

RH: Interactive cues and spring phenology

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

THE LAB IN 2017^{1,2}

¹ *Arnold Arboretum of Harvard University, 1300 Centre Street, Boston, Massachusetts, 02131, USA*

² *Organismic & Evolutionary Biology, Harvard University, 26 Oxford Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 02138, USA*

³ *Forest & Conservation Sciences, Faculty of Forestry, University of British Columbia, 2424 Main Mall, Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z4*

Corresponding author: Lizzie, see ^{1,2} above ; E-mail:.

Abstract

Climate change has shifted plant phenology globally, with average shifts of 4-6 days per °C and some species shifting much more. Globally, such shifts have been some of the most reported and most predictable biological impacts of climate change. This predictability comes from decades of research, which have outlined the major cues that drive most studied plant phenology: temperatures (including spring warming and winter chilling) and daylength. Further simplifying predictions, spring temperatures are often the dominant cue in nature, making linear models of heat sums often excellent at predicting interannual variation in phenology. 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. Here we argue that some of these inaccurate predictions are due to simple models that neglect to consider other major cues—especially winter chilling and daylength, which moderate and shape plant phenological responses to spring warming. We highlight how over 60 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.

Main message (and, really, it's important): If you want to project climate change impacts, you need to focus on relevant changes in all three cues. The relevant changes part is about comparing cues, the all three cues is about interactive cues.

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 cue that matters to predicting responses to continued warming (Chuine *et al.*, 2016; Gauzere *et al.*, 2019).

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

Together, forcing, chilling and photoperiod cues may produce non-linear responses that many current methods do not predict (e.g., Ellwood *et al.*, 2013). 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 data 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 days (Elmendorf & Ettinger, 2020), and chilling and photoperiod cues both yield similar predictions (i.e., both cues predict later spring phenology with warming). Second, most observational studies focus on linear models of each cue and 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 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 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 that integrate over any interactions (Gelman & Hill, 2006) may provide more robust estimates from observational data. 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).

Controlled environment studies of plant phenology 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 growth chamber studies for spring phenological cues, they have rarely been reviewed. Perhaps more surprisingly, they have been 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 (Fu *et al.*, 2015; Richardson *et al.*, 2018, e.g.,).

Here we aim to integrate the long-term literature on growth chamber studies 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 understand interactive cues and 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 apply to non-woody species and/or other phenophases with similar underlying interactive cues.

1.1 How do phenological cues produce non-linear responses?

Forcing, chilling and photoperiod cues together generally determine budburst each year 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 sum 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 average values, 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 more constant (e.g., Worrall & Mergen, 1967; Heide, 1993a,b; Skuterud & Dietrichson, 1994). These controlled environment studies show two major ways these cues can produce non-linear response—each cue alone, or through interactions between cues.

Holding the other cues constant, each cue alone may produce a non-linear phenological response when examined across a sufficiently wide range of values. 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 not grow or budburst erratically (Heide, 1993a; Partanen *et al.*, 1998; Singh *et al.*, 2017; Rinne *et al.*, 2018), similarly maximum growth may occur at photoperiods of 18 hours, meaning photoperiods longer than 18 hours will have no additional effect on budburst timing (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 amount of forcing needed is determined by the level 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 (see FIGURE) 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, and may be critical to accurate forecasts with climate change.

The complexity of cues for spring phenology likely allows species to maintain their fitness across relevant spatiotemporal environmental variation (Chaine, 2000; Chaine & Regniere, 2017). In the spring, selection for species to track the start of resources each year (to gain access to them before other individuals have depleted them) without major tissue loss to frost, herbivores or other factors (Wainwright *et al.*, 2012; Chamberlain *et al.*, 2019) should select for cues that work across the interannual variation in climate across of their ranges. Species thus need cues with either plasticity and/or local adaptation. Spring phenology can be fairly plastic (Vitasse *et al.*, 2013; Kramer *et al.*, 2017). Especially compared to other phenophases, such as budset phenology, budburst and leafout often do not show high local adaptation across a range (Mimura & Aitken, 2010). This means that species ideally need a set of cues that work across their range (Liepe *et al.*, 2016), though there may be variation in the importance of each cue across a range (e.g., chilling can be higher in coastal versus continental, see Campbell & Sugano, 1979), and genetic work suggests the same genes can be triggered by very different environmental cues (e.g., Simpson & Dean, 2002; Stinchcombe *et al.*, 2004).

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 (See Fig. 1), 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 (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 be also predicted where temperature regimes that were previously too low to accumulate chilling in many months of the winter warm such that chilling now accumulates in those months (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 reparametrize 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 potential increases and decreases as outcomes of warming.

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 in its effect. 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 extremes of some cues (e.g., high chilling and/or long photoperiods, where responses may be effectively muted) and climate change has now pushed budburst into periods where these cues are at the more linear part. 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 previous accumulated sufficient chilling for a minimal effect of chilling—making forcing the dominant cue—whereas warming as 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 the cues caused by environmental change. While simple linear interactions between cues do not produce non-linearities (FIG), they quickly become non-linear when changes occur together—for example if increased forcing also occurs in step with shorter experienced photoperiods (FIG X). Predicting these non-linearities, however, requires a refined understanding of the interaction 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 are designed in a range relevant to current versus future conditions, and contain enough variation in treatments to capture precisely when non-linearities occur. Indeed, one of the major advantages of experiments is that they allow treatments outside of the historical range—an option long-term observational data can never provide.

213

214 We reviewed controlled environment studies over the last seven decades (1947-2014) to under-
215 stand the range of treatments already available, and how they compare to current and future
216 conditions. We note that these studies were rarely conducted for climate change research, and
217 most often done for fundamental science or other areas of applied science (e.g., horticulture or
218 forestry). Yet they are some of the best available data for how plants respond to the environment
219 and thus a critical resource for climate change research today.

220

221 *How studies and their experimental treatments vary globally*

222 Controlled environment studies have been conducted across 227 species across the globe, with
223 the majority of papers report research occurring in Europe (54 of 85 papers), followed by North
224 America (23, Fig. 3). Most studies manipulate one cue (Fig. 4), though studies of two or
225 three cues have occurred in almost every decade. Forcing and photoperiod were the most com-
226 monly studied cues (56% manipulated forcing; 55% manipulated photoperiod), with chilling
227 being studied in only a third of all studies (33% manipulated chilling). The actual cues studied
228 varied across latitude with a general trend toward examining more extreme values at higher
229 latitudes. Thus, forcing and chilling treatments decline 0.1°C per 1° latitude (for forcing, min
230 is -0.12 , for max it's -0.08 , see Fig 5; for chilling it's -0.1 for min and -0.07 for max); and the
231 maximum studied photoperiod increases with latitude (0.08 hr per degree $^{\circ}$ latitude). These
232 shifts across space appear related to differences in extremes across latitudes (higher latitudes
233 experience colder temperatures and longer photoperiods), but introduce a bias in results as any
234 comparisons of studies from lower and higher latitudes are also comparing a different range of
235 cues generally.

236

237 *How studies manipulate cues*

238 These studies can be broadly categorized as manipulating one, two or (rarely) three cues at
239 once. Single cue studies were the most common (ADDINFO). While valuable for defining po-
240 tential non-linearities in one cue, single cue studies prevent understanding interactions among
241 cues or comparisons of which cues dominate phenological responses; studies of multiple cues can
242 overcome these challenges.

243

244 Of the studies manipulating at least one cue, half additionally manipulated another cue. Study
245 designs most often allowed examining whether cues were interactive (that is, whether the effect
246 of one cue depends on the level of the other cue), with the most studies testing for interactions
247 between photoperiod and forcing (21 studies), followed by studies that examined the effects of
248 photoperiod (13 studies) and forcing (12 studies) across the fall-winter. Such studies follow the
249 design generally attributed to Weinberger *et al.* (1950) where tissue (e.g., cuttings) are taken
250 progressively across the fall and/or winter seasons then exposed to controlled environment con-
251 ditions. These studies often equate tissue removed later from the field as having received more
252 chilling and thus often treat 'time of cutting' as interchangeable with 'chilling,' though forcing
253 and photoperiod conditions also change. Studies examining photoperiod or forcing crossed with
254 experimental chilling treatments (either through changes in temperature or days of chilling) were
255 much less common (8 studies each for photoperiod and forcing).

256

257 Studies examining three cues directly were very rare: we identified only two studies examining
 258 all three cues at once, and both were on *Picea abies* (Worrall & Mergen, 1967; Sogaard *et al.*,
 259 2008). A slightly larger set of studies (5 studies) examined three cues indirectly—manipulating
 260 photoperiod and forcing in controlled environments but equating chilling with sequential removal
 261 of tissue from the field—for 11 species (Schnabel & Wample, 1987; Heide, 1993a; Partanen *et al.*,
 262 1998; Basler & Körner, 2014).

263

264 The paucity of studies examining multiple cues limits our fundamental understanding of each
 265 cue, as well as how—when combined—they will determine future leafout with continued warm-
 266 ing. Because the cues are all known to be interactive, estimates of any one cue are influenced
 267 by the level of each other cue. Knowing the level of each other cue is difficult both because
 268 they are often not reported, and also because they are somewhat impossible to know given
 269 our current understanding of endodormancy (when we understand chilling is accumulated) and
 270 ecodormancy (when we understand forcing is accumulated). Authors may use the terms ‘chill-
 271 ing’ and ‘forcing’ for their treatments, but they rarely have physiological evidence that these
 272 are the actual conditions plants experience. Studies using sequential removal from the field to
 273 estimate chilling are at perhaps the greatest disadvantage to estimate the cues applied: chilling
 274 must rely on field estimates from models that are currently only hypotheses of actual chilling
 275 (Dennis, 2003), and forcing and photoperiod treatments are most probably a mix conditions in
 276 the field and conditions applied in controlled environments. Though such studies also have the
 277 advantage of the most natural chilling conditions.

278

279 *How relevant are treatments to current and future conditions?*

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

292

293 Experimental shifts were generally larger than expected shifts due to climate change. This makes
 294 sense from an experimental-statistical perspective: if the goal of an experiment is to identify if
 295 a cue is present then larger treatment differences should yield larger effect sizes and thus higher
 296 statistical power. But such large shifts may be risky to extrapolate to smaller shifts due to
 297 warming. Further, experimental studies vary from natural settings in myriad ways. Different
 298 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) 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). Such differences mean extrapolating from controlled environment studies should be done with care, and highlight 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 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; for example, a study with two photoperiod and three forcing levels would need six different 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 on a (relatively) smaller scale (Fig. 1). Thus, when designing studies to contribute to improved forecasting of particular species, experimentalists should examine cues within the current and projected future range of species. 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. [Alt: Most species distribution models assume that species occupy a consistent climate envelope with climate change; that is, species will track current climate conditions by moving in space.] 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 light throughout the day, 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 technically 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 of 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 (e.g., >90% of buds on a cutting) budburst 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 future much improved physiological understanding of endodormancy release.

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 in the future 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 (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.

Recent observations of declining responses to warming in long-term data suggest cues beyond forcing may be playing a role (Fu *et al.*, 2015) and highlight the major need for non-linear models based on interactive cues. To this aim, a number of recent papers have attempted to identify chilling or photoperiod cues in long-term data. Correlations between these predictors, however, are almost always too high for any useful analysis (Elmendorf & Ettinger, 2020; Ettinger *et al.*, 2020). Other 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 that mean cues shifts along these gradients in complex ways (Tansey *et al.*, 2017). 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 1,600 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 a ‘study ID’ variable in such models). 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 (cite Table I need to build). 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, any 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.
- Campbell, R.K. & Sugano, A.I. (1979) Genecology of bud-burst phenology in douglas-fir - response to flushing temperature and chilling. *Botanical Gazette* **140**, 223–231.
- 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.
- Chamberlain, C.J., Cook, B.I., García de Cortázar-Atauri, I. & Wolkovich, E.M. (2019) Rethinking false spring risk. *Global Change Biology* **25**, 2209–2220.
- 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.

501 Chuine, I., Bonhomme, M., Legave, J.M., García de Cortázar-Atauri, I., Charrier, G., Lacointe,
 502 A. & Améglio, T. (2016) Can phenological models predict tree phenology accurately in the
 503 future? The unrevealed hurdle of endodormancy break. *Global Change Biology* **22**, 3444–3460.

504 Chuine, I. & Regniere, J. (2017) Process-based models of phenology for plants and animals.
 505 *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* **48**, 159–182.

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

508 Delpierre, N., Dufrene, E., Soudani, K., Ulrich, E., Cecchini, S., Boe, J. & Francois, C. (2009)
 509 Modelling interannual and spatial variability of leaf senescence for three deciduous tree species
 510 in France. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **149**, 938–948.

511 Dennis, F. (2003) Problems in standardizing methods for evaluating the chilling requirements
 512 for the breaking of dormancy in buds of woody plants. *HortScience* **38**, 347–350.

513 Ellwood, E.R., Temple, S.A., Primack, R.B., Bradley, N.L. & Davis, C.C. (2013) Record-
 514 breaking early flowering in the eastern united states. *Plos One* **8**, ellwood, Elizabeth R.
 515 Temple, Stanley A. Primack, Richard B. Bradley, Nina L. Davis, Charles C.

516 Elmendorf, S.C. & Ettinger, A.K. (2020) Is photoperiod a dominant driver of secondary growth
 517 resumption? *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*
 518 **117**, 32861–32864.

519 Erwin, J.E. (1998) Temperature and light effects on stem elongation. *Journal of the Japanese*
 520 *Society for Horticultural Science* **67**, 1113–1120.

521 Erwin, J.E. & Heins, R.D. (1995) Thermomorphogenic responses in stem and leaf development.
 522 *Hortscience* **30**, 940–949.

523 Ettinger, A., Chamberlain, C., Morales-Castilla, I., Buonaiuto, D., Flynn, D., Savas, T.,
 524 Samaha, J. & Wolkovich, E. (2020) Winter temperatures predominate in spring phenolog-
 525 ical responses to warming. *Nature Climate Change* pp. 1–6.

526 Fishman, S., Erez, A. & Couvillon, G. (1987) The temperature dependence of dormancy break-
 527 ing in plants: mathematical analysis of a two-step model involving a cooperative transition.
 528 *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **124**, 473–483.

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

531 Ford, K.R., Harrington, C.A., Bansal, S., Gould, Peter, J. & St. Clair, J.B. (2016) Will changes
 532 in phenology track climate change? A study of growth initiation timing in coast Douglas-fir.
 533 *Global Change Biology* **22**, 3712–3723.

534 Fu, Y.H., Piao, S., Zhou, X., Geng, X., Hao, F., Vitasse, Y. & Janssens, I.A. (2019) Short
 535 photoperiod reduces the temperature sensitivity of leaf-out in saplings of *Fagus sylvatica* but
 536 not in horse chestnut. *Global Change Biology* **25**, 1696–1703.

537 Fu, Y.S.H., Zhao, H.F., Piao, S.L., Peaucelle, M., Peng, S.S., Zhou, G.Y., Ciais, P., Huang, M.T.,
538 Menzel, A., Uelas, J.P., Song, Y., Vitasse, Y., Zeng, Z.Z. & Janssens, I.A. (2015) Declining
539 global warming effects on the phenology of spring leaf unfolding. *Nature* **526**, 104–107.

540 Gauzere, J., Delzon, S., Davi, H., Bonhomme, M., de Cortazar-Atauri, I.G. & Chuine, I. (2017)
541 Integrating interactive effects of chilling and photoperiod in phenological process-based mod-
542 els. A case study with two European tree species: *Fagus sylvatica* and *Quercus petraea*.
543 *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **244**, 9–20.

544 Gauzere, J., Lucas, C., Ronce, O., Davi, H. & Chuine, I. (2019) Sensitivity analysis of tree phe-
545 nology models reveals increasing sensitivity of their predictions to winter chilling temperature
546 and photoperiod with warming climate. *Ecological Modelling* **441**, 108805.

547 Gelman, A. & Hill, J. (2006) *Data analysis using regression and multilevel/hierarchical models*.
548 Cambridge University Press.

549 Güsewell, S., Furrer, R., Gehrig, R. & Pietragalla, B. (2017) Changes in temperature sensitivity
550 of spring phenology with recent climate warming in Switzerland are related to shifts of the
551 preseason. *Global Change Biology* **23**, 5189–5202.

552 Guy, R.D. (2014) The early bud gets to warm. *New Phytologist* **202**, 7–9.

553 Harrington, C.A. & Gould, P.J. (2015) Tradeoffs between chilling and forcing in satisfying
554 dormancy requirements for pacific northwest tree species. *Frontiers in Plant Science* **6**, 120.

555 Heide, O. (1993a) Daylength and thermal time responses of budburst during dormancy release
556 in some northern deciduous trees. *Physiologia Plantarum* **88**, 531–540.

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

559 Hereford, J., Schmitt, J. & Ackerly, D.D. (2017) The seasonal climate niche predicts phenology
560 and distribution of an ephemeral annual plant, *mollugo verticillata*. *Journal of Ecology* **105**,
561 1323–1334.

562 Heuvelink, E. (1989) Influence of day and night temperature on the growth of young tomato
563 plants. *Scientia Horticulturae* **38**, 11–22.

564 IPCC (2014) *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability*. Cambridge Univer-
565 sity Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.

566 Jochner, S., Caffarra, A. & Menzel, A. (2013) Can spatial data substitute temporal data in
567 phenological modelling? a survey using birch flowering. *Tree Physiology* **33**, 1256–1268.

568 Junttila, O. & Hänninen, H. (2012) The minimum temperature for budburst in *Betula* depends
569 on the state of dormancy. *Tree physiology* **32**, 337–345.

570 Keenan, T.F., Richardson, A.D. & Hufkens, K. (2020) On quantifying the apparent temperature
571 sensitivity of plant phenology. *New Phytologist* **225**, 1033–1040.

572 Kramer, K., Ducousso, A., Gomory, D., Hansen, J.K., Ionita, L., Liesebach, M., Lorent, A.,
573 Schueler, S., Sulkowska, M., de Vries, S. & von Wuehlisch, G. (2017) Chilling and forcing
574 requirements for foliage bud burst of European beech (*Fagus sylvatica* L.) differ between
575 provenances and are phenotypically plastic. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **234**, 172–
576 181.

577 Laube, J., Sparks, T.H., Estrella, N., Höfler, J., Ankerst, D.P. & Menzel, A. (2014) Chilling
578 outweighs photoperiod in preventing precocious spring development. *Global Change Biology*
579 **20**, 170–182.

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

582 Liepe, K.J., Hamann, A., Smets, P., Fitzpatrick, C.R. & Aitken, S.N. (2016) Adaptation of
583 lodgepole pine and interior spruce to climate: implications for reforestation in a warming
584 world. *Evolutionary Applications* **9**, 409–419.

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

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

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

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

595 Menzel, A., Sparks, T.H., Estrella, N., Koch, E., Aasa, A., Ahas, R., Alm-Kuebler, K. *et al.*
596 (2006) European phenological response to climate change matches the warming pattern. *Global*
597 *Change Biology* **12**, 1969–1976.

598 Mimura, M. & Aitken, S. (2010) Local adaptation at the range peripheries of Sitka spruce.
599 *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **23**, 249–258.

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

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

605 Nienstaedt, H. (1966) Dormancy and dormancy release in white spruce. *Forest Science* **12**,
606 374–384.

607 Parent, B. & Tardieu, F. (2012) Temperature responses of developmental processes have not
608 been affected by breeding in different ecological areas for 17 crop species. *New Phytologist*
609 **194**, 760–774.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Schwartz, M.D. (1997) Spring index models: An approach to connecting satellite and surface phenology. *Phenology in Seasonal Climates I* (eds. H. Lieth & M.D. Schwartz), pp. 22–38, Backhuys Publisher, Leiden, The Netherlands.
- Shen, X.J., Liu, B.H., Henderson, M., Wang, L., Wu, Z.F., Wu, H.T., Jiang, M. & Lu, X.G. (2018) Asymmetric effects of daytime and nighttime warming on spring phenology in the temperate grasslands of china. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **259**, 240–249.
- Simpson, G.G. & Dean, C. (2002) Flowering - arabidopsis, the rosetta stone of flowering time? *Science* **296**, 285–289.
- Singh, R.K., Miskolczi, P., Maurya, J.P. & Bhalerao, R.P. (2019) A tree ortholog of short vegetative phase floral repressor mediates photoperiodic control of bud dormancy. *Current Biology* **29**, 128–+.
- Singh, R.K., Svystun, T., AlDahmash, B., Jönsson, A.M. & Bhalerao, R.P. (2017) Photoperiod- and temperature-mediated control of phenology in trees—a molecular perspective. *New Phytologist* **213**, 511–524.
- Skuterud, R. & Dietrichson, J. (1994) Budburst in detached birch shoots (*Betula pendula*) of different varieties winter-stored in darkness at three different temperatures. *Silva Fennica* **28**, 223–224.
- Søgaard, G., Johnsen, Ø., Nilsen, J. & Junttila, O. (2008) Climatic control of bud burst in young seedlings of nine provenances of norway spruce. *Tree Physiology* **28**, 311–320.
- Sparks, T.H. & Carey, P.D. (1995) The responses of species to climate over two centuries - an analysis of the Marsham phenological record, 1736-1947. *Journal of Ecology* **83**, 321–329.
- Stearns, F. & Olson, J. (1958) Interactions of photoperiod and temperature affecting seed germination in *Tsuga canadensis*. *American Journal of Botany* **45**, 53–58.
- Stinchcombe, J.R., Weinig, C., Ungerer, M., Olsen, K.M., Mays, C., Halldorsdottir, S.S., Purugganan, M.D. & Schmitt, J. (2004) A latitudinal cline in flowering time in *Arabidopsis thaliana* modulated by the flowering time gene FRIGIDA. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **101**, 4712–4717.
- Tansey, C.J., Hadfield, J.D. & Phillimore, A.B. (2017) Estimating the ability of plants to plastically track temperature-mediated shifts in the spring phenological optimum. *Global Change Biology* **23**, 3321–3334.
- Thingnaes, E., Torre, S., Ernstsén, A. & Moe, R. (2003) Day and night temperature responses in arabidopsis: Effects on gibberellin and auxin content, cell size, morphology and flowering time. *Annals of Botany* **92**, 601–612.
- van der Schoot, C., Paul, L.K. & Rinne, P.L.H. (2014) The embryonic shoot: a lifeline through winter. *Journal of Experimental Botany* **65**, 1699–1712.

- 678 Vitasse, Y., Hoch, G., Randin, C.F., Lenz, A., Kollas, C., Scheepens, J.F. & Koerner, C.
679 (2013) Elevational adaptation and plasticity in seedling phenology of temperate deciduous
680 tree species. *Oecologia* **171**, 663–678.
- 681 Wainwright, C.E., Wolkovich, E.M. & Cleland, E.E. (2012) Seasonal priority effects: implications
682 for invasion and restoration in a semi-arid system. *Journal of Applied Ecology* **49**, 234–241,
683 wainwright, Claire E. Wolkovich, Elizabeth M. Cleland, Elsa E.
- 684 Way, D.A. & Montgomery, R.A. (2015) Photoperiod constraints on tree phenology, performance
685 and migration in a warming world. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **38**, 1725–1736.
- 686 Weinberger, J.H. *et al.* (1950) Chilling requirements of peach varieties. *Proceedings. American*
687 *Society for Horticultural Science*, vol. 56, pp. 122–28.
- 688 Wilczek, A.M., Roe, J.L., Knapp, M.C., Cooper, M.D., Lopez-Gallego, C., Martin, L.J., Muir,
689 C.D., Sim, S., Walker, A., Anderson, J., Egan, J.F., Moyers, B.T., Petipas, R., Giakountis, A.,
690 Charbit, E., Coupland, G., Welch, S.M. & Schmitt, J. (2009) Effects of genetic perturbation
691 on seasonal life history plasticity. *Science* **323**, 930–934.
- 692 Wolkovich, E.M., Cook, B.I., Allen, J.M., Crimmins, T.M., Betancourt, J.L., Travers, S.E.,
693 Pau, S., Regetz, J., Davies, T.J., Kraft, N.J.B., Ault, T.R., Bolmgren, K., Mazer, S.J.,
694 McCabe, G.J., McGill, B.J., Parmesan, C., Salamin, N., Schwartz, M.D. & Cleland, E.E.
695 (2012) Warming experiments underpredict plant phenological responses to climate change.
696 *Nature* **485**, 494–497.
- 697 Worrall, J. & Mergen, F. (1967) Environmental and genetic control of dormancy in *Picea abies*.
698 *Physiologia Plantarum* **20**, 733–745.
- 699 Yu, H.Y., Luedeling, E. & Xu, J.C. (2010) Winter and spring warming result in delayed spring
700 phenology on the Tibetan Plateau. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the*
701 *United States of America* **107**, 22151–22156.
- 702 Zohner, C.M., Benito, B.M., Svenning, J.C. & Renner, S.S. (2016) Day length unlikely to
703 constrain climate-driven shifts in leaf-out times of northern woody plants. *Nature Climate*
704 *Change* **6**, 1120–1123.
- 705 Zohner, C.M. & Renner, S.S. (2014) Common garden comparison of the leaf-out phenology
706 of woody species from different native climates, combined with herbarium records, forecasts
707 long-term change. *Ecology Letters* **17**, 1016–1025.

708 **3 Figures**




Figure 1: 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).





Figure 2: Interactions in linear models can produce nonlinearities *if cues shift also* (and only if that, according to my work in `nonlinearities_intxns.R`). Brown lines show a model of budburst without interactions, the yellow shows all two-way interactions and the pink lines vary the forcing \times photoperiod interactions. In both cases we vary forcing, but on the left photoperiod decreases as forcing increases, while on the right chilling decreases while forcing increases.



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 3: Overview of the data across space.




Figure 4: Cues manipulated over time.




Figure 5: One correlation with latitude plot? Or more?




Figure 6: Our old heat maps, based only on what we could convert to numeric easily. See the next two figures please!




Figure 7: Heatmap using all woody species data in OSPREE: shows number of studies for different study designs (we could clean this up in various ways ... perhaps only show budbreak or budburst studies?).




Figure 8: Heatmap using all woody species data in OSPREE and attempting to show three-way treatments (note that chilldays includes a mix of experimental chilling and field-sample day chilling; this could be very tricky to clean up).