

RH: Interactive cues and spring phenology

Limiting cues: How spring warming, winter chilling and daylength will shape climate change responses

THE LAB IN 2017^{1–5}

¹ *Forest & Conservation Sciences, Faculty of Forestry, University of British Columbia, 2424 Main Mall, Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z4*

² *Arnold Arboretum of Harvard University, 1300 Centre Street, Boston, Massachusetts, 02131, USA*

³ *Organismic & Evolutionary Biology, Harvard University, 26 Oxford Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 02138, USA*

⁴ *The Nature Conservancy, 74 Wall Street, Seattle, Washington USA*

⁵ *Global Change Ecology and Evolution Group, Department of Life Sciences, University of Alcalá, Alcalá de Henares 28805, Spain*

Corresponding author: Lizzie, see ³ above ; E-mail: e.wolkovich@ubc.ca

Abstract

Climate change has shifted plant phenology globally, with average shifts of 4-6 days per °C, and some species shifting much more. Such shifts have been some of the most reported and predictable biological impacts of rising temperatures. Yet as climate change has marched on, new research has uncovered possible failures to predict the current observed changes; increasingly, phenological shifts appear more muted over recent decades, or in certain locations. The main hypotheses for these changing trends is that other cues of spring phenology—long-documented in lab environments—are playing a greater role in natural environments due to climate change. Here we argue that accurately linking shifts observed in long-term data to underlying phenological cues requires a much greater integration of data from lab experiments conducted in controlled environments (e.g., growth chambers). We highlight how over 70 years of research in controlled environments can improve predictions for when, where and how the interactive effects of other cues will impact simple linear predictions. Finally, we discuss how a new generation of controlled environment experiments could rapidly improve our predictive capacity for woody plant phenology in coming decades.

Keywords: phenology, climate change, spring warming, chilling, forcing, daylength, photoperiod, non-linear responses, leafout, budburst

1 Main text

Shifts in spring plant phenology are one of the most reported and most predictable changes with climate change. Decades of research have documented advancing budburst, leafout and flowering across systems (Delpierre *et al.*, 2009; Yu *et al.*, 2010; Ellwood *et al.*, 2013; Jochner *et al.*, 2013; Hereford *et al.*, 2017), especially in temperate systems where long-term records highlight how humans have altered the timing of spring (Schwartz, 1997; Menzel *et al.*, 2003, 2006). Recently, however, these advances have appeared to slow (Fu *et al.*, 2015) or even reverse in some places (Yu *et al.*, 2010)—failing to match simple predictions of an advancing spring with continued warming (Ellwood *et al.*, 2013). The main hypothesis for this failure is that spring warming—which most observational studies focus on—is no longer the only environmental cue that matters to predicting responses to warming (Chuine *et al.*, 2016; Gauzere *et al.*, 2019).

Despite the strong focus of spring phenology research on spring temperatures, increasing evidence suggests a more complicated underlying physiology for most temperate species (e.g., Zohner *et al.*, 2016; Gauzere *et al.*, 2019; Ettinger *et al.*, 2020). For many species three major cues underlie spring phenology: forcing (warm temperatures, generally occurring in the late winter and early spring), chilling (cool temperatures, generally occurring in the fall and winter), and photoperiod (daylength).

Together, forcing, chilling and photoperiod may produce non-linear responses that many current methods do not predict, but observational studies appear to have seen recently (Fu *et al.*, 2015). Predicting these non-linearities is a common goal in plant phenology research today (Güsewell *et al.*, 2017; Martinez-Luscher *et al.*, 2017; Gauzere *et al.*, 2019; Chen *et al.*, 2019; Keenan *et al.*, 2020), but has been slowed by data gaps and the underlying complexity of spring phenology.

The first step towards improved phenological predictions is robust measurements of chilling, forcing and photoperiod cues. Recently, much effort has focused on estimating these cues from long-term observational data. Yet observational studies may often fail to robustly estimate any of the three major cues due to two types of statistical issues. First, in most observational data these cues are correlated: forcing increases alongside longer photoperiods (Elmendorf & Ettinger, 2020), and chilling and photoperiod cues both yield similar predictions (i.e., both cues predict later spring phenology with warming). Approaches that attempt to break some of these correlations, such as leveraging elevational or latitudinal gradients, may run afoul of other correlations; for example, gradients in local adaptation can create shifts in the underlying cues along environmental gradients in complex ways (Tansey *et al.*, 2017). Second, most observational studies focus on linear models of each cue, often without interactions between cues.

Using simple linear models with observational data may make sense as phenological responses to most cues are expected to be linear except at the extremes. Natural conditions often see only a small slice of the range of values of each cue that are possible—and those values often appear to be in the middle—potentially linear—range (Gauzere *et al.*, 2017; Ettinger *et al.*, 2020). Further, given that interactions between cues are difficult to estimate—more so when those cues are highly correlated in nature—focusing on main effects of cues may provide more robust estimates

from observational data (main effects integrate over any interactions and require lower statistical power to robustly estimate compared to interactions, Gelman & Hill, 2006).

In contrast to the limitations of observational studies, one method is designed to measure the complexity of cues: controlled environment (e.g., growth chamber) studies (Nagano *et al.*, 2012; Satake *et al.*, 2013). Such studies have been conducted for over 70 years and are specifically designed to understand non-linearities both in individual cues and produced by interactions between cues. In contrast to observational studies, controlled environment studies can manipulate all three cues, extend to other cues that may be important in some species or biomes (e.g., humidity, drought conditions, light spectra), and can tease out interactions between cues by experimentally decoupling them.

Despite the prevalence of controlled environment studies on spring phenological cues, they have rarely been reviewed. Perhaps more surprisingly, they are often poorly integrated into the current phenological literature on climate change. This includes in debates where they are critical, such as about the importance of photoperiod (e.g., Fu *et al.*, 2015; Richardson *et al.*, 2018).

Here we review how the long-term literature on controlled environment studies can be integrated into current phenological research on climate change more fully. We begin by outlining how the three major phenological cues—forcing, chilling and photoperiod—can produce non-linearities and how they will shift in coming decades with anthropogenic climate change. We then review controlled environment studies to understand how much of the cue-space (possible natural range of each cue and interactions across cues) has been studied and how experimental treatments compare to shifts in cues caused by climate change. Based on this, we discuss how controlled environment studies can be best designed to build more robust predictions.

Given our aim to improve understanding of current trends and forecasts we focus on early vegetative phases (budburst and leafout) of wild species, which are critical to plant growth and thus to models of carbon uptake and storage, and which have shifted most with climate change (Cleland *et al.*, 2007; IPCC, 2014). We touch on other areas of research, which have been important to our understanding of the cues underlying phenology. In particular, research has been especially strong in model systems (e.g., *Arabidopsis*, *Populus*) and crops (Cesaraccio *et al.*, 2004)—with the exact phenophase of interest varying (potentially by a species’ life history: more focus on germination and flowering in *Arabidopsis*, and more on leafout and budset in *Populus*). Given our focus on budburst and leafout, our review concentrates on woody species phenology, where most research has been conducted. Most of our conclusions and suggested approaches, however, could be adapted to non-woody species and other phenophases with similar underlying interactive cues.

1.1 How do phenological cues produce non-linear responses?

Forcing, chilling and photoperiod cues together determine budburst each year for woody species in many temperate species (e.g., Chuine & Regniere, 2017; Ettinger *et al.*, 2020). Forcing and chilling cues are generally understood to be accumulation processes, where plants must integrate

chilling and forcing experienced over time to meet a threshold value at which they can budburst, leafout or flower (Chuine, 2000). In contrast, photoperiod is generally not considered an integral cue, but one evaluated daily (Singh *et al.*, 2017). In practice, these two types of processes are often abstracted into the effects of average experienced values (mean temperature or daylength), either over some window in long-term data (e.g., Wolkovich *et al.*, 2012; Fu *et al.*, 2015), or through controlled environments that hold temperatures and light regimes more constant (e.g., Worrall & Mergen, 1967; Heide, 1993a,b; Skuterud & Dietrichson, 1994).

Controlled environment studies show two major ways these cues can produce non-linear response—each cue alone, or through interactions between cues (Figs. 1-2). Each cue alone may produce a non-linear phenological response when examined across a sufficiently wide range of values (Fig. 1). Cues may be linear in the mid-range of values, while extremely high or low values of some cues may produce alternative response (Gauzere *et al.*, 2017). For example, at very low photoperiod (short days) plants often will budburst erratically (Heide, 1993a; Partanen *et al.*, 1998; Singh *et al.*, 2017; Rinne *et al.*, 2018), while at sufficiently long photoperiods maximum growth may occur, meaning photoperiods longer than some threshold will have no additional effect on budburst timing (e.g., Major, 1980). Similarly, extremely cool or very hot temperatures may limit forcing as plant developmental processes slow (Parent & Tardieu, 2012). Such extreme values of cues, however, are likely less common than interactions between cues that can produce non-linearities.

More commonly research has focused on how the interaction of cues may produce non-linearities. For example, multiple studies now show that the threshold of forcing needed for budburst depends on the sum of chilling over the fall and winter and by the photoperiod while forcing is accumulating in the spring (e.g., Zohner & Renner, 2014; Flynn & Wolkovich, 2018). Higher forcing is generally needed given lower chilling (Fig. 3) and short photoperiods (Basler & Körner, 2014; Fu *et al.*, 2019)—producing generally a subadditive effect of forcing x chilling and forcing x photoperiod (i.e., both cues together produce a more muted response than the addition of each cue’s effect alone). This interaction of cues produces a non-linearity in environments where levels of cues are correlated over time or space—for example, if chilling declines are correlated with greater forcing (Fig. 2)—and may be critical to accurate forecasts with climate change.

1.2 How will chilling, forcing and photoperiod shift with climate change?

Translating when or if these non-linearities may be triggered by warming first requires understanding how climate change alters each of the three cues. All three cues are expected to shift with climate change, though the shifts will vary substantially across space and time. Most notably to date, warming increases the forcing plants experience each day, with more rapid shifts—and thus also greater shifts—at higher elevations and in the arctic (IPCC, 2014). Daily minima (generally night-time temperature) generally have and will warm more than maxima temperatures (though this effect varies spatially Alexander *et al.*, 2006), making efforts to understand whether plants accumulate temperatures differently in the night or day more critical (Prasad *et al.*, 2008; Shen *et al.*, 2018).

Warming across seasons is also variable (Alexander *et al.*, 2006), meaning warming’s impact on forcing (generally accumulating in the late winter and spring) may not be equivalent to impacts on chilling (generally accumulating in the late fall through winter). Warming should translate into important shifts in chilling, which long-term observational studies have repeatedly suggested may already be occurring (Fu *et al.*, 2015; Piao *et al.*, 2017). Our poor understanding of chilling, however, makes current and predicted shifts in chilling complicated (Chuine *et al.*, 2016).

Research to date suggests chilling only accumulates in a certain range of temperatures with low (e.g., $<0^{\circ}\text{C}$) temperatures generally not contributing to chilling accumulations and higher temperatures (e.g., $>12^{\circ}\text{C}$) potentially decreasing previously accumulated chilling (see Fig. 4 and Richardson, 1974; Fishman *et al.*, 1987). Long-term studies generally focus on the warmer part of this chilling accumulation curve, suggesting that chilling should decrease with warming (Fu *et al.*, 2015; Piao *et al.*, 2017; Gauzere *et al.*, 2019). However, major shifts in accumulated chilling would also be predicted where temperature regimes that warm previously too low to accumulate chilling in many months of the winter warm to such a degree that chilling begins to accumulate (Guy, 2014). Areas with this shift would then expect much earlier budburst with warming, potentially far earlier than last frost dates.

Unfortunately, these predictions are based on models developed almost solely for agricultural crops (but see Harrington & Gould, 2015), especially stone fruits, and have rarely been robustly adapted to forest trees. While the development of classic models of chilling for peaches and related fruit trees benefited from data on these species being planted far outside their range into regions with extremely low or potentially no chilling, equivalent data on forest trees is almost never available (Dennis, 2003). Thus chilling models to date generally use limited observational and experimental data from forest trees to try to re-parametrize the basic stone fruit models (Chuine, 2000). This in turn makes any current observations of shifts in chilling—and all forecasts with warming—uncertain. Thus, we believe is especially important to consider both increases and decreases as potential outcomes of warming (Fig. 2, 4).

Shifts in chilling and forcing with warming have been studied far more than shifts in photoperiod (but see Saikkonen *et al.*, 2012; Way & Montgomery, 2015). While an environment’s photoperiod does not shift with climate change, the relevant photoperiod a plant experiences at critical physiological points may change dramatically with warming. In particular, increases in chilling and/or forcing, which could alone produce much earlier budburst, may be offset by short photoperiods that delay budburst (Gauzere *et al.*, 2019). Similarly, long photoperiods can lead to budburst sooner than predicted by solely low chilling or forcing conditions (Nienstaedt, 1966; Myking & Heide, 1995; Partanen *et al.*, 1998). Thus, changes in chilling and/or forcing correspond to changes in the relevant photoperiod with climate change.

These shifts—in forcing, chilling and photoperiod experienced near the time of an event (henceforth ‘experienced photoperiod’)—can produce non-linearities when they push a single cue across a critical threshold or inflection point (see Fig. 1). For example, if some species have a critical photoperiod for budburst and warming means forcing cues are met before the critical threshold,

then we would expect incomplete or highly delayed budburst (Singh *et al.*, 2017; Rinne *et al.*, 2018). Alternatively, the threshold could be crossed in the other direction. For example, if pre-climate change conditions generally caused budburst to occur at the extreme levels of some cues and climate change has now pushed budburst into levels where responses are more linear. This is often the mechanism suggested for declining responses to warming in some temperate trees (Fu *et al.*, 2015; Piao *et al.*, 2017; Gauzere *et al.*, 2019), specifically that plants previously accumulated sufficient chilling for a minimal effect of chilling—making forcing the dominant cue—whereas warming has now reduced chilling such that more forcing is needed for budburst (producing an overall muted effect when estimated with current methods). As this example highlights, however, changes in a single cue are unlikely to occur without additional effects on other cues—complicating how well we can understand them in long-term data without robust understanding of the exact cue requirements from experimental studies.

We expect most non-linearities from climate change will come from the effects of interactive cues, as in the previous example where one cue pushed beyond an inflection point triggers shifts in other cues, and due to other covarying shifts caused by environmental change. While simple linear interactions between cues may not alone produce non-linearities (Fig. 2), they quickly become non-linear when changes occur together—for example if increased forcing also occurs in step with shorter experienced photoperiods (Fig. 2). Predicting these non-linearities, however, requires a refined understanding of the interaction between cues and whether there are critical inflection points that may be crossed with continued warming. These complexities highlight how difficult predictions may be without careful efforts to tease out how each cue works alone and interactively.

1.3 Forecasting non-linear responses

Controlled environment (generally growth chamber) studies can help predict non-linear responses by allowing researchers to examine the effects of one cue with the others held constant, and examine interactive effects, given the appropriate study design. Such experiments may be especially useful for forecasting if they contain enough variation in treatments to capture precisely where non-linearities occur, and are designed across a range of levels relevant to current versus future conditions. Indeed, one of the major advantages of experiments is that they allow treatments outside of the historical range—an option long-term observational data cannot provide.

We reviewed controlled environment studies over the last seven decades to understand the range of treatments already available, and how they compare to current and future conditions. We note that these studies were rarely conducted for climate change research, and most often done for fundamental science or other areas of applied science (e.g., horticulture or forestry). Yet they are some of the best available data for how plants respond to the environment and thus a critical resource for climate change research today.

How studies and their experimental treatments vary globally

Controlled environment studies have been conducted across 227 species across the globe, with

the majority of papers reporting research occurring in Europe (54 of 91 papers), followed by North America (23 papers, Fig. 5). Most studies manipulate one cue (Fig. 6), though studies of two or three cues have occurred in almost every decade. Forcing and photoperiod were the most commonly studied cues (64% manipulated forcing; 63% manipulated photoperiod) followed closely by chilling (53% manipulated chilling). The actual cues studied varied across latitude with a general trend toward examining more extreme values at higher latitudes (see Supp). These shifts across space appear related to differences in extremes across latitudes (higher latitudes experience colder temperatures and longer photoperiods, and see similar shifts in their controlled environment study designs), but introduce a bias in results as any comparisons of studies from lower and higher latitudes are also comparing a different range of cues.

How studies manipulate cues

Studies can be broadly categorized as manipulating one, two or (rarely) three cues at once. Single cue studies were the most common (64 studies). While valuable for defining potential non-linearities in one cue, single cue studies prevent understanding interactions among cues or comparisons of which cues dominate phenological responses—challenges that studies of multiple cues can overcome.

Of the studies manipulating at least one cue, half additionally manipulated another cue. Study designs most often allowed examining whether cues were interactive (that is, whether the effect of one cue depends on the level of the other cue), with the most studies testing for interactions between photoperiod and forcing (17 studies), followed by studies that examined the effects of photoperiod (13 studies) and forcing (12 studies) across the fall-winter. Such studies follow the design generally attributed to Weinberger *et al.* (1950) where tissue (e.g., cuttings of adult dormant trees) are taken progressively across the fall and/or winter seasons then exposed to controlled environment conditions. These studies often equate tissue removed later from the field as having received more chilling and thus often treat ‘time of cutting’ as interchangeable with ‘chilling,’ though forcing and photoperiod conditions also change. Studies examining photoperiod or forcing crossed with experimental chilling treatments (either through changes in temperature or days of chilling) were much less common (11 studies for photoperiod and 9 studies for forcing).

Studies examining three cues directly were very rare: we identified only three studies examining all three cues at once (Worrall & Mergen, 1967; Skuterud & Dietrichson, 1994; Sogaard *et al.*, 2008), and two of which were on *Picea abies* (Worrall & Mergen, 1967; Sogaard *et al.*, 2008). A slightly larger set of studies (5 studies) examined three cues indirectly—manipulating photoperiod and forcing in controlled environments but equating chilling with sequential removal of tissue from the field—for 11 species (Schnabel & Wample, 1987; Heide, 1993a; Partanen *et al.*, 1998; Basler & Körner, 2014).

The paucity of studies examining multiple cues limits our fundamental understanding of each cue, as well as how—when combined—they will determine future budburst with continued warming. Because the cues are all known to be interactive, estimates of any one cue are influenced by the level of each other cue. Knowing the level of each other cue is difficult both because they

are often not reported (see ‘NA’ in ??), and also because they are somewhat impossible to know given our current understanding of endodormancy (when we understand chilling is accumulated) and ecodormancy (when we understand forcing is accumulated). Authors may use the terms ‘chilling’ and ‘forcing’ for their treatments, but they rarely have physiological evidence that these are the actual conditions plants experience. Studies using sequential removal from the field to estimate chilling are at perhaps the greatest disadvantage to estimate the cues applied: chilling must rely on field estimates from models that are currently only hypotheses of actual chilling (Dennis, 2003), and forcing and photoperiod treatments are most probably a mix conditions in the field and conditions applied in controlled environments. Though such studies also have the advantage of the most natural chilling conditions.

How relevant are treatments to current and future conditions?

The utility of controlled environment studies to forecasting also depends on how relevant treatments are to current and future conditions. Estimating such relevance is difficult as it depends on a species’ range and projections considered. However, a simple analysis of two well studied species, *Fagus sylvatica* and *Betula pendula*, suggests experiments have generally bracketed the range of projected temperatures (Fig. 9). Projected changes in maximum temperatures generally fit within the range of temperature differences conducted within forcing treatments in experiments (e.g., an experiment with both 16°C and 20°C forcing treatments would have a 4°C difference), and similarly matched differences in minimum temperatures in chilling treatments. As we noted above, however, there is a paucity of chilling studies that directly manipulate chilling temperature—and thus allow a comparison of how differences in chilling temperatures impact phenology. Indeed, we found no studies with multiple chill temperatures tested for *Fagus sylvatica*, even though it is one of the most well-studied species.

Experimental shifts were generally larger than expected shifts due to climate change. This makes sense from an experimental-statistical perspective: if the goal of an experiment is to identify if a cue is present then larger treatment differences should yield larger effect sizes and thus higher statistical power. But such large shifts may be risky to extrapolate to smaller shifts due to warming. Further, experimental studies vary from natural settings in myriad ways. Different studies have ameliorated some of these differences. For example, most studies (34 of the 48 that manipulated forcing) have constant day/night temperatures, but some vary day and night temperatures (26 studies) with nights generally being cooler, while some have even introduced ramped temperature through the day and across an experiment’s length (e.g., Basler & Körner, 2012; Laube *et al.*, 2014). Such ramped conditions are generally introduced across all treatments in experiments and thus provide little insight on how much such experimental artifacts matter (but see Erwin & Heins, 1995). This means extrapolating from controlled environment studies should be done with care, and highlights a need for future experiments designed to improve forecasting effects of climate change.

1.4 Paths forward

We argue that controlled environment experiments will be critical for accurate predictions of phenology given future warming. How accurate such predictions are will depend on the design

of future experiments, breakthroughs in our physiological understanding of the major cues, and how well these two areas can be integrated with long-term data to improve models.

Improving controlled environment studies

We expect the most useful future experiments will be designed to improve phenological models. In particular, experiments designed to identify threshold effects and optimal temperatures/photoperiods, and non-linearities from interactive cues may be most useful. Identifying threshold effects and optimal temperatures or photoperiods generally requires many different levels of a single cue, which can make such experiments difficult to cross with other cues. Yet, understanding if findings are consistent across varying levels of other cues should be a follow-up step to confirm that findings can be applied across levels of other cues. Studies manipulating more than one cue also test for non-linearities due to interactive cues, as long as they are fully-crossed (i.e., every combination of levels is present in treatments). Such experiments can quickly require a large number of controlled environments, but provide critical information for models and to connect to long-term findings. As growing experimental results support that all cues are dependent on the level of other cues (Stearns & Olson, 1958; Flynn & Wolkovich, 2018) and long-term data hint at multiple cues (Fu *et al.*, 2015), we believe this should be a major research aim.

Controlled environment studies may also be more readily applied to forecasting by exploring more realistic conditions. While identifying thresholds, optima and non-linearities may involve considering informative extremes in levels of cues, most changes in cues due to climate change are and will be on a (relatively) smaller scale (Fig. 9). Thus, when designing studies to contribute to improved forecasting of a particular species, experimentalists should examine cues within the current and projected future species' range. In most species distribution models, species are expected to remain in the same climatic conditions, suggesting there may be minimal changes—assuming such models of species distribution are accurate and that species track perfectly. Most evidence, however, suggests species will lag in their spatial responses (Loarie *et al.*, 2009), meaning shifts in cues in the current range may be important to the fate of trailing edge populations (Bertrand *et al.*, 2011; Lenoir & Svenning, 2015; Savage & Vellend, 2015).

Beyond the absolute level of cues, controlled environment studies need more work on what attributes of the design are more or less critical for replicating responses from the field. For example, controlled environment studies have shown differing day/night temperatures are important for some species (Heuvelink, 1989; Abrol & Ingram, 1996; Thingnaes *et al.*, 2003; Pressman *et al.*, 2006), but comparison studies have not been conducted for most species. Equally, a few studies have attempted to replicate certain aspects of the environment, such as fluctuating temperatures, ramped temperatures and the coincidence of temperature and sunrise (Erwin, 1998), but these are by no means widespread enough to understand how important these conditions are for extrapolation to models.

Understanding the physiology of phenology

Even with all the suggested above improvements, controlled environment studies will still be

fundamentally limited in their utility for prediction without an improved understanding of how major phenological cues act physiologically. This problem is most apparent with chilling, but translates also to forcing—as the two are both defined by physiological phases of dormancy that are not easily measured.

Chilling is defined as what leads to break of endodormancy, after which plants enter ecodormancy, when accumulated forcing then leads to budburst (Chuine *et al.*, 2016). Measuring endodormancy and its transition into ecodormancy, however, is notoriously difficult. Thus, in practice, most phenology studies use the terms ‘chilling’ and ‘forcing’ to mean ‘cool temperatures’ (often either in the fall and winter or applied in experimental conditions) and ‘warm temperatures’ (often either in the spring or applied after sufficient chilling) and generally hope they correspond to endo- and eco-dormancy—without any evidence or tests of this hoped-for correspondence. Some studies use the sequential transfer of cuttings to warm conditions to estimate the transition from endo- to eco-dormancy, with rapid and full budburst (e.g., >90% of buds on a cutting) generally meaning a plant is ecodormant (e.g., Junttila & Hänninen, 2012), but, given that this is labor- and space-intensive, few studies of chilling include this.

Physiologists have long recognized this issue and recent breakthroughs provide new insights into what causes dormancy at the cellular level (van der Schoot *et al.*, 2014). Research suggests endodormancy may break when enzymes sufficiently remove the sugar (callose) that blocks plasmodesmata in bud cells (reviewed in Chang *et al.*, 2021), but work thus far has relied generally on cellular staining methods tested on a very limited subset of species (Rinne *et al.*, 2011; Singh *et al.*, 2019), making extrapolation to other species difficult. Such results, however, hold promise for a much improved physiological understanding of endodormancy release in the future.

An improved physiological understanding of endodormancy release could revolutionize models of chilling, and in turn, estimates of forcing. Forcing in controlled environment experiments is generally defined simply as warm temperatures (or warm temperatures after cool temperatures). Future estimates could be accurately defined simply as temperatures during ecodormancy, assuming tractable tests of endo- and eco-dormancy and the uptake of such tests in controlled environment studies. With these experiment studies in hand though, researchers could quickly build improved models of chilling, and forcing and—for the first time—provide accurate predictions of how chilling will shift with climate change.

Improving integration of controlled environment and physiological studies with long-term data

A major need currently is improved integration between long-term observational, physiological and controlled environment studies. With important exceptions (e.g., Gauzere *et al.*, 2017), studies of long-term observational phenology data have moved forward independently from advances in our physiological understanding and from controlled environment studies. Similarly, controlled environment studies, as we have reviewed here, generally do not use long-term data to help interpret results or define treatments.

While most studies of long-term data and controlled environments generally ignore one another,

attempts to integrate the two provide a useful path forward that can happen now (Caffarra *et al.*, 2011; Nagano *et al.*, 2012; Satake *et al.*, 2013; Ford *et al.*, 2016; Chuine & Regniere, 2017), while we await physiological breakthroughs in defining endo- and eco-dormancy. Experiments that test for thresholds and the presence of important interactions have helped re-design models (Caffarra *et al.*, 2011; Chuine & Regniere, 2017), while other studies have used experiments to test extremes (e.g., extremely low chilling) combined with data from long-term provenance studies to understand how growth and phenology will combine to determine future ranges (Ford *et al.*, 2016). Further, some work has used controlled environments to test model predictions, especially in future climate scenarios where non-linearities are predicted (see Nagano *et al.*, 2012). Such work underlies progress towards model development that relies continuously on a back-and-forth process between developing models based on both long-term data and experiments, then testing predictions with new experiments and as newer observational data are generated (i.e., more years and also data from new locations, Nagano *et al.*, 2012; Satake *et al.*, 2013). Such efforts of continual development take extensive data and thus have only been carried out for a very few species (e.g., *Arabidopsis thaliana*, *Oryza sativa* (rice), *Arabidopsis halleri*, Wilczek *et al.*, 2009; Nagano *et al.*, 2012; Satake *et al.*, 2013).

Building species-rich predictions

Given the efforts and data involved in models for a single species, building up to multi-species predictions may appear daunting, but multi-species models are crucial for accurate forecasts that can apply to diverse regions and large-scale vegetation models. Addressing this issue requires, of course, more data. Long-term data is generally more species-rich than controlled environment studies. For example long-term observational data in the PEP725 and NECTAR databases together have multi-site data on more than 2500 species, while our review of controlled environment studies found most studies focused on only one species with data on a total of 227 species. Thus, more diverse controlled environment studies may be the current major data limitation. Beyond data, however, new modeling approaches can help integrate current and future data more powerfully.

Bayesian hierarchical models are specifically designed for analysis of diverse datasets. With the right information and sufficient data, they can attribute variation across studies to the species studied, the cues (i.e., chilling, forcing and photoperiod levels in studies) and remaining unmeasured variation in studies (i.e., differences in chamber design may be captured by including a parameter to estimate a ‘study’ effect). Such models are extremely powerful for building species-rich predictions as they leverage data across all species into one model designed to capture both the cross-species and cross-study overall effects as well as species-level differences. Yet, like all models, they are more robust with more data. In particular, attributing variation due to study versus species requires the same species to be studied across several studies, which is currently not the case for most species, according to our literature review (over 80% of the 227 species in our dataset appear in only one study, 26 species, or 11.4%, appear in more than two studies and only 10 species, or 4.4%, appear in more than three studies). Thus, these models will be most useful given greater efforts to publish data. Given proper data reporting (i.e., all cue conditions must be defined, even when not manipulated, and controlled environment conditions should

be fully described including relative humidity and irradiance) all studies—whether designed to improve models or forecasting, or not—can be included in such models.

1.5 Right now: It’s your tomorrow

Research on phenology had been conducted for centuries before anthropogenic climate change caused earlier budburst and leafout across much of the globe (Sparks & Carey, 1995). Decades of controlled environment studies contributed to our fundamental understanding of the drivers of spring plant phenology. Today, climate change requires leveraging these decades and centuries of research for more accurate predictions that can help humans adapt to warming.

We have outlined how researchers could better harness the power of controlled environment experiments to transform our fundamental understanding of phenology and advance forecasting. Controlled environment studies can critically rule out, or support, hypotheses to explain observed discrepancies in long-term data and open up new pathways to use long-term data to understand current trends, helping the field move beyond trying to tease out cues using only long-term data where cues are inherently correlated. While understanding, modeling and predicting interactions among cues and their effects on phenology is challenging, advances would yield more accurate predictions, with valuable implications to more realistically assess the effects of climate change on plant biodiversity, including agricultural and forest species.

2 References

- Abrol, Y.P. & Ingram, K.T. (1996) Effects of higher day and night temperatures on growth and yields of some crop plants. *Global climate change and agricultural production: Direct and indirect effects of changing hydrological, pedological and plant physiological processes* pp. 123–140.
- Alexander, L.V., Zhang, X., Peterson, T.C., Caesar, J., Gleason, B., Tank, A., Haylock, M., Collins, D., Trewin, B., Rahimzadeh, F., Tagipour, A., Kumar, K.R., Revadekar, J., Griffiths, G., Vincent, L., Stephenson, D.B., Burn, J., Aguilar, E., Brunet, M., Taylor, M., New, M., Zhai, P., Rusticucci, M. & Vazquez-Aguirre, J.L. (2006) Global observed changes in daily climate extremes of temperature and precipitation. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres* **111**.
- Basler, D. & Körner, C. (2012) Photoperiod sensitivity of bud burst in 14 temperate forest tree species. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **165**, 73–81.
- Basler, D. & Körner, C. (2014) Photoperiod and temperature responses of bud swelling and bud burst in four temperate forest tree species. *Tree Physiology* **34**, 377–388.
- Bertrand, R., Lenoir, J., Piedallu, C., Riofrío-Dillon, G., de Ruffray, P., Vidal, C., Pierrat, J.C. & Gégout, J.C. (2011) Changes in plant community composition lag behind climate warming in lowland forests. *Nature* **479**, 517.
- Caffarra, A., Donnelly, A. & Chuine, I. (2011) Modelling the timing of *Betula pubescens* bud-burst. II. Integrating complex effects of photoperiod into process-based models. *Climate Research* **46**, 159–170.
- Cesaraccio, C., Spano, D., Snyder, R.L. & Duce, P. (2004) Chilling and forcing model to predict bud-burst of crop and forest species. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **126**, 1–13.
- Chang, C.Y.Y., Brautigam, K., Huner, N.P.A. & Ensminger, I. (2021) Champions of winter survival: cold acclimation and molecular regulation of cold hardiness in evergreen conifers. *New Phytologist* **229**, 675–691.
- Chen, L., Huang, J.G., Ma, Q.Q., Hanninen, H., Tremblay, F. & Bergeron, Y. (2019) Long-term changes in the impacts of global warming on leaf phenology of four temperate tree species. *Global Change Biology* **25**, 997–1004.
- Chuine, I. (2000) A unified model for budburst of trees. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **207**, 337–347.
- Chuine, I., Bonhomme, M., Legave, J.M., García de Cortázar-Atauri, I., Charrier, G., Lacointe, A. & Améglio, T. (2016) Can phenological models predict tree phenology accurately in the future? The unrevealed hurdle of endodormancy break. *Global Change Biology* **22**, 3444–3460.

- 480 Chuine, I. & Regniere, J. (2017) Process-based models of phenology for plants and animals.
481 *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* **48**, 159–182.
- 482 Cleland, E.E., Chuine, I., Menzel, A., Mooney, H.A. & Schwartz, M.D. (2007) Shifting plant
483 phenology in response to global change. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **22**, 357–365.
- 484 Delpierre, N., Dufrene, E., Soudani, K., Ulrich, E., Cecchini, S., Boe, J. & Francois, C. (2009)
485 Modelling interannual and spatial variability of leaf senescence for three deciduous tree species
486 in France. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **149**, 938–948.
- 487 Dennis, F. (2003) Problems in standardizing methods for evaluating the chilling requirements
488 for the breaking of dormancy in buds of woody plants. *HortScience* **38**, 347–350.
- 489 Ellwood, E.R., Temple, S.A., Primack, R.B., Bradley, N.L. & Davis, C.C. (2013) Record-
490 breaking early flowering in the eastern united states. *Plos One* **8**, ellwood, Elizabeth R.
491 Temple, Stanley A. Primack, Richard B. Bradley, Nina L. Davis, Charles C.
- 492 Elmendorf, S.C. & Ettinger, A.K. (2020) Is photoperiod a dominant driver of secondary growth
493 resumption? *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*
494 **117**, 32861–32864.
- 495 Erwin, J.E. (1998) Temperature and light effects on stem elongation. *Journal of the Japanese*
496 *Society for Horticultural Science* **67**, 1113–1120.
- 497 Erwin, J.E. & Heins, R.D. (1995) Thermomorphogenic responses in stem and leaf development.
498 *Hortscience* **30**, 940–949.
- 499 Ettinger, A., Chamberlain, C., Morales-Castilla, I., Buonaiuto, D., Flynn, D., Savas, T., Samaha,
500 J. & Wolkovich, E. (2020) Winter temperatures predominate in spring phenological responses
501 to warming. *Nature Climate Change* pp. 1–6.
- 502 Fishman, S., Erez, A. & Couvillon, G. (1987) The temperature dependence of dormancy break-
503 ing in plants: mathematical analysis of a two-step model involving a cooperative transition.
504 *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **124**, 473–483.
- 505 Flynn, D.F.B. & Wolkovich, E.M. (2018) Temperature and photoperiod drive spring phenology
506 across all species in a temperate forest community. *New Phytologist* **219**, 1353–1362.
- 507 Ford, K.R., Harrington, C.A., Bansal, S., Gould, Peter, J. & St. Clair, J.B. (2016) Will changes
508 in phenology track climate change? A study of growth initiation timing in coast Douglas-fir.
509 *Global Change Biology* **22**, 3712–3723.
- 510 Fu, Y.H., Piao, S., Zhou, X., Geng, X., Hao, F., Vitasse, Y. & Janssens, I.A. (2019) Short
511 photoperiod reduces the temperature sensitivity of leaf-out in saplings of *Fagus sylvatica* but
512 not in horse chestnut. *Global Change Biology* **25**, 1696–1703.
- 513 Fu, Y.S.H., Zhao, H.F., Piao, S.L., Peaucelle, M., Peng, S.S., Zhou, G.Y., Ciais, P., Huang, M.T.,
514 Menzel, A., Uelas, J.P., Song, Y., Vitasse, Y., Zeng, Z.Z. & Janssens, I.A. (2015) Declining
515 global warming effects on the phenology of spring leaf unfolding. *Nature* **526**, 104–107.

- 516 Gauzere, J., Delzon, S., Davi, H., Bonhomme, M., de Cortazar-Atauri, I.G. & Chuine, I. (2017)
 517 Integrating interactive effects of chilling and photoperiod in phenological process-based mod-
 518 els. A case study with two European tree species: *Fagus sylvatica* and *Quercus petraea*. *Agricu-*
 519 *cultural and Forest Meteorology* **244**, 9–20.
- 520 Gauzere, J., Lucas, C., Ronce, O., Davi, H. & Chuine, I. (2019) Sensitivity analysis of tree phe-
 521 nology models reveals increasing sensitivity of their predictions to winter chilling temperature
 522 and photoperiod with warming climate. *Ecological Modelling* **441**, 108805.
- 523 Gelman, A. & Hill, J. (2006) *Data analysis using regression and multilevel/hierarchical models*.
 524 Cambridge University Press.
- 525 Güsewell, S., Furrer, R., Gehrig, R. & Pietragalla, B. (2017) Changes in temperature sensitivity
 526 of spring phenology with recent climate warming in Switzerland are related to shifts of the
 527 preseason. *Global Change Biology* **23**, 5189–5202.
- 528 Guy, R.D. (2014) The early bud gets to warm. *New Phytologist* **202**, 7–9.
- 529 Harrington, C.A. & Gould, P.J. (2015) Tradeoffs between chilling and forcing in satisfying dor-
 530 mancy requirements for pacific northwest tree species. *Frontiers in Plant Science* **6**, 120.
- 531 Heide, O. (1993a) Daylength and thermal time responses of budburst during dormancy release
 532 in some northern deciduous trees. *Physiologia Plantarum* **88**, 531–540.
- 533 Heide, O. (1993b) Dormancy release in beech buds (*Fagus sylvatica*) requires both chilling and
 534 long days. *Physiologia Plantarum* **89**, 187–191.
- 535 Hereford, J., Schmitt, J. & Ackerly, D.D. (2017) The seasonal climate niche predicts phenology
 536 and distribution of an ephemeral annual plant, *mollugo verticillata*. *Journal of Ecology* **105**,
 537 1323–1334.
- 538 Heuvelink, E. (1989) Influence of day and night temperature on the growth of young tomato
 539 plants. *Scientia Horticulturae* **38**, 11–22.
- 540 IPCC (2014) *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability*. Cambridge Univer-
 541 sity Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.
- 542 Jochner, S., Caffarra, A. & Menzel, A. (2013) Can spatial data substitute temporal data in
 543 phenological modelling? a survey using birch flowering. *Tree Physiology* **33**, 1256–1268.
- 544 Junttila, O. & Hänninen, H. (2012) The minimum temperature for budburst in *Betula* depends
 545 on the state of dormancy. *Tree physiology* **32**, 337–345.
- 546 Keenan, T.F., Richardson, A.D. & Hufkens, K. (2020) On quantifying the apparent temperature
 547 sensitivity of plant phenology. *New Phytologist* **225**, 1033–1040.
- 548 Laube, J., Sparks, T.H., Estrella, N., Höfler, J., Ankerst, D.P. & Menzel, A. (2014) Chilling
 549 outweighs photoperiod in preventing precocious spring development. *Global Change Biology*
 550 **20**, 170–182.

551 Lenoir, J. & Svenning, J.C. (2015) Climate-related range shifts—a global multidimensional syn-
552 thesis and new research directions. *Ecography* **38**, 15–28.

553 Loarie, S.R., Duffy, P.B., Hamilton, H., Asner, G.P., Field, C.B. & Ackerly, D.D. (2009) The
554 velocity of climate change. *Nature* **462**, 1052–U111.

555 Major, D.J. (1980) Photoperiod response characteristics controlling flowering of 9 crop species.
556 *Canadian Journal of Plant Science* **60**, 777–784.

557 Martinez-Luscher, J., Hadley, P., Ordidge, M., Xu, X.M. & Luedeling, E. (2017) Delayed chilling
558 appears to counteract flowering advances of apricot in southern uk. *Agricultural and Forest*
559 *Meteorology* **237**, 209–218.

560 Menzel, A., Jakobi, G., Ahas, R., Scheifinger, H. & Estrella, N. (2003) Variations of the climato-
561 logical growing season (1951–2000) in Germany compared with other countries. *International*
562 *Journal of Climatology* **23**, 793–812.

563 Menzel, A., Sparks, T.H., Estrella, N., Koch, E., Aasa, A., Ahas, R., Alm-Kuebler, K. *et al.*
564 (2006) European phenological response to climate change matches the warming pattern. *Global*
565 *Change Biology* **12**, 1969–1976.

566 Myking, T. & Heide, O. (1995) Dormancy release and chilling requirement of buds of latitudinal
567 ecotypes of *Betula pendula* and *B. pubescens*. *Tree Physiology* **15**, 697–704.

568 Nagano, A.J., Sato, Y., Mihara, M., Antonio, B.A., Motoyama, R., Itoh, H., Nagamura, Y.
569 & Izawa, T. (2012) Deciphering and prediction of transcriptome dynamics under fluctuating
570 field conditions. *Cell* **151**, 1358–1369.

571 Nienstaedt, H. (1966) Dormancy and dormancy release in white spruce. *Forest Science* **12**,
572 374–384.

573 Parent, B. & Tardieu, F. (2012) Temperature responses of developmental processes have not
574 been affected by breeding in different ecological areas for 17 crop species. *New Phytologist*
575 **194**, 760–774.

576 Partanen, J., Koski, V. & Hänninen, H. (1998) Effects of photoperiod and temperature on the
577 timing of bud burst in Norway spruce (*Picea abies*). *Tree Physiology* **18**, 811–816.

578 Piao, S., Liu, Z., Wang, T., Peng, S., Ciais, P., Huang, M., Ahlstrom, A., Burkhardt, J.F.,
579 Chevallier, F., Janssens, I.A. *et al.* (2017) Weakening temperature control on the interannual
580 variations of spring carbon uptake across northern lands. *Nature climate change* **7**, 359.

581 Prasad, P.V.V., Pisipati, S.R., Ristic, Z., Bukovnik, U. & Fritz, A.K. (2008) Impact of nighttime
582 temperature on physiology and growth of spring wheat. *Crop Science* **48**, 2372–2380.

583 Pressman, E., Shaked, R. & Firon, N. (2006) Exposing pepper plants to high day temperatures
584 prevents the adverse low night temperature symptoms. *Physiologia Plantarum* **126**, 618–626.

585 Richardson, A.D., Hufkens, K., Milliman, T., Aubrecht, D.M., Furze, M.E., Seyednasrollah, B.,
586 Krassovski, M.B., Latimer, J.M., Nettles, W.R., Heiderman, R.R., Warren, J.M. & Hanson,
587 P.J. (2018) Ecosystem warming extends vegetation activity but heightens vulnerability to cold
588 temperatures. *Nature* **560**, 368–+.

589 Richardson, E. (1974) A model for estimating the completion of rest for ‘Redhaven’ and ‘Elberta’
590 peach trees. *HortScience* **9**, 331–332.

591 Rinne, P.L.H., Paul, L.K. & van der Schoot, C. (2018) Decoupling photo- and thermoperiod by
592 projected climate change perturbs bud development, dormancy establishment and vernaliza-
593 tion in the model tree populus. *Bmc Plant Biology* **18**.

594 Rinne, P.L.H., Welling, A., Vahala, J., Ripel, L., Ruonala, R., Kangasjarvi, J. & van der Schoot,
595 C. (2011) Chilling of dormant buds hyperinduces FLOWERING LOCUS T and recruits GA-
596 Inducible 1,3-beta-Glucanases to reopen signal conduits and release dormancy in *Populus*.
597 *Plant Cell* **23**, 130–146.

598 Saikkonen, K., Taulavuori, K., Hyvönen, T., Gundel, P.E., Hamilton, C.E., Vänninen, I., Nissi-
599 nen, A. & Helander, M. (2012) Climate change-driven species’ range shifts filtered by pho-
600 toperiodism. *Nature Climate Change* **2**, 239.

601 Satake, A., Kawagoe, T., Saburi, Y., Chiba, Y., Sakurai, G. & Kudoh, H. (2013) Forecasting
602 flowering phenology under climate warming by modelling the regulatory dynamics of flowering-
603 time genes. *Nature Communications* **4**.

604 Savage, J. & Vellend, M. (2015) Elevational shifts, biotic homogenization and time lags in
605 vegetation change during 40 years of climate warming. *Ecography* **38**, 546–555.

606 Schnabel, B.J. & Wample, R.L. (1987) Dormancy and cold hardiness in *Vitis vinifera* L. cv.
607 White Riesling as influenced by photoperiod and temperature. *American Journal of Enology*
608 *and Viticulture* **38**, 265–272.

609 Schwartz, M.D. (1997) Spring index models: An approach to connecting satellite and surface
610 phenology. *Phenology in Seasonal Climates I* (eds. H. Lieth & M.D. Schwartz), pp. 22–38,
611 Backhuys Publisher, Leiden, The Netherlands.

612 Shen, X.J., Liu, B.H., Henderson, M., Wang, L., Wu, Z.F., Wu, H.T., Jiang, M. & Lu, X.G.
613 (2018) Asymmetric effects of daytime and nighttime warming on spring phenology in the
614 temperate grasslands of china. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **259**, 240–249.

615 Singh, R.K., Miskolczi, P., Maurya, J.P. & Bhalerao, R.P. (2019) A tree ortholog of short
616 vegetative phase floral repressor mediates photoperiodic control of bud dormancy. *Current*
617 *Biology* **29**, 128–+.

618 Singh, R.K., Svystun, T., AlDahmash, B., Jönsson, A.M. & Bhalerao, R.P. (2017) Photoperiod-
619 and temperature-mediated control of phenology in trees—a molecular perspective. *New Phy-*
620 *tologist* **213**, 511–524.

- 621 Skuterud, R. & Dietrichson, J. (1994) Budburst in detached birch shoots (*Betula pendula*) of
622 different varieties winter-stored in darkness at three different temperatures. *Silva Fennica* **28**,
623 223–224.
- 624 Søgaaard, G., Johnsen, Ø., Nilsen, J. & Junttila, O. (2008) Climatic control of bud burst in young
625 seedlings of nine provenances of norway spruce. *Tree Physiology* **28**, 311–320.
- 626 Sparks, T.H. & Carey, P.D. (1995) The responses of species to climate over two centuries - an
627 analysis of the Marsham phenological record, 1736-1947. *Journal of Ecology* **83**, 321–329.
- 628 Stearns, F. & Olson, J. (1958) Interactions of photoperiod and temperature affecting seed ger-
629 mination in *Tsuga canadensis*. *American Journal of Botany* **45**, 53–58.
- 630 Tansey, C.J., Hadfield, J.D. & Phillimore, A.B. (2017) Estimating the ability of plants to plas-
631 tically track temperature-mediated shifts in the spring phenological optimum. *Global Change*
632 *Biology* **23**, 3321–3334.
- 633 Thingnaes, E., Torre, S., Ernstsén, A. & Moe, R. (2003) Day and night temperature responses
634 in arabidopsis: Effects on gibberellin and auxin content, cell size, morphology and flowering
635 time. *Annals of Botany* **92**, 601–612.
- 636 van der Schoot, C., Paul, L.K. & Rinne, P.L.H. (2014) The embryonic shoot: a lifeline through
637 winter. *Journal of Experimental Botany* **65**, 1699–1712.
- 638 Way, D.A. & Montgomery, R.A. (2015) Photoperiod constraints on tree phenology, performance
639 and migration in a warming world. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **38**, 1725–1736.
- 640 Weinberger, J.H. *et al.* (1950) Chilling requirements of peach varieties. *Proceedings. American*
641 *Society for Horticultural Science*, vol. 56, pp. 122–28.
- 642 Wilczek, A.M., Roe, J.L., Knapp, M.C., Cooper, M.D., Lopez-Gallego, C., Martin, L.J., Muir,
643 C.D., Sim, S., Walker, A., Anderson, J., Egan, J.F., Moyers, B.T., Petipas, R., Giakountis, A.,
644 Charbit, E., Coupland, G., Welch, S.M. & Schmitt, J. (2009) Effects of genetic perturbation
645 on seasonal life history plasticity. *Science* **323**, 930–934.
- 646 Wolkovich, E.M., Cook, B.I., Allen, J.M., Crimmins, T.M., Betancourt, J.L., Travers, S.E.,
647 Pau, S., Regetz, J., Davies, T.J., Kraft, N.J.B., Ault, T.R., Bolmgren, K., Mazer, S.J.,
648 McCabe, G.J., McGill, B.J., Parmesan, C., Salamin, N., Schwartz, M.D. & Cleland, E.E.
649 (2012) Warming experiments underpredict plant phenological responses to climate change.
650 *Nature* **485**, 494–497.
- 651 Worrall, J. & Mergen, F. (1967) Environmental and genetic control of dormancy in *Picea abies*.
652 *Physiologia Plantarum* **20**, 733–745.
- 653 Yu, H.Y., Luedeling, E. & Xu, J.C. (2010) Winter and spring warming result in delayed spring
654 phenology on the Tibetan Plateau. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the*
655 *United States of America* **107**, 22151–22156.

- 656 Zohner, C.M., Benito, B.M., Svenning, J.C. & Renner, S.S. (2016) Day length unlikely to con-
657 strain climate-driven shifts in leaf-out times of northern woody plants. *Nature Climate Change*
658 **6**, 1120–1123.
- 659 Zohner, C.M. & Renner, S.S. (2014) Common garden comparison of the leaf-out phenology
660 of woody species from different native climates, combined with herbarium records, forecasts
661 long-term change. *Ecology Letters* **17**, 1016–1025.




Figure 1: Draft of one-cue figure showing various types of non-linearities possible in a single cue. Do we need? Or combine with interaction figure?

662 3 Figures

How cue response shapes budburst with warming...




Figure 2: Interactions in linear models can produce nonlinearities, even in simple linear models if there are correlated shifts in cues. Here we show an example considering a forcing x photoperiod interaction (left) and forcing x chilling (right), considering both a linear effect of photoperiod or chilling (in blue) or a threshold effect (in red) versus an effect of forcing only (black line).




Figure 3: A common example of how one cue can modify another is experiments that show how the amount of chilling units effects of the amount of forcing units needed for budburst. Here, I show this from the BB analysis of OSPREE. But I can clean up some by limiting to the same photoperiod and only studies that vary chilling ... if we decide to keep it.





Figure 4: Chilling is complicated. Here we explain with a conceptual figure using a common version of the Utah model (top) and showing two scenarios of how warming may affect chilling accumulated over the winter.



DatasetID			
ashby62 ; 3	gansert02 ; 1	lamb37 ; 1	ruesink98 ; 1
basler12 ; 28	ghelardini10 ; 6	laube14a ; 36	Sanz-Perez09 ; 2
basler14 ; 4	gianfagna85 ; 1	laube14b ; 9	sanzperez10 ; 3
biasi12 ; 2	gomory15 ; 2	li05 ; 3	schnabel87 ; 2
boyer ; 4	granhus09 ; 1	linkosalo06 ; 1	skuterud94 ; 6
caffarra11a ; 4	guak98 ; 1	man10 ; 1	sogaard08 ; 1
caffarra11b ; 1	guerriero90 ; 1	morin10 ; 3	sonsteby13 ; 8
calme94 ; 3	Heide03 ; 3	myking95 ; 6	sonsteby14 ; 5
campbell75 ; 6	heide05 ; 4	myking97 ; 1	spann04 ; 1
cannell83 ; 2	heide08 ; 5	myking98 ; 3	spiers74 ; 1
charrier11 ; 3	heide11 ; 3	nienstaedt66 ; 14	swartz81 ; 1
chavarria09 ; 1	heide12 ; 3	nishimoto95 ; 3	viheraarnio06 ; 2
cook00b ; 2	heide15 ; 1	pagter15 ; 2	webb78 ; 3
cook05 ; 2	heide93 ; 9	partanen01 ; 3	worral167 ; 12
cronje03 ; 1	heide93a ; 5	partanen98 ; 3	yazdaniha64 ; 1
falusi03 ; 1	howe95 ; 2	pettersen71 ; 1	zohner16 ; 144
falusi90 ; 1	jones12 ; 3	ramos99 ; 1	
falusi96 ; 5	junttila12 ; 6	rinne94 ; 1	
falusi97 ; 2	karlsson03 ; 2	rinne97 ; 1	

Figure 5: Overview of the data across space.




Figure 6: Cues manipulated over time.




Figure 7: One correlation with latitude plot ... I think we could move to Supplement




Figure 8: Heat maps of all data showing how few studies manipulate chilling experimentally (left); most use field sampling dates (right).




Figure 9: Predicted changes in temperatures relevant to chilling (A, C) and forcing (B, D) compared to a 1970s baseline shown for two species: *Fagus sylvatica* (A-B) and *Betula pendula*. Points represent a PEP725 site with XX data. Inlay plots in the upper left-hand corner of each plot show a histogram of the predicted changes in temperature overlaid with densities of the chilling (A, C) and forcing (B, D) treatments (green lines show the treatments for that exact species, while black lines show across all species; note that for *Fagus sylvatica* there are no chilling treatments of differing temperatures).