

## OSPREE

### Notes on what we want to do before moving on...

It feels like we have started to hone in on one model (see Fig. 1), which could relate to one data manuscript from OSPREE. In starting to think on this manuscript and discuss it with some people, it occurred to me that we will want to release much of the OSPREE database at that time. That means we'll also want to have done most of what we're really excited about *before* releasing the database.

This means to me that one thing we should answer soon is: given these data what would you want to know? Or, phrased differently, what do you expect others would immediately do with these data and of that list which items would we have wished we had done?

**Paper 1: Species share three major cues** Some notes/words I was pulling together for the main paper. We're not stuck with this text at all but in working through the setup I realized how many different directions it could lead to. So I'll share it here:

#### Abstract

Decades of research on woody species highlight how three major cues shape spring phenological events (e.g., budburst and leafout): forcing (warm temperatures, generally occurring in the late winter and early spring), daylength (photoperiod) and chilling (cool temperatures, generally occurring in the fall and late winter). How pervasive these cues are and whether some species are effectively governed by only one or two cues is a critical area of climate change biology research, as it would shape how complex responses to warming will be. Here we use a global meta-analysis of all published growth chamber studies to test for the relative effects of these three major cues across XX species. We find they almost all show these cues, making climate change responses complex.

*Random text:* While climate change research benefits from this long history of study that has identified the proximate mechanisms of spring phenology (Chuine and Regniere, 2017), much current research still examines phenology from a simplified perspective. This is perhaps understandable as such complex cues are difficult to tease apart and most research has focused on a very few species and little to no information on all others. Whatever the reason however, the end result are studies that tend to use simplified metrics of phenology, especially in long-term observational studies—such as the simple calendar date when an event occurs or a correlation between budburst observed over time and a simple metric of temperature. This latter approach is often assumed to estimate

‘forcing’ but must inherently integrate over other cues determining budburst each year—and the relative role of each cue likely varies year-to-year.

*And with that out of the way ...*

### **Directions I can think of that we could take these budburst data:**

1. Examination of what can predict variation in cues (pro: lots of people will ask about this so we’ll have an answer; con: need to set it up so it is not a fishing expedition):
  - (a) Range size
  - (b) Some climatic attribute of range
  - (c) How far outside their range the cutting was taken + some climatic attribute of range
  - (d) Traits (would need to collect these data ourselves and then see if we trust them)
  - (e) Other cues (do cues trade-off or correlate across species)?
  - (f) Phylogeny
  - (g) None of the above, it’s about study design or such ... see below
2. Understanding our results (cue estimates) in relation as to when species may delay or do weird things (pro: it’s an obvious and important question, and one we have a lot of expertise to answer; cons: we know that real phenological models are more complex, so what can we really offer?)
  - (a) How similar are our estimates from sensitivities you could estimate from long-term data (I think we can do this for chilling and forcing using PEP725 data).
  - (b) Use species from (Fu et al., 2015) to illustrate what 1°C would mean if:
    - i. Evenly applied across year
    - ii. Applied to only certain seasons ...
  - (c) We could see if we can predict the delay seen in PEP725 data? (see Fig. 3)
3. Look into two major areas that could cause variation we see given the data we have ... (pros: we have the data to do this; cons: may be too similar to limiting cues MS). There are two (three) big sources of reasons for the variation:
  - (a) Methodology
    - i. Imputation model
    - ii. Weinberger method
    - iii. Model with experimental versus field chilling...
    - iv. Non-linear model?
    - v. How to do photoperiod (i.e., does temperature co-vary with photoperiod)?

- (b) Species, population-level etc.
  - i. Latitude model
  - ii. Provenance model
  - iii. Trade-offs and correlations in cues among species (see Fig. ??)
  - iv. Coastal versus non-coastal
  - v. Continent of origin?
- (c) Also, sort of climate (i.e., the same tree planted in Finland and southern low-elevation Germany will leaf out first at the German site) ... but we sort of deal with that via the study design, no?

**One critical thing we need to think of:** When I think of the setup it goes something like:

Increasing rates of global climate change are testing ecological predictions of how climate shapes species, communities and ecosystems. For decades, plant phenology has been one of the most reported and consistent biological impacts of climate change, as many temperate plants have shifted their leafing and flowering earlier with increasing temperatures (Wolkovich et al., 2012; IPCC, 2014). Such shifts are important as phenology shapes a suite of ecosystem services, including pollination and carbon sequestration, and scales up to impact projections of climate change itself (Cleland et al., 2007).

Yet as research interest in phenology has increased, discrepancies and uncertainties in our understanding have emerged. Responses to warming—while consistent on average—show high variation across species, sites and time (Wolkovich et al., 2014). Recently, data on some of the most-studied species suggest the long-term trend towards ever-earlier springs may be stalling in parts of Europe (Fu et al., 2015).

So ... if that is our setup (big if), how can we maximize what we have to really advance this area of research?

Also, whatever happens I think that we must not lose sight of **what an important finding the basic model already is** so we don't want a paper that dilutes that message and must avoid it like the plague. That said, now is the time to think of things we want to analyze and figure how they would fit into one or more papers.

## References

- Chuine, I. and Regniere, J. (2017). Process-based models of phenology for plants and animals. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 48:159–182.
- Cleland, E. E., Chuine, I., Menzel, A., Mooney, H. A., and Schwartz, M. D. (2007). Shifting plant phenology in response to global change. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 22(7):357–365.
- Fu, Y. S. H., Zhao, H. F., Piao, S. L., Peaucelle, M., Peng, S. S., Zhou, G. Y., Ciais, P., Huang, M. T., Menzel, A., Uelas, J. P., Song, Y., Vitasse, Y., Zeng, Z. Z., and Janssens, I. A. (2015). Declining global warming effects on the phenology of spring leaf unfolding. *Nature*, 526(7571):104–107.
- IPCC (2014). *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.
- Wolkovich, E. M., Cook, B. I., Allen, J. M., Crimmins, T. M., Betancourt, J. L., Travers, S. E., Pau, S., Regetz, J., Davies, T. J., Kraft, N. J. B., Ault, T. R., Bolmgren, K., Mazer, S. J., McCabe, G. J., McGill, B. J., Parmesan, C., Salamin, N., Schwartz, M. D., and Cleland, E. E. (2012). Warming experiments underpredict plant phenological responses to climate change. *Nature*, 485(7399):494–497. Wolkovich, E. M. Cook, B. I. Allen, J. M. Crimmins, T. M. Betancourt, J. L. Travers, S. E. Pau, S. Regetz, J. Davies, T. J. Kraft, N. J. B. Ault, T. R. Bolmgren, K. Mazer, S. J. McCabe, G. J. McGill, B. J. Parmesan, C. Salamin, N. Schwartz, M. D. Cleland, E. E.
- Wolkovich, E. M., Cook, B. I., and Davies, T. J. (2014). Progress towards an interdisciplinary science of plant phenology: building predictions across space, time and species diversity. *New Phytologist*, 201(4):1156–1162.




Figure 1: Z-score estimates using current model.




Figure 2: Z-score estimates using current model compared across species.

```
>
> fu2015spp.cues
      spp      force      photo      chill
1 Aesculus_hippocastanum  0.8822269 -3.454658 -6.792918
2      Alnus_glutinosa -9.4037387 -2.181830 -12.447442
3      Betula_pendula -0.2553877 -1.798908 -3.913679
4      Fagus_sylvatica -1.6485263 -17.723879 -23.790442
5      Fraxinus_excelsior -3.3517179 -4.877887 -9.617518
6      Quercus_robur -6.4894932 -3.904036 -6.550124
7      Tilia_cordata -6.5560232 -10.108073 -4.295974
>
```

Figure 3: Lizzie's screen grab of the cues we estimate in the Fu et al. 2015 species