

Spatial and temporal shifts in photoperiod with climate change

A. K. Ettinger (ailene.ettinger@tnc.org)^{1,2,a}, D. M. Buonaiuto
(dbuonaiuto@g.harvard.edu)^{2,3}, C. J. Chamberlain (cchamberlain@g.harvard.edu)^{2,3}, I.
Morales-Castilla (ignacio.moralesc@uah.es)^{2,3,4,5}, and E. M. Wolkovich
(e.wolkovich@ubc.ca)^{2,3,6}

¹The Nature Conservancy, Seattle, Washington, USA

²Arnold Arboretum of Harvard University, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

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

⁴Department of Life Sciences, University of Alcalà CTRA N-II, KM., 33,600, 28802, Alcalà
de Henares, Spain

⁵Department of Environmental Science and Policy, George Mason University, Fairfax,
Virginia, USA

⁶Forest & Conservation Sciences, Faculty of Forestry, University of British Columbia,
Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

^aCorresponding author; phone: 781-296-4821; mailing address: 74 Wall Street, Seattle, WA
98121 USA

August 4, 2020

Statement of authorship All authors conceived of this manuscript and each contributed data analysis and figures. AKE wrote the manuscript, and all authors contributed revisions to the manuscript.

Data Accessibility Should the manuscript be accepted, the data supporting our results will be archived in an appropriate public repository. The OSPREE database will be publicly archived at KNB, doi:10.5063/F1QV3JQR (Wolkovich et al., 2019).

Running head Shifts in photoperiod with climate change

Key words phenology, global warming, range shifts, timing, spring, budburst, daylength

Paper type ‘Research review’ or ‘Viewpoint’

1 Abstract

2 Climate change causes both temporal (e.g., advancing spring phenology) and geographic (e.g., range ex-
3 pansion poleward) species shifts, which affect the photoperiod experienced at critical developmental stages
4 ('experienced photoperiod'). As photoperiod is a common trigger of seasonal biological responses—affecting
5 plant phenology in 84% of reviewed studies that manipulated photoperiod—shifts in experienced photoperiod
6 may have important implications for future plant distributions and fitness. However, photoperiod has not
7 been a focus of climate change forecasting to date, especially for early-season ('spring') events, often assumed
8 to be driven by temperature. Synthesizing published studies, we find that impacts on experienced photope-
9 riod from temporal shifts could be orders of magnitude larger than from spatial shifts (1.6 hours of change
10 for expected temporal versus one minute for latitudinal shifts). Incorporating these effects into forecasts is
11 possible by leveraging existing experimental data; we show that results from growth chamber experiments
12 on woody plants often have data relevant for climate change impacts, and suggest that shifts in experienced
13 photoperiod may increasingly constrain responses to additional warming. Further, combining modeling ap-
14 proaches and empirical work on when, where, and how much photoperiod affects spring phenology could
15 rapidly advance our understanding and predictions of future spatio-temporal shifts from climate change.

¹⁶ Introduction

¹⁷ Shifts in spring phenology—i.e., the timing of spring events, including budburst, leafout, and flowering in
¹⁸ plants, as well as bird arrival, egg hatching and myriad other biological activities—are some of the most
¹⁹ widely documented signals of climate change. Spring phenology is occurring earlier as temperatures warm,
²⁰ with average shifts of 1.2 to 5.1 days earlier per decade (Bradley et al., 1999; Parmesan and Yohe, 2003;
²¹ Poloczanska et al., 2013; Root et al., 2003) or 1.3 to 5.6 days earlier per °C of warming (Polgar et al., 2013;
²² Wolkovich et al., 2012). These changes are some of the largest climate change-induced shifts observed, with
²³ early spring phenology shifting more rapidly than later season phenology in most cases (Bradley et al., 1999;
²⁴ Menzel et al., 2006).

²⁵ Spring phenology is not controlled solely by temperature, however. Photoperiod is also a critical cue, signaling
²⁶ changes in growth and reproduction across diverse species (e.g., Flynn and Wolkovich, 2018; Lagercrantz,
²⁷ 2009; Bradshaw and Holzapfel, 2007; Howe et al., 1996; Solbakken et al., 1994), and spring phenology is
²⁸ thought to be determined interactively by photoperiod and temperature (Fu et al., 2019, see also Box 1).

²⁹ Photoperiod is a useful cue to synchronize activities with seasonal climatic changes (e.g., Singh et al., 2017;
³⁰ Basler and Körner, 2012; Hsu et al., 2011) because it is consistent across years, especially compared to other
³¹ cues such as temperature and precipitation (Saikkonen et al., 2012). For example, relying on a threshold
³² photoperiod (see *Glossary*), rather than temperature alone, may prevent woody plants from leafing out during
³³ ‘false spring’ events (unusually warm periods during winter and early spring that are followed by a return to
³⁴ cold temperatures, Gu et al., 2008).

³⁵ Recent studies suggest that photoperiod cues may eventually restrict advances in spring phenology in a
³⁶ warmer world. With additional climate change, photoperiod may limit phenological shifts of certain species
³⁷ such that they will not track rising temperatures (Fu et al., 2015; Way and Montgomery, 2015; Basler and
³⁸ Körner, 2012; Körner and Basler, 2010a), and the trend of ever-earlier springs with warming may halt. The
³⁹ idea of photoperiod constraints is controversial, however, as other studies suggest that photoperiod will not
⁴⁰ slow responses to warming for most species (Chuine et al., 2010; Zohner et al., 2016). Resolving this debate
⁴¹ requires a greater understanding of the extent to which daylength constrains phenology and how rapidly
⁴² photoperiod responses can acclimate or adapt to new environmental conditions (Grevstad and Coop, 2015).

⁴³ Perhaps because of these variable and uncertain responses, photoperiod is often not included in forecasts of
⁴⁴ biological responses to climate change, especially in the spring, even though it is known to be an important
⁴⁵ cue for biological activity (but see Duputié et al., 2015; Grevstad and Coop, 2015; Caffarra et al., 2011a).

⁴⁶ The exclusion of photoperiod may be problematic: although photoperiod itself is stable over time, the
⁴⁷ photoperiod that species *experience* at critical developmental stages (henceforth, ‘experienced photoperiod’),
⁴⁸ as they undergo climate change-induced shifts in space and time, is likely to be much less stable (Fig. 1).
⁴⁹ This shift in experienced photoperiod extends to distributional shifts due to climate change, as many species’
⁵⁰ distributions have moved poleward and upward in elevation (i.e., range shifts, Chen et al., 2011; Harsch et al.,
⁵¹ 2009; Parmesan, 2006; Peñuelas and Boada, 2003).

⁵² The implications of potential climate change-induced shifts in experienced photoperiod are unclear, as the
⁵³ magnitudes of potential shifts have not been described. Effects of photoperiod shifts may be relatively
⁵⁴ minor, especially compared to the substantial year-to-year variation in experienced photoperiod (Fig. 2).
⁵⁵ Alternatively, photoperiod may begin to constrain species’ responses to climate change (Fu et al., 2015; Way
⁵⁶ and Montgomery, 2015; Basler and Körner, 2012; Körner and Basler, 2010a).

⁵⁷ Here, we ask:

- ⁵⁸ 1. How will climate change alter experienced photoperiod for plants?
- ⁵⁹ 2. What are the implications of altered experienced photoperiods for plant responses to climate change?
- ⁶⁰ 3. Can researchers apply data from experiments that alter photoperiod to improve forecasting biological
⁶¹ implications of climate change?

⁶² We focus on spring events, as phenology during this time is one of the most widely observed and rapidly
⁶³ changing biological responses to climate change (Parmesan, 2006). In addition, the role of photoperiod is
⁶⁴ less understood in spring phenology compared with autumn phenophases (reviewed in, e.g., Azeez and Sane,
⁶⁵ 2015; Gallinat et al., 2015; Lagercrantz, 2009; Allona et al., 2008), but recent studies showing declines in
⁶⁶ responses of spring budburst to warming (e.g., Fu et al., 2019; Güsewell et al., 2017; Yu et al., 2010) suggest
⁶⁷ that photoperiod constraints may be imminent. While our questions are broadly relevant for diverse species,
⁶⁸ we use a case study of spring woody plant phenology to illustrate several of our points (Boxes 1-2).

69 How will climate change alter the photoperiod experienced by or-
70 ganisms?

71 Species experience different photoperiod regimes depending on their location on Earth, the seasonal timing
72 of their activity, and inter-annual variation in climate (Fig. 1-2). Consider, as an example, the daylength
73 experienced by plants on the date that spring ‘green-up’ occurs. (We use green-up date as an example because
74 it represents an important spring event, signaling the start of the growing season, and global estimates are
75 available.) Spring green-up varies with latitude (Fig. 2A), in part because latitudinal variation in green-
76 up date, which occurs earlier toward the equator and later toward the poles, is strongly driven by climatic
77 differences that affect phenology, and in part because of latitudinal variation in photoperiod (e.g., at the
78 poles, the daylength at the summer solstice is 24 hours; see also Fig. 1).

79 Some consistent patterns in experienced photoperiod are apparent at a broad scale. Across years, photoperiod
80 at green-up is longer toward the poles (i.e., on the day of year when green-up occurs close to the north pole,
81 daylength approaches 24 hours in both an average year, Fig. 2A, and in an early year, Fig. 2B). In addition,
82 green-up does not appear to occur at daylengths less than 10 hours across North America and Europe.

83 Despite these consistent broad-scale patterns, there is also strong spatiotemporal variation in experienced
84 photoperiod across years. Comparing the photoperiod at green-up in an ‘early’ versus an ‘average’ year (Fig.
85 2) shows that experienced photoperiod at green-up can vary by two to three hours from one year to the next
86 in the same location (Fig. 2C).

87 Against this existing background variation, climate change will cause shifts in experienced photoperiod as
88 species respond to warming temperatures. Spatial shifts in species’ ranges and temporal shifts in phenology
89 will alter the photoperiods experienced by organisms with future climate change. The magnitude of these
90 alterations will vary depending on the organism’s location and the type of shift(s) it undergoes. For example,
91 poleward shifts in species’ ranges cause plants to experience a wider range of daylength throughout the year
92 (Fig. 1). Elevational shifts, in contrast, cause minimal change to the range of daylength throughout the year.

93 To date, most focus on shifts in photoperiod with climate change has been centered on how spatial range
94 shifts will affect photoperiod (e.g., Saikkonen et al., 2012; Way and Montgomery, 2015). However, shifting

95 phenology—especially the large changes seen in spring phenology—will also alter experienced photoperiod,
96 because of the seasonal patterns of daylength (Fig. 1).

97 Current data suggest that temporal shifts will yield much larger changes in experienced photoperiod than
98 latitudinal shifts (Fig. 1). Consider a tree species that bursts its buds at latitude 45°, on average around
99 day of year 91 (April 2), when daylength is 12.8 hours. If the species' phenology shifts 30 days earlier over
100 the next century (i.e., a rate of 3 days per decade, as has been observed, Parmesan and Yohe, 2003), it will
101 experience a daylength that is 1.6 hours shorter. This 1.6 hour decrease in daylength is equivalent to moving
102 up 28.5° in latitude on this day of year. However, if the same species shifts its range up in latitude 0.5° (i.e.,
103 60 km over the next century, comparable to observed rates, Chen et al., 2011; Parmesan and Yohe, 2003), it
104 will experience a daylength that differs by less than a minute on the same day of year.

105 **What are the implications of altered photoperiods for biological
106 responses to climate change?**

107 Climate change alters the experienced photoperiod, but the implications of this change for plants is currently
108 unclear, in part, because phenology both affects and is affected by experienced photoperiod: climate change-
109 induced shifts in phenology alter experienced photoperiod, which in turn affects phenology. Daylength,
110 often in combination with temperature, can play a role in controlling critical biological functions, including
111 vegetative growth, cell elongation, budburst, and flowering in plants (Fu et al., 2019; Heide and Sønsteby,
112 2012; Heide, 2011; Hsu et al., 2011; Sidaway-Lee et al., 2010; Mimura and Aitken, 2007; Linkosalo and
113 Lechowicz, 2006; Erwin, 1998; Ashby et al., 1962) Climate change-induced shifts in photoperiod are therefore
114 likely to alter these functions.

115 Growth chamber studies show that the magnitude of daylength shifts expected with climate change (i.e., 1-2
116 hours of difference in daylength with temporal shifts over the next century) are substantial enough to affect
117 spring phenology in trees (Table S1). The direction and magnitude of responses will vary, however, because
118 of variation in photoperiod sensitivity, and because photoperiod often interacts with other environmental
119 drivers, such as temperature, to affect phenology (Box 1).

120 The climate change-induced trend toward ever-earlier springs means that experienced photoperiod may in-
121 creasingly approach threshold photoperiods (see *Glossary*) for many species, constraining their ability to
122 respond to additional warming (Fu et al., 2019; Vitasse and Basler, 2013; Körner and Basler, 2010a; Morin
123 et al., 2010; Nienstaedt, 1966). Interactions between photoperiod and temperature may therefore result in
124 muted phenological shifts, compared to what would be expected based on temperature change alone (Körner
125 and Basler, 2010a; Mimura and Aitken, 2007; Wareing, 1956). This has been a topic of much interest in
126 the climate change literature because it predicts that as photoperiod becomes limiting, the average trend of
127 earlier phenology with warming (Polgar et al., 2013; Peñuelas et al., 2002; Menzel, 2000) may stop.

128 A challenge in predicting if or when the trend of earlier phenology with warming may slow or stop abruptly
129 is the wide range of observed photoperiod sensitivity (see *Glossary*) across species (Flynn and Wolkovich,
130 2018; Zohner et al., 2016; Sanz-Perez et al., 2009), populations (Gauzere et al., 2017; Saikkonen et al., 2012;
131 Caffarra et al., 2011b; Bradshaw and Holzapfel, 2007; Viherä-Aarnio et al., 2006; Partanen et al., 2005), and
132 ecotypes (Howe et al., 1995). How much genotype versus environment explain this variation is an active
133 area of research (e.g., Fréjaville et al., 2019; Franks et al., 2014; Gould et al., 2010; Mimura and Aitken,
134 2010). Environmental conditions clearly play a role, since different combinations of ambient temperature
135 and photoperiod may explain some of this variation and because temperature cues can override photoperiod
136 requirements under certain conditions (e.g., Tanino et al., 2010). In such cases, climate change-induced
137 phenological shifts may occur at different rates than past shifts with warming. On the other hand, some of
138 this variation may be due to underlying genetic differences driven by local adaptation, because photoperiod
139 responses can be under strong genetic control (Bradshaw and Stettler, 1995; Keller et al., 2011; Weih, 2004,
140 see also Boxes 1, 2). Teasing out the relative roles of genetics versus environmental conditions will be critical
141 to accurate forecasts of future phenology under climate change.

142 Species- and population-level variation in photoperiod sensitivity may scale up to alter communities as climate
143 change progresses. For example, a species or population that is relatively insensitive to photoperiod can take
144 advantage of warmer springs by having an earlier start to its growing season. Indeed, phenological tracking of
145 temperature (e.g., earlier flowering, leafout, migration with warming) has been linked with higher performance
146 in plants and animals (Cleland et al., 2012; Muir et al., 1994; Willis et al., 2010). Species or populations
147 that are sensitive to temperature but relatively insensitive to photoperiod may therefore outcompete slower-

¹⁴⁸ growing or later-emerging ones that are limited by photoperiod and thus cannot take advantage of longer
¹⁴⁹ growing season conditions. Not all studies, however, find links between performance and high sensitivity
¹⁵⁰ to temperature (e.g., Block et al., 2020), and early-season species in most temperate zones risk losing to
¹⁵¹ tissue to frost (Sakai and Larcher, 1987). Thus, the advantages of tracking warming may depend on how
¹⁵² quickly mean temperatures versus last frost dates shift (e.g., Inouye et al., 2002), such that in some systems
¹⁵³ photoperiod cues could prevent species from starting growth or reproduction too early (when they risk losing
¹⁵⁴ their investments in new tissue). To identify where, when, and how communities may be altered therefore
¹⁵⁵ requires quantifying species-specific temperature and photoperiod sensitivities, and developing methods that
¹⁵⁶ incorporate both photoperiod and environmental events that impact fitness (such as frosts).

¹⁵⁷ Future directions: outstanding questions and incorporating photoperiod into forecasting

¹⁵⁹ The complexity of photoperiod effects on phenology and how warming alters experienced photoperiod high-light that future rates of phenological shifts are unlikely to be straightforward extrapolations from past and
¹⁶⁰ current rates. Statistical and process-based models—the two broad categories of forecasting approaches—
¹⁶¹ both acknowledge this difficulty, but differ importantly in how they relate phenology to climate change.
¹⁶² Statistical models relating phenology to climate change often assume linear relationships between species'
¹⁶³ responses and environmental variables (e.g., Flynn and Wolkovich, 2018; Ibáñez et al., 2010), whereas
¹⁶⁴ process-based models often incorporate nonlinear threshold relationships (e.g. Chuine and Beaubien, 2001;
¹⁶⁵ Morin and Thuiller, 2009). Further, statistical models of phenology under climate change frequently ignore
¹⁶⁶ photoperiod, focusing instead on seasonal or annual temperature (e.g. Diez et al., 2012; Ibáñez et al., 2010,
¹⁶⁷ but see Richardson et al. (2013)), whereas process-based models of phenology more frequently incorporate
¹⁶⁸ photoperiod, along with temperature (Lundell et al., 2020; Duputié et al., 2015; Zhao et al., 2013; Morin
¹⁶⁹ and Thuiller, 2009). Process-based models may thus seem superior for integrating photoperiod, but they
¹⁷⁰ can be challenging to develop, requiring detailed data that are often not readily available (e.g., daily climate
¹⁷¹ data, nonlinear biological responses to fine-scale changes in temperature). Perhaps because of this, statistical
¹⁷² models remain more commonly used in climate change forecasts of biological responses (e.g., García-Valdés
¹⁷³

174 and Morales-Castilla, 2016; Basler and Körner, 2012; Diez et al., 2012; Zhu et al., 2012; Ibáñez et al., 2010).

175 Future modelling of spring plant phenology can incorporate photoperiod by leveraging the large amount of
176 experimental data on photoperiod responses (e.g., for woody plants, see Fig. 3, Table S1, Box 2), especially
177 when process-based approaches are used. Researchers can use these data to first learn whether the study
178 species (or a phylogenetically closely related species) shows a photoperiod effect and, ideally, identify its
179 threshold photoperiod and how it varies by population, ecotype, or other factors (Tobin et al., 2008; Bradshaw
180 and Holzapfel, 2006). If there is evidence of a photoperiod response (e.g., *Fagus grandifolia*, or *Tilia americana*
181 with low chilling shown in Box 1), daylength should be added to forecasting models, using the threshold
182 photoperiod to define short-day and long-day conditions (Fig. 4). Given the large change in experienced
183 photoperiod with temporal shifts (Fig. 1), this may be particularly important for phenological forecasting.
184 Since spatial shifts are associated with smaller changes in experienced photoperiod, it may be less important
185 for distribution forecasts. Many species, however, may shift in *both* space and time simultaneously. Even
186 though experienced photoperiod changes little as species distributions shift in space, phenology may be altered
187 significantly.

188 For some species, experimental data can be immediately used in forecasting because experiments manipulate
189 photoperiod at relevant scales (e.g., Heide and Sonsteby, 2015; Basler and Körner, 2014, Figs. 3& S1A,
190 Table S1). For example, photoperiod treatments from growth chamber experiments with *Fagus sylvatica*
191 span the variation in both current and expected future ranges (Fig. S1A, Duputié et al., 2015), and
192 may allow identification of threshold photoperiods (Fig. 4). In other cases, attempting to incorporate
193 photoperiod into forecasts of future phenology will reveal gaps in our understanding of many aspects of
194 photoperiod responses. For example, photoperiod treatments from existing experiments of *Quercus robur*
195 do not accurately represent experienced photoperiods from current or future estimates (Fig. S1B), making
196 fine-scale projections difficult, even for this relatively well-studied species. This gap extends to many species,
197 as most experiments manipulate photoperiod much more dramatically than will occur with climate change
198 (Figs. 3, S1). Although these studies can be useful for a mechanistic understanding of photoperiod responses,
199 extrapolating them to climate change models may not be reasonable.

200 Photoperiod is not fully integrated into most current forecasts of biological responses to climate change (but
201 see Tobin et al., 2008, for an example in insects); this omission could affect forecast accuracy. Photoperiod

202 is incorporated into some ecosystem models (e.g., the Ecosystem Demography model Jolly et al., 2005;
203 Medvigy et al., 2013) used for forecasting but not others (e.g., Richardson et al., 2012), and is rarely included
204 in species distribution models (e.g., Morin and Thuiller, 2009; Zhu et al., 2012). The sensitivity of model
205 outcomes to assumptions made about experienced photoperiod and threshold responses to photoperiod needs
206 further study, including understanding how variation in photoperiod responses across ecosystems, species,
207 populations, and life stages impacts forecasts.

208 As researchers more fully integrate experienced photoperiod into forecasting, a critical area of further study
209 is understanding *how* photoperiod acts as a cue. Photoperiod seems to interact with temperature to affect
210 phenology (e.g., Box 1, Zydlewski et al., 2014); this would explain the divergent effects of photoperiod observed
211 across studies in woody plants (Box 1). However, exactly how it interacts with temperature is not well-
212 defined for most species or populations. For many species, additional experimental and physiological research
213 is necessary, since the dormancy-breaking processes that photoperiod affects require detailed physiological
214 approaches to observe (Box 2, Hänninen et al., 2019; Chuine et al., 2016). Understanding the drivers, as well
215 as the consequences, of variation in photoperiod responses across species and populations will be particularly
216 beneficial for forecasting. For example, what traits are associated with photoperiod sensitivity and does
217 variation in photoperiod sensitivity or related traits have a strong genetic component? If so, are species or
218 populations from some locations or lineages more likely than others to be constrained by photoperiod in their
219 responses to climate change?

220 Conclusions

221 Organisms may undergo large changes to the photoperiod they experience with climate change, even if they
222 do not shift their ranges spatially. Here we have shown that these altered photoperiods may result in stalled
223 future advances of spring phenology with warming (e.g., Table S1, Fig. S1, Fu et al., 2019; Güsewell et al.,
224 2017; Yu et al., 2010), with cascading effects on growth, fitness, and community composition due to the large
225 variation in photoperiod responses across species and populations (Box 1). We have focused on woody plant
226 spring phenology, but shifts in photoperiod with climate change have implications for a variety of plant and
227 animal responses, given that daylength affects critical activities for diverse species from insects (Bradshaw and

²²⁸ Holzapfel, 2006) and salmon (Taranger et al., 2003) to birds (Dawson et al., 2001) and marsupials (McAllan
²²⁹ et al., 2006). Given what we know, incorporating photoperiod into forecasting of climate change responses
²³⁰ should improve model accuracy (Fig. 4), and will illuminate additional experiments that could improve our
²³¹ mechanistic understanding of photoperiod as a critical cue for diverse biological responses.

²³² Glossary

- ²³³ • budburst: one or more leaf buds has visible green tips.
- ²³⁴ • chilling: the intensity and duration of winter temperature, often a certain sum of chilling that is required
²³⁵ (e.g., some amount of hours or days of cold temperatures, defined by a specific critical temperature or
²³⁶ range of temperatures, such as between 0 and 7.2 °C, Richardson, 1974), that must be experienced for
²³⁷ budburst to occur.
- ²³⁸ • daylength: the period of time during a 24-hour period during which an organism receives light.
- ²³⁹ • dormancy: halted or reduced growth or activity.
- ²⁴⁰ • forcing: warm spring temperatures, often a certain sum of forcing that is required (e.g., some amount
²⁴¹ of hours or days above a specific temperature) before budburst or flowering can occur.
- ²⁴² • green-up: the beginning of a new cycle of plant growth, usually evaluated at the landscape scale.
- ²⁴³ • phenology: the timing of life cycle events in organisms.
- ²⁴⁴ • photoperiod: the daily duration of light (daylength) and dark to which an organism is exposed; often
²⁴⁵ used synonymously with daylength.
- ²⁴⁶ • photoperiod sensitivity: the degree to which phenology is controlled by daylength; may be a nonlinear,
²⁴⁷ or ‘threshold’, response in plants (Box 2).
- ²⁴⁸ • photoperiodism: the ability of an organism to assess or respond to length of day or night in its behavior,
²⁴⁹ physiology, growth, development, or reproduction.
- ²⁵⁰ • threshold photoperiod: length of day that causes an organism to switch from a short- to a long-day
²⁵¹ response (or vice versa). For example, in European larch (*Larix decidua*), budburst development may

252 be constrained under short-day conditions, when daylengths are less than a threshold photoperiod of
253 10-11 hours (Migliavacca et al., 2008). Above this threshold photoperiod, the long-day response of
254 unconstrained budburst development can occur.

255 Acknowledgements

256 We thank the many researchers who conducted the experiments synthesized in this manuscript; H. Kharouba
257 for helpful comments that improved the manuscript; B. Feist for improving the appearance of Fig. 3 dramati-
258 cally; and A. Duputié and I. Chuine for sharing projections from PhenoFit. The National Science Foundation
259 (DBI 14-01854 to AKE), NSERC Discovery Award (RGPIN-05038 to EMW) and Canada Research Chair
260 in Temporal Ecology (EMW) provided funding. Any opinion, findings, and conclusions or recommendations
261 expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National
262 Science Foundation or the Nature Conservancy.

263 References

- 264 Allona, I., A. Ramos, C. Ibáñez, A. Contreras, R. Casado, and C. Aragoncillo. 2008. Molecular control of
265 winter dormancy establishment in trees: a review. Spanish Journal of Agricultural Research **6**:201–210.
- 266 Andrés, F., and G. Coupland. 2012. The genetic basis of flowering responses to seasonal cues. Nature reviews.
267 Genetics **13**:627.
- 268 Ashby, W., et al. 1962. Germination capacity in American Basswood *Tilia americana*. Transactions of the
269 Illinois State Academy of Science **55**:120–3.
- 270 Azeez, A., and A. P. Sane. 2015. Photoperiodic growth control in perennial trees. Plant signaling & behavior
271 **10**:e1087631.
- 272 Basler, D., and C. Körner. 2012. Photoperiod sensitivity of bud burst in 14 temperate forest tree species.
273 Agricultural and Forest Meteorology **165**:73–81.

- 274 Basler, D., and C. Körner. 2014. Photoperiod and temperature responses of bud swelling and bud burst in
275 four temperate forest tree species. *Tree Physiology* **34**:377–388.
- 276 Bastow, R., and C. Dean. 2002. The molecular basis of photoperiodism. *Developmental cell* **3**:461–462.
- 277 Block, S., J. Alexander, and J. M. Levine. 2020. Phenological plasticity is a poor predictor of subalpine plant
278 population performance following experimental climate change. *Oikos* **129**:184–193.
- 279 Bradley, N. L., A. C. Leopold, J. Ross, and W. Huffaker. 1999. Phenological changes reflect climate change
280 in Wisconsin. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **96**:9701–9704.
- 281 Bradshaw, H., and R. F. Stettler. 1995. Molecular genetics of growth and development in *Populus*. IV.
282 Mapping QTLs with large effects on growth, form, and phenology traits in a forest tree. *Genetics* **139**:963–
283 973.
- 284 Bradshaw, W. E., and C. M. Holzapfel. 2006. Evolutionary response to rapid climate change. *Science*
285 **312**:1477–1478.
- 286 Bradshaw, W. E., and C. M. Holzapfel. 2007. Evolution of animal photoperiodism. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol.
287 Syst.* **38**:1–25.
- 288 Büning, E. 1936. Endogenous daily rhythms as the basis of photoperiodism. *Ber Deut Bot Ges* **54**:590–607.
- 289 Burghardt, L. T., C. J. E. Metcalf, A. M. Wilczek, J. Schmitt, and K. Donohue. 2015. Modeling the
290 Influence of Genetic and Environmental Variation on the Expression of Plant Life Cycles across Landscapes.
291 *American Naturalist* **185**:212–227. URL <Go to ISI>://WOS:000348456700007.
- 292 Caffarra, A., and A. Donnelly. 2011. The ecological significance of phenology in four different tree species:
293 effects of light and temperature on bud burst. *International Journal of Biometeorology* **55**:711–721.
- 294 Caffarra, A., A. Donnelly, and I. Chuine. 2011a. Modelling the timing of *Betula pubescens* budburst. II.
295 Integrating complex effects of photoperiod into process-based models. *Climate Research* **46**:159–170.
- 296 Caffarra, A., A. Donnelly, I. Chuine, and M. B. Jones. 2011b. Modelling the timing of *Betula pubescens*
297 bud-burst. I. Temperature and photoperiod: A conceptual model. *Climate Research* **46**:147.

- 298 Campbell, R. K., and A. I. Sugano. 1975. Phenology of bud burst in Douglas-fir related to provenance,
299 photoperiod, chilling, and flushing temperature. *Botanical Gazette* pages 290–298.
- 300 Chen, I.-C., J. K. Hill, R. Ohlemüller, D. B. Roy, and C. D. Thomas. 2011. Rapid Range Shifts of Species
301 Associated with High Levels of Climate Warming. *Science* **333**:1024–1026.
- 302 Chuine, I., and E. G. Beaubien. 2001. Phenology is a major determinant of tree species range. *Ecology*
303 Letters **4**:500–510.
- 304 Chuine, I., M. Bonhomme, J.-M. Legave, I. García de Cortázar-Atauri, G. Charrier, A. Lacointe, and
305 T. Améglio. 2016. Can phenological models predict tree phenology accurately in the future? The un-
306 revealed hurdle of endodormancy break. *Global Change Biology* **22**:3444–3460.
- 307 Chuine, I., X. Morin, and H. Bugmann. 2010. Warming, photoperiods, and tree phenology. *Science* **329**:277–
308 278.
- 309 Cleland, E. E., J. M. Allen, T. M. Crimmins, J. A. Dunne, S. Pau, S. E. Travers, E. S. Zavaleta, and E. M.
310 Wolkovich. 2012. Phenological tracking enables positive species responses to climate change. *Ecology*
311 **93**:1765–1771.
- 312 Davis, S. J. 2002. Photoperiodism: the coincidental perception of the season. *Current Biology* **12**:R841–R843.
- 313 Dawson, A., V. M. King, G. E. Bentley, and G. F. Ball. 2001. Photoperiodic control of seasonality in birds.
314 *Journal of Biological Rhythms* **16**:365–380.
- 315 Diez, J. M., I. Ibáñez, A. J. Miller-Rushing, S. J. Mazer, T. M. Crimmins, M. A. Crimmins, C. D. Bertelsen,
316 and D. W. Inouye. 2012. Forecasting phenology: from species variability to community patterns. *Ecology*
317 Letters **15**:545–553.
- 318 Ding, J., and O. Nilsson. 2016. Molecular regulation of phenology in trees— because the seasons they are
319 a-changin. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology* **29**:73–79.
- 320 Duputié, A., A. Rutschmann, O. Ronce, and I. Chuine. 2015. Phenological plasticity will not help all species
321 adapt to climate change. *Global Change Biology* **21**:3062–3073.
- 322 Erwin, J. E. 1998. Temperature and light effects on stem elongation. *Journal of the Japanese Society for*
323 *Horticultural Science* **67**:1113–1120. URL <Go to ISI>://WOS:000077212300031.

- 324 Falusi, M., and R. Calamassi. 1990. Bud dormancy in beech (*Fagus sylvatica* L.). Effect of chilling and
325 photoperiod on dormancy release of beech seedlings. *Tree Physiology* **6**:429–438.
- 326 Fishman, S., A. Erez, and G. Couvillon. 1987. The temperature dependence of dormancy breaking in plants:
327 mathematical analysis of a two-step model involving a cooperative transition. *Journal of Theoretical
328 Biology* **124**:473–483.
- 329 Flynn, D. F. B., and E. M. Wolkovich. 2018. Temperature and photoperiod drive spring phenology across
330 all species in a temperate forest community. *New Phytologist* **219**:1353–1362. URL <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.15232>.
- 332 Fournier-Level, A., E. O. Perry, J. A. Wang, P. T. Braun, A. Migneault, M. D. Cooper, C. J. E. Metcalf,
333 and J. Schmitt. 2016. Predicting the evolutionary dynamics of seasonal adaptation to novel climates in
334 *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*
335 **113**:E2812–E2821. URL <GotoISI>://WOS:000375977600009.
- 336 Franks, S. J., J. J. Weber, and S. N. Aitken. 2014. Evolutionary and plastic responses to climate change in
337 terrestrial plant populations. *Evolutionary Applications* **7**:123–139.
- 338 Fréjaville, T., B. Fady, A. Kremer, A. Ducouso, and M. Benito Garzón. 2019. Inferring phenotypic plasticity
339 and population responses to climate across tree species ranges using forest inventory data. *Global Ecology
340 and Biogeography* **28**:1259–1271.
- 341 Fu, Y. H., S. Piao, X. Zhou, X. Geng, F. Hao, Y. Vitasse, and I. A. Janssens. 2019. Short photoperiod
342 reduces the temperature sensitivity of leaf-out in saplings of *Fagus sylvatica* but not in horse chestnut.
343 *Global Change Biology* **25**:1696–1703.
- 344 Fu, Y. S. H., H. F. Zhao, S. L. Piao, M. Peaucelle, S. S. Peng, G. Y. Zhou, P. Ciais, M. T. Huang, A. Menzel,
345 J. P. Uelas, Y. Song, Y. Vitasse, Z. Z. Zeng, and I. A. Janssens. 2015. Declining global warming effects on
346 the phenology of spring leaf unfolding. *Nature* **526**:104–107. URL <GotoISI>://WOS:000362095100042.
- 347 Gallinat, A. S., R. B. Primack, and D. L. Wagner. 2015. Autumn, the neglected season in climate change
348 research. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **30**:169–176.

- 349 García-Valdés, R., and I. Morales-Castilla. 2016. Efectos del cambio climático en los ecosistemas forestales:
350 integrando inventarios y modelos. *Ecosistemas* **25**:51–59.
- 351 Gauzere, J., S. Delzon, H. Davi, M. Bonhomme, I. G. de Cortazar-Atauri, and I. Chuine. 2017. Integrating
352 interactive effects of chilling and photoperiod in phenological process-based models. A case study with
353 two European tree species: *Fagus sylvatica* and *Quercus petraea*. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*
354 **244**:9–20.
- 355 Glover, B. 2014. Understanding flowers and flowering, Second edition. OUP Oxford.
- 356 Gould, P. J., C. A. Harrington, and J. B. St. Clair. 2010. Incorporating genetic variation into a model
357 of budburst phenology of coast Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii* var. *menziesii*). *Canadian Journal of*
358 *Forest Research* **41**:139–150.
- 359 Grevstad, F. S., and L. B. Coop. 2015. The consequences of photoperiodism for organisms in new climates.
360 *Ecological Applications* **25**:1506–1517.
- 361 Gu, L., P. J. Hanson, W. M. Post, D. P. Kaiser, B. Yang, R. Nemani, S. G. Pallardy, and T. Meyers. 2008.
362 The 2007 Eastern US spring freeze: Increased cold damage in a warming world. *BioScience* **58**:253.
- 363 Güsewell, S., R. Furrer, R. Gehrig, and B. Pietragalla. 2017. Changes in temperature sensitivity of spring
364 phenology with recent climate warming in Switzerland are related to shifts of the preseason. *Global Change*
365 *Biology* **23**:5189–5202.
- 366 Hänninen, H., K. Kramer, K. Tanino, R. Zhang, J. Wu, and Y. H. Fu. 2019. Experiments are necessary in
367 process-based tree phenology modelling. *Trends in Plant Science* **24**:199–209.
- 368 Harsch, M. A., P. E. Hulme, M. S. McGlone, and R. P. Duncan. 2009. Are treelines advancing? A global
369 meta-analysis of treeline response to climate warming. *Ecology Letters* **12**:1040–1049.
- 370 Hawkins, C. D., and A. Dhar. 2012. Spring bud phenology of 18 *Betula papyrifera* populations in British
371 Columbia. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research* **27**:507–519.
- 372 Heide, O. 1993a. Daylength and thermal time responses of budburst during dormancy release in some
373 northern deciduous trees. *Physiologia Plantarum* **88**:531–540.

- 374 Heide, O. 1993b. Dormancy release in beech buds (*Fagus sylvatica*) requires both chilling and long days.
- 375 Physiologia Plantarum **89**:187–191.
- 376 Heide, O. M. 1977. Photoperiod and temperature interactions in growth and flowering of strawberry.
- 377 Physiologia Plantarum **40**:21–26.
- 378 Heide, O. M. 2008. Interaction of photoperiod and temperature in the control of growth and dormancy of
- 379 *Prunus* species. Scientia Horticulturae **115**:309–314.
- 380 Heide, O. M. 2011. Temperature rather than photoperiod controls growth cessation and dormancy in *Sorbus*
- 381 species. Journal of Experimental Botany **62**:5397–5404.
- 382 Heide, O. M., and A. Sønsteby. 2012. Floral initiation in black currant cultivars (*Ribes nigrum* L.): Effects of
- 383 plant size, photoperiod, temperature, and duration of short day exposure. Scientia Horticulturae **138**:64–
- 384 72.
- 385 Heide, O. M., and A. Sonsteby. 2015. Simultaneous dormancy induction interferes with short day floral
- 386 induction in black currant (*Ribes nigrum* L.). Scientia Horticulturae **185**:228–232. URL <[Goto ISI](#)>:
- 387 //WOS:000352046800029.
- 388 Howe, G. T., G. Gardner, W. P. Hackett, and G. R. Furnier. 1996. Phytochrome control of short-day-induced
- 389 bud set in black cottonwood. Physiologia Plantarum **97**:95–103.
- 390 Howe, G. T., W. P. Hackett, G. R. Furnier, and R. E. Klevorn. 1995. Photoperiodic responses of a northern
- 391 and southern ecotype of black cottonwood. Physiologia Plantarum **93**:695–708.
- 392 Hsu, C.-Y., J. P. Adams, H. Kim, K. No, C. Ma, S. H. Strauss, J. Drnevich, L. Vandervelde, J. D. Ellis,
- 393 B. M. Rice, et al. 2011. FLOWERING LOCUS T duplication coordinates reproductive and vegetative
- 394 growth in perennial poplar. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **108**:10756–10761.
- 395 Ibáñez, I., R. B. Primack, A. J. Miller-Rushing, E. Ellwood, H. Higuchi, S. D. Lee, H. Kobori, and J. A.
- 396 Silander. 2010. Forecasting phenology under global warming. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal
- 397 Society B-Biological Sciences **365**.
- 398 Inouye, D. W., M. A. Morales, and G. J. Dodge. 2002. Variation in timing and abun-
- 399 dance of flowering by *Delphinium barbeyi* Huth (Ranunculaceae): the roles of snowpack,

- 400 frost, and La Niña, in the context of climate change. *Oecologia* **130**:543–550. URL
401 <GotoISI>://WOS:000174695700007http://download.springer.com/static/pdf/569/art%
402 253A10.1007%252Fs00442-001-0835-y.pdf?originUrl=http%3A%2Flink.springer.com%
403 2Farticle%2F10.1007%2Fs00442-001-0835-y&token2=exp=1436720643~acl=%2Fstatic%2Fpdf%
404 2F569%2Fart%25253A10.1007%25252Fs00442-001-0835-y.pdf%3ForiginUrl%3Dhttp%253A%
405 252F%252Flink.springer.com%252Farticle%252F10.1007%252Fs00442-001-0835-y*~hmac=
406 7525f8478e9652d61a7797e6dca73e5b0e0d92c8117087291f62fc10aa4ac347.
- 407 Jolly, W. M., R. Nemani, and S. W. Running. 2005. A generalized, bioclimatic index to predict foliar
408 phenology in response to climate. *Global Change Biology* **11**:619–632.
- 409 Keller, S. R., R. Y. Soolanayakanahally, R. D. Guy, S. N. Silim, M. S. Olson, and P. Tiffin. 2011. Climate-
410 driven local adaptation of ecophysiology and phenology in balsam poplar, *Populus balsamifera* L. (Salicaceae). *American Journal of Botany* **98**:99–108.
- 412 Kobayashi, Y., and D. Weigel. 2007. Move on up, it's time for change—mobile signals controlling photoperiod-
413 dependent flowering. *Genes & Development* **21**:2371–2384.
- 414 Körner, C., and D. Basler. 2010a. Phenology Under Global Warming. *Science* **327**:1461–1462.
- 415 Körner, C., and D. Basler. 2010b. Warming, Photoperiods, and Tree Phenology Response. *Science* **329**:278–
416 278.
- 417 Lagercrantz, U. 2009. At the end of the day: a common molecular mechanism for photoperiod responses in
418 plants? *Journal of Experimental Botany* **60**:2501–2515.
- 419 Laube, J., T. H. Sparks, N. Estrella, J. Höfler, D. P. Ankerst, and A. Menzel. 2014. Chilling outweighs
420 photoperiod in preventing precocious spring development. *Global Change Biology* **20**:170–182.
- 421 Linkosalo, T., and M. J. Lechowicz. 2006. Twilight far-red treatment advances leaf bud burst of silver
422 birch (*Betula pendula*). *Tree Physiology* **26**:1249–1256. URL <http://treephys.oxfordjournals.org/content/26/10/1249.full.pdf>.
- 424 Lundell, R., H. Hänninen, T. Saarinen, H. Åström, and R. Zhang. 2020. Beyond rest and quiescence

- 425 (endodormancy and ecodormancy): A novel model for quantifying plant–environment interaction in bud
426 dormancy release. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **43**:40–54.
- 427 Malyshev, A. V., H. A. Henry, A. Bolte, M. A. A. Khan, and J. Kreyling. 2018. Temporal photoperiod
428 sensitivity and forcing requirements for budburst in temperate tree seedlings. *Agricultural and Forest
429 Meteorology* **248**:82–90.
- 430 Mcallan, B. M., C. R. Dickman, and M. S. Crowther. 2006. Photoperiod as a reproductive cue in the
431 marsupial genus *Antechinus*: ecological and evolutionary consequences. *Biological Journal of the Linnean
432 Society* **87**:365–379.
- 433 Medvigy, D., S.-J. Jeong, K. L. Clark, N. S. Skowronski, and K. V. Schäfer. 2013. Effects of seasonal variation
434 of photosynthetic capacity on the carbon fluxes of a temperate deciduous forest. *Journal of Geophysical
435 Research: Biogeosciences* **118**:1703–1714.
- 436 Menzel, A. 2000. Trends in phenological phases in Europe between 1951 and 1996. *International Journal of
437 Biometeorology* **44**:76–81.
- 438 Menzel, A., T. H. Sparks, N. Estrella, E. Koch, A. Aasa, R. Ahas, K. Alm-Kuebler, et al. 2006. European
439 phenological response to climate change matches the warming pattern. *Global Change Biology* **12**:1969–
440 1976.
- 441 Migliavacca, M., E. Cremonese, R. Colombo, L. Busetto, M. Galvagno, L. Ganis, M. Meroni, E. Pari,
442 M. Rossini, C. Siniscalco, et al. 2008. European larch phenology in the Alps: can we grasp the role
443 of ecological factors by combining field observations and inverse modelling? *International Journal of
444 Biometeorology* **52**:587–605.
- 445 Mimura, M., and S. Aitken. 2007. Adaptive gradients and isolation-by-distance with postglacial migration
446 in *Picea sitchensis*. *Heredity* **99**:224.
- 447 Mimura, M., and S. Aitken. 2010. Local adaptation at the range peripheries of Sitka spruce. *Journal of
448 Evolutionary Biology* **23**:249–258.
- 449 Morin, X., J. Roy, L. Sonié, and I. Chuine. 2010. Changes in leaf phenology of three European oak species
450 in response to experimental climate change. *New Phytologist* **186**:900–910.

- 451 Morin, X., and W. Thuiller. 2009. Comparing niche-and process-based models to reduce prediction uncer-
452 tainty in species range shifts under climate change. *Ecology* **90**:1301–1313.
- 453 Muir, W. D., W. S. Zaugg, A. E. Giorgi, and S. McCutcheon. 1994. Accelerating smolt development and
454 downstream movement in yearling chinook salmon with advanced photoperiod and increased temperature.
455 *Aquaculture* **123**:387–399.
- 456 Myking, T., and O. Heide. 1995. Dormancy release and chilling requirement of buds of latitudinal ecotypes
457 of *Betula pendula* and *B. pubescens*. *Tree Physiology* **15**:697–704.
- 458 Nienstaedt, H. 1966. Dormancy and dormancy release in white spruce. *Forest Science* **12**:374–384.
- 459 Parmesan, C. 2006. Ecological and evolutionary responses to recent climate change. *Annual Review of
460 Ecology Evolution and Systematics* **37**:637–669.
- 461 Parmesan, C., and G. Yohe. 2003. A globally coherent fingerprint of climate change impacts across natural
462 systems. *Nature* **421**:37.
- 463 Partanen, J., H. Hänninen, and R. Häkkinen. 2005. Bud burst in Norway spruce (*Picea abies*): preliminary
464 evidence for age-specific rest patterns. *Trees* **19**:66–72.
- 465 Peñuelas, J., and M. Boada. 2003. A global change-induced biome shift in the Montseny mountains (NE
466 Spain). *Global Change Biology* **9**:131–140.
- 467 Peñuelas, J., I. Filella, and P. Comas. 2002. Changed plant and animal life cycles from 1952 to 2000 in the
468 Mediterranean region. *Global Change Biology* **8**:531–544.
- 469 Petterle, A., A. Karlberg, and R. P. Bhalerao. 2013. Daylength mediated control of seasonal growth patterns
470 in perennial trees. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology* **16**:301–306.
- 471 Polgar, C. A., R. B. Primack, E. H. Williams, S. Stichter, and C. Hitchcock. 2013. Climate effects on the
472 flight period of Lycaenid butterflies in Massachusetts. *Biological Conservation* **160**:25–31.
- 473 Poloczanska, E. S., C. J. Brown, W. J. Sydeman, W. Kiessling, D. S. Schoeman, P. J. Moore, K. Brander,
474 J. F. Bruno, L. B. Buckley, M. T. Burrows, et al. 2013. Global imprint of climate change on marine life.
475 *Nature Climate Change* **3**:919.

- 476 Richardson, A. D., R. S. Anderson, M. A. Arain, A. G. Barr, G. Bohrer, G. Chen, J. M. Chen, P. Ciais,
477 K. J. Davis, A. R. Desai, et al. 2012. Terrestrial biosphere models need better representation of vegetation
478 phenology: results from the North American Carbon Program Site Synthesis. *Global Change Biology*
479 **18**:566–584.
- 480 Richardson, A. D., T. F. Keenan, M. Migliavacca, Y. Ryu, O. Sonnentag, and M. Toomey. 2013. Climate
481 change, phenology, and phenological control of vegetation feedbacks to the climate system. *Agricultural
482 and Forest Meteorology* **169**:156–173.
- 483 Richardson, E. 1974. A model for estimating the completion of rest for ‘Redhaven’ and ‘Elberta’ peach trees.
484 *HortScience* **9**:331–332.
- 485 Root, T. L., J. T. Price, K. R. Hall, S. H. Schneider, C. Rosenzweig, and J. A. Pounds. 2003. Fingerprints
486 of global warming on wild animals and plants. *Nature* **421**:57–60.
- 487 Saikkonen, K., K. Taulavuori, T. Hyvönen, P. E. Gundel, C. E. Hamilton, I. Vänninen, A. Nissinen, and
488 M. Helander. 2012. Climate change-driven species’ range shifts filtered by photoperiodism. *Nature Climate
489 Change* **2**:239.
- 490 Sakai, A. K., and W. Larcher. 1987. Frost Survival of Plants. *Ecological Studies*, Springer-Verlag.
- 491 Sanz-Perez, V., P. Castro-Diez, and F. Valladares. 2009. Differential and interactive effects of temperature
492 and photoperiod on budburst and carbon reserves in two co-occurring Mediterranean oaks. *Plant Biology*
493 **11**:142–51. URL <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19228321>.
- 494 Sidaway-Lee, K., E.-M. Josse, A. Brown, Y. Gan, K. J. Halliday, I. A. Graham, and S. Penfield. 2010.
495 SPATULA links daytime temperature and plant growth rate. *Current Biology* **20**:1493–1497.
- 496 Singh, R. K., T. Svystun, B. AlDahmash, A. M. Jönsson, and R. P. Bhalerao. 2017. Photoperiod-and
497 temperature-mediated control of phenology in trees—a molecular perspective. *New Phytologist* **213**:511–
498 524.
- 499 Solbakken, V. A., T. Hansen, and S. O. Stefansson. 1994. Effects of photoperiod and temperature on
500 growth and parr-smolt transformation in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) and subsequent performance in
501 seawater. *Aquaculture* **121**:13–27.

- 502 Spann, T. M., J. G. Williamson, and R. L. Darnell. 2004. Photoperiod and temperature effects on growth
503 and carbohydrate storage in southern highbush blueberry interspecific hybrid. Journal of the American
504 Society for Horticultural Science **129**:294–298.
- 505 Suárez-López, P., K. Wheatley, F. Robson, H. Onouchi, F. Valverde, and G. Coupland. 2001. CONSTANS
506 mediates between the circadian clock and the control of flowering in *Arabidopsis*. Nature **410**:1116.
- 507 Tanino, K. K., L. Kalcsits, S. Silim, E. Kendall, and G. R. Gray. 2010. Temperature-driven plasticity in
508 growth cessation and dormancy development in deciduous woody plants: a working hypothesis suggesting
509 how molecular and cellular function is affected by temperature during dormancy induction. Plant Molecular
510 Biology **73**:49–65.
- 511 Taranger, G., E. Vikingstad, U. Klenke, I. Mayer, S. Stefansson, B. Norberg, T. Hansen, Y. Zohar, and
512 E. Andersson. 2003. Effects of photoperiod, temperature and GnRHa treatment on the reproductive
513 physiology of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) broodstock. Fish Physiology and Biochemistry **28**:403–406.
- 514 Tobin, P. C., S. Nagarkatti, G. Loeb, and M. C. Saunders. 2008. Historical and projected interactions between
515 climate change and insect voltinism in a multivoltine species. Global Change Biology **14**:951–957.
- 516 van der Schoot, C., L. K. Paul, and P. L. H. Rinne. 2014. The embryonic shoot: a lifeline through winter.
517 Journal of Experimental Botany **65**:1699–1712. URL <GotoISI>://WOS:000334917600004.
- 518 Viherä-Aarnio, A., R. Häkkinen, and O. Junntila. 2006. Critical night length for bud set and its variation in
519 two photoperiodic ecotypes of *Betula pendula*. Tree Physiology **26**:1013–1018.
- 520 Vitasse, Y., and D. Basler. 2013. What role for photoperiod in the bud burst phenology of European beech.
521 European Journal of Forest Research **132**:1–8.
- 522 Wareing, P. 1956. Photoperiodism in woody plants. Annual Review of Plant Physiology **7**:191–214.
- 523 Way, D. A., and R. A. Montgomery. 2015. Photoperiod constraints on tree phenology, performance and
524 migration in a warming world. Plant, Cell & Environment **38**:1725–1736.
- 525 Weih, M. 2004. Intensive short rotation forestry in boreal climates: present and future perspectives. Canadian
526 Journal of Forest Research **34**:1369–1378.

- 527 Willis, C. G., B. R. Ruhfel, R. B. Primack, A. J. Miller-Rushing, J. B. Losos, and C. C. Davis. 2010. Favorable
528 Climate Change Response Explains Non-Native Species' Success in Thoreau's Woods. Plos One **5**:e8878.
- 529 Wolkovich, E. M., B. I. Cook, J. M. Allen, T. M. Crimmins, J. L. Betancourt, S. E. Travers, S. Pau,
530 J. Regetz, T. J. Davies, N. J. B. Kraft, T. R. Ault, K. Bolmgren, S. J. Mazer, G. J. McCabe, B. J. McGill,
531 C. Parmesan, N. Salamin, M. D. Schwartz, and E. E. Cleland. 2012. Warming experiments underpredict
532 plant phenological responses to climate change. Nature **485**:494–497.
- 533 Wolkovich, E. M., A. K. Ettinger, D. Flynn, T. Savas, C. Chamberlain, D. Buonaiuto, and
534 J. Samaha, 2019. Observed Spring Phenology Responses in Experimental Environments (OSPREE).
535 doi:10.5063/F1QV3JQR.
- 536 Yu, H. Y., E. Luedeling, and J. C. Xu. 2010. Winter and spring warming result in delayed spring phenology
537 on the Tibetan Plateau. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America
538 **107**:22151–22156.
- 539 Zhao, M., C. Peng, W. Xiang, X. Deng, D. Tian, X. Zhou, G. Yu, H. He, and Z. Zhao. 2013. Plant
540 phenological modeling and its application in global climate change research: overview and future challenges.
541 Environmental Reviews **21**:1–14.
- 542 Zhu, K., C. W. Woodall, and J. S. Clark. 2012. Failure to migrate: lack of tree range expansion in response
543 to climate change. Global Change Biology **18**:1042–1052.
- 544 Zohner, C. M., B. M. Benito, J. C. Svenning, and S. S. Renner. 2016. Day length unlikely to constrain
545 climate-driven shifts in leaf-out times of northern woody plants. Nature Climate Change **6**:1120–1123.
- 546 Zydlowski, G. B., D. S. Stich, and S. D. McCormick. 2014. Photoperiod control of downstream movements
547 of Atlantic salmon *Salmo salar* smolts. Journal of Fish Biology **85**:1023–1041.

548 **Figures**




Figure 1: **Temporal (i.e., phenological) shifts in activity yield larger changes in experienced photoperiod compared to spatial (i.e., latitudinal) shifts** on the same day of year, due to patterns in photoperiod variation with latitude and by day of year. Here, we show this variation at two latitudes (22.5° , 45°), using hypothetical spatial and temporal shifts. These shifts are based on observed rates with recent global warming: 6-17 kilometers per decade, or approximately $0.5\text{--}1.5^\circ$ in 100 years, for spatial shifts (Parmesan and Yohe, 2003; Parmesan, 2006), and 2-3 days per decade, or 30 days in 100 years, for temporal shifts (Parmesan, 2006; Chen et al., 2011). They highlight the greater magnitude in daylength changes from temporal shifts in the early spring, close to the vernal equinox (e.g., day of year 91), versus close to the summer solstice (e.g., day of year 182).




Figure 2: Photoperiod on ‘green-up’ date varies over space and between years ‘Green-up’ date is the beginning of seasonal greening, identified by satellite remote sensing measurements, taken regularly throughout the year, of concentrations of green leaf vegetation. Hours of daylight on the date of spring green-up (here from MODIS satellite data) across North America and Europe for an average (2009, A) and early (2012, B) North American start of spring. The differences between the years (in hours of daylength) are shown in (C). A negative difference signifies earlier green-up in 2012 versus 2009; a positive difference is the result of later green-up in 2012 compared with 2009. See ‘Quantifying and mapping differences in green-up across the United States and Europe’ in the Supplemental Materials for more details.




Figure 3: **Experimental photoperiod treatments and their equivalent spatial and temporal shifts** for experiments in the OSPREE database that manipulated photoperiod (see Box 1). See ‘Mapping temporal and spatial shifts in space and time’ in the Supplemental Materials for details on how we calculated the required spatial (lines) or temporal (circles and Xes) shifts to be equivalent to photoperiod treatments in each experiment.




Figure 4: **Conceptual diagram of how to include photoperiod in forecasting biological responses to climate change.** Current approaches for forecasting spring phenology with climate change frequently rely on linear relationships between historical temperature data and observed dates of spring phenology (left panels). Adding responses to photoperiod, which commonly operate as threshold responses to short days (SD) versus long days (LD, see ‘photoperiod sensitivity’ in the *Glossary* and Box 2 for details), will alter these forecasts (center panel) in ways that differ across species with divergent threshold photoperiods. Other factors that interact with photoperiod, such as population-level variation in photoperiod responses, can be incorporated into forecasts to further improve their accuracy (right panel).

549 **Box 1. Are photoperiod effects widespread? A case study of woody**
550 **plant spring phenology**

551 Photoperiod responses are well-studied in woody plant phenology, making this a useful case study to con-
552 sider climate change-induced shifts in photoperiod. Spring woody plant phenology in particular has critical
553 implications for global carbon cycling and feedbacks to the climate system (Richardson et al., 2013), and
554 has been at the center of an important and controversial debate on the relative effects of photoperiod versus
555 temperature on phenology (e.g., Fu et al., 2019; Chuine et al., 2010; Körner and Basler, 2010*a,b*).

556 Experimental growth chamber studies have shown that photoperiod is an important cue for spring budburst
557 phenology in woody plants (e.g., Flynn and Wolkovich, 2018; Basler and Körner, 2014; Heide, 1993*b*). These
558 experiments often manipulate photoperiod in combination with temperature to address basic questions about
559 how these two environmental conditions act as biological cues. Temperature has a dual role in regulating
560 woody plant phenology: chilling—the prolonged exposure to cold temperatures after growth cessation in the
561 fall—is required to initiate budburst, and forcing—prolonged exposure to warm temperatures—is required
562 for budburst to occur. Different photoperiod treatments are typically applied during the forcing treatment
563 phase in growth chamber experiments (e.g., Laube et al., 2014; Spann et al., 2004; Falusi and Calamassi,
564 1990; Heide, 1977; Campbell and Sugano, 1975).

565 Woody plant growth chamber studies have been conducted for decades, but have only recently been syn-
566 thesized to show that photoperiod sensitivity is widespread, with large variation across studies and species.
567 These studies have been synthesized in Observed Spring Phenology Responses in Experimental Environments
568 (OSPREE), a new database of plant growth chamber studies that manipulate photoperiod and temperature
569 to measure plant phenological responses, including budburst and flowering (Wolkovich et al., 2019). The
570 database includes studies that manipulate photoperiod (by applying treatments with different daylength du-
571 rations, applying long-day versus short-day conditions for different lengths of time, and/or applying varying
572 versus constant photoperiods) and temperature (by imposing different chilling and/or forcing treatments).
573 The OSPREE database spans 201 woody plant species; all experiments in the database use dormant plant
574 tissue (grown in greenhouses or taken directly from the field) exposed to experimental conditions for which
575 we could identify forcing, photoperiod, and chilling treatments quantitatively. See Supplemental Methods

576 and Wolkovich et al. (2019) for details.

577 Growth chamber experiments in OSPREE suggest that the dominant photoperiod response in woody plant
578 species is earlier and more rapid budburst with longer days (e.g., Caffarra and Donnelly, 2011). Thirty of
579 the 72 studies in the OSPREE database included two or more different photoperiod treatments. Of these,
580 26 (87%) found significant photoperiod main effects or significant interactive effects with temperature (i.e.,
581 photoperiod x temperature effects), across 176 species (Table S1). Main effects included responses such as
582 growth (e.g., higher growth rates with longer days Ashby et al., 1962) and reproduction (e.g., increased
583 flowering with longer days Heide and Sønsteby, 2012).

584 Growth chamber experiments highlight that responses to photoperiod vary depending on temperature condi-
585 tions. For example, more rapid advancement of budburst was observed under long versus short days with low
586 chilling, than with high chilling in *Betula payrifera* (Hawkins and Dhar, 2012, see figure). Similarly, across
587 species, as chilling accumulates from winter to spring, sensitivity to both forcing and photoperiod sensitivity
588 can decrease (Malyshev et al., 2018). Frequently, long photoperiods can compensate for low amounts of
589 chilling (Caffarra et al., 2011b; Myking and Heide, 1995; Heide, 1993a).

590 Woody plant growth chamber experiments also demonstrate that, though photoperiod responses are com-
591 mon, they are variable, as shown in the figure. Responses to photoperiod differ by species (e.g., Flynn and
592 Wolkovich, 2018; Zohner et al., 2016; Basler and Körner, 2014, 2012; Howe et al., 1996; Heide, 1993b). For
593 example, with longer chilling treatments some species seem insensitive to daylength (e.g., *Hammamelis* spp.,
594 *Prunus* spp., Zohner et al., 2016), whereas others seem to be highly sensitive to daylength (e.g. *Fagus* spp.,
595 Fig. S1A), even with long chilling treatments (Zohner et al., 2016). In addition, some species demonstrate
596 a response to photoperiod opposite to that typically observed: *Tilia*, for example, showed delayed budburst
597 with longer daylengths (see figure, Ashby et al., 1962). Photoperiod sensitivity also varies by population
598 and ecotype (e.g., see figure). For example, photoperiod effects on budburst were more significant for lower
599 latitude populations of *Betula pendula* and *B. pubescens* (Partanen et al., 2005).




Figure: **Nonlinearities in phenological responses to daylength** are apparent in spring woody plant phenology experiments (from the OSPREE database) in which three or more photoperiod treatment levels were applied. The shape of the response curves for *Betula pubescens* (Caffarra et al., 2011b), *Fagus sylvatica* (Heide, 1993b) and *Tilia americana* (Ashby et al., 1962) differ depending on the amount of winter chilling received (measured in Chill portions Fishman et al., 1987). Species and chilling levels with multiple lines represent plant material from different populations.

600 Box 2. Dominant models of how photoperiod affects spring woody 601 plant phenology

602 The cues and molecular pathways underlying photoperiod sensitivity are poorly understood for most organ-
603 isms, even in relatively well-studied phenophases and taxa, such as spring budburst in woody plants (Ding
604 and Nilsson, 2016). Decades of growth chamber experiments demonstrate that three main cues—chilling,
605 forcing, and photoperiod—control spring budburst for woody species (Flynn and Wolkovich, 2018; Zohner
606 et al., 2016; Heide, 2008), with many models suggesting a dominant role of forcing in most natural conditions.
607 Forcing requirements, however, appear to increase given shorter photoperiods or lower chilling (Caffarra et al.,
608 2011a; Chuine et al., 2010). Research has yet to fully tease out effects of these three cues, their interactions,
609 and their prevalence; photoperiod responses appear variable across species and populations, as well as with
610 different chilling treatments (see Box 1). Not surprisingly, there is currently little agreement on the under-
611 lying model for how photoperiod affects spring phenology for most species (Chuine et al., 2016; Hänninen
612 et al., 2019). More physiological research will likely be necessary for major advances, as understanding the
613 exact cellular pathways through which chilling, forcing, and photoperiod act appears increasingly critical to
614 accurate modelling (van der Schoot et al., 2014; Hänninen et al., 2019).

615 Additional cellular and molecular studies may quickly advance understanding and scale up to improved
616 photoperiod models. While our understanding of how plants interpret photoperiod at the molecular-level
617 comes from few species, largely from studies of flowering in the model plant *Arabidopsis thaliana* (e.g.,
618 Suárez-López et al., 2001) and fall budset in woody plant species (e.g., Howe et al., 1996), these studies have
619 proved useful across other species. For example, the ‘external coincidence model’ (where plants sense light
620 via blue light receptors and phytochromes, then interpret photoperiod through a coordinated response to
621 light in relation to the time of day, see Lagercrantz, 2009) has been most widely studied in *Arabidopsis*, but
622 appears to be a relevant mechanism for photoperiod responses in diverse perennial and woody plant species
623 (Singh et al., 2017; Petterle et al., 2013; Andrés and Coupland, 2012; Kobayashi and Weigel, 2007; Davis,
624 2002; Bastow and Dean, 2002; Bünning, 1936). The model proposes the existence of a circadian rhythm of
625 light sensitivity, in which the night-phase is sensitive to light and the day-phase is insensitive to light. As days
626 get longer in the spring, daylight illuminates the light sensitive phase, triggering a response. This provides a
627 clear mechanistic pathway to build into models (Burghardt et al., 2015).

628 We expect progress on spring phenology will benefit from similar physiological research that spans the molec-
629 ular to whole-plant levels. To date, little is known about the genetic pathways responsible for the light-sensing
630 apparatuses involved in spring budburst, and how they may vary across species or populations. Some genes
631 have been identified that play a role in coordinating budburst in poplar (*Populus* spp.), and may occur in
632 other woody species as well. Many similarities exist between the proposed regulatory networks of vegetative
633 growth in *Populus* and those controlling floral initiation in *Arabidopsis*, (Ding and Nilsson, 2016). For exam-
634 ple, vegetative growth and inhibition of budset are promoted by the FLOWERING LOCUS T2 (FT2) gene, a
635 homolog of *Arabidopsis thaliana* gene FLOWERING LOCUS (FT). FT2 expression appears to be controlled
636 by a pathway that is effective in long days and warm temperatures, marking the onset of the growing season
637 (Hsu et al., 2011). Its loss of expression in autumn, when the days are getting shorter, is associated with the
638 onset of dormancy (Glover, 2014).

639 Efforts to better map the genetic and cellular pathways of spring phenology combined with common garden
640 studies can provide a powerful method to test mechanistic understanding and improve models (e.g., Burghardt
641 et al., 2015; Fournier-Level et al., 2016). Here we have mainly outlined how to combine growth chamber studies
642 with long-term data to improve models and forecasting; a greater physiological understanding of at least a

⁶⁴³ few species will likely also be necessary for generating robust predictions with climate change.