

Why longer seasons with climate change may not increase tree growth

E.M. Wolkovich¹, Ailene K. Ettinger², Alana Chin³, Catherine J. Chamberlain⁴,
Frederik Baumgarten¹, Kavya Pradhan⁵, Rubén D. Manzanedo^{6,7} & Janneke Hille Ris Lambers⁶

June 18, 2024

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

² The Nature Conservancy of Washington, 74 Wall Street, Seattle, WA USA

³ California State Polytechnic University, Humboldt. Department of Biological Sciences. Arcata, CA, USA

⁴ The Nature Conservancy, 334 Blackwell St Ste 300, Durham, NC, USA

⁵

⁶ Institute for Integrative Biology, ETH Zurich, 8092 Zurich, Switzerland

⁷ Institute of Plant Sciences, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

Author contributions: All authors conceived of the idea, prepared the literature review, edited the manuscript and contributed to designing figures; in addition EMW wrote the manuscript, AKE, AC, CJC and EMW synthesized the literature review, RD led developing Fig. 1 and 5, AKE and EMW developed Figure 2, CJC developed Fig 3, AC, RD and EMW led developing Fig. 4.

Abstract

A number of recent studies have challenged the fundamental assumption that longer growing seasons lead to increased tree growth, raising concerns that forecasts of future climate change—which include increased carbon storage through this assumption—may be overly optimistic. In a review of recent literature, we found that 58% of studies supported the assumption of increased growth with longer seasons, while 36% of studies did not. Diverging results remained when holding methodology constant, which suggests the current major challenge is to understand the biological mechanisms that underlie this widespread variation. Studies have proposed a suite of hypotheses for why longer growing seasons may not always increase tree growth, including drought-related constraints and internal limits. These hypotheses and their underlying mechanisms, however, were generally tested in different ways by different fields, making comparisons difficult. We outline how bridging these current divides while simultaneously integrating ecological theory could yield new advances in fundamental biology and build a mechanistic framework for when longer seasons will—or will not—lead to greater growth, with major forecasting implications.

Introduction

The idea that longer growing seasons lead to increased plant growth is an intuitive tenet across multiple fields of biology, including physiology, dendrochronology and ecosystem ecology (Nobel *et al.*, 1983; Frank *et al.*, 2022). It is also a foundational assumption of many global carbon cycle models (e.g. Friedlingstein *et al.*, 2022; Ito *et al.*, 2020). These models project that continued anthropogenic warming will be partly offset by increased carbon sequestration as warming lengthens growing seasons in many forests (Friedlingstein *et al.*, 2022), an assumption supported by ecosystem-scale studies (Chen *et al.*, 1999; Keenan *et al.*, 2014; Finzi *et al.*, 2020).

Yet recent work has questioned this longstanding assumption (e.g. Dow *et al.*, 2022; Green & Keenan, 2022; Silvestro *et al.*, 2023), with potentially large implications for future climate change. These recent studies challenge decades of research reporting increased growth with longer seasons, from observations along elevational and latitudinal gradients (Myneni *et al.*, 1997; Berdanier & Klein, 2011; King *et al.*, 2013; Cuapio-Hernández *et al.*, 2022), classic experiments in lab settings (Went, 1957), to trends in ecosystem fluxes with warming (Chen *et al.*, 1999; Keenan *et al.*, 2014; Finzi *et al.*, 2020). Proposed mechanisms for the apparent disconnect are diverse (Fig. 1), including the complex nature of climate change (e.g. drought or heat stress, Dow *et al.*, 2022) and internal limits on plant growth (Zohner *et al.*, 2023).

Here we review methods and metrics used in diverse fields to uncover connections between growing season length and tree growth and identify the potential mechanisms that unite—and could disconnect—these processes. Results suggest that predictable—and substantial—variation in growth \times season length relationships across species exist. However, we also find a pervasive disciplinary split between studies, which often test different mechanisms on different species, and overlook insights from community and phylogenetic ecology (e.g. Grime, 1977; Ackerly, 2009; Ávila-Lovera *et al.*, 2023). We therefore argue that increased cross-disciplinary efforts would allow the field to rapidly develop a unified theoretical framework to predict when, where and how climate change may increase tree growth.

Evidence that longer seasons increase plant growth, or not

The idea that time limits growth is a fundamental principle across biology. Many biological processes—including photosynthesis and aspects of growth—are rate-limited, making time a crucial commodity (Nobel *et al.*, 1983; Cosgrove, 2005; Hiltz *et al.*, 2021). Thus, the hypothesis that longer growing seasons should increase growth is intuitive—and pervasive.

Multiple fields have long assumed that longer seasons yield more growth. Foundational evidence comes from spatial clines across elevation and latitude, with growth decreasing alongside growing season length at higher elevations (Fig. 2) and latitudes. Experimentally, this assumption is supported by small-scale field warming studies that find that phenologically advancing species also grow more with warming (Cleland *et al.*, 2012), while observationally, ecosystem-scale studies have reported a similar positive relationship between season length and carbon fluxes across decades with global warming (Keenan *et al.*, 2014) or in years with warm, early springs (Chen *et al.*, 1999). However, some recent studies do not support these previous findings. These studies, which often focus on inter-annual correlations with metrics of standardized individual tree growth (Dow *et al.*, 2022; Silvestro *et al.*, 2023), have generated debate about whether future carbon storage forecasts are overestimated and which metrics of growth (Green & Keenan, 2022), or growing season length (Körner *et al.*, 2023), are relevant.

Despite this recent debate, we found little support for a wholesale disconnect between growth and growing season length—instead finding split support for when longer seasons lead to increased growth. Papers spanning 25 years have variously found evidence for—or against—the relationship, with no clear pattern by method or year (Fig. 3 and see ‘Literature review methods’ in Supplement). For example, carbon assimilation studies were evenly split in finding evidence for or against the relationship (or simply not testing it, Fig. 3). Diverging results were consistently found within methods, suggesting the drivers of this variation are likely due to biological mechanisms, not solely inconsistent definitions of growth or growing season length (as some, e.g. Green & Keenan, 2022; Körner *et al.*, 2023, have recently suggested).

Most studies tested hypothesis that longer seasons with climate change increase growth via either increased time to grow (10 of 36 papers) or because longer seasons are usually warmer (8 papers), although many also considered hypotheses that could disconnect growth from season length. Studies from dendrochronology (the study of tree rings and their dating) and physiology have readily offered explanations for findings that increased growth may not be a universal outcome of longer seasons (Fig. 1). External climatic drivers that offset the positive growth effects of longer seasons are often reported in tree ring studies (Kolář *et al.*, 2016; de Sauvage *et al.*, 2022; Camarero *et al.*, 2022). In particular, the hypothesis that higher temperatures paired with lower precipitation produce negative correlations of season length with growth appeared in 58% of tree ring studies we reviewed (and was only mentioned once outside of these studies, see also Fig. 1). In contrast, 43% of lab experimental and wood phenology (xylogenesis) studies suggested fundamental internal constraints that prevent trees from responding to longer seasons (Fig. S1, Cuny *et al.*, 2012; Michelot *et al.*, 2012; Zohner *et al.*, 2023). Yet we found that these hypotheses have been tested in radically different ways, never together, and all ignore a suite of relevant research from other disciplines.

Controllers on growth \times season length relationships

Studies have uncovered a suite of major mechanisms that could limit or disrupt the positive effects of longer growing seasons. These generally fall into two categories: (1) external factors, such as drought, which should impact ecosystem-level trends at regional scales, and (2) internal physiological constraints, which some research suggests are either universal across plants (e.g. Zohner *et al.*, 2023), or species- and population-specific (e.g. Soolanayakanahally *et al.*, 2013). The importance of internal versus external drivers, however, likely vary by species, highlighting the need to integrate perspectives from community and phylogenetic ecology.

External drivers

Fundamentally, temperature limits many biological processes. Temperatures that are too cool (below 5°C for temperate trees) and too warm (an area of active research, but likely between 35-45°C; Martinez-Meier *et al.*, 2008; Cabon *et al.*, 2022) slow down biological processes and eventually can lead to tissue death (see Fig. 4, Larcher, 1980; Kramer, 2012). Between these upper and lower limits, biological processes underpinning growth generally accelerate such that warming can have a direct effect, by accelerating biological time, up until the maximum rate for that particular process. Assuming a common growth response curve to temperature, increased growth should be predictable at an ecosystem level based on the current seasonal temperatures and the amount of warming.

Positive effects of longer seasons on growth, however, could be counteracted by moisture deficits from reduced precipitation or higher evaporative demand (commonly invoked in tree ring studies, Fig. 1). Support for this hypothesis comes from negative correlations between growth and precipitation or other metrics related to plant access to water in tree ring studies (Kolář *et al.*, 2016; Etzold *et al.*, 2022). While we found drought limitation was far less considered in physiologically-focused studies, the mechanism is well supported by physiological observations that tree water status can be a biophysical limit to growth (i.e., cells cannot expand without sufficient turgor, Peters *et al.*, 2021; Cosgrove, 2023), driving diel correlations between vapor pressure deficit and growth (Babst *et al.*, 2019; Zweifel *et al.*, 2021).

Even without the complicating factor of soil moisture, the non-linear effect of temperature on photosynthesis can also limit growth responses (Fig. 4). At very cool temperatures—such as in early spring—a small increase in temperature may have limited effect (or even increase frost risk, Fig. 1e, Chamberlain *et al.*, 2021), while an increase at warmer temperatures—such as those more common in the summer (e.g. 16 to 18°C)—could have a larger physiological impact. However, warming that pushes plants beyond their optima, where many biological rates crash, could have large negative impacts (Nobel *et al.*, 1983; Leuning, 2002). Thus, some studies hypothesize that longer seasons effectively only extend the very cool early-season periods and may have no discernible effect on growth, while other studies—based on tree rings—suggest that any increases in growth due to longer seasons are offset by reduced growth due to high summer temperatures (Fig. 1, Gantois, 2022; Dow *et al.*, 2022). In contrast, other researchers argue that warmer temperatures have not yet pushed trees above their optima (Schaber & Badeck, 2002), and instead have driven increases in growth through accelerated rates, rather than longer

seasons (e.g. Ren *et al.*, 2019).

Biotic interactions—including herbivory, disease and competition—can also act as external factors that limit growth, and may themselves be responsive to an extended growing season. For example, herbivory can have large impacts on forests, leading to declines in satellite measures of greenness often associated with plant senescence (Senf *et al.*, 2017). Plant pathogens are also known to respond to warming, and can limit productivity (Sturrock *et al.*, 2011; La Porta *et al.*, 2008). These biotic drivers were rarely mentioned in studies examining growing season length (we found no mention of them, Fig. 1e), but could increasingly limit growth as extended growing seasons allow for additional generations of pests and pathogens (Mitton & Ferrenberg, 2012; Lange *et al.*, 2006).

Internal constraints

When and how growth is initiated and ceases is under genetic and developmental control, and thus plants’ internal programming could limit growth responses to longer seasons (Marchand *et al.*, 2021; McKown *et al.*, 2016; Soolanayakanahally *et al.*, 2013). Research has repeatedly shown that populations vary in their growth and its responses to extended seasons (Fig. 1d), reflecting differences in genetic and developmental controls that likely evolved to limit tissue loss to rare early or late-season events. For example, populations often vary predictably in their end-of-season phenology, with more poleward populations tending to stop height growth (budset) earlier using locally adapted photoperiod cues (Soolanayakanahally *et al.*, 2013; Aitken & Bemmels, 2016). This means longer seasons are generally driven by spring phenology, which appears far more flexible, and has advanced more rapidly than fall events (Aitken & Bemmels, 2016). Some recent studies suggest a novel role for the summer solstice (Zohner *et al.*, 2023) in setting a universal developmental switch between when warming temperatures hasten or delay leaf senescence. Within populations, individual trees may also vary in how early or late they initiate (spring) or end (fall) growth. This can be driven by a shifting investment to growth, survival and/or reproduction with growth. For example, saplings, for which growth and survival are paramount, tend to both grow more rapidly (Hilty *et al.*, 2021) and have longer seasons relative to adult trees (Augspurger & Bartlett, 2003; Rozendaal *et al.*, 2010; Vitasse *et al.*, 2014), which need to also invest in reproduction.

Trade-offs between vegetative and reproductive investments may produce important growth response differences across years within individuals, as well as between species. Years of high reproductive output can reduce growth (Thomas, 2011; Hacket-Pain *et al.*, 2016a). For species that mast—producing abundant cones or fruits in only some years—high reproduction could especially impact measures of wood growth. Many hypotheses suggest higher summer temperatures trigger masting in the following year (Hacket-Pain *et al.*, 2016a,b); if true, then reduced growth in years following warm summers may not indicate temperatures too high for growth, as recent studies have suggested (e.g. Gantois, 2022; Dow *et al.*, 2022), but instead shifting investment to reproduction.

Species-level variation

The effects of these external and internal drivers are likely to vary across species, a reality rarely acknowledged by most studies (Fig. 1c). Species identity, however, strongly predicts variation in growth \times season length relationships (e.g. Cuny *et al.*, 2012; Michelot *et al.*, 2012) and thus is likely critical for understanding the widespread observed variation. Biogeographical patterns in climate and assembly within communities also predict species should evolve towards different optima and different strategies (Ackerly, 2009; Buckley & Kingsolver, 2012). For example, leaf strategies (e.g. leaf mass per area, longevity) vary strongly between evergreen and deciduous species, but also within each group—where variation in ‘determinacy’ defines the timing and investment of shoot growth and leaf emergence. Determinate species have most of their leaf material prebuilt in overwintering buds, generally unfolding their entire canopy within a few weeks each season, while indeterminate species continue to produce new shoots including leaves over the growing season (Kikuzawa, 1982; Lechowicz, 1984). Such differences would influence the extent to which the growth of different species respond to increases in growing season length, even under identical conditions. Current studies span a wide range of species (we found 57 species from 26 genera across 36 papers), making the aim of identifying a common relationship between growth and growing season length with current studies especially difficult.

Phylogenetic ecology provides tools to study imprints of past selection, which often shape species-level differences today—limiting how well species are adapted to current conditions and potentially constraining their responses to rapidly changing conditions (Ackerly, 2009). Most studies testing for such effects of evolutionary history on plant responses find them (e.g. Davies *et al.*, 2013), including new work on physiological traits (Ávila-Lovera *et al.*, 2023), and previous physiological syntheses find results suggestive of strong phylogenetic relationships (e.g. Way & Oren, 2010).

Building a new framework for growth \times season length relationships

Predicting when and where longer seasons lead to increased growth may seem overwhelming given the diversity of potential drivers and complexity of species-level differences, but together they offer a set of testable hypotheses that could rapidly advance progress—if tackled with a more cross-disciplinary approach. Such changes may take time, but major hypotheses can be tractably tested now. Taking advantage of existing data sets and ongoing experiments could provide tests of variation in growth at relevant organizing levels—individuals, populations, species and ecosystems—to provide a benchmark when comparing the effect sizes of external drivers of variation (e.g. climate, pest outbreaks). While multiple papers report a lack of relationship between growth and growing season length, we have no fundamental understanding of what the effect size of this relationship should be, and thus no way to know if we have good power in current studies to detect it. New experiments could also help address this gap and could be designed to directly compare effects of external versus internal drivers on growth. Combining observational and experimental data in models that build up from internal limits to external drivers and include species-level variation would then provide predictions while helping to refine theory. More tractable changes within fields would also help—the high variation in observed

growth responses to longer seasons (Figs. 3, S2) could be partly reduced through standardized measurements (see Box: Standardized measurements) and a broadening of perspective within fields (see ‘Extending disciplinary focus’ in Supplement).

Using existing data and networks to partition levels of variation across drivers

Taking advantage of existing ecological and field global change experiments could help bridge across the two major fields currently studying growth \times season length relationships—physiology and dendrochronology—and their contrasting timescales. We found most physiological studies of growth \times growing season length relationships studied 1-2 years of dynamics, usually of juvenile trees, while tree ring studies focused on synthesizing across decades of adult tree growth. Perhaps because of this dichotomy, tree ring studies often study lag effects, while they are rarely mentioned in physiological studies, but current large-scale experiments on heat (e.g. SPRUCE, Hanson *et al.*, 2017), moisture via drought or irrigation (e.g. DroughtNet, Pfyfswald Smith *et al.*, 2016) and other factors (e.g. CO₂ in FACE) have increasingly been used to test ecological ‘memory’ (e.g. Flinker *et al.*, 2021; Schweiger *et al.*, 2022). They thus could help scale up from smaller and shorter-time scales of physiological studies, potentially to ecosystem-level dynamics, such as carbon cycling (Ding *et al.*, 2021; Jensen *et al.*, 2019). Building on available data and infrastructure could also bridge this gap, for example, adding dendrometers to provenance studies (or other ways to measure growth, e.g., Montwé *et al.*, 2016) and locations with established phenological sampling and vice versa. Such efforts may be especially valuable in sites across elevational and latitudinal gradients (e.g. PSP, Feeley elevation network, Forest Inventory and Analysis). These sites in turn could be priority locations for xylogenesis and focused physiological studies.

Existing open data repositories could test predictions from community ecology for species-level variation in responses to external drivers. Combining large-scale databases of tree rings and vegetative phenology (e.g. the International Tree Ring Database, ITRDB, and the Pan European Phenology project, PEP725, see Fig. 5) would provide a major spatially and temporally diverse dataset to compare how external climatic drivers, species and population together explain growth \times season length relationships. While the low spatial and taxonomic overlap between these databases currently poses challenges (see ‘Extending disciplinary focus’ in Supplement), combining these datasets with theory from community ecology may also allow us to identify which species will grow more with longer growing seasons. Community ecology predicts trade-offs along an acquisitive to conservative axis, where some species grow rapidly and more flexibly to take advantage of resources, but are less defended against herbivores and compete poorly at low resource levels, whereas other species compete well at low resource levels, but at the expense of growing slower and conservatively (Grime, 1977). Integrating these perspectives within a broader framework would provide predictions that researchers could test from combined datasets, specifically that longer growing seasons will increase growth for species with regular reproduction (no masting, see also new masting database in Hackett-Pain *et al.*, 2022), an acquisitive strategy, from clades that are historically (on an evolutionary timescale) plastic, in locations that are warm—but not too warm—and moist.

New experiments to tease apart external & internal drivers

Given the complex effects of external drivers and internal constraints on growth \times growing season length relationships, fully disentangling them will likely require new experiments. Changes in growing season length covary with other environmental changes, in particular longer seasons are usually warmer seasons (Canadell *et al.*, 2021). Thus, experiments to robustly tease these drivers apart seem a paramount need, especially if done across multiple species spanning diverse strategies. Similarly, factorial experiments that manipulate season length (via early growth or delayed senescence), while additionally manipulating external abiotic (e.g. heat waves, droughts) and/or biotic (e.g. pests, competition) drivers could allow us to compare the effects of these drivers on tree growth. Such experiments could also test for lag effects, if sampled multiple years after the manipulations (versus the common practice of destructive sampling at the end of the treatment growing season). While such experiments are most easily done for juvenile trees, they could also be done on adult trees, given investment in infrastructure.

Efforts to design and launch such large-scale experiments should start now. Long-term experiments on adult trees that manipulate temperature, precipitation and growing season length could test a suite of drivers at relevant lifestages. Such experiments could robustly compare drivers and become a resource for testing the underlying mechanisms for constraints, if properly measured and designed. This would mean careful measurements of carbon allocation, including to reproductive output, and tissue lost to frost and biotic drivers, and choosing species to maximize divergent strategies and provide the potential for genomic and related studies (e.g. *Populus*, *Quercus*). Given the potential role of evolutionary history, selecting for these varying strategies within a clade, or—if not feasible—correcting for phylogenetic distance would provide more robust tests of how strategies influence the growth \times season length relationship. These highly measured experiments would represent a major investment to tackle this question in one location, and could form part of a broader network of sites to test these relationships at larger spatial scales. Distributed experiments to measure growth and phenology (ideally wood and vegetative) of multiple provenances of multiple species across sites could estimate variation—and potential constraints—that operate at different organizing levels.

Models that push forward theory and aid forecasting

Efforts to bridge observational trends with experimental insights will need statistical and more mechanistic models that can bridge across temporal and organismal scales while testing the major hypotheses. New statistical models should include the separate effects of temperature, moisture and growing season length while partitioning individual, population and species-level variation—thereby providing broad-scale estimates of the effects of the major external drivers versus potential internal constraints (which may be apparent as within-season and/or population differences). Including species-level effects while also integrating phylogenetic relationships between species could then test for the role of evolutionary history in shaping responses, while adding in site \times year-level effects of biotic disturbances could begin to compare across abiotic and biotic external drivers. Such models should be built alongside a suite of mechanistic process-focused models that scale up. For example, one model could build from carbohydrate balance and cell division (e.g. Locosselli & Buckeridge, 2017) to predict growth dynamics ob-

served in xylogenesis, while another could build from phenology, including frost disturbance and reproduction, to predict growth for different species (e.g. Chuine, 2000).

The success of modeling approaches will likely depend on how nimbly they respond to new findings and how well they make predictions for new studies to test, which likely requires bridging across statistical and mechanistic models. As new experiments identify potential internal growth constraints and what level they operate on (universal, population or otherwise), both statistical and physiological process models should be adapted, improved and interconnected. Currently, statistical models are often overly disconnected from our biological understanding of tree growth (for example, using linear models for non-linear processes, Fig. 4) while process-models are often so complex that they cannot clearly provide testable predictions for empirical data. Together the integration of statistical and more mechanistic process-focused models would provide major insights into the fundamental biology of how tree growth shifts with extended seasons—and yield a unified model for robust predictions of growth responses to warmer, longer seasons across species and levels of warming.

Conclusions: Anthropogenic climate change has often been described as an unfortunate and unplanned experiment. Like many experiments, it has highlighted important biology we don't know well, requiring us to rediscover dusty old fundamentals, and also expose their limits—and thus our limits of understanding. Understanding when, how and why longer seasons lead to increased tree growth requires an interdisciplinary reckoning with how temperature, time and a suite of external and internal drivers affect plant growth. A mechanistic understanding of how these drivers integrate to affect growth will be critical for accurate models of future forest and related carbon dynamics, with implications for and projections of carbon sequestration and carbon markets as well.

Acknowledgements: B. Wu for extracting growth \times elevation data; R. Zäch for logistical support; N. Pederson for discussion and J. Davies for comments that improved the manuscript.

1 Boxes

Box. Standardized measurements

Understanding the diverse drivers and testing underlying hypotheses (Fig. 1) for growth \times growing season length relationships requires a common language. We found 14 different metrics of start, 16 metrics of end of season (25 metrics of growing season length), and 21 different metrics of growth across 59 studies—highlighting just part of the problem (see also *The challenge of metrics: Measuring growth* in the Supplement). Definitions and metrics for external and internal drivers were myriad, with papers reporting dozens of tests of different aspects of climate over different temporal windows. Although this is understandable given the differing goals of these papers, it also slows progress.

A common framework for explanatory and response variables would accelerate research by easing communication between fields and providing a path to comparable quantitative estimates. This should also include expected statistical tests, as we found a number of papers failed to directly test for growth \times growing season length relationships (Fig. 3), often instead testing only certain hypothesized indirect relationships (e.g. spring temperature \times growth in Dow *et al.*, 2022).

2 Figures




Figure 1: Pathways through which climate change could alter growing season length and growth, with the number of papers we found mentioning each hypothesis from a review of growth \times growing season length relationship studies (for more details, see Supplement).




Figure 2: Growth \times elevation relationships from the literature with simple linear regression fits shown with 89% confidence intervals. Oleksyn *et al.* (1998) measured growth (mm) as diameter at breast height increments, while the other studies (Wang *et al.*, 2017; Zhou *et al.*, 2022) measured it as ring width. See Supplement for more methods details.




Figure 3: A review of growth \times growing season length relationship studies spanned a diversity of methods, but there was no coherency in which methods did or did not find a positive relationship. A number of studies tested relationships possibly related to growth \times growing season length (e.g., they tested how spring temperatures related to growth) but never directly growth \times growing season length, thus ‘not tested’ was surprisingly common across methods. See Supplement for review details.




Figure 4: (a) Growth responses to temperature depends on a suite of complex factors and is often represented as net photosynthesis, which has a non-linear response to temperature (blue curve, adapted from meta-analysis of Rezende & Bozinovic, 2019), though it is often modeled as linear (red). (b) This non-linearity means that increases in lower temperatures—such as those in the spring when much of growing season extensions may happen—have a lower absolute increase in photosynthesis compared to increases in later-season (e.g., summer) warmer temperatures, while a linear response assumes a constant scale of effect across low to high temperatures.




Figure 5: Data overlap between the two major databases of growth (International Tree Ring Data Bank, ITRDB, orange) and plant phenology (Pan European Phenology Project, PEP725, blue). Both databases are compared in terms of their spatial distributions (a), temporal overlaps (b), coverage of environmental conditions in climate space (c) and taxonomical representation (d). Note that the number of tree ring chronologies in (b) are composed by multiple trees per site, typically 10-20. Climatic data from Worldclim database ver. 2.1 at 2.5°grid resolution. PEP725 records in d) show the largest records for any given phenophase per species.

3 References

- Ackerly, D. (2009) Conservatism and diversification of plant functional traits: Evolutionary rates versus phylogenetic signal. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **106**, 19699–19706.
- Aitken, S.N. & Bemmels, J.B. (2016) Time to get moving: assisted gene flow of forest trees. *Evol Appl* **9**, 271–90.
- Augspurger, C.K. & Bartlett, E.A. (2003) Differences in leaf phenology between juvenile and adult trees in a temperate deciduous forest. *Tree Physiology* **23**, 517–525.
- Ávila-Lovera, E., Winter, K. & Goldsmith, G.R. (2023) Evidence for phylogenetic signal and correlated evolution in plant–water relation traits. *New Phytologist* **237**, 392–407.
- Babst, F., Bouriaud, O., Poulter, B., Trouet, V., Girardin, M.P. & Frank, D.C. (2019) Twentieth century redistribution in climatic drivers of global tree growth. *Science Advances* **5**, eaat4313.
- Berdanier, A.B. & Klein, J.A. (2011) Growing season length and soil moisture interactively constrain high elevation aboveground net primary production. *Ecosystems* **14**, 963–974.
- Buckley, L.B. & Kingsolver, J.G. (2012) Functional and phylogenetic approaches to forecasting species’ responses to climate change. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* **43**, 205–226.
- Cabon, A., Kannenberg, S.A., Arain, A., Babst, F., Baldocchi, D., Belmecheri, S., Delpierre, N., Guerrieri, R., Maxwell, J.T., McKenzie, S. *et al.* (2022) Cross-biome synthesis of source versus sink limits to tree growth. *Science* **376**, 758–761.
- Camarero, J.J., Campelo, F., Colangelo, M., Valeriano, C., Knorre, A., Solé, G. & Rubio-Cuadrado, Á. (2022) Decoupled leaf-wood phenology in two pine species from contrasting climates: Longer growing seasons do not mean more radial growth. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **327**, 109223.
- Canadell, J., Monteiro, P., Costa, M., Cotrim da Cunha, L., Cox, P., Eliseev, A., Henson, S., Ishii, M., Jaccard, S., Koven, C., Lohila, A., Patra, P., Piao, S., Rogelj, J., Syampungani, S., Zaehle, S. & Zickfeld, K. (2021) *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY.
- Chamberlain, C.J., Cook, B.I., Morales-Castilla, I. & Wolkovich, E.M. (2021) Climate change reshapes the drivers of false spring risk across european trees. *New Phytologist* **229**, 323–334.
- Chen, W., Black, T., Yang, P., Barr, A., Neumann, H., Nesic, Z., Blanken, P., Novak, M., Eley, J., Ketler, R. *et al.* (1999) Effects of climatic variability on the annual carbon sequestration by a boreal aspen forest. *Global Change Biology* **5**, 41–53.

- Chuine, I. (2000) A unified model for budburst of trees. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **207**, 337–347.
- Cleland, E.E., Allen, J.M., Crimmins, T.M., Dunne, J.A., Pau, S., Travers, S.E., Zavaleta, E.S. & Wolkovich, E.M. (2012) Phenological tracking enables positive species responses to climate change. *Ecology* **93**, 1765–1771.
- Cosgrove, D.J. (2005) Growth of the plant cell wall. *Nature reviews molecular cell biology* **6**, 850–861.
- Cosgrove, D.J. (2023) Structure and growth of plant cell walls. *Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology* pp. 1–19.
- Cuapio-Hernández, L., Reyes-Ortiz, J.L., De La Rosa, A.B., Pavón, N.P., López-Herrera, M., Villanueva-Díaz, J. & Sánchez-González, A. (2022) Is there a response pattern between radial growth of trees and elevation gradient? *Tree-Ring Research* .
- Cuny, H.E., Rathgeber, C.B., Lebourgeois, F., Fortin, M. & Fournier, M. (2012) Life strategies in intra-annual dynamics of wood formation: example of three conifer species in a temperate forest in north-east france. *Tree physiology* **32**, 612–625.
- Davies, T.J., Wolkovich, E.M., Kraft, N.J.B., Salamin, N., Allen, J.M., Ault, T.R., Betancourt, J.L., Bolmgren, K., Cleland, E.E., Cook, B.I., Crimmins, T.M., Mazer, S.J., McCabe, G.J., Pau, S., Regetz, J., Schwartz, M.D. & Travers, S.E. (2013) Phylogenetic conservatism in plant phenology. *Journal of Ecology* **101**, 1520–1530.
- de Sauvage, J.C., Vitasse, Y., Meier, M., Delzon, S. & Bigler, C. (2022) Temperature rather than individual growing period length determines radial growth of sessile oak in the pyrenees. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **317**, 108885.
- Ding, W., Cong, W.F. & Lambers, H. (2021) Plant phosphorus-acquisition and-use strategies affect soil carbon cycling. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **36**, 899–906.
- Dow, C., Kim, A.Y., D’Orangeville, L., Gonzalez-Akre, E.B., Helcoski, R., Herrmann, V., Harley, G.L., Maxwell, J.T., McGregor, I.R., McShea, W.J. *et al.* (2022) Warm springs alter timing but not total growth of temperate deciduous trees. *Nature* **608**, 552–557.
- Etzold, S., Sterck, F., Bose, A.K., Braun, S., Buchmann, N., Eugster, W., Gessler, A., Kahmen, A., Peters, R.L., Vitasse, Y. *et al.* (2022) Number of growth days and not length of the growth period determines radial stem growth of temperate trees. *Ecology Letters* **25**, 427–439.
- Finzi, A.C., Giasson, M.A., Plotkin, A.A.B., Aber, J.D., Boose, E.R., Davidson, E.A., Dietze, M.C., Ellison, A.M., Frey, S.D., Goldman, E., Keenan, T.F., Melillo, J.M., Munger, J.W., Nadelhoffer, K.J., Ollinger, V., S., Orwig, D.A., Pederson, N., Richardson, A.D., Savage, K., Tang, J., Thompson, J.R., Williams, C.A., Wofsy, S.C., Zhou, Z. & Foster, D.R. (2020) Carbon budget of the harvard forest long-term ecological research site: pattern, process, and response to global change. *Ecological Monographs* **90**.

- Flinker, R.H., Cardenas, M.B., Caldwell, T.G., Flerchinger, G.N., Roy, R. & Reich, P.B. (2021) Promise and pitfalls of modeling grassland soil moisture in a free-air co₂ enrichment experiment (biocon) using the shaw model. *Pedosphere* **31**, 783–795.
- Frank, D., Fang, K. & Fonti, P. (2022) Dendrochronology: Fundamentals and innovations. *Stable Isotopes in Tree Rings: Inferring Physiological, Climatic and Environmental Responses*, pp. 21–59, Springer International Publishing Cham.
- Friedlingstein, P., O’sullivan, M., Jones, M.W., Andrew, R.M., Gregor, L., Hauck, J., Le Quéré, C., Luijkx, I.T., Olsen, A., Peters, G.P. *et al.* (2022) Global carbon budget 2022. *Earth System Science Data Discussions* **2022**, 1–159.
- Gantois, J. (2022) New tree-level temperature response curves document sensitivity of tree growth to high temperatures across a us-wide climatic gradient. *Global Change Biology* **28**, 6002–6020.
- Green, J.K. & Keenan, T.F. (2022) The limits of forest carbon sequestration. *Science* **376**, 692–693.
- Grime, J.P. (1977) Evidence for existence of 3 primary strategies in plants and its relevance to ecological and evolutionary theory. *American Naturalist* **111**, 1169–1194.
- Hacket-Pain, A., Foest, J.J., Pearse, I.S., LaMontagne, J.M., Koenig, W.D., Vacchiano, G., Bogdziewicz, M., Caignard, T., Celebias, P., Van Dormolen, J. *et al.* (2022) Mastree+: Time-series of plant reproductive effort from six continents. *Global Change Biology* **28**, 3066–3082.
- Hacket-Pain, A., Friend, A., Lageard, J. & Thomas, P. (2016a) Tree rings and masting: considering reproductive phenomena when interpreting tree rings? *Tree Rings in Archaeology, Climatology and Ecology* **14**, 78–85.
- Hacket-Pain, A.J., Cavin, L., Friend, A.D. & Jump, A. (2016b) Consistent limitation of growth by high temperature and low precipitation from range core to southern edge of european beech indicates widespread vulnerability to changing climate. *European Journal of Forest Research* **135**, 897–909.
- Hanson, P.J., Riggs, J.S., Nettles, W.R., Phillips, J.R., Krassovski, M.B., Hook, L.A., Gu, L., Richardson, A.D., Aubrecht, D.M., Ricciuto, D.M. *et al.* (2017) Attaining whole-ecosystem warming using air and deep-soil heating methods with an elevated co₂ atmosphere. *Biogeosciences* **14**, 861–883.
- Hilty, J., Muller, B., Pantin, F. & Leuzinger, S. (2021) Plant growth: The what, the how, and the why. *New Phytologist* **232**, 25–41.
- Ito, G., Romanou, A., Kiang, N.Y., Faluvegi, G., Aleinov, I., Ruedy, R., Russell, G., Lerner, P., Kelley, M. & Lo, K. (2020) Global carbon cycle and climate feedbacks in the nasa giss modele2. 1. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems* **12**, e2019MS002030.

- Jensen, A.M., Warren, J.M., King, A.W., Ricciuto, D.M., Hanson, P.J. & Wullschlegel, S.D. (2019) Simulated projections of boreal forest peatland ecosystem productivity are sensitive to observed seasonality in leaf physiology. *Tree Physiology* **39**, 556–572.
- Keenan, T.F., Gray, J., Friedl, M.A., Toomey, M., Bohrer, G., Hollinger, D.Y., Munger, J.W., O’Keefe, J., Schmid, H.P., Wing, I.S. *et al.* (2014) Net carbon uptake has increased through warming-induced changes in temperate forest phenology. *Nature Climate Change* **4**, 598–604.
- Kikuzawa, K. (1982) Leaf survival and evolution in betulaceae. *Annals of Botany* **50**, 345–353.
- King, G.M., Gugerli, F., Fonti, P. & Frank, D.C. (2013) Tree growth response along an elevational gradient: climate or genetics? *Oecologia* **173**, 1587–1600.
- Kolář, T., Giagli, K., Trnka, M., Bednářová, E., Vavřík, H. & Rybníček, M. (2016) Response of the leaf phenology and tree-ring width of european beech to climate variability. *Silva Fennica* **50**.
- Körner, C., Möhl, P. & Hiltbrunner, E. (2023) Four ways to define the growing season. *Ecology Letters* .
- Kramer, P. (2012) *Physiology of woody plants*. Elsevier, New York.
- La Porta, N., Capretti, P., Thomsen, I., Kasanen, R., Hietala, A. & Von Weissenberg, K. (2008) Forest pathogens with higher damage potential due to climate change in europe. *Canadian Journal of Plant Pathology* **30**, 177–195.
- Lange, H., Økland, B. & Krokene, P. (2006) Thresholds in the life cycle of the spruce bark beetle under climate change. *Interjournal for Complex Systems* **1648**, 1–10.
- Larcher, W. (1980) *Plant Physiological Ecology*. Springer-Verlag.
- Lechowicz, M.J. (1984) Why do temperate deciduous trees leaf out at different times - adaptation and ecology of forest communities. *American Naturalist* **124**, 821–842.
- Leuning, R. (2002) Temperature dependence of two parameters in a photosynthesis model. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **25**, 1205–1210.
- Locosselli, G.M. & Buckeridge, M.S. (2017) Dendrobiochemistry, a missing link to further understand carbon allocation during growth and decline of trees. *Trees* **31**, 1745–1758.
- Marchand, L.J., Dox, I., Gričar, J., Prislan, P., Van den Bulcke, J., Fonti, P. & Campioli, M. (2021) Timing of spring xylogenesis in temperate deciduous tree species relates to tree growth characteristics and previous autumn phenology. *Tree Physiology* **41**, 1161–1170.
- Martinez-Meier, A., Sanchez, L., Pastorino, M., Gallo, L. & Rozenberg, P. (2008) What is hot in tree rings? the wood density of surviving douglas-firs to the 2003 drought and heat wave. *Forest Ecology and Management* **256**, 837–843.
- McKown, A.D., Guy, R.D. & Quamme, L.K. (2016) Impacts of bud set and lammas phenology on root: shoot biomass partitioning and carbon gain physiology in poplar. *Trees* **30**, 2131–2141.

- Michelot, A., Simard, S., Rathgeber, C., Dufrêne, E. & Damesin, C. (2012) Comparing the intra-annual wood formation of three european species (*fagus sylvatica*, *quercus petraea* and *pinus sylvestris*) as related to leaf phenology and non-structural carbohydrate dynamics. *Tree physiology* **32**, 1033–1045.
- Mitton, J.B. & Ferrenberg, S.M. (2012) Mountain pine beetle develops an unprecedented summer generation in response to climate warming. *The American Naturalist* **179**, E163–E171.
- Montwé, D., Isaac-Renton, M., Hamann, A. & Spiecker, H. (2016) Drought tolerance and growth in populations of a wide-ranging tree species indicate climate change risks for the boreal north. *Global Change Biology* **22**, 806–815.
- Myneni, R.B., Keeling, C., Tucker, C.J., Asrar, G. & Nemani, R.R. (1997) Increased plant growth in the northern high latitudes from 1981 to 1991. *Nature* **386**, 698–702.
- Nobel, P.S. *et al.* (1983) *Biophysical plant physiology and ecology*. WH Freeman and company.
- Oleksyn, J., Modrzyński, J., Tjoelker, M., Z. ytkowiak, R., Reich, P.B. & Karolewski, P. (1998) Growth and physiology of *picea abies* populations from elevational transects: common garden evidence for altitudinal ecotypes and cold adaptation. *Functional Ecology* **12**, 573–590.
- Peters, R.L., Steppe, K., Cuny, H.E., De Pauw, D.J., Frank, D.C., Schaub, M., Rathgeber, C.B., Cabon, A. & Fonti, P. (2021) Turgor—a limiting factor for radial growth in mature conifers along an elevational gradient. *New Phytologist* **229**, 213–229.
- Ren, P., Ziacco, E., Rossi, S., Biondi, F., Prislan, P. & Liang, E. (2019) Growth rate rather than growing season length determines wood biomass in dry environments. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **271**, 46–53.
- Rezende, E.L. & Bozinovic, F. (2019) Thermal performance across levels of biological organization. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B* **374**, 20180549.
- Rozendaal, D.M., Brien, R.J., Soliz-Gamboa, C.C. & Zuidema, P.A. (2010) Tropical tree rings reveal preferential survival of fast-growing juveniles and increased juvenile growth rates over time. *New Phytologist* **185**, 759–769.
- Schaber, J. & Badeck, F.W. (2002) Evaluation of methods for the combination of phenological time series and outlier detection. *Tree Physiology* **22**, 973–982.
- Schweiger, A., Awdamet, F.T., Drenckhan, W. & Berauer, B.J. (2022) Transgenerational effects of elevated CO_2 : Downregulation of photosynthetic efficiency and stomatal sensitivity to drought .
- Senf, C., Seidl, R. & Hostert, P. (2017) Remote sensing of forest insect disturbances: Current state and future directions. *International journal of applied earth observation and geoinformation* **60**, 49–60.
- Silvestro, R., Zeng, Q., Buttò, V., Sylvain, J.D., Drolet, G., Mencuccini, M., Thiffault, N., Yuan, S. & Rossi, S. (2023) A longer wood growing season does not lead to higher carbon sequestration. *Scientific reports* **13**, 4059.

- Smith, M.D., Wilcox, K., Sala, O., Phillips, R., Luo, Y., Knapp, A. & Lemoine, N.P. (2016) Drought-net: A global network merging observations, experiments, and modeling to forecast terrestrial ecosystem sensitivity to drought. *AGU Fall Meeting Abstracts*, vol. 2016, pp. B11J-06.
- Soolanayakanahally, R.Y., Guy, R.D., Silim, S.N. & Song, M. (2013) Timing of photoperiodic competency causes phenological mismatch in balsam poplar (*populus balsamifera* l.). *Plant, cell & environment* **36**, 116–127.
- Sturrock, R., Frankel, S., Brown, A., Hennon, P., Kliejunas, J., Lewis, K., Worrall, J. & Woods, A. (2011) Climate change and forest diseases. *Plant pathology* **60**, 133–149.
- Thomas, S.C. (2011) Age-related changes in tree growth and functional biology: The role of reproduction. *Size- and Age-Related Changes in Tree Structure and Function* (eds. F.C. MEINZER, B. Lachenbruch & T.E. Dawson), chap. 2, pp. 33–64, Springer.
- Vitasse, Y., Lenz, A., Hoch, G. & Körner, C. (2014) Earlier leaf-out rather than difference in freezing resistance puts juvenile trees at greater risk of damage than adult trees. *Journal of Ecology* **102**, 981–988.
- Wang, M., Jiang, Y., Zhang, W., Dong, M., Kang, M. & Xu, H. (2017) Climatic response of tracheid features of *picea meyeri* along altitude gradient of luyashan mountains of north china. *Polish Journal of Ecology* **65**, 345–358.
- Way, D.A. & Oren, R. (2010) Differential responses to changes in growth temperature between trees from different functional groups and biomes: a review and synthesis of data. *Tree physiology* **30**, 669–688.
- Went, F.W. (1957) The experimental control of plant growth. *The experimental control of plant growth*. **17**.
- Zhou, Y., Yi, Y., Liu, H., Song, J., Jia, W. & Zhang, S. (2022) Altitudinal trends in climate change result in radial growth variation of *pinus yunnanensis* at an arid-hot valley of southwest china. *Dendrochronologia* **71**, 125914.
- Zohner, C.M., Mirzaghali, L., Renner, S.S., Mo, L., Rebindaine, D., Bucher, R., Palouš, D., Vitasse, Y., Fu, Y.H., Stocker, B.D. *et al.* (2023) Effect of climate warming on the timing of autumn leaf senescence reverses after the summer solstice. *Science* **381**, eadf5098.
- Zweifel, R., Sterck, F., Braun, S., Buchmann, N., Eugster, W., Gessler, A., Häni, M., Peters, R.L., Walthert, L., Wilhelm, M. *et al.* (2021) Why trees grow at night. *New Phytologist* **231**, 2174–2185.