**Working Title:** The genetic basis of two flowering time cues in switchgrass (*Panicum virgatum*)

**Authors:** Alice MacQueen\*, Li Zhang\*, Jason Bonette, …who else? …, Tom Juenger

**Intended Audience:**

**Target Journal:**

**Possible Friendly Reviewers/Reviewers**

**Abstract**

Switchgrass (*Panicum virgatum*) is a perennial, warm-season species native to North America which has evolved into multiple divergent populations that vary in ploidy, morphology, and phenological timing. Its potential uses have expanded in the past few decades to include biofuels. Flowering time is a key life-history trait for biofuel production, as plants cease biomass accumulation upon completion of floral development. Here, we present evidence that photoperiodic sensitivity in switchgrass flowering time varies between genetic subpopulations using a diversity panel grown at eight field sites in the central United States spanning 17 degrees of latitude. We then map the genetic basis of flowering time in this population and in an independent four-way cross created from two highly divergent southern lowland and northern upland populations. We describe eight additive QTLs across these seven field sites with moderate effects on flowering, five of which had overlapping significant associations in the diversity panel. \_sentence about major gene candidates found – prevalence of genes involved in \_\_/expressed in \_\_.

**Introduction**

The timing of floral development is a major component of plant fitness affected by multiple external environmental cues (e.g. temperature, daylength, and water availability) that signal existing or upcoming growing conditions. Genetic responses to these cues determine the speed, timing, and energy apportioned to reproductive growth, shaping both the individual’s lifespan and its lifetime production of viable seed. Global climate forcing is increasing temperatures and causing more extreme weather events, such as droughts, heatwaves, and severe rain events (Ummenhofer and Meehl, 2017). These events will alter both the timing of reproductive development and the reliability of the environmental signals that plants use to cue flowering. It is thus of increasing importance that we understand the environmental cues driving floral development and the genetics underlying flowering responses to understand the genetic potential for adaptation to novel, changing environments.

Switchgrass (*Panicum virgatum*) is a warm-season perennial with wide environmental adaptation across the eastern half of North America. The US Department of Energy named switchgrass a model herbaceous biofuel feedstock in 1992

14, and since then, cultivars have been bred that significantly outproduce ethanol relative to maize and other cellulosic feedstocks15. Over the course of one season, switchgrass behaves as a determinate plant. It typically produces a single flush of tillers, which all become reproductive after a period of vegetative (leaf) development, and – critically for a biofuel crop – cease biomass accumulation upon completion of floral development (Van Esbroeck et al 2003).

Spring growth is initiated by “adequate temperature” according to McMillan and Weiler (1959), with adequacy thought to be dependent on the cultivar (Parrish and Fike 2005). During vegetative growth, switchgrass phenology is closely correlated with growing degree days (GDD), the cumulative mean daily temperature less a base temperature (Madakadze et al 1998c; Sanderson and Wolf, 1995a, 1995b). A base temperature of 12 C for vegetative and reproductive development is commonly used for growth models (Kiniry et al 2005, Kinery et al 2008a, Berhman et al 2013). However, base temperatures vary by cultivar (Madakadze et al 2003) and there may be a photoperiod or vernalization mechanism rather than a temperature threshold *per se* that triggers spring growth (Parish and Fike 2005).

Switchgrass is considered a short-day plant that flowers when exposed to shortening days of a specific length (Benedict, 1940) and reproductive development is strongly linked to day-of-the year (Cornelius and Johnston, 1941; Eberhart and Newell, 1959; Hopkins et al., 1995a; Sanderson and Wolf, 1995a). However, the nature of switchgrass photoperiodicity may be genotype dependent – both northern and southern cultivars with distinctive upland and lowland ecotypes flowered under both 12 and 16 hour photoperiods, but flowering was delayed in the upland cultivar (Van Esbroeck et al 2003). Photoperiodicity likely differs with plant latitude of origin (Parish and Fike 2005). Moving plants from southern populations northward is thought to delay flowering, increasing leaf number and yields, while moving northern populations to southern latitudes is thought to hasten the transition to reproductive development, reducing vegetative growth and biomass yield (Sanderson et al 1996).

Switchgrass has substantial untapped genetic and morphological diversity, with tetraploid and octoploid individuals (cite), three distinctive ecotypes, and three geographically distinct, deeply diverged genetic subpopulations within tetraploid individuals (Lovell et al 20XX). Upland individuals are smaller in stature than lowland individuals, other big differences (cite). There is also a coastal ecotype with lowland whole-plant characteristics and upland leaf characteristics (Lovell et al 20XX). This diversity, particularly the genetic differences in flowering date and photoperiod response, can be a point of exploitation in biomass crop breeding. Breeding for plants with earlier greenup and later flowering dates may allow growers in the northern United States to take advantage of longer growing seasons, as photoperiod-sensitive strains will accumulate more biomass before flowering, contributing to higher biomass yields (cite?). Alternatively, breeding for cultivars with larger cumulative GDD requirements could increase the heat requirement needed for switchgrass development and stabilize switchgrass biomass yields at higher levels, which could help offset the negative impacts of climate warming (cite). However, despite substantial study of the mechanisms controlling switchgrass development, genetics of flowering and prediction equations with broad application remain elusive.

Here, we grow and phenotype a diversity panel of 978 distinct switchgrass genotypes, clonal replicates of which were planted at eight common garden sites across 17 degrees of latitude. We use this panel to interrogate environmental mechanisms controlling greenup and flowering. We then use a F2 cross between individuals from the most distinctive subpopulations for flowering response to dissect the genetics of flowering in these groups. Finally, we combine the results from this cross with genome-wide association results from the diversity panel to narrow in on candidate genes affecting flowering date. Taken together, our results allow us to describe the environmental cues, genes, and alleles affecting flowering across multiple distinct switchgrass populations.

**Results**

*Diversity panel captures the range of phenological responses across the common gardens*

In 2019, we grew and phenotyped a diversity panel of 978 distinct, clonally propagated switchgrass genotypes at eight common gardens. These common gardens cover the majority of the latitudinal and climatic range of switchgrass and therefore capture the most comprehensive picture to date of genotype-specific environmental plasticity, or genotype-by-environment interactions, in this species. We scored plant green up and flowering at these common gardens every three days. Given the deep genetic divergence within this species, we divided these switchgrass genotypes into five categories: tetraploid individuals in the Atlantic, Midwest, and Gulf genetic subpopulations with sequence data (Lovell et al 202X), admixed/unsequenced tetraploid individuals, and octoploid individuals. We then explored the overall patterns of greenup and flowering within these five subpopulations.

We first evaluated the evidence that switchgrass photoperiodicity was genotype dependent – specifically, that switchgrass genotypes flowered when exposed to shortening days of a specific length. Many genotypes flowered while days were lengthening at the three Texas sites (Figure 1). At these three sites, only individuals from the Gulf subpopulation consistently flowered when days were shortening (Figure 1; 85.3%, 94%, 99.5%). Our data thus only supports a consistent flowering time cue of shortening days within the Gulf subpopulation. Response to this cue may be segregating within the Atlantic subpopulation and within 8X individuals and is absent or rare in Midwest individuals.

A screenshot of a cell phone

Description automatically generated**Figure 1.** *Many genotypes do not use a shortening day photoperiodicity cue at the three Texas (TX) common garden sites. Bars represent the number of distinct genotypes that had 50% of tillers flowering before the summer solstice (when days were lengthening) or after the summer solstice (when days were shortening). Colors represent the five categories we grouped genotypes into: tetraploid individuals in the Atlantic, Midwest, and Gulf genetic subpopulations, admixed/uncategorized tetraploid individuals, and octoploid individuals.*

We then looked for a specific day length that triggered flowering during shortening days. For plants with sequenced genomes, we modelled daylength at flowering as a function of common garden and a genomic relationship matrix (GRM), both as random effects. To ensure we detected a daylength cue for shortening days, we removed daylength response values for genotypes that flowered during lengthening days. The heritability for daylength at flowering during shortening days was 12%, while the heritability for flowering as a Julian date for the same set of individuals was 23.7% (Supplementary Table: Variance Components analysis). This reduction in heritability did not support the hypothesis that flowering was cued by any specific day length during shortening days in our common gardens. Instead, the flowering photoperiodicity cue was simply exposure to shortening days.

Next, we evaluated whether photoperiodicity, defined as exposure to shortening days, differed by plant latitude of origin (Parish and Fike 2005). We observed a strong signal of latitude of origin on whether plants grown in Texas common gardens flowered in lengthening or shortening days (binomial glm, *Pr* < 2x10-16, Supp. Figure 1). The majority of plants from latitudes of origin below 35°N did not flower until days were shortening at the Texas sites, while the majority of plants from latitudes of origin above 38°N flowered while days were lengthening. Interestingly, the Oklahoma (OK) site, our first common garden at which most genotypes flowered during shortening days, was at 36°N; in contrast, the three sites where a photoperiod cue was evident were below 32°N. Plants grown in 2019 in our common gardens north of 35°N did not have sufficient vegetative growth to flower before the summer solstice, and thus were not competent to repress flowering during lengthening days. As this is a common feature of growing seasons at these latitudes, we hypothesize that plants from more northern latitudes have evolved a flowering time response to a separate, non-photoperiod based environmental cue.

A screenshot of a cell phone

Description automatically generated**Supplementary Figure 1.** *Latitude of origin correlates with flowering response to an environmental cue of shortening day length. Bars represent the number of distinct genotypes that had 50% of tillers flowering before the summer solstice (when days were lengthening) or after the summer solstice (when days were shortening). Colors represent the five categories we grouped genotypes into: tetraploid individuals in the Atlantic, Midwest, and Gulf genetic subpopulations, admixed/uncategorized tetraploid individuals, and octoploid individuals.*

Because switchgrass phenology is closely correlated with growing degree days (GDD) during vegetative growth, we tested for a temperature-based environmental cue for flowering. To do this, we evaluated flowering date as a function of cumulative GDD between plant green up and flowering, using a base temperature of 12 C (Kiniry et al 2005, Behrman 2013). We then modelled GDD as a function of subpopulation and the interaction between subpopulation and latitude of origin, both as random effects. To avoid confounding with a photoperiod-based environmental cue, we removed GDD response values for genotypes predicted to have a photoperiod cue at the four common gardens south of 38°N. Including these GDD response values substantially increased the residual variance for photoperiod sensitive individuals at these sites (data not shown//in supplement). Subpopulation explained most of the variation in flowering as a function of GDD (% Varsubpop = 85.9%). Predicted values of GDD necessary for flowering were largest for the Gulf subpopulation (1056; 95% CI 973-1099), smallest for the Midwest (667; 95% CI 517 – 814) and intermediate for the other three groups (741 (599-1019); 776 (483-1195); 747 (573 – 1043); Supplementary table of effects). The heritability for GDD at flowering for photoperiod insensitive, sequenced individuals was 30%, while the heritability for flowering as a Julian date for the same set of individuals was 10.8% (Supplementary Table: Variance Components analysis). Thus, more phenotypic variance was explained by GDD than by Julian date for these individuals.

If flowering date is frequently a function of GDD in switchgrass, this explains observations that moving southern populations northwards delays flowering, and moving northern populations south hastens flowering (Sanderson et al 1996). To explore this further, we tested whether subpopulation flowering as a function of GDD varied significantly by latitude of origin. The Midwest subpopulation response to GDD varied significantly by latitude of origin, with plants from the northernmost 20% of the range flowering at an average GDD of 568, and plants from the southernmost 20% of the range flowering at an average GDD of 779. In contrast, the southernmost and northernmost 20% of the Gulf plants differed only slightly in GDD (1008 vs 1090, \*statistically significant). Taken together, these data support latitude-of-origin based, low GDD cue for flowering in the Midwest subpopulation, a consistent, high GDD cue for flowering in the Gulf subpopulation that is superseded by a photoperiod cue, and the potential for both of these cues to be segregating in the Atlantic subpopulation by latitude of origin.

*Fourway cross breaks up genetics of flowering for the two most distinctive subpopulations*

The Midwest and Gulf subpopulations had the most distinct phenological responses of our five groups across our common gardens and had heritable variation for flowering in response to two distinct environmental cues. To analyze the genomic regions and allelic effects underlying the phenological responses in these subpopulations, we analyzed flowering date in an F2 cross between four individuals, two Midwest and two Gulf individuals. The parents of this cross were DAC, an early flowering Midwest individual, VS16, a late flowering Midwest individual, AP13, an early flowering Gulf individual, and WBC, a late flowering Gulf individual (Supplementary Figure X.). We made F1 crosses of the two early flowering individuals, AP13xDAC, and the two late flowering individuals, WBCxVS16. We then clonally propagated and planted the four parents, the two F1 individuals (AP13xDAC, and VS16xWBC), and 801 F2 individuals at eight field sites, then recorded greenup and flowering date every three days for the 2016-2019 seasons. Unfortunately, no parent clonal replicates flowered exclusively during shortening days at the three Texas sites (AP13: 62.4% of 173; WBC: 85.6% of 104; DAC 0% of 15; VS16 3.6% of 56).

We first compared the 2019 flowering dates of F1 individuals to the parents and the diversity panel to determine dominance of the two flowering date environmental cues. Though there was an average difference in flowering date of 17 days between the two F1 crosses, all F1 individuals flowered at similar dates as the Midwest parents each year, and as Midwest subpopulation individuals in general (Figure 2; early and late F1s flowered 8.1 +/- 8.1 and 7.9 +/- 13.3 days behind their F0 parents). In addition, neither F1 flowered consistently in shortening days in 2016 through 2019 (AxD 0% of 119; VxW 18.1% of 127). These data indicated that the lower GDD environmental cue for flowering in the Midwest subpopulation was dominant to the photoperiod response and the higher GDD environmental cue for flowering in the Gulf subpopulation.

*A close up of a map

Description automatically generated***Figure 2.** *F1 flowering dates indicate dominance of Midwest subpopulation flowering environmental cues. Vertical dashed lines show F1 flowering dates in 2019 for two Midwest x Gulf crosses. Violin plots show the distributions of flowering dates in the Midwest and Gulf subpopulations in the diversity panel. Bold yellow vertical line indicates the summer solstice. 2018 data is shown for the TX3 site, as 2019 data was not collected for this cross at this common garden.*

To determine if Gulf subpopulation flowering date phenotypes were recoverable in F2 individuals, we compared the flowering date distributions of F2 individuals to those of the parents. Very few F2 phenotypes recaptured the Gulf subpopulation parent phenotypes: only 15.7% of F2 flowering dates occurred on or after the minimum flowering date of a Gulf parent in that common garden and year. Long tails for the F2 flowering date distributions were mainly observed at TX2 and TX3, where there was the potential to isolate QTL that affected the ability of the plant to flower in response to a photoperiod cue (Figure 3, or as supplement?). F2 individuals at TX2 and TX3 had flowering dates similar to late flowering Midwest individuals to early- to mid-range flowering Gulf individuals in the diversity panel (Supplementary Figure). In contrast, at the northern five sites and at Kingsville, F2 individuals had similar flowering dates as individuals from the Midwest subpopulation. Thus, at the northern five sites, we expected to find QTL controlling flowering date from the Midwest subpopulation, potentially by affecting the cumulative GDD requirements for the plant before flowering.

**A close up of a logo

Description automatically generatedFigure 3.** *Distribution of flowering date for F2 individuals (violin plots) relative to parent plants (x’s). Maybe represent the earliest flowering date and latest flowering date for each parent as horizontal lines instead of all these X’s.*

We next analyzed the genetics of greenup and flowering in 2019 for seven fourway sites. We analyzed the flowering phenotype in two ways: as a function of Julian date (‘flowering date’), and as a function of cumulative GDD between greenup and flowering (‘flowering GDD’). There were no significant QTL for greenup. There were eight QTL for flowering date; the largest QTL were on Chr02N, Chr04K, and Chr05N (Figure 4). There were five QTL for flowering GDD, all of which overlapped with QTL for flowering date. Though most QTL LOD scores were similar for these two flowering phenotypes, the QTL on Chr02K was highly significant for flowering GDD and marginally significant for flowering date, while the QTL on the first part of Chr05N was highly significant for flowering date and not significant for flowering GDD.

**Figure 4.** *Distribution of LOD scores by chromosome for flowering date and flowering GDD across 7 common gardens in 2019. Dashed lines indicate significance for the solid LOD lines of the same color.*

A picture containing hanging, light, sitting, white


Description automatically generatedA picture containing colorful, white

Description automatically generatedAll eight QTL exhibited significant GxE between common garden sites. Our cross design allowed us to estimate allelic effects of alleles from all four parents as contrasts of alleles in the F1 individuals. In the early flowering allele set, AxB, at TX2, five of eight lowland alleles delayed flowering date. In the CxD cross at TX2, four of eight lowland alleles delayed flowering date – four of the same five regions that delayed flowering date in the AxB cross. These effects were consistent with the observed order of flowering in F0 and F1 individuals. We therefore hypothesized that these regions: Chr02N, Chr04K, Chr05N, (Chr08N), and Chr09K were important regions affecting flowering in the Gulf subpopulation. At the northern sites, because of the dominance of Midwest phenotypes and alleles that we observed, we compared effects of the Midwest allele from the early and late F1 cross. For 29 site by QTL combinations for the AxB early flowering alleles, the Midwest allele was accelerating flowering by reducing flowering date. For 17 site by QTL combinations for the CxD late flowering alleles, the Midwest allele was accelerating flowering, and for 2 site by QTL the upland allele was delaying flowering. These effects, if additive, would be consistent with the observed order of flowering in the F0 and F1. All eight QTL affected flowering date for at least one northern site for both the early and late flowering allele sets. Thus, we hypothesized that all eight regions were important regions affecting A screenshot of a cell phone

Description automatically generatedflowering in the Midwest subpopulation.

21 AxB accelerating flowering by decreasing required GDD. 16 CxD accelerating at northern 5 sites. 2 accel 2 decel at KING in AxB. 4 accel 2 decel at PKLE in AxB. 4 accel at PKLE in CxD. 1 accel at KING in CxD.

Kingsville (TX1) represents a marked departure from the temperate growth habits at the other nine sites. In general, heritability for flowering was lowest at TX1 in both the diversity panel and the fourway cross, indicating a larger effect of environment on phenotypic variance at this site. At this site, 2 AxB Midwest QTL accelerated flowering, and two delayed flowering. In CxD, alleles at three Midwest QTL accelerated flowering.



*Genome wide association identifies candidates affecting flowering in fourway QTL intervals*

Though QTLs detected using the fourway cross are too coarse to be informative about gene identity by themselves, combining linkage and association mapping can outperform each method used in isolation (cite Brachi, others?). We therefore conducted GWAS on greenup and flowering date at seven common garden sites for individuals from both the Midwest and Gulf subpopulation. We then analyzed the allelic effects across common garden sites for the top XK SNPs using mash. Using this data, we focused on identifying associations in or near the important QTL regions for flowering date from the fourway cross, as well as the population that allele was found within and the effect that that SNP had across sites.

Five of the eight QTL – the four largest QTL, and all five QTL that we hypothesized affected flowering in the Gulf subpopulation – colocalized with one or more of the top 25 mash hits. Discussion of candidate genes, where they are in the QTL interval, what the effects look like in mash, what subpops they are segregating in, for:

* Candidate on Chr02N
* Candidate on Chr04K
* Candidate on Chr05N 4.3 Mb
* Candidate on Chr05N 64.4 Mb
* Candidate on Chr08N

*Possible Genomic Prediction Section*

* I don’t know how to tie genomic prediction in here. Ideally we’d perhaps have information on which parts of the genome being Midwestern vs Gulf would make you sensitive to photoperiod cues, and which parts affect how much cumulative GDD you need, if you’re not sensitive to photoperiod cues. That would be a nice way to bring this full circle.

**Discussion**

* Possible reasons why we didn’t find candidates in GWAS for other three QTL intervals: false negatives, type of allele shifts we are testing here vs the fourway, other things
* And what are other types of region we can detect with GWAS that we couldn’t detect in our fourway? Particularly differences between Gulf alleles… maybe offer up Gulf specific GWAS/mash here. Or GWAS on any individual that is tetraploid and looks like it’s photoperiod sensitive – including some admixed and Atlantic individuals. As an idea.
* Want to bring back discussion of environmental cues… may be able to lead in to this by talking about which subpopulations are segregating for these things.

**Methods**

***Diversity panel and Single Nucleotide Polymorphism Dataset***

Overview of the diversity panel.

*Panel collection, propagation, cultivation, and phenotyping*

The formation of the diversity panel has been described previously (Lovell et al 202X). In brief, seeds, rhizomes, and clonal propagules from natural and common gardens were collected from 2015-2018, and propagated by clonal division from 2016 to 2018 with the aim of generating > 10 clones per unique accession. Plants were grown in 1 gallon pots in the final propagation before transplanting to the field. Planting at the ten field sites occurred in the spring of 2018 and followed the methods of Lowry et al 2019, with the exception that the Blackwell cultivar was used instead of the Alamo cultivar at edge positions of the plot to control for edge effects. Plant aboveground biomass was removed in the spring of 2019 before spring tiller emergence. Plants without new growth from the crown by June 1st, 2019 were removed from the experiment and replaced with Blackwell cultivar plants in July or September 2019.

<<Paragraph about how the phenotypes of greenup, emergence, and flowering were scored. Should talk with Jason for specifics after looking in his metadata about this.>>

*Panel sequencing, ploidy assessment, and ecotype classification*

The resequencing of the diversity panel has been described previously (Lovell et al 202X). Briefly, 789 diversity panel samples were resequenced at a median depth of 59x (range 20 – 140x). 630 samples were used for this analysis, after filtering for missing sequence or phenotype data, outlier heterozygousity scores, and collection site discrepancies. The reads were mapped to the V5 assembly using bwa-memcite\_bwa, and SNPs were called using SAMtools mpileup84 and Varscan V2.4.085 with a minimum coverage of eight and a minimum alternate allele count of four. Only SNPs with ≤ 20% missing data and minor allele frequencies > 0.05 were retained, resulting in 8.8 to 12.3 million SNPs used for genome wide association, depending on the individuals retained.

Ploidy assessment has been described previously (Lovell et al 202X). Briefly, two methods were used to assess ploidy: a LSRFortessa SORP Flow Cytometer (BD Biosciences), and the distribution of variant allele frequency at bi-allelic SNPs. These methods agreed for 837 out of 870 samples (96.2%) with flow cytometry data. Ecotype assessment has also been described previously (Lovell et al 202X). Briefly, at the TX2 and MI common gardens, we assessed mature switchgrass individuals at or near anthesis for a suite of 16 non-redundant traits typically used to characterize switchgrass ecotypes (e.g. leaf thickness, plant height, phenology). Convoluted neural networks were trained on seven cultivars with known ecotypes, then used to probabilistically assign ecotypes to 630 planted and sequenced tetraploid individuals. 16 tiller and leaf appearance traits were also assessed at TX2 to validate these results.

*Genome-wide association mapping*

We used the switchgrassGWAS R package (https://github.com/Alice-MacQueen/switchgrassGWAS) to allow fast, less memory intensive GWAS on the diversity panel.

*Analysis of correlated SNP effects on phenotypes at multiple sites*

We used the switchgrassGWAS R package to estimate and test the significance of SNP effects on phenology phenotypes measured at our common garden sites.

***Fourway cross and Quantitative Trait Locus Dataset***

*Creation, propagation, cultivation, and phenotyping*

The formation of the fourway mapping population has been described previously (Lovell et al 2019). Briefly,

*Sequencing and QTL mapping*

The …

***Data availability statement***

**References**

Parrish DJ, Fike JH. 2005. The Biology and Agronomy of Switchgrass for Biofuels. Critical Reviews in Plant Sciences 24:423-459.

Tables & Figures, Maybe Supplementary

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Site | Latitude | Genotypes that flowered while: | 4X | 8X | Atlantic | Gulf | Midwest |
| Kingsville, TX, USDA/PMC | 27.55 | days lengthening | 9 | 8 | 44 | 23 | 23 |
| Kingsville, TX, USDA/PMC | 27.55 | days shortening | 11 | 4 | 18 | 134 | 1 |
| Austin, TX, UT PRC | 30.38 | days lengthening | 19 | 167 | 206 | 11 | 115 |
| Austin, TX, UT PRC | 30.38 | days shortening | 12 | 66 | 56 | 173 | 6 |
| Temple, TX, USDA/ARS | 31.04 | days lengthening | 8 | 7 | 45 | 1 | 46 |
| Temple, TX, USDA/ARS | 31.04 | days shortening | 15 | 6 | 62 | 193 | 15 |
| Stillwater, OK, OSU | 35.99 | days lengthening | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Stillwater, OK, OSU | 35.99 | days shortening | 18 | 8 | 86 | 83 | 52 |
| Columbia, MO, MU BRF | 38.90 | days lengthening | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Columbia, MO, MU BRF | 38.90 | days shortening | 31 | 206 | 228 | 149 | 113 |
| Lincoln, NE, UNL ARF | 41.15 | days shortening | 18 | 13 | 123 | 66 | 67 |
| Hickory Corners, MI, KBS | 42.42 | days lengthening | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hickory Corners, MI, KBS | 42.42 | days shortening | 36 | 181 | 199 | 198 | 109 |
| Brookings, SD, SDSU | 44.31 | days shortening | 15 | 12 | 109 | 73 | 63 |

**Supplementary Figure X.** Average flowering date from 2016 – 2019 for the four parents of the fourway cross, compared to the 2019 distribution of flowering date for the Gulf and Midwest subpopulations. The two Midwest parents are DAC and VS16, and the two Gulf parents are AP13 and WBC. Bold yellow line indicates the summer solstice.

A close up of a map

Description automatically generated

A close up of a logo

Description automatically generated

However, cumulative GDD was not sufficient to explain the variation in flowering time in the Gulf subpopulation. Instead, we hypothesized that the Gulf subpopulation also used a photoperiod cue, given the imperfect relationship between GDD, photothermal time, and flowering in the Gulf subpopulation, and the presence of a relationship between latitude of common A screenshot of a cell phone

Description automatically generatedA close up of a map

Description automatically generatedgarden and flowering time based on cumulative GDD.

Cumulative GDD vs photoperiodicity as a function of each plant’s location of origin.