Supplemental materials for Spatial and temporal shifts in photoperiod with climate change

A.K. Ettinger, D. Buonaiuto, C. Chamberlain, I. Morales-Castilla, E. Wolkovich

August 16, 2019

Supplemental Methods

Quantifying and mapping differences in green-up across the United States and Europe (Figure 2)

Satellite images can be combined with algorithms—e.g. MODIS Land Cover Dynamics— to identify the dates on which phenophases transition from one to the next. Using data from the MODIS sensor (available at: https://lpdaacsvc.cr.usgs.gov/appeears/), we extracted spatial data for North American and Western European green-up—the beginning of seasonal greening—for the years 2009 and 2012. Green-up dates are calculated on the basis of the onset of the Enhanced Vegetation Index (Huete et al., 2002). From green-up maps for each year, we derived the photoperiod corresponding to each pixel (according to its geographic coordinates and day of the year), using R function "daylength" in package geopshere (see Fig. 2a,b in main text). Finally, we mapped spatial patterns of temporal shifts in green-up by comparing an early and late spring years. To do so, we substracted the 2013 green-up map from the 2009 one. The spatial resolution corresponding to the maps is of 0.1 x 0.1 degrees.

Nonlinearities in phenological responses to daylength (Figure 3)

We selected OSPREE publications that had three or more photoperiod treatments, and, after reading the methods of these papers in detail, identified three that used three or more photoperiod treatments in the same experiment(Ashby et al., 1962; Heide, 1993; Caffarra et al., 2011). These experiments used forcing temperatures of 21 or 22°C. Chilling varied considerably across experiments, and chilling level was categorized as follows:

- <1 Chill Portions = None
- 1-44 = Low
- 45-69 = Medium
- 70-106 = High
- >106 = Very High

Mapping temporal and spacial shifts in space and time (Figure 4)

Ailene needs to add methods (Reference Table S1)

PhenoFit Methods (Figure 5)

We took current budburst data (1981-2000) and model projection budburst (2081-2100) using the A1Fi Phenofit scenario for two species – *Fagus sylvatica* and *Quercus robur* – and compared these points to data obtained from the OSPREE dataset. The OSPREE data points were collected from experiments and days of budburst were calculated from the start of the experiment, rather than from the start of the year. In order to render these points comparable to the current observations and the model projections, we scaled the days to budburst by adding the day of budburst from the first Phenofit observation to all of the OSPREE data points. We only used Phenofit estimates that had both current and projection data. In the right panel for *Quercus robur*, we explored the 3 OSPREE data points that have later day to budburst times than the current or projected days to budburst, which all had much lower forcing temperatures (**?**, 3.8-5.7°).

Supplemental Box S1. Dominant models of how photoperiod affects spring woody plant phenology

The molecular mechanisms and pathways underlying photoperiod sensitivity are poorly understood for most organisms, even in relatively well-studied phenophases such as spring budburst in woody plants (Ding and Nilsson, 2016). Spring budburst in woody plants is thought to be controlled by three main cues: chilling, forcing, and photoperiod, as well as interactions between them (Flynn and Wolkovich, 2018; Heide, 2008; Zohner et al., 2016). Our understanding of how plants interpret photoperiod comes largely from studies of flowering in the model plant *Arabidopsis thaliana* (e.g., Suárez-López et al., 2001) and fall budset in woody plant species (e.g., Howe et al., 1996).

Plants sense light inputs by blue light receptors and phytochromes, which have been found in nearly all organs throughout the plant. Plants are thought to interpret photoperiod through a coordinated response to light in relation to the time of day. When the internal circadian rhythm coincides with an external signal (light) under certain conditions (e.g., warm days), a response is induced (Lagercrantz, 2009). This "external coincidence model" has been most widely studied in *Arabidopsis*, and is thought to be a relevant mechanism for photoperiod responses in diverse perennial and woody plant species (Bünning, 1936; Davis, 2002; Bastow and Dean, 2002; Kobayashi and Weigel, 2007; Andrés and Coupland, 2012; Petterle et al., 2013; Singh et al., 2017). The model proposes the existence of a circadian rhythm of light sensitivity, in which the night-phase is sensitive to light and the day-phase is insensitive to light. As days get longer in the spring, daylight illuminates the light sensitive phase, triggering a response.

Little is known about the genetic pathways responsible for the light-sensing apparatuses involved in spring budburst, and how they may vary across species or populations. Some genes have been identified that play a role in coordinating budburst in poplar (*Populus* spp.), and may occur in other woody species as well. Many similarities exist between the proposed regulatory networks of vegetative growth in *Populus* and those controlling floral initiation in *Arabidopsis*, Ding and Nilsson (2016). For example, vegetative growth and inhibition of budset are promoted by the FLOWERING LOCUS T2 (FT2) gene, a homolog of *Arabidopsis thaliana* gene FLOWERING LOCUS (FT). FT2 expression appears to be controlled by a pathway that is effective in long days and warm temperatures, marking the onset of the growing season (**?**). Its loss of expression in autumn, when the days are getting shorter, is associated with the onset of dormancy (Glover, 2014).

There are large gaps in our understanding of how photoperiod sensing pathways affect budburst, the genetics behind these pathways, and the extent of species- and population-level genetic variation. Questions also remain about how photoperiod sensing interacts with temperature sensing to affect responses. For example, Figure 3 shows the most detailed data we were able to find of budburst responses across different photoperiod and chilling treatments. These data underscore how variable responses to photoperiod are, across species and populations, and with different chilling treatments.

References

Andrés, F., and G. Coupland. 2012. The genetic basis of flowering responses to seasonal cues. Nature reviews. Genetics 13:627.

Ashby, W., et al. 1962. Germination capacity in American Basswood *Tilia americana*. Transactions of the Illinois State Academy of Science 55:120–3.

Bastow, R., and C. Dean. 2002. The molecular basis of photoperiodism. Developmental cell 3:461–462.

Bünning, E. 1936. Endogenous daily rhythms as the basis of photoperiodism. Ber Deut Bot Ges 54:590–607.

Caffarra, A., A. Donnelly, I. Chuine, and M. B. Jones. 2011. Modelling the timing of *Betula pubescens* bud-burst. I. Temperature and photoperiod: A conceptual model. Climate Research 46:147.

Davis, S. J. 2002. Photoperiodism: the coincidental perception of the season. Current Biology 12:R841–R843.

Ding, J., and O. Nilsson. 2016. Molecular regulation of phenology in trees– because the seasons they are a-changin. Current opinion in plant biology 29:73–79.

Flynn, D. F. B., and E. M. Wolkovich. 2018. Temperature and photoperiod drive spring phenology across all species in a temperate forest community. New Phytologist 219:1353–1362.

Glover, B. 2014. Understanding flowers and flowering second edition. OUP Oxford.

Heide, O. 1993. Dormancy release in beech buds (*Fagus sylvatica*) requires both chilling and long days. Physiologia Plantarum 89:187–191.

Heide, O. M. 2008. Interaction of photoperiod and temperature in the control of growth and dormancy of *Prunus* species. Scientia Horticulturae 115:309–314.

Howe, G. T., G. Gardner, W. P. Hackett, and G. R. Furnier. 1996. Phytochrome control of short-day-induced bud set in black cottonwood. Physiologia Plantarum 97:95–103.

Huete, A., K. Didan, T. Miura, E. P. Rodriguez, X. Gao, and L. G. Ferreira. 2002. Overview of the radiometric and biophysical performance of the modis vegetation indices. Remote sensing of environment 83:195–213.

Kobayashi, Y., and D. Weigel. 2007. Move on up, it's time for change—mobile signals controlling photoperiod-dependent flowering. Genes & development 21:2371–2384.

Lagercrantz, U. 2009. At the end of the day: a common molecular mechanism for photoperiod responses in plants? Journal of experimental botany 60:2501–2515.

Petterle, A., A. Karlberg, and R. P. Bhalerao. 2013. Daylength mediated control of seasonal growth patterns in perennial trees. Current Opinion in Plant Biology 16:301–306.

Singh, R. K., T. Svystun, B. AlDahmash, A. M. Jönsson, and R. P. Bhalerao. 2017. Photoperiod-and temperature-mediated control of phenology in trees–a molecular perspective. New Phytologist 213:511–524.

Suárez-López, P., K. Wheatley, F. Robson, H. Onouchi, F. Valverde, and G. Coupland. 2001. CONSTANS mediates between the circadian clock and the control of flowering in *Arabidopsis*. Nature 410:1116.

Zohner, C. M., B. M. Benito, J. C. Svenning, and S. S. Renner. 2016. Day length unlikely to constrain climate-driven shifts in leaf-out times of northern woody plants. Nature Climate Change 6:1120–1123.

Supplemental Tables

idstudy	continent	lat	long	daylength_range	photo.effect
ashby62_exp1	north america	42.99	-89.41	8-16	Y
basler14_exp1	europe	46.31	8.27	9.2-16	Y
caffarra11b_exp2	europe	52.32	-6.93	10-16	Y
falusi90_exp1	europe	46.03	10.75	9-13	N
falusi96_exp3	europe	38.27	15.99	9-13	Y
ghelardini10_exp1	europe	43.72	11.37	8-16	N
heide05_exp1	europe	56.18	-4.32	10-24	Y/N
heide08_exp1	europe	48.40	11.72	10-24	Y
heide11_exp1	europe	59.67	10.67	10-20	N
heide12_exp1	europe	56.50	-3.06	10-24	Y
heide15_exp2	europe	56.50	-3.06	10-15	Y
heide93_exp1	europe	59.50	10.77	8-24	Y
heide93a_exp1	europe	59.67	10.83	8-24	Y
heide93a_exp3	europe	47.50	7.60	13-16	Y
howe95_exp1	north america	40.55	-124.10	9-24	Y
laube14a_exp1	europe	48.40	11.71	8-16	N
myking95_exp1	europe	56.10	9.15	8-24	Y
nienstaedt66_exp1	north america	44.17	-103.92	8-20	Y
okie11_exp1	north america	32.12	-83.12	0-12	Y
partanen01_exp1	europe	61.93	26.68	6-16	Y
partanen05_exp1	europe	61.82	29.32	5-20	Y
partanen98_exp1	europe	60.03	23.05	8.66-12	Y
pettersen71_exp1	europe	59.66	10.77	10-24	N
Sanz-Perez09_exp1	europe	40.40	-3.48	10-16	Y
viheraaarnio06_exp1	europe	60.45	24.93	16-17	Y
viheraaarnio06_exp1	europe	67.73	24.93	20-21	Y
viheraaarnio06_exp2	europe	60.45	24.93	15-19	Y
viheraaarnio06_exp2	europe	67.73	24.93	22-23	Y
worrall67_exp3	north america	41.31	-72.93	8-16	Y
zohner16_Exp1	europe	48.16	11.50	8-16	Y