] chill portions were calculated both for the natural chilling experienced by harvest and the chilling experienced in the 4°C and 1.5°C treatments. The Utah Model and Dynamic Model of chill portions account for variation in the amount of chilling accumulated at different temperatures, with the greatest chilling occurring approximately between 5-10°C, and fewer chill portions accumulating at low temperatures and that higher temperatures can reduce accumulated chilling effects. The two differ in the parameters used to determine the shape of the chilling accumulation curve, with the Dynamic Model being shown to be the most successful in predicting phenology for some woody species [15]. With both the Utah and Dynamic model, the more severe chilling treatment resulted in fewer calculated chilling portions.

Species varied widely in response to chilling treatments, with some exhibiting strong chilling requirements (*Acer saccharum*, *Fagus grandifolia*), while others exhibited little change in phenological advancement under experimentally manipulated chilling. Overall, budburst and leaf-out advanced by 22.1 or 26.4 days under additional 30 d of vernalization at 4°C, and advanced by a reduced amount of 19.7 or 26.1 days under 30 d of vernalization at 1.5°C. The reduced chilling effect at the lower temperature chilling is consistent with the Dynamic Model of chilling accumulation.

Species-specific responses to chilling demonstrate that chilling requirements are not uniform across species, with of *Fagus grandifolia* to increasingly strong vernalization varies by latitude of origin and by phenological stage; winter chilling reduced day to budburst and leaf-out, but more strongly for individuals from the northern site.

While nearly all species showed advances in spring phenology in response to the experimental chilling treatment, as indicated by fewer days to phenological events for the 4°C and 1.5°C treatments, the majority of species (e.g.

*Populus grandidentata*) showed delays in both budburst and leafout at the more severe chilling treatment. Of the species exposed to the additional chilling, only *Fagus grandifolia* was consistently advanced by the more severe chilling.

## Species-specific responses

Species traits partly explain variation in warming and photoperiod sensitivities of leafout. Plants with high nitrogen leaves, as well as high SLA (thinner, less dense) leaves, were significantly later in both budburst and leafout. Thus early leafout species tended to be tougher, less N-dense, and have higher carbon investments than later species. Greater wood density had inconsistent effects as a driver, with higher wood density driving later budburst but tending to drive earlier leafout.

Ring-porous species (*Fraxinus* sp., *Lonicera*, *Myrica*, and *Quercus*; lower values of Pore Anatomy variable) exhibited significantly later budburst and leafout compared to diffuse-porous species, in line with previous work on wood anatomy and freezing risk [16].

Shrubs with low specific leaf area (thick/dense leaves) and high stem density were more likely to leaf out earlier. For trees, with an overall later leafout pattern,

## Nonleafouts

Separate analysis of samples which did not break bud or leafout. Across species, there was no overall predictive effect of temperature, photoperiod, chilling, or site on the propensity to fail to leaf out. Species ranged from complete leafout (*Hamamelis*) to only 50% leafout (*Fagus grandifolia*, *Acer saccharum*) across all treatments. The percent of nonleafouts by site was similar, with 12.4% of Harvard Forest and 9.5% of St. Hippolyte samples failing to leaf out. Examining individual species, there was an interaction of temperature by daylength for some species, with greater failure to leafout in cool, short conditions for *Acer pensylvanicum* and *Acer saccharum*. Site effects were inconsistent, with greater failure to leafout for cuttings from St. Hippolyte in *Acer rubrum* and *Fagus grandifolia*, and from Harvard Forest in *Acer saccharum*.

Rank order of leafout and budburst was stable across warming and photoperiod treatments. Chilling treatments shifted the order, for example *Fagus grandifolia* was always the 23-28th species to burst bud in chill0, but always the 10-11th species to burst bud in chill1 and chill2. Within chilling treatments, the standard deviation of the rank order ranged from 2.05 (budburst, chill0) to 0.75 (leafout, chill1). Compared to field observations, rank order of leafout was generally most related in the cool, short-day treatment with no additional chilling (Fig. S10).

## Discussion

- Photoperiod sensitivity is common in northeastern woody plants; Phenological sensitivity to photoperiod and temperature are largely coordinated across species.
- Chilling is the most important factor, even of greater importance than forcing. Mild winters spur greater phenological advancement than colder winters. Chilling much more important than temperature or photoperiod in driving earlier budbreak, and still relatively more important for leafout. Chilling and forcing temperature are more substitutable than chilling and photoperiod, for both budburst and leafout.
- Only limited support for risk-avoidance strategies for northern populations of these 28 species was found, with small delays in both phenological events for populations from the more northern site. The latitudinal range studied here is within the range of the phenotypic flexibility of these species. Of these study species, we should not be overly concerned about being photoperiod limited at the more northern sites; given sufficient pace of dispersal, they will be able to track a changing climate.
- Budburst is sensitive to the same environmental cues as leafout, but species show idiosyncratic orderings of their sensitivity to environmental cues at these two phenological stages; leafout responses can not necessarily be used to back-cast budburst responses. Budburst showed a more limited total response to environmental cues, and species were more tightly clustered in those responses.
- Surprisingly, the smaller statured, earlier-leafing out shrubs and small trees exhibited reduced sensitivity to all three factors of temperature, photoperiod, and chilling. They are relatively more fixed in their timing of both budburst and leafout, perhaps indicating an alternative mechanism for timing of spring phenology in these plants, such depending on carbohydrate metabolism to time budburst [17].
- Given these results, the future of the northeastern forests may shift away from shrubs and small trees, as late-successional, later-event species demonstrated a greater ability to lengthen their growing seasons opportunistically in response to warmer temperatures.

## Methods

### Field sampling

Woody plant cuttings were made in January 2015 for 28 species which occurred in both Harvard Forest (HF, 42.5°N, 72.2°W) and the Station de Biologie des Laurentides in St-Hippolyte, Quebec (SH, 45.9°N, 74.0°W).

The typical late January temperatures are -3.4 and -22°C, respectively; daylength between these two sites differs by a maximum of 45 minutes. Weather station data from each field site was obtained for calculations of chilling units.

Cuttings were grown in growth chambers at the Arnold Arboretum in Boston, MA, in distilled water, with water changed every 7-10 days. Cuttings of an individual tree were exposed to each of 12 experimental treatments in a fully-factorial design: 2 temperature (20°C / 10°C warm vs. 15°C / 5°C cool) x 2 photoperiod (12 vs. 8 h) x 3 chilling (zero, 33 d at 4°C, 33 d at 1.5°C) treatments.

With 6 replicates of these species across 6 experimental treatments being monitored at 5-7 day intervals for over 3 months, we made over 17,500 individual phenological observations following a modified BBCH scale.

**Growth chamber experiment** Cuttings were kept in Erlenmyer flasks with distilled water. Water was changed every 7-12 days, with the bases of cuttings re-cut each time under water to prevent callusing.

Phenology was assessed using a modified BBCH scale [18], with observations on each of the 2136 cuttings made every 2-3 days for the course of the 82-day experiment.

#### Statistical analysis

Linear mixed effects models in R, then stan.

## References Cited

## References

[1] Chuine, I. & Cour, P. Climatic determinants of budburst seasonality in four temperate-zone tree species.

*New Phytologist* **143**, 339–349 (1999).

[2] Körner, C. & Basler, D. Phenology under global warming. *Science* **327**, 1461–1462 (2010).

[3] Polgar, C. A. & Primack, R. B. Leaf-out phenology of temperate woody plants: from trees to

ecosystems. *New Phytologist* **191**, 926–941 (2011). URL

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/store/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2011.03803.x/asset/j.1469-8137.2011.03803.x.pdf?v=1t=icm7hgeys=3ca10a38b674b1048e0f0906bd4640192d52b7fc>.

[4] Chuine, I., Cambon, G. & Comtois, P. Scaling phenology from the local to the regional level: advances

from species-specific phenological models. *Global Change Biology* **6**, 943–952 (2000). URL

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2486.2000.00368.x>.

- [5] Diez, J. M. *et al.* Forecasting phenology: from species variability to community patterns. *Ecol Lett* **15**, 545–53 (2012). URL <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22433120>.
- [6] Basler, D. & Körner, C. Photoperiod and temperature responses of bud swelling and bud burst in four temperate forest tree species. *Tree physiology* **34**, 377–388 (2014). URL <http://treephys.oxfordjournals.org/content/34/4/377.full.pdf>.
- [7] Chuine, I. Why does phenology drive species distribution? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences* **365**, 3149–3160 (2010).
- [8] Foley, M. E., Anderson, J. V. & Horvath, D. P. The effects of temperature, photoperiod, and vernalization on regrowth and flowering competence in *Euphorbia esula* (Euphorbiaceae) crown buds. *Botany* **87**, 986–992 (2009).
- [9] Heide, O. Dormancy release in beech buds (*Fagus sylvatica*) requires both chilling and long days. *Physiologia Plantarum* **89**, 187–191 (1993).
- [10] Falusi, M. & Calamassi, R. Geographic variation and bud dormancy in beech seedlings (*Fagus sylvatica* L). In *Annales des Sciences forestières*, vol. 53, 967–979 (EDP Sciences, 1996).
- [11] Heide, O. Daylength and thermal time responses of budburst during dormancy release in some northern deciduous trees. *Physiologia Plantarum* **88**, 531–540 (1993).
- [12] Caffarra, A., Donnelly, A., Chuine, I. & Jones, M. B. Modelling the timing of *Betula pubescens* bud-burst. i. temperature and photoperiod: A conceptual model. *Climate Research* **46**, 147 (2011).
- [13] Myking, T. & Heide, O. Dormancy release and chilling requirement of buds of latitudinal ecotypes of *Betula pendula* and *B. pubescens*. *Tree physiology* **15**, 697–704 (1995). URL <http://treephys.oxfordjournals.org/content/15/11/697.full.pdf>.
- [14] Erez, A., Fishman, S., Gat, Z. & Couvillon, G. A. Evaluation of winter climate for breaking bud rest using the dynamic model 76–89 (1988). URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.17660/ActaHortic.1988.232.10>.
- [15] Luedeling, E., Zhang, M., McGranahan, G. & Leslie, C. Validation of winter chill models using historic records of walnut phenology. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **149**, 1854–1864 (2009).
- [16] Sperry, J. S. & Sullivan, J. E. Xylem embolism in response to freeze-thaw cycles and water stress in ring-porous, diffuse-porous, and conifer species. *Plant Physiology* **100**, 605–613 (1992).



- [17] Pagter, M., Andersen, U. B. & Andersen, L. Winter warming delays dormancy release, advances budburst, alters carbohydrate metabolism and reduces yield in a temperate shrub. *AoB plants* **7**, plv024 (2015).
- [18] Finn, G. A., Straszewski, A. E. & Peterson, V. A general growth stage key for describing trees and woody plants. *Annals of Applied Biology* **151**, 127–131 (2007).

## Figures and Tables

### List of Tables

1	Chill units in field and field and growth chamber conditions. . . . .	13
2	Phylogenetic signal in timing of budburst and leafout and species specific traits, as estimated in the caper package with simultaneous fitting of lambda. Pore anatomy (ring- versus diffuse-porous species) was highly clustered phylogenetically, but no other trait examined demonstrated significant phylogenetic signal . . . . .	13
3	Trees, budburst . . . . .	13
4	Trees, leafout . . . . .	13
5	Shrubs, budburst . . . . .	13
6	Shrubs, leafout . . . . .	14

### List of Figures

1	Coordinated responses of 28 woody plant species to photoperiod and temperature cues for leafout. Color of circle reflect average leafout day across treatments, across sites of origin, while size of circle represents the total number of clippings in the experiment—this varies mainly based on whether the species was found at both sites and whether it was exposed to all three chilling treatments, see Supp X for more details. . . . .	10
2	Modeled effects plots, Budburst and Leafout . . . . .	11
3	Sensitivity of budburst and leafout to warming, leafout, and chilling. . . . .	12

Figure 1: Coordinated responses of 28 woody plant species to photoperiod and temperature cues for leafout. Color of circle reflect average leafout day across treatments, across sites of origin, while size of circle represents the total number of clippings in the experiment—this varies mainly based on whether the species was found at both sites and whether it was exposed to all three chilling treatments, see Supp X for more details.




Figure 2: Modeled effects plots, Budburst and Leafout




Figure 3: Sensitivity of budburst and leafout to warming, leafout, and chilling.




Table 1: Chill units in field and field and growth chamber conditions.

Site	Treatment	Chilling Hours	Utah Model	Chill portions
Harvard Forest	Field chilling	892	814.50	56.62
	4.0 °C x 30 d	2140	2062.50	94.06
	1.5 °C x 30 d	2140	1702.50	91.17
St. Hippolyte	Field chilling	682	599.50	44.63
	4.0 °C x 30 d	1930	1847.50	82.06
	1.5 °C x 30 d	1930	1487.50	79.18

Table 2: Phylogenetic signal in timing of budburst and leafout and species specific traits, as estimated in the caper package with simultaneous fitting of lambda. Pore anatomy (ring- versus diffuse-porous species) was highly clustered phylogenetically, but no other trait examined demonstrated significant phylogenetic signal

Relationship	Lambda
SLA - Temperature	0.000
SLA - Photoperiod	0.000
SLA - Chilling 4 °C	0.000
SLA - Chilling 1.5 °C	0.000
Wood Density - Temperature	0.000
Wood Density - Photoperiod	0.000
Wood Density - Chilling 4 °C	0.000
Wood Density - Chilling 1.5 °C	0.000
% N - Temperature	0.285
% N - Photoperiod	0.203
% N - Chilling 4 °C	0.127
% N - Chilling 1.5 °C	0.130
Pore anatomy - Temperature	1.000
Pore anatomy - Photoperiod	1.000
Pore anatomy - Chilling 4 °C	1.000
Pore anatomy - Chilling 1.5 °C	1.000

Table 3: Trees, budburst

	est	se	stat	p	lwr	upr
Intercept	29.45	0.37	78.70	0.00	28.72	30.19
Stem density	2.16	0.48	4.47	0.00	1.21	3.11
SLA	1.70	0.38	4.52	0.00	0.96	2.44
Pore anatomy	-4.81	0.37	-12.89	0.00	-5.55	-4.08

Table 4: Trees, leafout

	est	se	stat	p	lwr	upr
Intercept	42.91	0.44	97.56	0.00	42.04	43.77
Stem density	-2.81	0.60	-4.68	0.00	-3.98	-1.63
SLA	2.07	0.44	4.74	0.00	1.21	2.92
Pore anatomy	-3.52	0.42	-8.35	0.00	-4.35	-2.70

Table 5: Shrubs, budburst

	est	se	stat	p	lwr	upr
Intercept	23.76	0.53	45.07	0.00	22.72	24.79
Stem density	-4.59	0.79	-5.84	0.00	-6.13	-3.04
SLA	0.29	0.52	0.55	0.58	-0.74	1.32
Pore anatomy	1.58	1.27	1.25	0.21	-0.91	4.07

Table 6: Shrubs, leafout

	est	se	stat	p	lwr	upr
Intercept	27.16	0.68	39.69	0.00	25.82	28.50
Stem density	0.56	0.93	0.60	0.55	-1.28	2.39
SLA	2.32	0.57	4.06	0.00	1.20	3.45
Pore anatomy	-1.11	1.63	-0.68	0.50	-4.32	2.10