

Why longer seasons with climate change may not increase tree growth

Team Grephon

April 8, 2024

Abstract

Recently a number of studies have challenged the fundamental assumption that longer growing seasons lead to increased tree growth, raising concerns that forecasts of future climate change—which generally include increased carbon storage through this assumption—may be overly optimistic. In a review of recent literature, we found that 58% of studies report increased growth with longer seasons; however, 36% of studies found no increased growth with longer seasons. We suggest the current major challenge is thus to understand and predict 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, internal limits, and methodological differences. Yet we found that results diverged even when using similar methods, but hypotheses—and their underlying mechanisms—were generally tested in different ways by different sub-fields, making comparisons a difficult. We argue that bridging disciplinary divides and integrating theory from community and phylogenetic ecology could rapidly help develop and test a mechanistic framework for when longer seasons will—or will not—lead to greater growth.

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 most models of the future global carbon cycle (e.g. Friedlingstein *et al.*, 2022; Ito *et al.*, 2020). Most models project that continued anthropogenic warming will be partly offset by increased carbon sequestration as warming lengthens growing seasons in temperate and boreal forests (Friedlingstein *et al.*, 2022), an assumption supported by a suite of ecosystem-scale studies (Chen *et al.*, 1999; Keenan *et al.*, 2014; Finzi *et al.*, 2020).

Yet recent work has questioned this longstanding assumption and suggested that longer growing seasons do not necessarily lead to greater growth (e.g. Dow *et al.*, 2022; Green & Keenan, 2022; Silvestro *et al.*, 2023), with potentially large implications for future climate change. Such findings challenge decades of research that report increased growth with longer seasons, from studies along natural elevational and latitudinal gradients (Myneni *et al.*, 1997; Berdanier & Klein, 2011; King *et al.*, 2013; Cuapio-Hernández *et al.*, 2022), classic studies in lab settings

(Went, 1957), to stand-level 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 non-linear effects of climate change itself (e.g., drought or heat stress, Dow *et al.*, 2022), internal limits on plant growth (Zohner *et al.*, 2023), as well as inconsistent use of growth and growing season metrics and definitions (Green & Keenan, 2022; Körner *et al.*, 2023).

Here we review the connections between growing season length and plant growth across fields to identify the potential mechanisms that unite—and could disconnect—these processes. Leveraging a review of the literature alongside the current proposed hypotheses, we examine which methods and metrics suggest that extended seasons lead to increased growth. We find a pervasive disciplinary split between studies, which may limit progress. Further, research has generally tested different mechanisms on different species, ignoring insights from community and phylogenetic ecology (e.g., Grime, 1977; Ackerly, 2009; Ávila-Lovera *et al.*, 2023) that suggest predictable—and substantial—variation in growth \times growing season relationships across species. We argue that—with increased cross-disciplinary efforts—the field could rapidly develop a framework to predict when, where and how climate change may increase tree growth, with implications both for forecasts of future climate change and fundamental science.

Evidence that longer seasons increase plant growth, or not

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

Across a systematic review of the recent literature, the hypothesis that longer seasons yield more time for growth was by far the most common hypothesis for why longer seasons should increase growth, with 19 of 59 total studies including it (Fig. 1). Foundational evidence for this relationship comes primarily from spatial clines across elevation and latitude, with growth decreasing alongside growing season length at higher elevations and latitudes (Fig. 2). Experimentally, this hypothesis is supported by small-scale field warming studies that find that species which advance phenologically with warming also grow more (Cleland *et al.*, 2012), while observationally, ecosystem-scale studies have reported a similar positive relationship between growing 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). These findings, however, have not been supported by recent work, which has focused often on inter-annual correlations with metrics of standardized individual tree growth (Dow *et al.*, 2022; Silvestro *et al.*, 2023), and 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, research has generally found split support—across methods—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 Supplement). For example, studies that measured carbon assimilation were evenly split in

finding evidence for or against the relationship—or simply not testing it (Fig. 3). Diverging results were consistently found within all well-studied methods, suggesting the drivers of this variation are likely due to biological mechanisms, not solely inconsistent definitions or methods (as some, e.g. Green & Keenan, 2022; Körner *et al.*, 2023, have recently suggested).

Studies from the disciplines of dendrochronology (the study of tree rings and their dating) and physiology have readily offered mechanisms for the recent results that increased growth may not be a universal outcome of longer seasons. Hypotheses focus on both source (photosynthesis-limited, including CO_2 limitation) and sink limitations (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 with growth appeared in 33% of tree ring studies we reviewed (and was only mentioned once outside of studies measuring radial growth, see also Fig. 1). In contrast, 64% 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 ignore a suite of relevant research from other disciplines on this topic. As we outline below, a single mechanism is unlikely to explain all results, requiring a more unified framework—and tests of it—for progress.

Controllers on growth \times growing season length relationships

A suite of major mechanisms that could limit or disrupt the positive effects of longer growing seasons on growth group into categories that operate at different levels. Currently disconnected research has focused on: (1) external factors, such as drought, which should impact ecosystem-level trends at regional scales, and (2) internal physiological limits, such as photoperiod constraints, which contrasting research suggest are either universal across plants (e.g., Zohner *et al.*, 2023), or population-specific (e.g., Soolanayakanahally *et al.*, 2013). The effects of the mechanisms in these two groups, however, are highly likely to vary by species, highlighting the importance of integrating perspectives from community and phylogenetic ecology, as we review below.

External

Fundamentally, temperature limits many biological processes. Temperatures that are too cool (often considered to be below 5°C for temperate trees) and too warm (an area of active research, 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 the 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. Given a common growth response to curve temperature, increased growth should then be predictable at an ecosystem-level based on the current seasonal temperatures and the scale of warming.

Positive effects of longer seasons on growth, however, could be counteracted by moisture deficits

due to reduced precipitation or higher evaporative demand, which was a common hypothesis in tree ring studies (Fig. 1). Such studies reported support for this through negative correlations between growth and precipitation or other metrics related to plant access to water (George, 2014; Babst *et al.*, 2019). While we found drought limitation was far less studied by more physiological-focused studies, the mechanism is well supported by fundamental physiology. Because cells cannot expand without sufficient turgor (Cosgrove, 1987, 2023) tree water status is an inescapable biophysical limit to growth (Peters *et al.*, 2021), 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, temperature’s non-linear effects on growth can also limit growth responses (Fig. 4). At very cool temperatures—such as those of early spring—a small increase in warming may have limited effect, while a jump in more common summer-time temperatures, for example from 16 to 18°C, would be physiologically more significant. 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 thus have no discernible effect on growth, while a number of other studies—based on tree rings—suggest that any increases in growth due to longer seasons are offset by reduced growth from high summer temperatures (Fig. 1, Gantois, 2022; Dow *et al.*, 2022). Other studies suggest current summer temperatures have not pushed trees above their optima (Schaber & Badeck, 2002), with some suggesting increased growth is driven only by higher growth rates, not longer seasons (e.g. Ren *et al.*, 2019).

External factors related to biotic interactions—including herbivory, disease and competition—can also 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 signals of plant senescence (Senf *et al.*, 2017). Plant pathogens are also known to respond to warming, and limit productivity (Sturrock *et al.*, 2011; La Porta *et al.*, 2008). These biotic drivers of growth 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 generation cycles in many pest species (Mitton & Ferrenberg, 2012; Lange *et al.*, 2006).

Internal

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). Some recent studies suggest a novel role for the summer solstice (Zohner *et al.*, 2023) in setting a developmental switch between when warming temperatures hasten or delay leaf senescence—thus influencing growing season length and growth. While recent work suggests this switching may be universal (i.e., all plants use the solstice), decades of work show similar apparent pre-programmed limits that vary at the population level.

Research has repeatedly shown that populations vary in their growth and its responses to ex-

tended 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). Within populations, individual trees may also vary in how early or late they are for both spring and fall events. This can be driven by maturity and a shifting investment to growth, survival and/or reproduction. 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 (Augsburger & 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 also 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 on growth are likely to vary across species, a reality rarely acknowledged by current studies (Fig. 1c, but strongly predicts variation when studied, see Cuny *et al.*, 2012; Michelot *et al.*, 2012) with major implications for understanding the widespread observed variation in growth \times growing season relationships. Biogeographical patterns in climate and assembly within communities predict species should evolve towards different optima and different strategies (Ackerly, 2009; Buckley & Kingsolver, 2012). For example, leaf strategies 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 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 do not generally control for species identity (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.

Yet studies could leverage community and phylogenetic ecology theory to make useful predictions for when and where growth \times growing season should be most apparent. 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). These ideas would predict indeterminate acquisitive species, such as poplar, to grow more with longer seasons, while conservative species, such as beech, may not. Functional traits could further refine these predictions, with where species fall along the acquisitive versus conservative trade-off defined by suite of leaf, wood and reproductive traits (Diaz *et al.*, 2016). Under this framework, species with low leaf mass per area, diffuse vessels and consistent investment in fruit would show stronger shifts in growth with changing growing season length—assuming no other factors (e.g., drought or high temperatures) become limiting.

Phylogenetic ecology layers onto these predictions drivers from past periods, producing species differences that have critical implications for current plant responses to warming. Imprints of past selection often drive species-level differences, producing phylogenetic patterns that both limit how well species are adapted to current conditions and may constrain their responses to rapidly changing conditions (Ackerly, 2009). Most studies testing for such historical effects 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 finding results suggestive of strong phylogenetic relationships (e.g., Way & Oren, 2010).

Building a framework for growth \times growing 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 organized and cross-disciplinary approach. The high variation we found in observed growth responses to longer seasons across methods and even within species (Figs. 3, S2) could be reduced in some part through standardized measurements (see Box: Standardized measurements) and larger shifts within fields (see Box: Extending disciplinary focus). 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—and potentially controllers on it—across individual to species and ecosystem scales, while new experiments can compare effects of external versus internal drivers on growth. Combining these 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.

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

Existing freely-available repositories of data 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 growing season length relationships. Depending on the data overlap

(see Box: Extending disciplinary focus), these datasets may also allow us to identify where longer growing seasons will increase growth and for which types of species. For example, combined databases could test the prediction 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.

Existing common garden studies provide an opportunity for more robust tests of population and individual variation. Given that many common garden studies have data on phenology (Aitken & Bemmels, 2016) and are designed to tease out population versus inter-annual variation, collecting tree ring data from them seems a rapid way to estimate variation across these two levels. New measurements of biomass or greenness within a growing season could also help compare support for whether internal limits are universal at solstice (Zohner *et al.*, 2023), variable by population (Soolanayakanahally *et al.*, 2013), or some mix.

Taking advantage of existing ecological and field global change experiments could help bridge across the two major fields currently studying growth \times growing 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 or longer 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, Phynwald Smith *et al.*, 2016) and other factors (e.g., CO_2 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 locations with phenological sampling and vice versa. Such efforts may be especially valuable in sites across elevational and latitudinal gradients (e.g., PSP, Feeley elevation network, Coweeta). These sites in turn could be priority locations for xylogenesis and focused physiological studies.

Understanding the scale of variation across all these levels could provide a benchmark when comparing the effect sizes of other drivers of variation. 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. Estimates of how growth shifts with elevation (Fig. 2) likely include responses from both plasticity (within-individual variation) and local adaptation (population-level variation) and thus could be an upper bound on our expectations, yet elevational trends to date appear relatively weak and noisy—suggesting this is only part of our missing mechanistic understanding.

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, disentangling them will require new experiments. The longer growing seasons of anthropogenic climate change generally co-vary multiple mechanisms, in particular longer seasons are also warmer seasons. Thus, experiments to robustly tease these drivers apart seems a paramount need, especially if done across multiple species spanning diverse strategies. Similarly, experiments to compare impacts of extended seasons (via early growth or delayed senescence), and differentiating between external abiotic (e.g., heat waves, droughts) and biotic (e.g., pests, competition) drivers could provide comparable estimates. Such experiments could also test 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 these 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. A long-term experiment on adult trees that manipulates temperature, precipitation and growing season length, would test a suite of drivers at the relevant lifestage. It could robustly compare drivers and become a resource for studies of 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 growing season length relationship. These highly measured experiments could form part of a broader network of study sites that test these relationships at a larger spatial scale. 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 towards forecasting

Efforts to bridge observational trends with experimental insights will need models that can bridge across temporal and organismal scales while testing the major hypotheses. Statistical models that include separate effects of temperature, moisture and growing season length while partitioning individual, population and species-level variation could provide 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 observed in xylogenesis, while another could build from phenology, including frost disturbance and reproduction, to predict growth (e.g. Chuine, 2000).

The success of these models will likely depend on how nimbly they respond to new findings, and how well they make predictions for new studies to test. 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 and improved. Together the interplay of statistical and more mechanistic process-focused models would likely provide major insights into the fundamental biology how tree growth \times 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, growth and a suite of external and internal drivers affect plant growth. The task may seem large, but bridging across theory and data from dendrochronology, physiology, community and phylogenetic ecology could rapidly advance fundamental biology in ways that translate directly to improved models of future forest dynamics, and the suite of species and services that depend on them.

Acknowledgements: B. Wu for extracting growth \times elevation data; N. Pederson for discussions and J. Davies for comments that improved the manuscript.

1 Boxes!

Box. Standardized measurements

Tackling the diverse drivers and their underlying hypotheses (Fig. 1) for growth \times growing season length relationships requires a common language and set of metrics for growing season length (Körner *et al.*, 2023), growth, and the potential drivers. 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 many papers reporting dozens of tests of different aspects of climate over different temporal windows. This is understandable, given the complexity of environmental variables and our limited understanding of how they trigger phenology and growth, but also slows progress.

A common framework where researchers measure and report common 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).

Box: Extending disciplinary focus to help bridge the internal-external drivers divide

Each field studying growth \times growing season length today has its own historical aims, and thus its own biases towards certain species, methods and metrics. Dendrochronology’s original focus on using tree growth to estimate climate has led to certain assumptions and methods that may obscure the complexity of how growth shifts with growing season length. Fundamentally, the field relies on an assumed relationship that, within individual and populations of trees, growth (measured by annual ring width) is greater when growing conditions—climatically—are better (e.g. Cook & Kairiukstis, 2013). Dendrochronologists’ traditional aim to magnify this climate signal has led to standard approaches, including sampling biases (e.g. to ‘climate-sensitive’ individual trees, Klesse *et al.*, 2018; Nehrbass-Ahles *et al.*, 2014) and statistical detrending (Rollinson *et al.*, 2021), that may obscure patterns where the signal of longer growing seasons and biotic drivers may be most apparent (such as rapid growth phases, Manzanedo & Pederson, 2019). Further, these approaches mean dendrochronology studies are also fundamentally washing out much of what physiological studies focus on, limiting opportunities for interdisciplinary overlap.

Opportunities to overlap dendrochronology with metrics of growing season length measured through vegetative phenology appear high, but sampling biases limit current opportunities. Dendrochronology generally focuses on conifers (gymnosperms, Zhao *et al.*, 2019), creating a major split from most studies of leaf phenology, which focus almost entirely on deciduous angiosperm species (see Fig. 5). Phenology research has also been strongly focused on spring events (e.g., budburst, leafout), with limited data on fall events and thus limited data to calculate growing season length. This focus on spring events may have been justified decades ago,

when most shifts from anthropogenic warming occurred in the spring, but less justified as increasing research suggests important complexity in fall shifts (Gill *et al.*, 2015; Zohner *et al.*, 2023) and a need to scale up phenological research to understand tree growth.

All fields could benefit from tackling the challenge of understanding the physiological connections between growing season length and growth, and even the genetic and developmental underpinnings of these connections. To date, much work has focused on measures of growth and phenology without a clear mechanistic understanding of what triggers growth and its cessation, and how these triggers and responses have evolved. Progress in this area is could be particularly important for making projections, as extrapolating can be dangerous when the underlying mechanistic model is wrong. Physiological studies that follow carbohydrate balance and cell division (see Locosselli & Buckeridge, 2017) versus growth dynamics could yield insights, as could additional work on xylogenesis—especially if done with a focus both to extrapolate to long-term tree ring studies and/or in physiological experiments (Fang *et al.*, 2020; Simard *et al.*, 2013). Expanding beyond the current disciplines focused on this topic could also be informative. For example, a clearer physiological understanding of which environmental stimuli trigger leaf expansion, senescence, woody growth, and heartwood formation alongside an evolutionary perspective could contribute towards a clearer understanding of growth constraints (Baas & Wheeler, 2011; Eckert *et al.*, 2019; Ensminger *et al.*, 2015; Juvany *et al.*, 2013).

2 Figures




Figure 1: Pathways through which climate change could alter growing season length and growth.




Figure 2: Growth \times elevation relationships from the literature, see Supplement for more methods details and Fig. S3 for an example from one site.




Figure 3: A review of growth × 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. Not directly testing for the relationship was surprisingly common across methods. See Supplement for review details.




Figure 4: 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. 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 warmer temperatures. Because there is no unified model of this relationships, we show two different versions of the relationship based on Larcher (2003); Rezende & Bozinovic (2019).




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.
- Baas, P. & Wheeler, E. (2011) Wood anatomy and climate change. *Climate change, ecology and systematics* **78**, 141–155.
- 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.
- 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.

- Cook, E.R. & Kairiukstis, L.A. (2013) *Methods of dendrochronology: applications in the environmental sciences*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Cosgrove, D.J. (1987) Wall relaxation and the driving forces for cell expansive growth. *Plant physiology* **84**, 561–564.
- 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.
- Diaz, S., Kattge, J., Cornelissen, J.H.C., Wright, I.J., Lavorel, S., Dray, S., Reu, B., Kleyer, M., Wirth, C., Prentice, I.C., Garnier, E., Bonisch, G., Westoby, M., Poorter, H., Reich, P.B., Moles, A.T., Dickie, J., Gillison, A.N., Zanne, A.E., Chave, J., Wright, S.J., Sheremet'ev, S.N., Jactel, H., Baraloto, C., Cerabolini, B., Pierce, S., Shipley, B., Kirkup, D., Casanoves, F., Joswig, J.S., Gunther, A., Falczuk, V., Ruger, N., Mahecha, M.D. & Gorne, L.D. (2016) The global spectrum of plant form and function. *Nature* **529**, 167–U73.
- 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.
- Eckert, C., Sharmin, S., Kogel, A., Yu, D., Kins, L., Strijkstra, G.J. & Polle, A. (2019) What makes the wood? exploring the molecular mechanisms of xylem acclimation in hardwoods to an ever-changing environment. *Forests* **10**, 358.
- Ensminger, I., Chang, C.Y.Y. & Bräutigam, K. (2015) Tree responses to environmental cues. *Advances in botanical research* **74**, 229–263.

- Fang, J., Lutz, J.A., Shugart, H.H. & Yan, X. (2020) A physiological model for predicting dynamics of tree stem-wood non-structural carbohydrates. *Journal of Ecology* **108**, 702–718.
- 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.
- George, S.S. (2014) An overview of tree-ring width records across the northern hemisphere. *Quaternary Science Reviews* **95**, 132–150.
- Gill, A.L., Gallinat, A.S., Sanders-DeMott, R., Rigden, A.J., Gianotti, D.J.S., Mantooth, J.A. & Templer, P.H. (2015) Changes in autumn senescence in northern hemisphere deciduous trees: a meta-analysis of autumn phenology studies. *Annals of Botany* **116**, 875–888.
- 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. & Wullschleger, S.D. (2019) Simulated projections of boreal forest peatland ecosystem productivity are sensitive to observed seasonality in leaf physiology. *Tree Physiology* **39**, 556–572.
- Juvany, M., Müller, M. & Munné-Bosch, S. (2013) Photo-oxidative stress in emerging and senescing leaves: a mirror image? *Journal of experimental botany* **64**, 3087–3098.
- 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.
- Klesse, S., DeRose, R.J., Guiterman, C.H., Lynch, A.M., O’Connor, C.D., Shaw, J.D. & Evans, M.E. (2018) Sampling bias overestimates climate change impacts on forest growth in the southwestern united states. *Nature communications* **9**, 5336.
- 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.
- Larcher, W. (2003) Plants under stress. *Physiological Plant Ecology: Ecophysiology and Stress Physiology of Functional Groups*, chap. 6, pp. 345–450, Springer, Heidelberg, 4th edn.
- 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.
- Manzanedo, R.D. & Pederson, N. (2019) Towards a more ecological dendroecology. *Tree-Ring Research* **75**, 152–159.
- 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.
- 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.
- Nehrbass-Ahles, C., Babst, F., Klesse, S., Nötzli, M., Bouriaud, O., Neukom, R., Dobbertin, M. & Frank, D. (2014) The influence of sampling design on tree-ring-based quantification of forest growth. *Global change biology* **20**, 2867–2885.
- Nobel, P.S. *et al.* (1983) *Biophysical plant physiology and ecology*. WH Freeman and company.

- 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., Ziaco, 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.
- Rollinson, C.R., Alexander, M.R., Dye, A.W., Moore, D.J., Pederson, N. & Trouet, V. (2021) Climate sensitivity of understory trees differs from overstory trees in temperate mesic forests. *Ecology* **102**, e03264.
- 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.
- Simard, S., Giovannelli, A., Treydte, K., Traversi, M.L., King, G.M., Frank, D. & Fonti, P. (2013) Intra-annual dynamics of non-structural carbohydrates in the cambium of mature conifer trees reflects radial growth demands. *Tree Physiology* **33**, 913–923.
- 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.
- 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**.
- Zhao, S., Pederson, N., D’Orangeville, L., HilleRisLambers, J., Boose, E., Penone, C., Bauer, B., Jiang, Y. & Manzanedo, R.D. (2019) The international tree-ring data bank (itrd) revisited: data availability and global ecological representativity. *Journal of Biogeography* **46**, 355–368.
- 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.