

A simple explanation for declining temperature sensitivity with warming

E. M. Wolkovich^{1,a}, J. L. Auerbach², C. J. Chamberlain³, D. M. Buonaiuto³,
A. K. Ettinger⁴, I. Morales-Castilla⁵ & A. Gelman²

¹Forest & Conservation Sciences, Faculty of Forestry, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

²Department of Statistics, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027, USA

³Department of Organismic and Evolutionary Biology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA

⁴The Nature Conservancy in Washington, 74 Wall Street, Seattle, WA, USA

⁵Department of Life Sciences, University of Alcalà CTRA N-II, KM., 33,600, 28802, Alcalà de Henares, Spain

^aCorresponding author (ORCID: 0000-0001-7653-893X)

Abstract

Temperature sensitivity—the magnitude of a biological response per °C—is a fundamental concept across scientific disciplines, especially biology, where temperature determines the rate of many plant, animal and ecosystem processes. Recently, a growing body of literature in global change biology has found temperature sensitivities decline as temperatures rise (Fu et al., 2015; Güsewell et al., 2017; Piao et al., 2017; Dai et al., 2019). Such observations have been used to suggest climate change is reshaping biological processes, with major implications for forecasts of future change. Here we present a simple alternative explanation for observed declining sensitivities: the use of linear models to estimate non-linear temperature responses. Corrections for the non-linearity of temperature response in simulated data and long-term phenological data from Europe remove the apparent decline. Our results show that rising temperatures combined with linear estimates based on calendar time produce observations of declining sensitivity—without any shift in the underlying biology. Current methods may thus undermine efforts to identify when and how warming will reshape biological processes.

1 Main text

Climate change has reshaped biological processes around the globe, with shifts in the timing of major life history events (phenology), carbon dynamics and other ecosystem processes (IPCC, 2014). With rising temperatures, a growing body of literature has documented changes in temperature sensitivity—the magnitude of a biological response scaled per °C. Many studies have found declining responses to temperature in recent decades (Fu et al., 2015; Güsewell et al., 2017; Piao et al., 2017; Dai et al., 2019), and some have reported more uniform sensitivities across elevation (Vitasse et al., 2018), or lower sensitivities in warmer, urban areas (Meng et al., 2020).

Most studies attribute changes in temperature sensitivity to shifts in underlying biological processes. For example, researchers have suggested weaker temperature sensitivities are evidence of increased light limitation in the tundra (Piao et al., 2017), or a decline in the relative importance of warm spring temperatures for spring phenological events (e.g., leafout, insect emergence) in the temperate zone (Fu et al., 2015; Meng et al., 2020), as other environmental triggers (e.g., winter temperatures that determine ‘chilling’) play a larger role. Yet, despite an increase in studies reporting declining or shifting temperature sensitivities, none have provided strong evidence of the biological mechanisms underlying these changes (e.g., Fu et al., 2015; Meng et al., 2020). The missing mechanisms may be hidden in the data: environmental factors moderate biological processes in complex ways (Chuine et al., 2016; Güsewell et al., 2017), are strongly correlated in nature (e.g., Fu et al., 2015), and temperature variance shifts over time and space (Keenan et al., 2020).

Here we propose a simpler alternative explanation: the use of linear models for non-linear responses to temperature. Researchers generally use methods with assumptions of linearity to calculate temperature sensitivities, often relying on some form of linear regression to compute a change in a quantity—days to leafout or carbon sequestered over a fixed time, for example—per °C, thus ignoring that many biological responses to temperature are non-linear. We show, theoretically then with simulated and empirical data, how the use of linear methods for non-

linear responses can produce an illusion that the mechanisms underlying biological processes are changing.

Many observed biological responses are the result of continuous non-linear processes that depend on temperature, which are discretized into temporal units for measurement. For example, a biological response, such as leafout, occurs when a certain thermal sum is reached (Dijkhuis, 1956; Lindsey and Newman, 1956), and plants will reach this threshold more quickly—in calendar time—when average daily temperatures are warmer (Valentine, 1983; Lechowicz, 1984; Kramer, 2012). Biologically, however, the plants may require the same temperature sum. Indeed any process observed or measured as the time until reaching a threshold is inversely proportional to the speed at which that threshold is approached. Temperature determines the speed of many biological processes (Bonan and Sirois, 1992; Hinrichsen, 2009; Hofmann and Todgham, 2010). Thus, at very low temperatures plants would never leaf out and at higher temperatures they could leaf out in only a matter of days—yet sensitivities estimated from linear regression at higher (warmer) temperatures would appear much lower than those observed at lower temperatures. Warming acts to step on the biological accelerator, producing shifts in estimates when non-linear responses are modeled as linear.

We show this by deriving the relationship between a biological response and temperature using a simple stochastic model, which describes the first time a random process hits a threshold (see ‘A first-hitting-time model of leafout’ in Supplementary Information). Our model holds the temperature threshold for leafout constant (Hunter and Lechowicz, 1992; Zohner et al., 2020). Even though the mechanism by which temperature leads to leafout does not change, the model produces declining sensitivity—as measured in days per °C—with warming. Indeed, under this model constant temperature sensitivity would be evidence that the temperature threshold is not constant and the mechanisms underlying the leafout process have changed.

Simulations show that correcting for non-linearity using a log transformation removes apparent declines in temperature sensitivity (Fig. 1, S2, code link). In empirical long-term leafout data from Europe, correcting for non-linearity in responses produces little evidence for declining

sensitivities with warming (Figs. 1, S6, S7). An apparent decline in sensitivity for silver birch (*Betula pendula*) from -4.3 days/°C to -3.6 days/°C from 1950-1960 compared to 2000-2010 disappears using a log-log regression (-0.17 versus -0.22). We see similar corrections using 20-year windows, and a potential increase in sensitivity for European beech (*Fagus sylvatica*, see Tables S1-S2). Moreover, the variance of the leafout dates of both species declines as temperatures rise—(declines of roughly 50%, see Tables S1-S2), which is expected under our model as warming accelerates towards the thermal threshold that triggers leafout (and in contrast to predictions from changing mechanisms, see Ford et al., 2016).

Fundamentally rising temperature should alter many biological processes, making robust methods for identifying these changes critical. In spring plant phenology, where declining sensitivities are often reported (Fu et al., 2015; Piao et al., 2017; Dai et al., 2019), warming may increase the role of ‘chilling’ (determined mainly by winter temperatures) and daylength (Laube et al., 2014; Zohner et al., 2016)—potentially increasing the thermal sum required for leafout at lower values of these cues (Polgar et al., 2014; Zohner et al., 2017; Flynn and Wolkovich, 2018). Adjusting our simulations to match this model yielded shifts in sensitivities with warming. Unlike a model with no underlying biological change, however, after correcting for non-linearity, the shifts in sensitivities remained and they occurred in step with the biological change (Fig. S4a, c). In contrast, sensitivities estimated from a linear model showed shifts across the entire range of warming, well before the simulated biological change (Fig. S4a, c). Further, we found that an increase in the thermal sum required for leafout should yield larger in magnitude temperature sensitivities, not smaller, as is often expected (e.g., Fu et al., 2015), thus highlighting the complexity of identifying what trends to expect in sensitivities with warming (see ‘Simulations of common hypotheses for declining sensitivity’ in Supplementary Information for an extended discussion).

Our theoretical model and empirical results show that rising temperatures are sufficient to explain declining temperature sensitivity. It is not necessary to invoke changes to the mechanisms that underlie the biological processes themselves. Our results provide a simpler explanation for observations of declining temperature sensitivities, but do not rule out that important changes

in biological processes may underlie such declines. Instead, our results highlight how the use of linear models may make identifying when—and why—warming alters underlying biology far more difficult.

Inferring biological processes from statistical artifacts is not a new problem (e.g., Nee et al., 2005), but climate change provides a new challenge in discerning mechanism from measurements because it affects biological time, while researchers continue to use calendar time. Other fields focused on temperature sensitivity often use approaches that acknowledge the non-linearity of responses (e.g., Yuste et al., 2004). Researchers have called for greater use of process-based models (Keenan et al., 2020), which often include non-linear responses to temperature, but rely themselves on exploratory methods and descriptive analyses for progress (Chuine et al., 2016). The challenge, then, is to interrogate the implicit and explicit models we use to interpret data summaries, and to develop null expectations that apply across biological and calendar time.

References

- Bonan, G. B., and L. Sirois. 1992. Air-temperature, tree growth, and the northern and southern range limits to *Picea-mariana*. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 3:495–506.
- Chuine, I., M. Bonhomme, J.-M. Legave, I. García de Cortázar-Atauri, G. Charrier, A. Lacointe, and T. Améglio. 2016. Can phenological models predict tree phenology accurately in the future? The unrevealed hurdle of endodormancy break. *Global Change Biology* 22:3444–3460.
- Dai, W. J., H. Y. Jin, Y. H. Zhang, T. Liu, and Z. Q. Zhou. 2019. Detecting temporal changes in the temperature sensitivity of spring phenology with global warming: Application of machine learning in phenological model. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 279.
- Dijkhuis, F. J. 1956. Computation of heat unit accumulations in maize for practical application. *Euphytica* 5:267–275.

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

132 Ford, K. R., C. A. Harrington, S. Bansal, J. Gould, Peter, and J. B. St. Clair. 2016. Will changes
 133 in phenology track climate change? A study of growth initiation timing in coast Douglas–fir.
 134 *Global Change Biology* 22:3712–3723.

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

138 Güsewell, S., R. Furrer, R. Gehrig, and B. Pietragalla. 2017. Changes in temperature sensitivity
 139 of spring phenology with recent climate warming in Switzerland are related to shifts of the
 140 preseason. *Global Change Biology* 23:5189–5202.

141 Hinrichsen, H. H. 2009. Biological processes and links to the physics. *Deep-Sea Research Part*
 142 *II-Topical Studies in Oceanography* 56:1968–1983.

143 Hofmann, G. E., and A. E. Todgham. 2010. Living in the now: Physiological mechanisms to
 144 tolerate a rapidly changing environment. *Annual Review of Physiology* 72:127–145.

145 Hunter, A. F., and M. J. Lechowicz. 1992. Predicting the timing of budburst in temperate trees.
 146 *Journal of Applied Ecology* 29:597–604.

147 IPCC. 2014. *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability*. Cambridge Uni-
 148 versity Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.

149 Keenan, T. F., A. D. Richardson, and K. Hufkens. 2020. On quantifying the apparent temper-
 150 ature sensitivity of plant phenology. *New Phytologist* 225:1033–1040.

151 Kramer, P. 2012. *Physiology of woody plants*. Elsevier, New York.

152 Laube, J., T. H. Sparks, N. Estrella, J. Höfler, D. P. Ankerst, and A. Menzel. 2014. Chilling
 153 outweighs photoperiod in preventing precocious spring development. *Global Change Biology*
 154 20:170–182.

155 Lechowicz, M. J. 1984. Why do temperate deciduous trees leaf out at different times - adaptation
156 and ecology of forest communities. *American Naturalist* 124:821–842. Lechowicz, mj.

157 Lindsey, A. A., and J. E. Newman. 1956. Use of official weather data in spring time - temperature
158 analysis of an Indiana phenological record. *Ecology* 37:812–823.

159 Meng, L., J. Mao, Y. Zhou, A. D. Richardson, X. Lee, P. E. Thornton, D. M. Ricciuto, X. Li,
160 Y. Dai, X. Shi, and G. Jia. 2020. Urban warming advances spring phenology but reduces the
161 response of phenology to temperature in the conterminous United States. *Proceedings of the*
162 *National Academy of Sciences* 117:4228.

163 Nee, S., N. Colegrave, S. A. West, and A. Grafen. 2005. The illusion of invariant quantities in
164 life histories. *Science* 309:1236–1239.

165 Piao, S., Z. Liu, T. Wang, S. Peng, P. Ciais, M. Huang, A. Ahlstrom, J. F. Burkhart, F. Cheval-
166 lier, I. A. Janssens, et al. 2017. Weakening temperature control on the interannual variations
167 of spring carbon uptake across northern lands. *Nature Climate Change* 7:359.

168 Polgar, C., A. Gallinat, and R. B. Primack. 2014. Drivers of leaf-out phenology and their
169 implications for species invasions: insights from Thoreau’s Concord. *New Phytologist* 202:106–
170 15.

171 Valentine, H. T. 1983. Budbreak and leaf growth functions for modeling herbivory in some
172 gypsy-moth hosts. *Forest Science* 29:607–617.

173 Vitasse, Y., C. Signarbieux, and Y. H. Fu. 2018. Global warming leads to more uniform spring
174 phenology across elevations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115:1004–1008.

175 Yuste, J., I. A. Janssens, A. Carrara, and R. Ceulemans. 2004. Annual Q_{10} of soil respiration
176 reflects plant phenological patterns as well as temperature sensitivity. *Global Change Biology*
177 10:161–169.

178 Zohner, C. M., B. M. Benito, J. D. Fridley, J. C. Svenning, and S. S. Renner. 2017. Spring
179 predictability explains different leaf-out strategies in the woody floras of North America,
180 Europe and East Asia. *Ecology Letters* 20:452–460.

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

184 Zohner, C. M., L. D. Mo, T. A. M. Pugh, J. F. Bastin, and T. W. Crowther. 2020. Interactive
185 climate factors restrict future increases in spring productivity of temperate and boreal trees.
186 *Global Change Biology* 26:4042–4055.

187 *Acknowledgements:* Thanks to TJ Davies, A Donnelly, TM Giants, D. Lipson, C. Rollinson and
188 C. Zohner.

189

190 *Data & Code Availability:* Code for simulations and plots is provided here. For empirical ex-
191 amples, we used PEP 725 phenological data and E-OBS climate data, both of which are freely
192 available via the links.

193

194 *List of Supplementary Information:*

195 A first-hitting-time model of leafout

196 Simulations of common hypotheses for declining sensitivity

197 Methods & results using long-term empirical data (PEP725)

198 Table S1-S2

199 Fig S1-S7

200

Figures




Figure 1: **Shifts in temperature sensitivities (response per °C) with warming occur when using linear models for non-linear processes.** Estimated sensitivities decline (in magnitude) with warming in simulations (shading, estimated across 45 sites with a base temperature of normal(6,4), variation comes from fluctuation in the Monte Carlo simulations) with no underlying change in the biological process when sensitivities were estimated with linear regression (left). This decline disappears when performing the regression on logged predictor and response variables (right). Such issues may underlie declining sensitivities calculated from observational data, including long-term observations of leafout across Europe (for *Betula pendula* from PEP725 from for the 45 sites that had complete data for 1950-1960 and 2000-2010), which show a lower sensitivity with warming when calculated on raw data, but no change in sensitivity using logged data. Shading, symbols and lines represent means \pm standard deviations of regressions across sites. See Supplementary Information for a discussion of why estimated sensitivities are -1 or lower in non-linear models.