

Thesis Proposal

Christophe Rouleau-Desrochers

November 6, 2025

1 Introduction

1.1 Climate change impacts on tree phenology

An important body of research from the past decades have shown convincing evidence that human activity are increasingly affecting many worldwide environmental processes Ceballos *et al.* (2017); Intergovernmental Panel On Climate Change (Ipcc) (2023); Laurance (2007); Parmesan & Yohe (2003). This can be through land use change and destruction, pollution, invasive species, ressource overexploitation and climate change Driscoll *et al.* (2018); Parmesan *et al.* (1999); Wu (2013). That alone raises major concern and actions have been deployed to mitigate these impacts, with varying success (e.g. Campbell *et al.* (2014)). Even though immediate actions can have positive impacts and potentially reduce some threats to biodiversity, reversing 150 years of human induced greenhouse gas emissions is harder. These emissions have already affected Earth's climate and they are projected to continue affecting Earth's climate centuries. While there is a scientific consensus that observed climate change is human-caused Change (2014); Lynas *et al.* (2021); Oreskes (2004), the magnitude and the extent of the consequences that a warming climate will have on biological processes are still debatable Huey *et al.* (2012). Historically, the first case of attribution of a biological change to climate change was about poleward shifts of european butterflies in Europe in response to regional warming Parmesan *et al.* (1999).

1.1.2. Trends of spring and autumn phenological events and their drivers The most frequently observed biological impact of climate change over the past decades are major changes on spring and autumn phenology — the timing of recurring life history events Parmesan & Yohe (2003); Cleland *et al.* (2007); Lieth *et al.* (1974); Woolway *et al.* (2021); Menzel *et al.* (2006). Understanding the consequences of these shifts on ecosystems requires understanding how much the growing season has changed Duputié *et al.* (2015). Spring phenological events (e.g. budburst and leafout) have been advancing from 0.5 Wolfe *et al.* (2005) to 4.2 days/decade Chmielewski & Rötzer (2001); Fu *et al.* (2014) and are mainly driven by temperature Chuine (2010); Cleland *et al.* (2007); Peñuelas & Filella (2001). In contrast, autumn phenology (e.g. budset and leaf colouring) is delayed, though to a much lesser extent than spring Gallinat *et al.* (2015); Jeong & Medvigy (2014). The drivers regulating autumn phenology are far less understood than those of spring for many reasons. First, autumn phenology has attracted much less attention compared to spring Piao *et al.* (2019). Second, the data is often much noisier, since meteorological conditions in the fall can drastically influence phenological phenomena. To illustrate this, trees going through leaf senescence are subjected to a gradual leaf abscission that follows nutrient reabsorption, and the leaves within the same individual might be at different senescence stage, but a strong wind spell may trigger leaf drop for all leaves, thus affecting the temporal resolution of these data Wu *et al.* (2024). However, there is a general belief that autumn phenophases are driven by shortening photoperiod and colder temperatures Cooke *et al.* (2012); Flynn & Wolkovich (2018); Körner & Basler (2010); Delpierre *et al.* (2016). Different hypothesis are proposed to explain delayed autumn phenophases. First, warmer autumn temperature may extend the activity of photosynthetic enzymes which could be maintained at a higher level. Thus, the degradation rate of chlorophyll would decrease and timing of senescence would be delayed Yan *et al.* (2021). Second, summer droughts could make trees pause their activity schedule and delay senescence to increase carbon assimilation Dox *et al.* (2022). Third, there could be an antagonistic effect of warming and brightening—caused by reductions in atmospheric pollution and cloud cover Sanchez-Lorenzo *et al.* (2015)—on leaf senescence Wu *et al.* (2021). Brightening accelerates the leaf senescence processes and reduces the temperature sensitivity during that period, counteracting the

expected warming-induced delays in leaf senescence. The photo-protection and sink limitation hypothesis provide plausible explanations for the negative effect of radiation on leaf senescence and the declining effect of temperature sensitivity of leaf senescence in response to brightening Wu *et al.* (2021); Zani *et al.* (2020).

1.1.3. Mis-leading evidence of declining sensitivity to warming While we have convincing proof that spring events advanced in the past decades, there is evidence that this might decelerate because of declining sensitivity to warming Fu *et al.* (2015); Meng *et al.* (2020). The proposed mechanism is through the action of warmer winters on tree dormancy. In the fall, trees in boreal and temperate forests slowly enter dormancy which is initiated with budset. During this phases, cold hardiness increases which prepares the trees for the upcoming cold temperatures and prevents tissue damage. Then, the trees enter dormancy, during which a certain duration of chilling temperatures—with some interaction with photoperiod for some species—is necessary for the trees to be ready to accumulate forcing Vitasse *et al.* (2014). In the late winter and early spring, they go through two forms of deacclimation before budburst Vitasse *et al.* (2014). When deacclimation is reached, a certain amount of heat (forcing) is required to initiate budburst Fu *et al.* (2015). The argument of declining sensitivity appears here: heat requirement is met sooner in warm springs, but it's also negatively correlated with chilling Fu *et al.* (2015, 2013); Laube *et al.* (2014). However, it is this interaction between chilling and forcing requirements that determines the timing of leaf unfolding. In other words, a decrease in chilling accumulation is proposed to explain the observed weaker spring temperature sensitivities, where spring forcing loses of its relative importance Fu *et al.* (2015); Meng *et al.* (2020); Wolkovich *et al.* (2021). However, a meta-analysis compiling 72 studies of 203 species suggests that declining sensitivities observed in Europe may be a statistical artifact of how these responses are calculated, thus casting doubt on this proposed trend Ettinger *et al.* (2020). This statistical artifact may be caused by using linear models for calculating non-linear processes Wolkovich *et al.* (2021).

1.1.2. Mechanisms that could limit growth despite having a longer growing season Plants seasonal activity has internal and external controls, both determined by environmental conditions. Internal controls operate via autonomous clocks, activating genes and releasing hormones which often rely on chilling and/or photoperiod. The external controls, often referred to as forcing, act directly on the developmental rate, meristem activity, tissue differentiation and metabolism Körner *et al.* (2023). These controls have often been overlooked, but are nevertheless critical to our understanding of plant's capacity to adjust their activity schedule in response to changing conditions Chuine & Régnière (2017). In light of this, I hypothesize two possible drivers that could explain why a longer growing season might not lead to increased growth: external (environmental) Kolář *et al.* (2016) and internal (via physiological constraints) Zohner *et al.* (2023) constraints to growth.

1.1.2.1. External constraints The complex nature of climate change makes predicting the external limits to growth hard to quantify at the individual level, as these drivers affect communities as a whole. However, drought, spring frost and heat waves are commonly mentioned as the main extreme events that could limit tree growth under climate change Tyree & Zimmermann (2002); Choat *et al.* (2018); Li *et al.* (2023); Trenberth *et al.* (2014); Change (2014); Chiang *et al.* (2021); Polgar & Primack (2011); Reinmann *et al.* (2023). Their respective mechanisms, global trend of occurrence, consequences and difference among species are describe in Tables 3.1. (Spring frosts), 3.2. (Droughts) and 3.3. (Heat waves).

1.1.2.2. Internal constraints As for the internal constraints to growth, recent hypothesis propose that broadleaf deciduous tree species may be sink-saturated, such that longer growing season with more carbon fixation do not necessarily increase growth Dow *et al.* (2022). This one pathway is directly linked to the internal controls of plant growth, which are under strong genetic control. In addition to height and radial growth varying across species, these growth responses also vary by site Silvestro *et al.* (2023a); Aitken & Bemmels (2016). Populations from higher altitude or latitude grow less under the same conditions than individuals from lower altitude or latitude Way & Montgomery (2015). This is further supported by phenological studies showing that growth stop arrives earlier from populations of higher latitude, demonstrating local adaptation to potentially avoid fall frost, before nutrient uptake has finished Aitken & Bemmels (2016); Vitasse (2013); Way & Montgomery (2015). These trees rely on photoperiod cues for setting buds (stopping height growth) Way & Montgomery (2015); Soolanayakanahally *et al.* (2013).

Growth seasonality has huge consequences on overall annual growth and so are the environmental con-

ditions during these periods. For instance, warming spring temperatures seem to positively affect growth, but recent evidence suggest a shift in this net positive effect near the summer solstice. Indeed Zohner *et al.* (2023) found that warmer temperatures before the solstice advanced the onset of senescence, but it slowed the progression of leaf colouring when temperatures postsolstice were warmer. This further reinforces the importance of understanding how the timing of warmer conditions affect tree species.

1.1.3. How these shifts translate into effects on trees/forests are not clear - Pros and cons of early/late start/end of season (figure? Shifts in spring and autumn phenology support a long-lasting and intuitive assumption that earlier spring and delayed autumn events lead to longer seasons—and thus increased growth Keenan *et al.* (2014); Stridbeck *et al.* (2022). However, research from the past three years has cast doubt on this hypothesis Dow *et al.* (2022); Green & Keenan (2022); Silvestro *et al.* (2023b). For instance, Dow *et al.* (2022) showed that despite an earlier growth onset, neither growth rate nor overall annual increment was increased by longer seasons. This could substantially affect carbon-cycle model projections and thus feedbacks to future climate Richardson *et al.* (2013); Swidrak *et al.* (2013).

Understanding these findings requires answering why trees do not grow more despite longer growing seasons. While carbon allocation to above ground biomass is one of the largest carbon sink, how this carbon is allocated into wood is poorly understood. Indeed, the linear relationship assumption between wood growth and carbon assimilation is not well supported mechanistically and represents an important limitation of vegetation models Cabon *et al.* (2022). Net primary production represents the difference between photosynthesis and plant respiration, but this commonly used metric completely omits the representation of growth processes. This is perhaps because of a long-lasting paradigm of source-limited photosynthesis. This has now since then been debunked with carbon fertilization experiments, supporting evidence that direct environmental constraints on growth may be stronger than those on photosynthesis Friend *et al.* (2019); Parent *et al.* (2010). This opens up a new, poorly tested, temperature sensitivity between cambial activity and photosynthesis. Growing evidence suggest that cambial activity may be more sensitive than photosynthesis to a range of environmental conditions such as: water and nutrient availability, and temperature Cabon *et al.* (2022, 2020); Muller *et al.* (2011); Peters *et al.* (2021). This demonstrates that carbon projection models that heavily rely on vegetation alone may mislead the amount of carbon sequestered in our forests.

1.1.4. Growing season shifts and consequences on forest ecosystems and services Spring and fall phenological events are shifting with debatable consequences on tree growth. The sensitivity of cambial activity to water, temperature and nutrients have the potential to have far-reaching consequences given the hard-to-predict nature of future climate change, where any of these variables could vary from low to high amplitude Almagro *et al.* (2025); Cabon *et al.* (2022). This expected asymmetry of future environmental changes makes understanding the internal and external limits to growth critical. Especially, the capacity to tease apart different biomes—as for example boreal vs tropical forests are expected to react differently (REF)—is critical and empirical data coming from experiments, but also from observations are paramount to predict the changes of forest carbon offset from human GHG emissions.

1.2 Nature of the problem, and how to address it

1.2.1. Past phenological trends can help (or not) predict future phenological changes Observed phenological trends in the last decades cannot be used directly to extrapolate future phenological changes because: (1) the mechanisms guiding them aren't clear and (2) phenological responses of trees to warming are very likely to not be linear Ettinger *et al.* (2020); Fu *et al.* (2013). Indeed, accurate predictions require an in-depth accurate mechanistic understanding of phenophases and their sensitivities to environmental drivers, especially to temperature and photoperiod Fu *et al.* (2013). Therefore, the very foundation of the assumption that longer seasons increase growth may shift with future climate change. The well observed advance in spring phenology may slow down, and delayed fall phenology may shift towards earlier leaf senescence (through summer drought induced growth cessation).

1.2.2. The assumption that longer seasons lead to increased growth is called into question Recent work shows an absence of increased growth despite apparent better environmental conditions, thus casting doubt on a simple and intuitive positive relationship between growing season length and growth. This paradox further emphasizes the need to understand better the drivers regulating growth across biomes, but

also how these drivers vary across the species within these biomes. Phenology vary greatly across species (e.g. closely related species tend to budburst at similar time under similar conditions) Wolkovich *et al.* (2014), but so does the relationship between growth and season length which may explain the wide variation of this relationship among communities Buckley & Kingsolver (2012). This highlights a weakness of certain carbon sequestration models that pool species together, which likely overpass important that nuances in the growth responses that could be explained by species differences. This may mislead the future of forest carbon source-sink ratios Green & Keenan (2022); Cabon *et al.* (2022). To better understand how different species respond to warming, different strategies can be used. Experiments are paramount to robustly tease apart the external vs internal drivers (e.g. warmer springs from severe drought later in the season—a common co-occurring reality in natural environments) Morin *et al.* (2010); Primack *et al.* (2015). However, experiments are most often performed on juvenile trees, which are critical for their role in forest regeneration projections, but their responses can hardly be translated to mature trees, which hold the overwhelming carbon biomass proportion of forests Augspurger & Bartlett (2003); Silvestro *et al.* (2023b); Vitasse (2013). Leaf phenology through ground-based observations can provide valuable insights into the growth onset and end of trees that are not suitable for experimental trials since cambial and leaf phenology are closely linked to another. It is to say that knowing when leaves elongate and color, can guide when trees start and stop to grow—fundamental metrics to determine the growing season length. Ground observations has the advantage of providing accurate data of phenological events for specific sites and species. Recently, the widespread use of smart-phones has opened a whole new world of possible phenological through citizen scientists records of data over much larger areas and for a wider range of species Dickinson *et al.* (2012); Hufkens *et al.* (2019); Piao *et al.* (2019). While there are drawbacks of these observations (e.g. non-standard protocols, highly uneven spatial-temporal distribution of these observations), these methods have a huge potential to diversify the phenology data.

1.2.3. Impacts on carbon source-sink projections

1.2.4. Goals of my thesis Using citizen science data, a common garden trial and a large-scale experiment, I aim to better understand how different tree species, at different lifespan stages vary in their growth responses to different season length.

1.3 Complexity of measuring growth and defining growing season length

What is a growing season?

To understand how trees respond to growing season conditions, it is important to define the growing season and growth. First, a problem that arises when one tries to quantify how shifting growing seasons affect growth comes from the definition of the growing season itself. Recently, Körner *et al.* (2023) proposed four definitions addressing this issue: 1. true growing season, based on measurable growth; 2. phenological season, based on visible phenological markers; 3. the productive season, based on primary production and 4. meteorological season, based on environmental conditions.

Here, I will focus on how definition 2., incorporating 4. affects definition 1. as the data collected for this thesis can't address 3. I will use definition 2. to infer a "window of opportunity" during which meteorological conditions (4.) will be used to calculate growing degree days (GDD). I am using the meteorological season within a constrained window, instead of simply using it irrespective of phenology because of the illusion that an absolute increase in GDD over the last decades—irrespective of the timing of phenophases—also increases growth. Springs are warmer, falls are also sometimes warmer, and summers are warmer which together, increase the number of GDD which may appear to be a reliable proxy for better environmental conditions. However, a fundamental distinction is that there is a "theoretical" and a "real" period at which trees can grow, which is usually defined through the period between budburst and leaf senescence, highlighting the importance of accurate phenology data (REF). FALSE! Check Korner2023.

Models using degree-days are increasing even though they have been used for decades in agriculture (e.g. Gilmore & Rogers (1958); McMaster (1997)). These rely on developmental patterns that are based on temperature dependence to estimate a particular ecological process, in my case, tree-ring width. These models describe a particular response variable as a composite of time and temperature as opposed to time alone. This is a parsimonious method that requires three variables: daily minimum and maximum temperatures and the base temperature at which the process of interest cannot occur (cambial activation in this case) McMaster (1997); Moore & Remais (2014). However, this simplicity comes with a drawback of over-

simplifying potentially complex developmental processes in response to varying environmental conditions within a season Bonhomme (2000).

What is growth?

What is growth? Wood formation (xylogenesis) is the major biological process by which carbon is allocated and long-term stored in woody plants. Radial growth is determined by the production of xylem and phloem cells that begins with cambial activation and cell production by cambial initials, following by cell differentiation through the following events: 1. Cell enlargement 2. Secondary-wall formation and lignification and 3. programmed cell death Etzold *et al.* (2022); Silvestro *et al.* (2025). The rate and duration of these phases lead irreversible radial growth increment usually represented through tree-rings. In these, secondary xylem cells account disproportionally to the number of cells produced because they divide more than phloem cells Plomion *et al.* (2001); Rathgeber *et al.* (2016).

1.3.1. Traditional diameter measurements miss the resolution of annual growth increment

Foresters have measured tree diameter and height for decades to infer allometries that could give them a good estimate of how much wood they could collect in a forest (e.g. Meyer (1940); Saunders & Wagner (2008)). The widely used method in forestry is to measure diameter at breast height at punctual time intervals (REF – perhaps saunders?). However these measurements don't provide short-term indicators of growth—especially if taken at multiple years intervals. Therefore, extreme events affecting growth are likely to be missed. In addition, many forest inventories only report diameter measurements and exclude height, because of logistical constraints (Saunders & Wagner (2008)), which reduces biomass estimation quality. This growth data lacks the temporal resolution necessary to properly infer a relationship between growth and environmental conditions.

Alongside diameter-height allometric relationship, dendrochronology and its related fields also have long standing traditions in forestry and silviculture. Indeed, tree-ring research was developed in the early 1900s to perform archaeological dating and climate reconstruction Douglass (1928); Pearl *et al.* (2020). Since then, different dendrochronology methods have developed for different purposes, such as the calibration of the terrestrial radiocarbon curve (Helama2023Distinguishin;Reimer2020The) and modelling Earth's past climate and ecological change Pearl *et al.* (2020). More recently, dendroecology—applications of dendrochronological techniques to problems in ecology Fritts & Swetnam (1989)—emerged to answer ecological problems as well as to hindcast (e.g. Bergeron *et al.* (2004)) and forecast ecological processes both at the regional Gazol *et al.* (2018) and global scale Manzanedo & Pederson (2019). Now, these methods can be used to understand more precise growth patterns and their relationship with different environmental factors.

1.3.2. Growth increment needs to incorporate wood density in order to evaluate how much structural carbohydrates were stored within a single year. While tree-ring width are reliable proxies to how much trees grow in each year, at relatively low cost and time, the inclusion of wood density in the analysis may provide data hidden within the tree rings. Indeed Čufar *et al.* (2008) showed that intra- and inter- annual density variations in beech provided more information and at a higher temporal resolution than tree-rings widths alone.

In addition to densitometry, increasing number of studies are going beyond traditional ring width by performing analysis using wood anatomy data. For instance, low cost techniques (e.g. "blue intensity" proxy for latewood density Babst *et al.* (2016); Campbell *et al.* (2007) and high resolution imaging Griffin *et al.* (2021); Levanič (2007); Von Arx & Carrer (2014) give rise to a whole new world of possibility regarding the microscopic components of wood anatomical features. Micro-anatomical analyses within tree-rings could be applied to a wide range of applications Pearl *et al.* (2020). The character of annual rings, cell structure, timing of growth and markers for trauma can assist in answering a variety ecological and physiological questions previously unanswered with ring width or density alone, such as how growth is affected by growing season length under anthropogenic forcing.

1.3.3. Asynchrony between primary and secondary growth (internal growth control? I argue that internal growth control in trees may shape their growth responses to growing season length and these can be split into two categories: primary and secondary growth synchronicity and growth determinancy.

Primary (shoot) and secondary (xylem and phloem formation) growth both contribute to how much carbon is stored in plant tissue, but how much they differ in their responses to environmental drivers is poorly understood. After a dormancy period, trees will start growing, both vertically (primary) and horizontally

(secondary), but there is extreme variation among species as to when each growth starts, for how long it lasts and when it stops. For instance, ring-porous species initiate primary growth early in the season, sometimes, even before budburst (e.g. oaks) Stridbeck *et al.* (2022), whereas xylogenesis in diffuse-porous species are usually more synchronized with budburst. These two examples highlight how more complicated it might be to infer general conclusions as to how growing season shifts may also shift growth, where some species may extend their primary growth, but restrict their secondary growth and vice versa.

In addition to differences in primary and secondary growth synchronicity, the role of internal growth control—often overlooked—may reshape our understanding of growth responses to growing season length Baumgarten *et al.* (2025). In perennial plants, two dichotomous growth strategies are commonly mentioned: determinate and indeterminate growth, though it may appear as species may exist along a gradient of these Baumgarten *et al.* (2025) (REF). Indeterminate growth is usually associated with short-lived and fast growth species where these life-history strategies may give them a competing advantage as tissue growth can be produced quickly in response to changing environmental conditions, but this comes with higher risk of late spring and early fall frost as well as late droughts Baumgarten *et al.* (2025); Brien *et al.* (2020). At the opposite side of the spectrum, determinate species are usually long-lived and slow-growth and are mainly constrained by conditions during bud formation, this may increase bud survival at the detriment of opportunistic growth in face of better-than-expected conditions Baumgarten *et al.* (2025) (REF).

Thus primary versus secondary growth allocation, coupled with growth determinancy are variables often overlooked, but which greatly vary across species and that are likely to affect how they species respond to shifting season length.

1.3.4. Getting growth temporal resolution is labor-intensive and expensive (e.g. dendrometer costs) To know when trees start and stop to grow within a single growing season (data not extractable through tree-rings), there are two methods, one being labor intensive (1) and the other being expensive (2).

1. Trephor is a tool that allows recurrent sampling of mature trees where a 2mm microcore is extracted from the tree a different times during the growing season. By sampling multiple times a single tree, growth temporality can be inferred by counting the ring cell increment between each sample. While this non-destructive tool can be extremely valuable, getting large sample size can hardly be feasible Rossi *et al.* (2006).

2. Dendrometers allow to monitor stem radius variation, measuring irreversible secondary growth, but also stem water fluctuations and thermal expansion, often leading to biased estimates of growth increment temporality Camarero *et al.* (2010).

1.4 Objectives

My objectives for Fuelinex are to assess tree species' potential to prolong or stretch their activity schedule by artificially manipulating growing season length and analyse how this translates (or not) into growth, during the current year (2024) and in the following year (2025). I will also conduct a secondary experiment to examine whether trees can absorb nutrients late in the season and if that translates into growth during the following season. For the CookieSpotters projects, I will investigate how the timing of phenological events affects growth across years for juvenile and mature trees, using observational phenology data and tree ring images.

Together, my two chapters will allow me to address the paradox of the absence of increased growth despite longer growing seasons.

1.5 Research questions

necessary after the objectives? Fuelinex: How do extended growing seasons affect tree growth across different species, both immediately (in the same year as the extended season) and in subsequent years? CookieSpotters: How does phenology regulate tree growth in urban ecosystems?

2 Methods

2.1 Fuelinex

2.2 CookieSpotters

Wildchrokie

1. Common garden from 2015 to 2023
2. Four species within the Betulacea family (Table 2)
3. Data: phenology, height, tree rings
4. Analysis: Hierarchical model to understand how tree ring width relates to GDD

Treespotters

1. Citizen science project from 2015 to today (Table 3)
2. Tree coring
3. Data: phenology, tree rings
4. Analysis: Hierarchical model to understand how tree ring width relates to GDD

3.1. Spring frosts

Mechanisms	Early warm spells → early leaf out → hard frost (<-2Celsius) → tissue death = loss of photosynthetic capacity Polgar & Primack (2011); Response: second cohort of leaves are more efficient and mitigate carbon sequestration loss Reinmann <i>et al.</i> (2023)
Global trend of occurrence	Most vulnerable regions are the ones with no past risk of occurrence (); ↑ in Europe and East Asia, but ↓ North America; Global trend is controversial Reinmann <i>et al.</i> (2023)
Consequences (Individual and Ecosystem level consequences)	Loss of vegetative tissue = ↓ photosynthesis = ↓ and remobilization of NSC to repair damaged tissues = ↓ secondary growth (Meyer24); Loss of reproductive tissue (higher flower mortality) (Sgubin2018The risk); Costs for orchards and stuff Reinmann <i>et al.</i> (2023)
Differences across species/provenance	

Table 1: Fuelinex species grouped by tree type, life history, and wood anatomy.

Deciduous Trees			
Common Name (Latin)	Life History Strategy	Wood Anatomy	n (approx)
Bur oak (<i>Quercus macrocarpa</i>)	Slow-growth, long life	Ring-porous	87
Bitter cherry (<i>Prunus virginiana</i>)	Fast-growth, short life	Diffuse-porous	78
Box elder (<i>Acer negundo</i>)	Fast-growth, short life	Diffuse-porous	90
Balsam poplar (<i>Populus balsamifera</i>)	Fast-growth, short life	Diffuse-porous	84
Paper birch (<i>Betula papyrifera</i>)	Fast-growth, short life	Diffuse-porous	90
Evergreen Trees			
White pine (<i>Pinus strobus</i>)	Slow-growth, long life	Non-porous	89
Giant Sequoia (<i>Sequoiadendron giganteum</i>)	Slow-growth, long life	Non-porous	54

Table 2: Wilchrokie species grouped by tree type, life history, and wood anatomy.

Deciduous Trees			
Common Name (Latin)	Life History Strategy	Wood Anatomy	n
Paper birch (<i>Betula papyrifera</i>)	Fast-growth, short life	Diffuse-porous	8
Yellow birch (<i>Betula alleghaniensis</i>)	Moderate-growth, moderate life	Diffuse-porous	21
Grey birch (<i>Betula populifolia</i>)	Fast-growth, short life	Diffuse-porous	29
Grey alder (<i>Alnus incana</i>)	Fast-growth, short life	Diffuse-porous	31

Table 3: Treepotters species grouped by tree type, life history, and wood anatomy.

Deciduous Trees			
Common Name (Latin)	Life History Strategy	Wood Anatomy	n
American basswood (<i>Tilia americana</i>)	Fast-growth, moderate life	Diffuse-porous	5
Eastern cottonwood (<i>Populus deltoides</i>)	Fast-growth, short life	Diffuse-porous	4
Northern red oak (<i>Quercus rubra</i>)	Moderate-growth, long life	Ring-porous	4
White oak (<i>Quercus alba</i>)	Slow-growth, long life	Ring-porous	5
Pignut hickory (<i>Carya glabra</i>)	Slow-growth, long life	Ring-porous	4
Shagbark hickory (<i>Carya ovata</i>)	Slow-growth, long life	Ring-porous	4
River birch (<i>Betula nigra</i>)	Fast-growth, short life	Diffuse-porous	5
Yellow birch (<i>Betula alleghaniensis</i>)	Moderate-growth, moderate life	Diffuse-porous	4
Sugar maple (<i>Acer saccharum</i>)	Slow-growth, long life	Diffuse-porous	5
Red maple (<i>Acer rubrum</i>)	Slow-growth, long life	Diffuse-porous	4
Yellow buckeye (<i>Aesculus flava</i>)	Moderate-growth, moderate life	Diffuse-porous	5

317

3.2. Drought

318

Mechanisms	<p>— Hot temperature + low precipitation (aka global-change-type drought Tyree & Zimmermann (2002)) = \uparrow evapotranspiration \rightarrow less water in soil \rightarrow cavitation \rightarrow embolism \rightarrow hydraulic failure Tyree & Zimmermann (2002) = tissue death Choat <i>et al.</i> (2018);</p> <p>— Earlier spring phenology = longer GS \rightarrow increases vegetative growth \rightarrow increases evapotranspiration \rightarrow increases drawdown of soil moisture = progressive water stress Li <i>et al.</i> (2023)</p> <p>— Long-term vs short-term stomatal responses and consequences on tissue death Choat <i>et al.</i> (2018);</p> <p>— Recovery and its determinants Choat <i>et al.</i> (2018); Li <i>et al.</i> (2023)</p>
Global trend of occurrence	<p>— \uparrow precipitation anomalies since 1990 Trenberth <i>et al.</i> (2014);</p> <p>— Models often exclude PDO/ENSO which limit the capacity to attribute increasing droughts to CC Trenberth <i>et al.</i> (2014);</p> <p>— Weak evidence of detection and attribution of changes in meteorological drought since the mid-20th century Change (2014);</p> <p>— Using a spacial, model-based perspective, anthropogenic forcing increased the frequency, duration and intensity of SPI-based droughts for Americas, Mediterranean, W/S Africa and E Asia Chiang <i>et al.</i> (2021) (Marvel2019Twentieth; Hidalgo2009Detection)</p>
Consequences (Individual and Ecosystem level consequences)	<p>— Recurring droughts may limit trees' ability to recover from other types of stress.</p> <p>— Tree mortality (e.g. Texas and California extreme droughts are estimated to have killed 300 and 102 million trees Li <i>et al.</i> (2023))</p>
Differences across species/provenance	

319

320

3.3. Heat waves

Definition:	Heat wave is a period of excessively hot weather (5 or more consecutive days of prolonged heat in which the daily maximum temperature is higher than the average maximum temperature by 5 °C), which may be accompanied by high humidity Marx <i>et al.</i> (2021).
Mechanisms	<p>↑ atmospheric CO₂ = ↑ temperature → ↑ heat waves... More specifically: A mechanism for the increase occurrence of heat waves is a weakening of the polar jet stream (important weather factor for middle latitude regions of North America, Europe and Asia) caused by global warming which increases the occurrence of stationary weather, resulting in heavy rain falls or heat waves Marx <i>et al.</i> (2021). Extreme heat → growth either through (1) Directly via cell processes disruption or (2) indirectly via effects of rising leaf-to-air vapour deficit (VPD) Gagne <i>et al.</i> (2020).</p> <p>Increased temperature leads to reduced photosynthesis which can be attributed to: 1. Damage to photosynthetic machinery 2. Inactivation of RUBISCO 3. Reduction to RuBP regeneration 4. Membrane stability 5. Increased mitochondrial respiration and photorespiration (Hauck2025Heat)</p>
Global trend of occurrence	Heat waves have increased Gagne <i>et al.</i> (2020); Meehl & Tebaldi (2004); Teskey <i>et al.</i> (2015) and are expected to increase under future climate change Dosio <i>et al.</i> (2018); Change (2014); Teskey <i>et al.</i> (2015). Summertime extreme temperatures associated with prolonged heat waves, lasting for several weeks, now impact approximately 10% of land surfaces, up from only 1% in the 1960s. Teskey <i>et al.</i> (2015). The more intense and more frequently occurring heat waves cannot be explained solely by natural climate variations and without human-made climate change Marx <i>et al.</i> (2021).
Consequences (Individual and Ecosystem level consequences)	- Reduced photosynthesis - Increased mortality - Photosynthetic tissue loss Gagne <i>et al.</i> (2020).
Differences across species/provenance	Some species have thermal photosynthetic/respiratory acclimation while others don't. Growth and survival will change depending on species to thermally acclimate to both photosynthesis and respiration - This is explained by growth strategies of gymnosperms vs angiosperms (which are usually better)

3 References

References

- Aitken, S.N. & Bemmels, J.B. (2016). Time to get moving: assisted gene flow of forest trees. *Evolutionary Applications*, 9, 271–290.
- Almagro, D., Martin-Benito, D., Rossi, S., Conde, M., Fernández-de-Uña, L. & Gea-Izquierdo, G. (2025). Long-Term Cambial Phenology Reveals Diverging Growth Responses of Two Tree Species in a Mixed Forest Under Climate Change. *Global Change Biology*, 31, e70503.
- Augspurger, C.K. & Bartlett, E.A. (2003). Differences in leaf phenology between juvenile and adult trees in a temperate deciduous forest. *Tree Physiology*, 23, 517–525.
- Babst, F., Wright, W.E., Szejner, P., Wells, L., Belmecheri, S. & Monson, R.K. (2016). Blue intensity parameters derived from Ponderosa pine tree rings characterize intra-annual density fluctuations and reveal seasonally divergent water limitations. *Trees*, 30, 1403–1415.
- Baumgarten, F., Aitken, S., Vitasse, Y., Guy, R.D. & Wolkovich, E. (2025). Invest now, get paid later? Limits and opportunities of woody plants to time growth in a future climate. *In review*.
- Bergeron, Y., Gauthier, S., Flannigan, M. & Kafka, V. (2004). Fire regimes at the transition between mixedwood and coniferous boreal forest in northwestern Quebec. *Ecology*, 85, 1916–1932.

338 Bonhomme, R. (2000). Bases and limits to using ‘degree.day’ units. *European Journal of Agronomy*, 13,
339 1–10.

340 Brien, R.J.W., Caldwell, L., Duchesne, L., Voelker, S., Barichivich, J., Baliva, M., Ceccantini, G., Di Fil-
341 ippo, A., Helama, S., Locosselli, G.M., Lopez, L., Piovesan, G., Schöngart, J., Villalba, R. & Gloor, E.
342 (2020). Forest carbon sink neutralized by pervasive growth-lifespan trade-offs. *Nature Communications*,
343 11, 4241.

344 Buckley, L.B. & Kingsolver, J.G. (2012). Functional and Phylogenetic Approaches to Forecasting Species’
345 Responses to Climate Change. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 43, 205–226.

346 Cabon, A., Fernández-de-Uña, L., Gea-Izquierdo, G., Meinzer, F.C., Woodruff, D.R., Martínez-Vilalta, J. &
347 De Cáceres, M. (2020). Water potential control of turgor-driven tracheid enlargement in Scots pine at its
348 xeric distribution edge. *New Phytologist*, 225, 209–221.

349 Cabon, A., Kannenberg, S.A., Arain, A., Babst, F., Baldocchi, D., Belmecheri, S., Delpierre, N., Guerrieri,
350 R., Maxwell, J.T., McKenzie, S., Meinzer, F.C., Moore, D.J.P., Pappas, C., Rocha, A.V., Szejner, P.,
351 Ueyama, M., Ulrich, D., Vincke, C., Voelker, S.L., Wei, J., Woodruff, D. & Anderegg, W.R.L. (2022).
352 Cross-biome synthesis of source versus sink limits to tree growth. *Science*, 376, 758–761.

353 Camarero, J.J., Olano, J.M. & Parras, A. (2010). Plastic bimodal xylogenesis in conifers from continental
354 Mediterranean climates. *New Phytologist*, 185, 471–480.

355 Campbell, L.M., Hagerman, S. & Gray, N.J. (2014). Producing Targets for Conservation: Science and Politics
356 at the Tenth Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. *Global Environmental*
357 *Politics*, 14, 41–63.

358 Campbell, R., McCarroll, D., Loader, N.J., Grubb, H., Robertson, I. & Jalkanen, R. (2007). Blue intensity
359 in *Pinus sylvestris* tree-rings: developing a new palaeoclimate proxy. *The Holocene*, 17, 821–828.

360 Ceballos, G., Ehrlich, P.R. & Dirzo, R. (2017). Biological annihilation via the ongoing sixth mass extinction
361 signaled by vertebrate population losses and declines. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*,
362 114.

363 Change, I.P.O.C. (2014). Detection and Attribution of Climate Change: from Global to Regional. In:
364 *Climate Change 2013 – The Physical Science Basis*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 867–952. 1st edn.

365 Chiang, F., Mazdiyasn, O. & AghaKouchak, A. (2021). Evidence of anthropogenic impacts on global drought
366 frequency, duration, and intensity. *Nature Communications*, 12, 2754.

367 Chmielewski, F.M. & Rötzer, T. (2001). Response of tree phenology to climate change across Europe.
368 *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 108, 101–112.

369 Choat, B., Brodribb, T.J., Brodersen, C.R., Duursma, R.A., López, R. & Medlyn, B.E. (2018). Triggers of
370 tree mortality under drought. *Nature*, 558, 531–539.

371 Chuine, I. (2010). Why does phenology drive species distribution? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal*
372 *Society B: Biological Sciences*, 365, 3149–3160.

373 Chuine, I. & Régnière, J. (2017). Process-Based Models of Phenology for Plants and Animals. *Annual*
374 *Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 48, 159–182.

375 Cleland, E., Chuine, I., Menzel, A., Mooney, H. & Schwartz, M. (2007). Shifting plant phenology in response
376 to global change. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 22, 357–365.

377 Cooke, J.E.K., Eriksson, M.E. & Junttila, O. (2012). The dynamic nature of bud dormancy in trees:
378 environmental control and molecular mechanisms. *Plant, Cell & Environment*, 35, 1707–1728.

379 Delpierre, N., Vitasse, Y., Chuine, I., Guillemot, J., Bazot, S., Rutishauser, T. & Rathgeber, C.B.K. (2016).
380 Temperate and boreal forest tree phenology: from organ-scale processes to terrestrial ecosystem models.
381 *Annals of Forest Science*, 73, 5–25.

- 382 Dickinson, J.L., Shirk, J., Bonter, D., Bonney, R., Crain, R.L., Martin, J., Phillips, T. & Purcell, K. (2012).
383 The current state of citizen science as a tool for ecological research and public engagement. *Frontiers in*
384 *Ecology and the Environment*, 10, 291–297.
- 385 Dosio, A., Mentaschi, L., Fischer, E.M. & Wyser, K. (2018). Extreme heat waves under 1.5 °C and 2 °C
386 global warming. *Environmental Research Letters*, 13, 054006.
- 387 Douglass, A. (1928). Climate and trees. *Nature Magazine*, 12, 51–53.
- 388 Dow, C., Kim, A.Y., D’Orangeville, L., Gonzalez-Akre, E.B., Helcoski, R., Herrmann, V., Harley, G.L.,
389 Maxwell, J.T., McGregor, I.R., McShea, W.J., McMahon, S.M., Pederson, N., Tepley, A.J. & Anderson-
390 Teixeira, K.J. (2022). Warm springs alter timing but not total growth of temperate deciduous trees.
391 *Nature*, 608, 552–557.
- 392 Dox, I., Skrøppa, T., Decoster, M., Prislan, P., Gascó, A., Gričar, J., Lange, H. & Campioli, M. (2022).
393 Severe drought can delay autumn senescence of silver birch in the current year but advance it in the next
394 year. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 316, 108879.
- 395 Driscoll, D.A., Bland, L.M., Bryan, B.A., Newsome, T.M., Nicholson, E., Ritchie, E.G. & Doherty, T.S.
396 (2018). A biodiversity-crisis hierarchy to evaluate and refine conservation indicators. *Nature Ecology &*
397 *Evolution*, 2, 775–781.
- 398 Duputié, A., Rutschmann, A., Ronce, O. & Chuine, I. (2015). Phenological plasticity will not help all species
399 adapt to climate change. *Global Change Biology*, 21, 3062–3073.
- 400 Ettinger, A.K., Chamberlain, C.J., Morales-Castilla, I., Buonaiuto, D.M., Flynn, D.F.B., Savas, T., Samaha,
401 J.A. & Wolkovich, E.M. (2020). Winter temperatures predominate in spring phenological responses to
402 warming. *Nature Climate Change*, 10, 1137–1142.
- 403 Etzold, S., Sterck, F., Bose, A.K., Braun, S., Buchmann, N., Eugster, W., Gessler, A., Kahmen, A., Peters,
404 R.L., Vitasse, Y., Walthert, L., Ziemińska, K. & Zweifel, R. (2022). Number of growth days and not length
405 of the growth period determines radial stem growth of temperate trees. *Ecology Letters*, 25, 427–439.
- 406 Flynn, D.F.B. & Wolkovich, E.M. (2018). Temperature and photoperiod drive spring phenology across all
407 species in a temperate forest community. *New Phytologist*, 219, 1353–1362.
- 408 Friend, A.D., Eckes-Shephard, A.H., Fonti, P., Rademacher, T.T., Rathgeber, C.B.K., Richardson, A.D. &
409 Turton, R.H. (2019). On the need to consider wood formation processes in global vegetation models and
410 a suggested approach. *Annals of Forest Science*, 76, 49.
- 411 Fritts, H. & Swetnam, T. (1989). Dendroecology: A Tool for Evaluating Variations in Past and Present
412 Forest Environments. In: *Advances in Ecological Research*. Elsevier, vol. 19, pp. 111–188.
- 413 Fu, Y.H., Campioli, M., Deckmyn, G. & Janssens, I.A. (2013). Sensitivity of leaf unfolding to experimental
414 warming in three temperate tree species. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 181, 125–132.
- 415 Fu, Y.H., Piao, S., Op De Beeck, M., Cong, N., Zhao, H., Zhang, Y., Menzel, A. & Janssens, I.A. (2014).
416 Recent spring phenology shifts in western Central Europe based on multiscale observations. *Global Ecology*
417 *and Biogeography*, 23, 1255–1263.
- 418 Fu, Y.H., Zhao, H., Piao, S., Peaucelle, M., Peng, S., Zhou, G., Ciais, P., Huang, M., Menzel, A., Peñuelas,
419 J., Song, Y., Vitasse, Y., Zeng, Z. & Janssens, I.A. (2015). Declining global warming effects on the
420 phenology of spring leaf unfolding. *Nature*, 526, 104–107. Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- 421 Gagne, M.A., Smith, D.D. & McCulloh, K.A. (2020). Limited physiological acclimation to recurrent heat-
422 waves in two boreal tree species. *Tree Physiology*, 40, 1680–1696.
- 423 Gallinat, A.S., Primack, R.B. & Wagner, D.L. (2015). Autumn, the neglected season in climate change
424 research. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 30, 169–176.

- Gazol, A., Camarero, J.J., Vicente-Serrano, S.M., Sánchez-Salguero, R., Gutiérrez, E., De Luis, M., Sangüesa-Barreda, G., Novak, K., Rozas, V., Tíscar, P.A., Linares, J.C., Martín-Hernández, N., Martínez Del Castillo, E., Ribas, M., García-González, I., Silla, F., Camisón, A., Génova, M., Olano, J.M., Longares, L.A., Hevia, A., Tomás-Burguera, M. & Galván, J.D. (2018). Forest resilience to drought varies across biomes. *Global Change Biology*, 24, 2143–2158.
- Gilmore, E.C. & Rogers, J.S. (1958). Heat Units as a Method of Measuring Maturity in Corn. *Agronomy Journal*, 50, 611–615.
- Green, J.K. & Keenan, T.F. (2022). The limits of forest carbon sequestration. *Science*, 376, 692–693.
- Griffin, D., Porter, S.T., Trumper, M.L., Carlson, K.E., Crawford, D.J., Schwalen, D. & McFadden, C.H. (2021). Gigapixel Macro Photography of Tree Rings. *Tree-Ring Research*, 77.
- Huey, R.B., Kearney, M.R., Krockenberger, A., Holtum, J.A.M., Jess, M. & Williams, S.E. (2012). Predicting organismal vulnerability to climate warming: roles of behaviour, physiology and adaptation. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 367, 1665–1679.
- Hufkens, K., Melaas, E.K., Mann, M.L., Foster, T., Ceballos, F., Robles, M. & Kramer, B. (2019). Monitoring crop phenology using a smartphone based near-surface remote sensing approach. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 265, 327–337.
- Intergovernmental Panel On Climate Change (Ipcc) (2023). *Climate Change 2022 – Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability: Working Group II Contribution to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. 1st edn. Cambridge University Press.
- Jeong, S. & Medvigy, D. (2014). Macroscale prediction of autumn leaf coloration throughout the continental United States. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 23, 1245–1254.
- Keenan, T.F., Gray, J., Friedl, M.A., Toomey, M., Bohrer, G., Hollinger, D.Y., Munger, J.W., O’Keefe, J., Schmid, H.P., Wing, I.S., Yang, B. & Richardson, A.D. (2014). Net carbon uptake has increased through warming-induced changes in temperate forest phenology. *Nature Climate Change*, 4, 598–604.
- Kolář, T., Giagli, K., Trnka, M., Bednářová, E., Vavřík, H. & Rybníček, M. (2016). Response of the leaf phenology and tree-ring width of European beech to climate variability. *Silva Fennica*, 50.
- Körner, C. & Basler, D. (2010). Phenology Under Global Warming. *Science*, 327, 1461–1462. Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science.
- Körner, C., Möhl, P. & Hiltbrunner, E. (2023). Four ways to define the growing season. *Ecology Letters*, 26, 1277–1292.
- Laube, J., Sparks, T.H., Estrella, N., Höfler, J., Ankerst, D.P. & Menzel, A. (2014). Chilling outweighs photoperiod in preventing precocious spring development. *Global Change Biology*, 20, 170–182.
- Laurance, W.F. (2007). Have we overstated the tropical biodiversity crisis? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 22, 65–70.
- Levanič, T. (2007). Atrics – A New System for Image Acquisition in Dendrochronology. *Tree-Ring Research*, 63, 117–122.
- Li, Y., Zhang, W., Schwalm, C.R., Gentine, P., Smith, W.K., Ciais, P., Kimball, J.S., Gazol, A., Kannenberg, S.A., Chen, A., Piao, S., Liu, H., Chen, D. & Wu, X. (2023). Widespread spring phenology effects on drought recovery of Northern Hemisphere ecosystems. *Nature Climate Change*, 13, 182–188.
- Lieth, H., Jacobs, J., Lange, O.L., Olson, J.S. & Wieser, W. (eds.) (1974). *Phenology and Seasonality Modeling*. vol. 8 of *Ecological Studies*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Lynas, M., Houlton, B.Z. & Perry, S. (2021). Greater than 99% consensus on human caused climate change in the peer-reviewed scientific literature. *Environmental Research Letters*, 16, 114005.

- Manzanedo, R.D. & Pederson, N. (2019). Towards a More Ecological Dendroecology. *Tree-Ring Research*, 75, 152.
- Marx, W., Haunschild, R. & Bornmann, L. (2021). Heat waves: a hot topic in climate change research. *Theoretical and Applied Climatology*, 146, 781–800.
- McMaster, G. (1997). Growing degree-days: one equation, two interpretations. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 87, 291–300.
- Meehl, G.A. & Tebaldi, C. (2004). More Intense, More Frequent, and Longer Lasting Heat Waves in the 21st Century. *Science*, 305, 994–997.
- Meng, L., Mao, J., Zhou, Y., Richardson, A.D., Lee, X., Thornton, P.E., Ricciuto, D.M., Li, X., Dai, Y., Shi, X. & Jia, G. (2020). Urban warming advances spring phenology but reduces the response of phenology to temperature in the conterminous United States. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117, 4228–4233.
- Menzel, A., Sparks, T.H., Estrella, N., Koch, E., Aasa, A., Ahas, R., Alm-Kübler, K., Bissolli, P., Braslavská, O., Briede, A., Chmielewski, F.M., Crepinsek, Z., Curnel, Y., Defila, C., Donnelly, A., Filella, Y., Jatczak, K., Mestre, A., Peñuelas, J., Pirinen, P., Scheifinger, H., Striz, M., Susnik, A., Van Vliet, A.J.H., Wielgolaski, F., Zach, S. & Züst, A. (2006). European phenological response to climate change matches the warming pattern. *Global Change Biology*, 12, 1969–1976.
- Meyer, H.A. (1940). A Mathematical Expression for Height Curves. *Journal of Forestry*, 38, 415–420.
- Moore, J.L. & Remais, J.V. (2014). Developmental Models for Estimating Ecological Responses to Environmental Variability: Structural, Parametric, and Experimental Issues. *Acta Biotheoretica*, 62, 69–90.
- Morin, X., Roy, J., Sonié, L. & Chuine, I. (2010). Changes in leaf phenology of three European oak species in response to experimental climate change. *New Phytologist*, 186, 900–910.
- Muller, B., Pantin, F., Génard, M., Turc, O., Freixes, S., Piques, M. & Gibon, Y. (2011). Water deficits uncouple growth from photosynthesis, increase C content, and modify the relationships between C and growth in sink organs. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, 62, 1715–1729.
- Oreskes, N. (2004). The Scientific Consensus on Climate Change. *Science*, 306, 1686–1686.
- Parent, B., Turc, O., Gibon, Y., Stitt, M. & Tardieu, F. (2010). Modelling temperature-compensated physiological rates, based on the co-ordination of responses to temperature of developmental processes. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, 61, 2057–2069.
- Parmesan, C., Ryrholm, N., Stefanescu, C., Hill, J.K., Thomas, C.D., Descimon, H., Huntley, B., Kaila, L., Kullberg, J., Tammara, T., Tennent, W.J., Thomas, J.A. & Warren, M. (1999). Poleward shifts in geographical ranges of butterfly species associated with regional warming. *Nature*, 399, 579–583.
- Parmesan, C. & Yohe, G. (2003). A globally coherent fingerprint of climate change impacts across natural systems. *Nature*, 421, 37–42.
- Pearl, J.K., Keck, J.R., Tintor, W., Siekacz, L., Herrick, H.M., Meko, M.D. & Pearson, C.L. (2020). New frontiers in tree-ring research. *The Holocene*, 30, 923–941.
- Peters, R.L., Steppe, K., Cuny, H.E., De Pauw, D.J., Frank, D.C., Schaub, M., Rathgeber, C.B., Cabon, A. & Fonti, P. (2021). Turgor – a limiting factor for radial growth in mature conifers along an elevational gradient. *New Phytologist*, 229, 213–229.
- Peñuelas, J. & Filella, I. (2001). Responses to a Warming World. *Science*, 294, 793–795. Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science.
- Piao, S., Liu, Q., Chen, A., Janssens, I.A., Fu, Y., Dai, J., Liu, L., Lian, X., Shen, M. & Zhu, X. (2019). Plant phenology and global climate change: Current progresses and challenges. *Global Change Biology*, 25, 1922–1940.

- Plomion, C., Leprovost, G. & Stokes, A. (2001). Wood Formation in Trees. *Plant Physiology*, 127, 1513–1523.
- Polgar, C.A. & Primack, R.B. (2011). Leaf-out phenology of temperate woody plants: from trees to ecosystems. *New Phytologist*, 191, 926–941.
- Primack, R.B., Laube, J., Gallinat, A.S. & Menzel, A. (2015). From observations to experiments in phenology research: investigating climate change impacts on trees and shrubs using dormant twigs. *Annals of Botany*, 116, 889–897.
- Rathgeber, C.B.K., Cuny, H.E. & Fonti, P. (2016). Biological Basis of Tree-Ring Formation: A Crash Course. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 7.
- Reinmann, A.B., Bowers, J.T., Kaur, P. & Kohler, C. (2023). Compensatory responses of leaf physiology reduce effects of spring frost defoliation on temperate forest tree carbon uptake. *Frontiers in Forests and Global Change*, 6, 988233.
- Richardson, A.D., Keenan, T.F., Migliavacca, M., Ryu, Y., Sonnentag, O. & Toomey, M. (2013). Climate change, phenology, and phenological control of vegetation feedbacks to the climate system. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 169, 156–173.
- Rossi, S., Anfodillo, T. & Menardi, R. (2006). Trephor: A New Tool for Sampling Microcores from tree stems. *IAWA Journal*, 27, 89–97.
- Sanchez-Lorenzo, A., Wild, M., Brunetti, M., Guijarro, J.A., Hakuba, M.Z., Calbó, J., Mystakidis, S. & Bartok, B. (2015). Reassessment and update of long-term trends in downward surface shortwave radiation over Europe (1939–2012). *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 120, 9555–9569.
- Saunders, M.R. & Wagner, R.G. (2008). Height-diameter models with random coefficients and site variables for tree species of Central Maine. *Annals of Forest Science*, 65, 203–203.
- Silvestro, R., Deslauriers, A., Prislan, P., Rademacher, T., Rezaie, N., Richardson, A.D., Vitasse, Y. & Rossi, S. (2025). From Roots to Leaves: Tree Growth Phenology in Forest Ecosystems. *Current Forestry Reports*, 11, 12.
- Silvestro, R., Mura, C., Alano Bonacini, D., De Lafontaine, G., Faubert, P., Mencuccini, M. & Rossi, S. (2023a). Local adaptation shapes functional traits and resource allocation in black spruce. *Scientific Reports*, 13, 21257.
- Silvestro, R., Zeng, Q., Buttò, V., Sylvain, J.D., Drolet, G., Mencuccini, M., Thiffault, N., Yuan, S. & Rossi, S. (2023b). A longer wood growing season does not lead to higher carbon sequestration. *Scientific Reports*, 13, 4059.
- Soolanayakanahally, R.Y., Guy, R.D., Silim, S.N. & Song, M. (2013). Timing of photoperiodic competency causes phenological mismatch in balsam poplar (*Populus balsamifera* L.). *Plant, Cell & Environment*, 36, 116–127.
- Stridbeck, P., Björklund, J., Fuentes, M., Gunnarson, B.E., Jönsson, A.M., Linderholm, H.W., Ljungqvist, F.C., Olsson, C., Rayner, D., Rocha, E., Zhang, P. & Seftigen, K. (2022). Partly decoupled tree-ring width and leaf phenology response to 20th century temperature change in Sweden. *Dendrochronologia*, 75, 125993.
- Swidrak, I., Schuster, R. & Oberhuber, W. (2013). Comparing growth phenology of co-occurring deciduous and evergreen conifers exposed to drought. *Flora: Morphology, Distribution, Functional Ecology of Plants*, 208, 609–617.
- Teskey, R., Wertin, T., Bauweraerts, I., Ameye, M., Mcguire, M.A. & Steppe, K. (2015). Responses of tree species to heat waves and extreme heat events. *Plant, Cell & Environment*, 38, 1699–1712.
- Trenberth, K.E., Dai, A., Van Der Schrier, G., Jones, P.D., Barichivich, J., Briffa, K.R. & Sheffield, J. (2014). Global warming and changes in drought. *Nature Climate Change*, 4, 17–22.

- Tyree, M.T. & Zimmermann, M.H. (2002). *Xylem Structure and the Ascent of Sap*. Springer Series in Wood Science. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Vitasse, Y. (2013). Ontogenic changes rather than difference in temperature cause understory trees to leaf out earlier. *New Phytologist*, 198, 149–155.
- Vitasse, Y., eLenz, A. & eKoerner, C. (2014). The interaction between freezing tolerance and phenology in temperate deciduous trees. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 5. Publisher: Frontiers Media S.A.
- Von Arx, G. & Carrer, M. (2014). ROXAS – A new tool to build centuries-long tracheid-lumen chronologies in conifers. *Dendrochronologia*, 32, 290–293.
- Way, D.A. & Montgomery, R.A. (2015). Photoperiod constraints on tree phenology, performance and migration in a warming world. *Plant, Cell & Environment*, 38, 1725–1736. _eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/pce.12431>.
- Wolfe, D.W., Schwartz, M.D., Lakso, A.N., Otsuki, Y., Pool, R.M. & Shaulis, N.J. (2005). Climate change and shifts in spring phenology of three horticultural woody perennials in northeastern USA. *International Journal of Biometeorology*, 49, 303–309.
- Wolkovich, E.M., Auerbach, J., Chamberlain, C.J., Buonaiuto, D.M., Ettinger, A.K., Morales-Castilla, I. & Gelman, A. (2021). A simple explanation for declining temperature sensitivity with warming. *Global Change Biology*, 27, 4947–4949.
- Wolkovich, E.M., Cook, B.I. & Davies, T.J. (2014). Progress towards an interdisciplinary science of plant phenology: building predictions across space, time and species diversity. *New Phytologist*, 201, 1156–1162. _eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/nph.12599>.
- Woolway, R.I., Sharma, S., Weyhenmeyer, G.A., Debolskiy, A., Golub, M., Mercado-Bettín, D., Perroud, M., Stepanenko, V., Tan, Z., Grant, L., Ladwig, R., Mesman, J., Moore, T.N., Shatwell, T., Vanderkelen, I., Austin, J.A., DeGasperi, C.L., Dokulil, M., La Fuente, S., Mackay, E.B., Schladow, S.G., Watanabe, S., Marcé, R., Pierson, D.C., Thiery, W. & Jennings, E. (2021). Phenological shifts in lake stratification under climate change. *Nature Communications*, 12, 2318.
- Wu, J. (2013). Key concepts and research topics in landscape ecology revisited: 30 years after the Allerton Park workshop. *Landscape Ecology*, 28, 1–11.
- Wu, X., Niu, C., Liu, X., Hu, T., Feng, Y., Zhao, Y., Liu, S., Liu, Z., Dai, G., Zhang, Y., Van Meerbeek, K., Wu, J., Liu, L., Guo, Q. & Su, Y. (2024). Canopy structure regulates autumn phenology by mediating the microclimate in temperate forests. *Nature Climate Change*, 14, 1299–1305.
- Wu, Z., Chen, S., De Boeck, H.J., Stenseth, N.C., Tang, J., Vitasse, Y., Wang, S., Zohner, C. & Fu, Y.H. (2021). Atmospheric brightening counteracts warming-induced delays in autumn phenology of temperate trees in Europe. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 30, 2477–2487.
- Yan, T., Fu, Y.H., Campioli, M., Peñuelas, J. & Wang, X. (2021). Divergent responses of phenology and growth to summer and autumnal warming. *Global Change Biology*, 27, null.
- Zani, D., Crowther, T.W., Mo, L., Renner, S.S. & Zohner, C.M. (2020). Increased growing-season productivity drives earlier autumn leaf senescence in temperate trees. *Science*, 370, 1066–1071. Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science.
- Zohner, C.M., Mirzagholi, L., Renner, S.S., Mo, L., Rebindaine, D., Bucher, R., Palouš, D., Vitasse, Y., Fu, Y.H., Stocker, B.D. & Crowther, T.W. (2023). Effect of climate warming on the timing of autumn leaf senescence reverses after the summer solstice. *Science*, 381.
- Čufar, K., Prislan, P., De Luis, M. & Gričar, J. (2008). Tree-ring variation, wood formation and phenology of beech (*Fagus sylvatica*) from a representative site in Slovenia, SE Central Europe. *Trees*, 22, 749–758.