

# Spatial and temporal shifts in photoperiod with climate change

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

<sup>1</sup>The Nature Conservancy, Seattle, Washington, USA

<sup>2</sup>Arnold Arboretum of Harvard University, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

<sup>3</sup>Department of Organismic and Evolutionary Biology, Harvard University, Cambridge,  
Massachusetts, USA

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

<sup>5</sup>Department of Environmental Science and Policy, George Mason University, Fairfax,  
Virginia, USA

<sup>6</sup>Forest & Conservation Sciences, Faculty of Forestry, University of British Columbia,  
Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

<sup>a</sup>Corresponding author; phone: 781-296-4821; mailing address: 74 Wall Street, Seattle, WA  
98121 USA

December 27, 2019

**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 in Ecology Letters, the data supporting our results will be archived in an appropriate public repository. The full 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** Review and Synthesis

**Number of words in abstract** 197

**Number of words in main text** 3,449

**Number of references** 95

**Number of tables** 0

**Number of figures** 6

**Number of text boxes** 1

## **1 Abstract**

2 Climate change causes both temporal and geographic shifts in species; these shifts in turn affect the daylength  
3 (photoperiod) that species experience. As photoperiod is a common trigger of seasonal biological responses  
4 (e.g., affecting plant phenology in 84% of studies that manipulated photoperiod), such shifts in experienced  
5 photoperiod may have important implications for future distributions and fitness of many species. However,  
6 photoperiod has not been a focus of climate change forecasting to date, especially for early-season ('spring')  
7 events—which are often assumed to be driven by temperature. Here we show that impacts on experienced  
8 photoperiod due to temporal shifts could be quite large and may be orders of magnitude larger than impacts  
9 due to spatial shifts (e.g., 1.6 hours of change for expected temporal shifts versus only one minute for spatial  
10 shifts). Incorporating these effects into forecasts may be possible by leveraging existing experimental data;  
11 for example, growth chamber experiments on woody plant spring phenology often have data relevant for  
12 climate change impacts. We highlight how combining novel modeling approaches and empirical work on  
13 when, where, and how much photoperiod affects spring phenology, could rapidly advance our understanding  
14 and predictions of future spatial-temporal shifts due to climate change.

## <sup>15</sup> Introduction

<sup>16</sup> Shifts in the timing of spring events—i.e., phenology, including flowering, bird arrival, egg hatching and myriad  
<sup>17</sup> other biological activities—are some of the most widely documented signals of climate change. Across taxa,  
<sup>18</sup> from plants and insects to mollusks and mammals, spring phenology is occurring earlier as temperatures  
<sup>19</sup> warm, with average shifts of 1.2 to 5.1 days earlier per decade (Bradley et al., 1999; Parmesan and Yohe,  
<sup>20</sup> 2003; Poloczanska et al., 2013; Root et al., 2003) or 1.3 to 5.6 days earlier per °C of warming (Polgar et al.,  
<sup>21</sup> 2013; Wolkovich et al., 2012). These changes are some of the largest climate change induced shifts observed,  
<sup>22</sup> with early spring phenology shifting more rapidly than later season phenology in most cases (Bradley et al.,  
<sup>23</sup> 1999; Menzel et al., 2006), and suggest that temperature is a major driver of spring phenophases.

<sup>24</sup> Spring phenology is not controlled solely by temperature, however. Photoperiod is also a critical cue for  
<sup>25</sup> plants and animals, signaling changes in growth, mating, and reproduction across diverse species (e.g., Flynn  
<sup>26</sup> and Wolkovich, 2018; Howe et al., 1996; Lagercrantz, 2009; McCallan et al., 2006; Solbakken et al., 1994).

<sup>27</sup> Photoperiod is a useful cue to synchronize activities with seasonal climatic changes (e.g., Basler and Körner,  
<sup>28</sup> 2012; Hsu et al., 2011; Singh et al., 2017) because it is consistent across years, especially compared to other  
<sup>29</sup> seasonal cues such as temperature and precipitation (Saikkonen et al., 2012). For example, relying on a  
<sup>30</sup> threshold photoperiod (see *Glossary*), rather than temperature alone, may prevent woody plants from leafing  
<sup>31</sup> out during “false spring” events (unusually warm periods during winter that are followed by a return of  
<sup>32</sup> cold temperatures, Gu et al., 2008). With current rapid warming photoperiod may also potentially slow the  
<sup>33</sup> observed trend of advancing spring phenology.

<sup>34</sup> Recent studies offer inconsistent views about whether photoperiod may eventually restrict advances in spring  
<sup>35</sup> phenology in a warmer world. Some studies suggest that, with additional warming, photoperiod will limit  
<sup>36</sup> phenological shifts of certain species such that they will not track rising temperatures (e.g., by leafing out  
<sup>37</sup> earlier in the spring, Körner and Basler, 2010; Way and Montgomery, 2015). Instead, these species’ responses  
<sup>38</sup> will increasingly become constrained by daylength and the trend of ever-earlier springs with warming may  
<sup>39</sup> halt. Other studies, however, suggest that photoperiod will not constrain responses to warming for most  
<sup>40</sup> species (Chuine et al., 2010; Zohner et al., 2016). The extent to which daylength constrains responses will  
<sup>41</sup> depend in part on how rapidly photoperiod cues can acclimate or adapt to new environmental conditions,

42 which remains poorly understood (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 Caffarra et al., 2011a; Duputié et al., 2015; Grevstad and Coop, 2015).

46 The exclusion of photoperiod may be problematic: although photoperiod itself is stable over time, the  
47 photoperiod that species *experience*, as they undergo climate change-induced shifts in space and time, is  
48 likely to be much less stable. In addition to shifting activity earlier with recent warming, many species have  
49 shifted their distributions poleward and upward in elevation (i.e., range shifts, Chen et al., 2011; Harsch et al.,  
50 2009; Parmesan, 2006; Peñuelas and Boada, 2003). These spatial and temporal shifts alter the photoperiod  
51 experienced by organisms (Fig. 1); altered photoperiods may have cascading effects on species' performance,  
52 since daylength can affect the timing of development (Grevstad and Coop, 2015; Muir et al., 1994), migration  
53 (Dawbin, 1966), and other important responses.

54 The implications of potential climate change-induced shifts in experienced photoperiod are unclear, as the  
55 magnitude of potential shifts has not been described. Effects of photoperiod shifts may be relatively mi-  
56 nor, especially because there can be substantial year-to-year variation in experienced photoperiod (Fig. 2).

57 Alternatively, photoperiod may begin to constrain species' responses to climate change (Körner and Basler,  
58 2010).

59 Here, we ask:

60 1. How will climate change alter the photoperiod experienced by organisms?

61 2. What are the implications of altered photoperiods for biological responses to climate change?

62 3. Can research apply data from experiments that alter photoperiod to aid in forecasting biological impli-  
63 cations of climate change?

64 These questions are broadly relevant for diverse species. Here, we use a case study of spring woody plant  
65 phenology to illustrate our points (Box 1). We focus on spring events, as phenology during this time is one  
66 of the most widely observed and rapidly changing biological responses to climate change (Parmesan, 2006).

67 Woody species are a useful focal group because they have been the subject of decades of growth chamber

68 experiments, are at the center of an important and controversial debate on the relative effects of photoperiod  
69 versus temperature on their phenology, and because their phenology (i.e., the length of the growing season)  
70 has critical implications for global carbon cycling and feedbacks to the climate system (Richardson et al.,  
71 2013). We use studies included in Observed Spring Phenology Responses in Experimental Environments  
72 (OSPREE), a new database of plant growth chamber studies that manipulate photoperiod and temperature  
73 to measure plant phenological responses, including budburst and flowering (Wolkovich et al., 2019).

## 74 **How will climate change alter the photoperiod experienced by or- 75 ganisms?**

76 Species experience different photoperiod regimes depending on their location on Earth (Fig. 1, 2), the  
77 seasonal timing of their activity, and inter-annual variation in climate. The daylength experienced by plants  
78 on the date that spring “green-up” occurs, for example, varies with latitude (Fig. 2a). This is in part  
79 because latitudinal variation in green-up date, which occurs earlier toward the equator and later toward the  
80 north pole, is strongly driven by climatic differences that affect phenology, and in part because of latitudinal  
81 variation in photoperiod (e.g., at the north pole, the daylength at the summer solstice is 24 hours; see also  
82 Fig. 1). A general pattern of longer photoperiod at green-up toward the poles is consistent across years (Fig.  
83 2b) and green-up does not appear to occur at daylengths less than 10 hours. There is strong spatiotemporal  
84 variation in experienced photoperiod across years (compare the photoperiod at green-up in “early” versus  
85 “late” years, Fig. 2): experienced photoperiod at green-up can vary by two to three hours from one year to  
86 the next in the same location (Fig. 2c). Though green-up date corresponds to plant phenology, we expect that  
87 spatiotemporal patterns of variation in spring phenology would be similar for other organisms (Ovaskainen  
88 et al., 2013; Peñuelas et al., 2002).

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

94 year (Fig. 1). Elevational shifts, in contrast, cause minimal changes in the range of daylength throughout  
95 the year.

96 To date, where the scientific literature has addressed shifts in photoperiod with climate change, the focus has  
97 been on how spatial range shifts will affect photoperiod (e.g., Saikkonen et al., 2012; Way and Montgomery,  
98 2015). However, shifting phenology—especially the large changes seen in spring phenology—will also alter  
99 experienced photoperiod, because of the seasonal patterns of daylength (Fig. 1).

100 Despite a focus on range shifts, current data suggest that temporal shifts will yield much larger changes in  
101 experienced photoperiod than spatial shifts (Fig. 1). For example, consider an insect that emerges from  
102 diapause or a tree that bursts its buds at latitude 45°, on average, around day of year 91 (April 2, when  
103 daylength is 12.8 hours). If the organism’s phenology shifts 30 days earlier over the next century (i.e., a rate  
104 of 3 days per decade, as has been observed, Parmesan and Yohe, 2003), it will experience a daylength that  
105 is 1.6 hours shorter. This 1.6 hour decrease in daylength is equivalent to moving up 28.5° in latitude on this  
106 day of year. However, if the same species shifts its range up in latitude 0.5°(i.e., 60 km over the next century,  
107 comparable to observed rates, Parmesan and Yohe, 2003; Chen et al., 2011), it will experience a daylength  
108 that differs by less than a minute on the same day of year.

109 In many cases organisms may shift both their ranges and their phenology simultaneously (i.e., due to new  
110 climatic conditions, Duputié et al., 2015; Grevstad and Coop, 2015). In addition, photoperiod sensitivity  
111 (see *Glossary*) can vary with latitude, likely due to population-level differences in sensitivity (Caffarra et al.,  
112 2011b; Gauzere et al., 2017; Howe et al., 1996; Partanen et al., 2005; Saikkonen et al., 2012; Viherä-Aarnio  
113 et al., 2006). With future climate change, it is unclear how these complexities will affect the photoperiod  
114 experienced by organisms and if these shifts in photoperiod will have important implications for biological  
115 responses. This lack of clarity stems, in part, from the fact that phenology both affects and is affected by  
116 experienced photoperiod: climate change-induced shifts in phenology alter experienced photoperiod, which  
117 in turn affects phenology.

<sup>118</sup> **What are the implications of altered photoperiods for biological  
<sup>119</sup> responses to climate change?**

<sup>120</sup> Daylength can play a role in controlling critical biological functions, including vegetative growth, cell elon-  
<sup>121</sup> gation, budburst, and flowering in plants (Ashby et al., 1962; Erwin, 1998; Sidaway-Lee et al., 2010; Heide,  
<sup>122</sup> 2011; Heide and Sønsteby, 2012; Hsu et al., 2011; Linkosalo and Lechowicz, 2006; Mimura and Aitken, 2007)  
<sup>123</sup> and growth rate, maturation, migration, and diapause in animals (Bradshaw and Holzapfel, 2006; Dawbin,  
<sup>124</sup> 1966; Muir et al., 1994; Saunders and Henderson, 1970; Tobin et al., 2008; Zydlowski et al., 2014). Climate  
<sup>125</sup> change-induced shifts in photoperiod are therefore likely to alter these functions. Indeed, growth chamber  
<sup>126</sup> studies demonstrate that the magnitude of daylength shifts we can expect with climate change (i.e., 1-2  
<sup>127</sup> hours of difference in daylength with temporal shifts over the next century) are substantial enough to affect  
<sup>128</sup> spring phenology in trees (Table S1). The direction and magnitude of responses will vary, however, because  
<sup>129</sup> of variation in photoperiod sensitivity, and because photoperiod often interacts with other environmental  
<sup>130</sup> drivers, such as temperature, to affect phenology (Box 1).

<sup>131</sup> The climate change-induced trend toward ever earlier springs means that experienced photoperiod may in-  
<sup>132</sup> creasingly approach threshold photoperiod for many species, constraining their ability to respond to additional  
<sup>133</sup> warming (Körner and Basler, 2010; Morin et al., 2010; Nienstaedt, 1966; Vitassee and Basler, 2013). Interac-  
<sup>134</sup> tions between photoperiod and temperature may therefore result in muted phenological shifts, compared to  
<sup>135</sup> what would be expected based on temperature change alone (Körner and Basler, 2010; Mimura and Aitken,  
<sup>136</sup> 2007; Wareing, 1956). If photoperiod does become limiting, the average trend of earlier phenology with  
<sup>137</sup> warming (Menzel, 2000; Ovaskainen et al., 2013; Peñuelas et al., 2002; Polgar et al., 2013) may stop.

<sup>138</sup> A challenge in understanding the implications of altered photoperiods under climate change, and for force-  
<sup>139</sup> casting whether and when the trend of earlier phenology with warming may slow or stop abruptly, is the wide  
<sup>140</sup> range of observed photoperiod sensitivity across species (Flynn and Wolkovich, 2018; Sanz-Perez et al., 2009;  
<sup>141</sup> Zohner et al., 2016), populations (Tanino et al., 2010), and ecotypes (Howe et al., 1995). How much genotype  
<sup>142</sup> versus environment explain this variation is an active area of research (e.g., Franks et al., 2014; Gould et al.,  
<sup>143</sup> 2010; Mimura and Aitken, 2010; Fréjaville et al., 2019). Environmental conditions clearly play a role, since  
<sup>144</sup> different combinations of ambient temperature and photoperiod may explain some of this variation, because

<sup>145</sup> temperature cues can override photoperiod requirements under certain conditions (e.g., Tanino et al., 2010).  
<sup>146</sup> In such cases, climate change-induced phenological shifts may occur at different rates than past shifts with  
<sup>147</sup> warming. On the other hand, some of this variation may be due to underlying genetic differences, because  
<sup>148</sup> photoperiod responses can be under strong genetic control (Bradshaw and Stettler, 1995; Keller et al., 2011;  
<sup>149</sup> Weih, 2004, , see also Box 1). Teasing out the relative roles of genetics versus environmental conditions will  
<sup>150</sup> be critical to accurate forecasts of future phenology under climate change.

<sup>151</sup> Species- and population-level variation in photoperiod sensitivity may result in altered communities as climate  
<sup>152</sup> change progresses. For example, a species or population that is relatively insensitive to photoperiod can take  
<sup>153</sup> advantage of warmer springs by having an earlier start to its growing season. Indeed, phenological tracking of  
<sup>154</sup> temperature (e.g., earlier flowering, leafout, migration with warming) has been linked with higher performance  
<sup>155</sup> in plants and animals (Cleland et al., 2012; Muir et al., 1994; Willis et al., 2010). Species or populations  
<sup>156</sup> that are sensitive to temperature but relatively insensitive to photoperiod may therefore outcompete slower  
<sup>157</sup> growing or later emerging ones that are limited by photoperiod and thus cannot take advantage of longer  
<sup>158</sup> growing season conditions. To identify where, when, and how communities may be altered, methods for  
<sup>159</sup> incorporating photoperiod into forecasting future phenology are critical.

## <sup>160</sup> Future directions: outstanding questions and incorporating photoperiod into forecasting

<sup>162</sup> Incorporating photoperiod into forecasting is complex for a few major reasons. Future rates of phenological  
<sup>163</sup> shifts are unlikely to be straightforward extrapolations from past and current rates. In addition, an organism's  
<sup>164</sup> experienced photoperiod is both a driver and an effect of phenological shifts.

<sup>165</sup> Approaches for forecasting can be grouped into two broad categories: statistical models and process-based  
<sup>166</sup> models. These two modelling paradigms differ in at least two ways, in terms of relating phenology to  
<sup>167</sup> climate change. First, statistical models generally assume linear relationships between species' responses and  
<sup>168</sup> environmental variables (e.g., Flynn and Wolkovich, 2018; Van Belle et al., 2007; Ibáñez et al., 2010), instead  
<sup>169</sup> process-based models often incorporate nonlinear threshold relationships as well (e.g. Chuine and Beaubien,

170 2001; Morin and Thuiller, 2009; Xie and Hsieh, 1989). Second, statistical models of phenology under climate  
171 change have typically ignored photoperiod, focusing instead on seasonal or annual temperature (e.g. Diez  
172 et al., 2012; Ibáñez et al., 2010; Van Belle et al., 2007, but see Richardson et al. (2013)). whereas process-  
173 based models of phenology more frequently incorporate photoperiod, along with temperature (Duputié et al.,  
174 2015; Morin and Thuiller, 2009; Xie and Hsieh, 1989; Zhao et al., 2013). A challenge of process-based models  
175 is that they require detailed data that are often not readily available (e.g., daily climate data, nonlinear  
176 biological responses to fine-scale changes in temperature). Perhaps because of this challenge, statistical  
177 models remain more commonly used in climate change forecasts of biological responses (e.g., Basler and  
178 Körner, 2012; Diez et al., 2012; García-Valdés and Morales-Castilla, 2016; Ibáñez et al., 2010; Van Belle  
179 et al., 2007; Zhu et al., 2012).

180 Future modelling can incorporate photoperiod by leveraging the large amount of experimental data on pho-  
181 toperiod responses (Fig. 3, Table S1), especially when process-based approaches are used. Researchers can  
182 use these data to first learn if the study species (or a phylogenetically closely related species) shows a pho-  
183 toperiod effect and, ideally, identify its threshold photoperiod and how it varies by population, ecotype, or  
184 other factors (Bradshaw and Holzapfel, 2006; Gwinner, 1996; Tobin et al., 2008). If there is evidence of a pho-  
185 toperiod response (e.g., *Fagus grandifolia*, or *Tilia americana* with low chilling in Fig. 4), daylength should  
186 be added to forecasting models, using the threshold photoperiod to define short-day and long-day conditions  
187 (Fig. 6). Given the large change in experienced photoperiod with temporal shifts (Fig. 1), this may be  
188 particularly important for phenological forecasting. Since spatial shifts are associated with smaller changes  
189 in experienced photoperiod, it may be less important for distribution forecasts. Many species, however, may  
190 shift in *both* space and time simultaneously. Thus, even though experienced photoperiod changes little as  
191 species distributions shift in space, phenology may be altered significantly.

192 For some species, experimental data can be immediately used in forecasting because experiments manipulate  
193 photoperiod at relevant scales (e.g., Basler and Körner, 2014; Heide and Sonsteby, 2015, Figs. 3, 5 A, Table  
194 S1). For example, photoperiod treatments from growth chamber experiments with *Fagus sylvatica* span  
195 the variation in both current and expected future ranges (Fig. 5A, Duputié et al., 2015), and may allow  
196 identification of threshold photoperiods (Fig. 6). In other cases, attempting to incorporate photoperiod  
197 into forecasts of future phenology will reveal gaps in our understanding of many aspects of photoperiod

198 responses. For example, photoperiod treatments from existing experiments of *Quercus robur* do not accurately  
199 represent experienced photoperiods from current or future estimates (Fig. 5B), making fine scale projections  
200 difficult, even for this relatively well-studied species. This gap extends to many species, as most experiments  
201 manipulate photoperiod much more dramatically than will occur with climate change (Figs. 3, 5). Although  
202 these studies can be useful for understanding mechanistically how photoperiod responses work, extrapolating  
203 them to climate change models may not be reasonable.

204 Photoperiod is not fully integrated into most current forecasts of biological responses to climate change (but  
205 see Tobin et al., 2008), an omission that could affect the accuracy of forecasts. Forecasts from ecosystem mod-  
206 els often incorporate photoperiod, along with other variables such as evaporative demand and temperature  
207 (e.g., the Ecosystem Demography model Jolly et al., 2005; Medvigy et al., 2013), but photoperiod is rarely  
208 included in species distribution models (e.g., Morin and Thuiller, 2009; Zhu et al., 2012). The sensitivity of  
209 model outcomes to assumptions made about experienced photoperiod and threshold responses to photope-  
210 riod needs further study, including understanding how variation in photoperiod responses across ecosystems,  
211 species, populations, and life stages impacts forecasts.

212 As researchers more fully integrate photoperiod into forecasting, a critical area of further study is under-  
213 standing *how* photoperiod acts as a cue. Photoperiod seems to interact with temperature to affect phenology  
214 (e.g., Zydlowski et al., 2014); this would explain the divergent effects of photoperiod observed across studies  
215 in woody plants (e.g., Fig. 4). However, exactly how it interacts with temperature is not well-defined for most  
216 species or populations (Boxes 1, S1). Understanding the drivers, as well as the consequences, of variations  
217 in photoperiod responses across species and populations will be particularly beneficial for forecasting. For  
218 example, what traits are associated with photoperiod sensitivity and does variation in photoperiod sensitivity  
219 or related traits have a strong genetic component? If so, are species or populations from some locations or  
220 lineages more likely than others to be constrained by photoperiod in their responses to climate change?

## 221 Conclusions

222 Organisms may undergo large changes to the photoperiod they experience with climate change, even if they  
223 do not shift their ranges spatially. Here we have shown that these altered photoperiods may result in stalled

future advances of woody plant phenology with warming (Table S1, Fig. 3), with cascading effects on growth, fitness, and community composition due to the large variation in photoperiod responses across species and populations (Fig. 4). Shifts in photoperiod with climate change have implications for a variety of plant and animal responses, given that daylength affects critical activities for diverse species from insects (Bradshaw and Holzapfel, 2006; Linn et al., 1996) and salmon (Solbakken et al., 1994; Taranger et al., 2003) to birds (Dawson et al., 2001) and marsupials (McCallan et al., 2006; Solbakken et al., 1994). Given what we know, incorporating photoperiod into forecasting of climate change responses should improve model accuracy, and will illuminate additional experiments that could improve our mechanistic understanding of photoperiod as a critical cue for diverse biological responses.

## Glossary

- budburst: when one or more leaf buds have visible green tips.
- chilling: the intensity and duration of winter temperature, often a certain sum of chilling that is required (e.g., some amount of hours or days of cold temperatures, defined by a specific critical temperature or range of temperatures, such as between 0 and 7.2 °C, Richardson, 1974), that must be experienced for budburst to occur.
- daylength: the period of time during a 24-hour period during which an organism receives light.
- diapause: period of suspended development or growth, usually used to describe invertebrates during unfavorable environmental conditions such as winter
- dormancy: halted or reduced growth or activity, usually used to describe plants
- forcing: warm spring temperatures, often a certain sum of forcing that is required (e.g., some amount of hours or days above a specific temperature) for budburst or flowering can occur.
- green-up: The beginning of a new cycle of plant growth, usually evaluated at the landscape scale
- phenology: the timing of life cycle events in organisms
- photoperiod: the daily duration of light (daylength) and dark to which an organism is exposed; often used synonymously with daylength

- 249 • photoperiod sensitivity: the degree to which phenology is controlled by daylength; may be a nonlinear,  
250 or “threshold”, response in plants (Box S1) and animals (Tobin et al., 2008; Grevstad and Coop, 2015).
- 251 • photoperiodism: the ability to assess the length of day or night to regulate behavior, physiology, growth,  
252 development or reproduction.
- 253 • threshold photoperiod: length of day that causes an organism to switch from a short- to a long-day  
254 response (or vice versa). For example, in European larch (*Larix decidua*), budburst development may  
255 be constrained under short-day conditions, when daylengths are less than a threshold photoperiod of  
256 10-11 hours (Migliavacca et al., 2008). Above this threshold photoperiod, the long-day response of  
257 unconstrained budburst development can occur.

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

260 Photoperiod responses are particularly well-studied in woody plant phenology. Decades of experimental  
261 growth chamber studies have shown that photoperiod is an important cue for spring budburst phenology  
262 in woody plants (e.g., Basler and Körner, 2014; Flynn and Wolkovich, 2018; Heide, 1993b). These experi-  
263 ments often manipulate photoperiod in combination with temperature to address basic questions about how  
264 these two environmental conditions act as biological cues. Temperature has a dual role in regulating woody  
265 plant phenology: chilling—the prolonged exposure to cold temperatures after growth cessation in the fall—is  
266 required to initiate budburst; and forcing—prolonged exposure to warm temperatures—is required for bud-  
267 burst to occur. Thus, chilling and forcing treatments are often altered in addition to photoperiod in growth  
268 chamber experiments (e.g., Campbell and Sugano, 1975; Falusi and Calamassi, 1990; Heide, 1977; Laube  
269 et al., 2014; Spann et al., 2004).

270 Woody plant growth chamber studies have been conducted for decades, but have only recently been syn-  
271 thesized (Wolkovich et al., 2019), revealing that photoperiod sensitivity is widespread, though with wide  
272 variation across studies and species. Growth chamber experiments in OSPREE suggest that the dominant  
273 photoperiod response in woody plant species is earlier and more rapid budburst with longer days (e.g., Caf-

<sup>274</sup> farra and Donnelly, 2011). Thirty-one of the 85 studies in the OSPREE database included two or more  
<sup>275</sup> different photoperiod treatments. Of these, 26 (84%) found significant photoperiod main effects or significant  
<sup>276</sup> interactive effects with temperature (i.e., photoperiod x temperature effects), across 176 species (Table S1).  
<sup>277</sup> Main effects included responses such as growth (e.g., higher growth rates with longer days Ashby et al., 1962)  
<sup>278</sup> and reproduction (e.g., increased flowering with longer days Heide and Sønsteby, 2012).

<sup>279</sup> Growth chamber experiments highlight that responses to photoperiod vary depending on temperature con-  
<sup>280</sup> ditions. For example, more rapid advancement of budburst was observed under long versus short days with  
<sup>281</sup> low chilling, than with high chilling in *Betula payrifera* (Hawkins and Dhar, 2012) (Fig. 4). Frequently, long  
<sup>282</sup> photoperiods can compensate for low amounts of chilling, resulting in enhanced cell growth (Heide, 1993a;  
<sup>283</sup> Myking and Heide, 1995; Caffarra et al., 2011b).

<sup>284</sup> Woody plant growth chamber experiments also demonstrate that, though photoperiod responses are common,  
<sup>285</sup> they are variable (Fig. 4). Responses to photoperiod differ by species (e.g., Basler and Körner, 2012, 2014;  
<sup>286</sup> Flynn and Wolkovich, 2018; Heide, 1993b; Howe et al., 1996; Zohner et al., 2016). For example, with longer  
<sup>287</sup> chilling treatments some species seem insensitive to daylength (e.g., *Hammamelis* spp., *Prunus* spp., Zohner  
<sup>288</sup> et al., 2016), whereas others (e.g. *Fagus* spp., Fig. 5A) seem to be highly sensitive to daylength, even with  
<sup>289</sup> long chilling treatments (Zohner et al., 2016). In addition, some species demonstrated an opposing response  
<sup>290</sup> to photoperiod than typically observed: *Tilia*, for example, showed delayed budburst with longer daylengths  
<sup>291</sup> (Fig. 4, Ashby et al., 1962). Photoperiod sensitivity also varies by population and ecotype (e.g., Partanen  
<sup>292</sup> et al., 2005) (Fig. 4). For example, photoperiod effects on budburst were more significant for lower latitude  
<sup>293</sup> populations of *Betula pendula* and *B. pubescens* (Partanen et al., 2005).

## <sup>294</sup> Acknowledgements

<sup>295</sup> We thank the many researchers who conducted the experiments synthesized in this manuscript; H. Kharouba  
<sup>296</sup> for helpful comments that improved the manuscript; B. Feist for improving the appearance of Fig. 3 dramat-  
<sup>297</sup> ically; and Anne Duputié and Isabelle Chuine for sharing projections from PhenoFit. The National Science  
<sup>298</sup> Foundation (DBI 14-01854 to AKE), NSERC Discovery Award (RGPIN-05038 to EMW) and Canada Re-  
<sup>299</sup> search Chair in Temporal Ecology (EMW) provided funding. Any opinion, findings, and conclusions or

<sup>300</sup> recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views  
<sup>301</sup> of the National Science Foundation.

<sup>302</sup> **References**

- <sup>303</sup> Ashby, W., et al. 1962. Germination capacity in American Basswood *Tilia americana*. Transactions of the  
<sup>304</sup> Illinois State Academy of Science 55:120–3.
- <sup>305</sup> Basler, D., and C. Körner. 2012. Photoperiod sensitivity of bud burst in 14 temperate forest tree species.  
<sup>306</sup> Agricultural and Forest Meteorology 165:73–81.
- <sup>307</sup> ———. 2014. Photoperiod and temperature responses of bud swelling and bud burst in four temperate forest  
<sup>308</sup> tree species. Tree Physiology 34:377–388.
- <sup>309</sup> Bradley, N. L., A. C. Leopold, J. Ross, and W. Huffaker. 1999. Phenological changes reflect climate change  
<sup>310</sup> in Wisconsin. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 96:9701–9704.
- <sup>311</sup> Bradshaw, H., and R. F. Stettler. 1995. Molecular genetics of growth and development in *Populus*. IV.  
<sup>312</sup> Mapping QTLs with large effects on growth, form, and phenology traits in a forest tree. Genetics 139:963–  
<sup>313</sup> 973.
- <sup>314</sup> Bradshaw, W. E., and C. M. Holzapfel. 2006. Evolutionary response to rapid climate change. Science  
<sup>315</sup> 312:1477–1478.
- <sup>316</sup> Caffarra, A., and A. Donnelly. 2011. The ecological significance of phenology in four different tree species:  
<sup>317</sup> effects of light and temperature on bud burst. International Journal of Biometeorology 55:711–721.
- <sup>318</sup> Caffarra, A., A. Donnelly, and I. Chuine. 2011a. Modelling the timing of *Betula pubescens* budburst. II.  
<sup>319</sup> Integrating complex effects of photoperiod into process-based models. Climate Research 46:159–170.
- <sup>320</sup> Caffarra, A., A. Donnelly, I. Chuine, and M. B. Jones. 2011b. Modelling the timing of *Betula pubescens*  
<sup>321</sup> bud-burst. I. Temperature and photoperiod: A conceptual model. Climate Research 46:147.
- <sup>322</sup> Campbell, R. K., and A. I. Sugano. 1975. Phenology of bud burst in Douglas-fir related to provenance,  
<sup>323</sup> photoperiod, chilling, and flushing temperature. Botanical Gazette pages 290–298.

- 324 Chen, I.-C., J. K. Hill, R. Ohlemüller, D. B. Roy, and C. D. Thomas. 2011. Rapid range shifts of species  
325 associated with high levels of climate warming. *Science* 333:1024–1026.
- 326 Chuine, I., and E. G. Beaubien. 2001. Phenology is a major determinant of tree species range. *Ecology*  
327 Letters 4:500–510.
- 328 Chuine, I., X. Morin, and H. Bugmann. 2010. Warming, photoperiods, and tree phenology. *Science* 329:277–  
329 278.
- 330 Cleland, E. E., J. M. Allen, T. M. Crimmins, J. A. Dunne, S. Pau, S. E. Travers, E. S. Zavaleta, and E. M.  
331 Wolkovich. 2012. Phenological tracking enables positive species responses to climate change. *Ecology*  
332 93:1765–1771.
- 333 Dawbin, W. H. 1966. The seasonal migratory cycle of humpback whales. *Whales, dolphins and porpoises*  
334 pages 145–170.
- 335 Dawson, A., V. M. King, G. E. Bentley, and G. F. Ball. 2001. Photoperiodic control of seasonality in birds.  
336 *Journal of Biological Rhythms* 16:365–380.
- 337 Diez, J. M., I. Ibáñez, A. J. Miller-Rushing, S. J. Mazer, T. M. Crimmins, M. A. Crimmins, C. D. Bertelsen,  
338 and D. W. Inouye. 2012. Forecasting phenology: from species variability to community patterns. *Ecology*  
339 Letters 15:545–553.
- 340 Duputié, A., A. Rutschmann, O. Ronce, and I. Chuine. 2015. Phenological plasticity will not help all species  
341 adapt to climate change. *Global Change Biology* 21:3062–3073.
- 342 Erwin, J. E. 1998. Temperature and light effects on stem elongation. *Journal of the Japanese Society for*  
343 *Horticultural Science* 67:1113–1120.
- 344 Falusi, M., and R. Calamassi. 1990. Bud dormancy in beech (*Fagus sylvatica* L.). Effect of chilling and  
345 photoperiod on dormancy release of beech seedlings. *Tree Physiology* 6:429–438.
- 346 Flynn, D. F. B., and E. M. Wolkovich. 2018. Temperature and photoperiod drive spring phenology across all  
347 species in a temperate forest community. *New Phytologist* 219:1353–1362.
- 348 Franks, S. J., J. J. Weber, and S. N. Aitken. 2014. Evolutionary and plastic responses to climate change in  
349 terrestrial plant populations. *Evolutionary Applications* 7:123–139.

- 350 Fréjaville, T., B. Fady, A. Kremer, A. Ducousoo, and M. Benito Garzón. 2019. Inferring phenotypic plasticity  
351 and population responses to climate across tree species ranges using forest inventory data. *Global Ecology*  
352 and *Biogeography* 28:1259–1271.
- 353 García-Valdés, R., and I. Morales-Castilla. 2016. Efectos del cambio climático en los ecosistemas forestales:  
354 integrando inventarios y modelos. *Ecosistemas* 25:51–59.
- 355 Gauzere, J., S. Delzon, H. Davi, M. Bonhomme, I. G. de Cortazar-Atauri, and I. Chuine. 2017. Integrating  
356 interactive effects of chilling and photoperiod in phenological process-based models. A case study with  
357 two European tree species: *Fagus sylvatica* and *Quercus petraea*. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*  
358 244:9–20.
- 359 Gould, P. J., C. A. Harrington, and J. B. St. Clair. 2010. Incorporating genetic variation into a model of  
360 budburst phenology of coast douglas-fir (*pseudotsuga menziesii* var. *menziesii*). *Canadian journal of forest*  
361 research 41:139–150.
- 362 Grevstad, F. S., and L. B. Coop. 2015. The consequences of photoperiodism for organisms in new climates.  
363 *Ecological Applications* 25:1506–1517.
- 364 Gu, L., P. J. Hanson, W. M. Post, D. P. Kaiser, B. Yang, R. Nemani, S. G. Pallardy, and T. Meyers. 2008.  
365 The 2007 Eastern US spring freeze: Increased cold damage in a warming world. *BioScience* 58:253.
- 366 Gwinner, E. 1996. Circadian and circannual programmes in avian migration. *Journal of Experimental Biology*  
367 199:39–48.
- 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 ———. 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. *Physiologia Plantarum* 40:21–26.
- 377 ———. 2011. Temperature rather than photoperiod controls growth cessation and dormancy in *Sorbus* species. *Journal of Experimental Botany* 62:5397–5404.
- 380 Heide, O. M., and A. Sønsteby. 2012. Floral initiation in black currant cultivars (*Ribes nigrum* L.): Effects of 381 plant size, photoperiod, temperature, and duration of short day exposure. *Scientia Horticulturae* 138:64–72.
- 382 Heide, O. M., and A. Sonsteby. 2015. Simultaneous dormancy induction interferes with short day floral 383 induction in black currant (*Ribes nigrum* L.). *Scientia Horticulturae* 185:228–232.
- 384 Howe, G. T., G. Gardner, W. P. Hackett, and G. R. Furnier. 1996. Phytochrome control of short-day-induced 385 bud set in black cottonwood. *Physiologia Plantarum* 97:95–103.
- 386 Howe, G. T., W. P. Hackett, G. R. Furnier, and R. E. Klevorn. 1995. Photoperiodic responses of a northern 387 and southern ecotype of black cottonwood. *Physiologia Plantarum* 93:695–708.
- 388 Hsu, C.-Y., J. P. Adams, H. Kim, K. No, C. Ma, S. H. Strauss, J. Drnevich, L. Vandervelde, J. D. Ellis, B. M. 389 Rice, et al. 2011. FLOWERING LOCUS T duplication coordinates reproductive and vegetative growth in 390 perennial poplar. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 108:10756–10761.
- 391 Ibáñez, I., R. B. Primack, A. J. Miller-Rushing, E. Ellwood, H. Higuchi, S. D. Lee, H. Kobori, and J. A. 392 Silander. 2010. Forecasting phenology under global warming. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal 393 Society B-Biological Sciences* 365.
- 394 Jolly, W. M., R. Nemani, and S. W. Running. 2005. A generalized, bioclimatic index to predict foliar 395 phenology in response to climate. *Global Change Biology* 11:619–632.
- 396 Keller, S. R., R. Y. Soolanayakanahally, R. D. Guy, S. N. Silim, M. S. Olson, and P. Tiffin. 2011. Climate- 397 driven local adaptation of ecophysiology and phenology in balsam poplar, *Populus balsamifera* L. (Salicaceae). *American Journal of Botany* 98:99–108.
- 399 Körner, C., and D. Basler. 2010. Warming, photoperiods, and tree phenology response. *Science* 329:278–278.
- 400 Lagercrantz, U. 2009. At the end of the day: a common molecular mechanism for photoperiod responses in 401 plants? *Journal of Experimental Botany* 60:2501–2515.

- 402 Laube, J., T. H. Sparks, N. Estrella, J. Höfler, D. P. Ankerst, and A. Menzel. 2014. Chilling outweighs  
403 photoperiod in preventing precocious spring development. *Global Change Biology* 20:170–182.
- 404 Linkosalo, T., and M. J. Lechowicz. 2006. Twilight far-red treatment advances leaf bud burst of silver birch  
405 (*Betula pendula*). *Tree Physiology* 26:1249–1256.
- 406 Linn, C. E., M. G. Campbell, K. R. Poole, W.-Q. Wu, and W. L. Roelofs. 1996. Effects of photoperiod on  
407 the circadian timing of pheromone response in male *Trichoplusia ni*: relationship to the modulatory action  
408 of octopamine. *Journal of Insect Physiology* 42:881–891.
- 409 Mcallan, B. M., C. R. Dickman, and M. S. Crowther. 2006. Photoperiod as a reproductive cue in the  
410 marsupial genus *Antechinus*: ecological and evolutionary consequences. *Biological Journal of the Linnean  
411 Society* 87:365–379.
- 412 Medvigy, D., S.-J. Jeong, K. L. Clark, N. S. Skowronski, and K. V. Schäfer. 2013. Effects of seasonal variation  
413 of photosynthetic capacity on the carbon fluxes of a temperate deciduous forest. *Journal of Geophysical  
414 Research: Biogeosciences* 118:1703–1714.
- 415 Menzel, A. 2000. Trends in phenological phases in Europe between 1951 and 1996. *International Journal of  
416 Biometeorology* 44:76–81.
- 417 Menzel, A., T. H. Sparks, N. Estrella, E. Koch, A. Aasa, R. Ahas, K. Alm-Kuebler, et al. 2006. European  
418 phenological response to climate change matches the warming pattern. *Global Change Biology* 12:1969–  
419 1976.
- 420 Migliavacca, M., E. Cremonese, R. Colombo, L. Busetto, M. Galvagno, L. Ganis, M. Meroni, E. Pari,  
421 M. Rossini, C. Siniscalco, et al. 2008. European larch phenology in the alps: can we grasp the role of  
422 ecological factors by combining field observations and inverse modelling? *International journal of biome-  
423 teorology* 52:587–605.
- 424 Mimura, M., and S. Aitken. 2007. Adaptive gradients and isolation-by-distance with postglacial migration  
425 in *Picea sitchensis*. *Heredity* 99:224.
- 426 ———. 2010. Local adaptation at the range peripheries of sitka spruce. *Journal of evolutionary biology*  
427 23:249–258.

- 428 Morin, X., J. Roy, L. Sonié, and I. Chuine. 2010. Changes in leaf phenology of three European oak species  
429 in response to experimental climate change. *New Phytologist* 186:900–910.
- 430 Morin, X., and W. Thuiller. 2009. Comparing niche-and process-based models to reduce prediction uncertainty  
431 in species range shifts under climate change. *Ecology* 90:1301–1313.
- 432 Muir, W. D., W. S. Zaugg, A. E. Giorgi, and S. McCutcheon. 1994. Accelerating smolt development and  
433 downstream movement in yearling chinook salmon with advanced photoperiod and increased temperature.  
434 *Aquaculture* 123:387–399.
- 435 Myking, T., and O. Heide. 1995. Dormancy release and chilling requirement of buds of latitudinal ecotypes  
436 of *Betula pendula* and *B. pubescens*. *Tree Physiology* 15:697–704.
- 437 Nienstaedt, H. 1966. Dormancy and dormancy release in white spruce. *Forest Science* 12:374–384.
- 438 Ovaskainen, O., S. Skorokhodova, M. Yakovleva, A. Sukhov, A. Kutenkov, N. Kutenkova, A. Shcherbakov,  
439 E. Meyke, and M. del Mar Delgado. 2013. Community-level phenological response to climate change.  
440 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110:13434–13439.
- 441 Parmesan, C. 2006. Ecological and evolutionary responses to recent climate change. *Annual Review of  
442 Ecology Evolution and Systematics* 37:637–669.
- 443 Parmesan, C., and G. Yohe. 2003. A globally coherent fingerprint of climate change impacts across natural  
444 systems. *Nature* 421:37.
- 445 Partanen, J., H. Hänninen, and R. Häkkinen. 2005. Bud burst in Norway spruce (*Picea abies*): preliminary  
446 evidence for age-specific rest patterns. *Trees* 19:66–72.
- 447 Peñuelas, J., and M. Boada. 2003. A global change-induced biome shift in the Montseny mountains (NE  
448 Spain). *Global Change Biology* 9:131–140.
- 449 Peñuelas, J., I. Filella, and P. Comas. 2002. Changed plant and animal life cycles from 1952 to 2000 in the  
450 mediterranean region. *Global Change Biology* 8:531–544.
- 451 Polgar, C. A., R. B. Primack, E. H. Williams, S. Stichter, and C. Hitchcock. 2013. Climate effects on the  
452 flight period of lycaenid butterflies in Massachusetts. *Biological Conservation* 160:25–31.

- 453 Poloczanska, E. S., C. J. Brown, W. J. Sydeman, W. Kiessling, D. S. Schoeman, P. J. Moore, K. Brander,  
454 J. F. Bruno, L. B. Buckley, M. T. Burrows, et al. 2013. Global imprint of climate change on marine life.  
455 Nature Climate Change 3:919.
- 456 Richardson, A. D., T. F. Keenan, M. Migliavacca, Y. Ryu, O. Sonnentag, and M. Toomey. 2013. Climate  
457 change, phenology, and phenological control of vegetation feedbacks to the climate system. Agricultural  
458 and Forest Meteorology 169:156–173.
- 459 Richardson, E. 1974. A model for estimating the completion of rest for ‘Redhaven’ and ‘Elberta’ peach trees.  
460 HortScience 9:331–332.
- 461 Root, T. L., J. T. Price, K. R. Hall, S. H. Schneider, C. Rosenzweig, and J. A. Pounds. 2003. Fingerprints  
462 of global warming on wild animals and plants. Nature 421:57–60.
- 463 Saikkonen, K., K. Taulavuori, T. Hyvönen, P. E. Gundel, C. E. Hamilton, I. Vänninen, A. Nissinen, and  
464 M. Helander. 2012. Climate change-driven species’ range shifts filtered by photoperiodism. Nature Climate  
465 Change 2:239.
- 466 Sanz-Perez, V., P. Castro-Diez, and F. Valladares. 2009. Differential and interactive effects of temperature  
467 and photoperiod on budburst and carbon reserves in two co-occurring Mediterranean oaks. Plant Biology  
468 11:142–51.
- 469 Saunders, R. L., and E. B. Henderson. 1970. Influence of photoperiod on smolt development and growth of  
470 Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*). Journal of the Fisheries Board of Canada 27:1295–1311.
- 471 Sidaway-Lee, K., E.-M. Josse, A. Brown, Y. Gan, K. J. Halliday, I. A. Graham, and S. Penfield. 2010.  
472 SPATULA links daytime temperature and plant growth rate. Current Biology 20:1493–1497.
- 473 Singh, R. K., T. Svystun, B. AlDahmash, A. M. Jönsson, and R. P. Bhalerao. 2017. Photoperiod-and  
474 temperature-mediated control of phenology in trees—a molecular perspective. New Phytologist 213:511–  
475 524.
- 476 Solbakken, V. A., T. Hansen, and S. O. Stefansson. 1994. Effects of photoperiod and temperature on growth  
477 and parr-smolt transformation in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) and subsequent performance in seawater.  
478 Aquaculture 121:13–27.

- 479 Spann, T. M., J. G. Williamson, and R. L. Darnell. 2004. Photoperiod and temperature effects on growth  
480 and carbohydrate storage in southern highbush blueberry interspecific hybrid. Journal of the American  
481 Society for Horticultural Science 129:294–298.
- 482 Tanino, K. K., L. Kalcsits, S. Silim, E. Kendall, and G. R. Gray. 2010. Temperature-driven plasticity in  
483 growth cessation and dormancy development in deciduous woody plants: a working hypothesis suggesting  
484 how molecular and cellular function is affected by temperature during dormancy induction. Plant Molecular  
485 Biology 73:49–65.
- 486 Taranger, G., E. Vikingstad, U. Klenke, I. Mayer, S. Stefansson, B. Norberg, T. Hansen, Y. Zohar, and  
487 E. Andersson. 2003. Effects of photoperiod, temperature and GnRHa treatment on the reproductive  
488 physiology of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) broodstock. Fish Physiology and Biochemistry 28:403–406.
- 489 Tobin, P. C., S. Nagarkatti, G. Loeb, and M. C. Saunders. 2008. Historical and projected interactions between  
490 climate change and insect voltinism in a multivoltine species. Global Change Biology 14:951–957.
- 491 Van Belle, J., J. Shamoun-Baranes, E. Van Loon, and W. Bouten. 2007. An operational model predicting  
492 autumn bird migration intensities for flight safety. Journal of Applied Ecology 44:864–874.
- 493 Viherä-Aarnio, A., R. Häkkinen, and O. Junntila. 2006. Critical night length for bud set and its variation in  
494 two photoperiodic ecotypes of *Betula pendula*. Tree Physiology 26:1013–1018.
- 495 Vitasse, Y., and D. Basler. 2013. What role for photoperiod in the bud burst phenology of European beech.  
496 European Journal of Forest Research 132:1–8.
- 497 Wareing, P. 1956. Photoperiodism in woody plants. Annual Review of Plant Physiology 7:191–214.
- 498 Way, D. A., and R. A. Montgomery. 2015. Photoperiod constraints on tree phenology, performance and  
499 migration in a warming world. Plant, Cell & Environment 38:1725–1736.
- 500 Weih, M. 2004. Intensive short rotation forestry in boreal climates: present and future perspectives. Canadian  
501 Journal of Forest Research 34:1369–1378.
- 502 Willis, C. G., B. R. Ruhfel, R. B. Primack, A. J. Miller-Rushing, J. B. Losos, and C. C. Davis. 2010. Favorable  
503 climate change response explains non-native species' success in Thoreau's woods. Plos One 5:e8878.

- 504 Wolkovich, E. M., B. I. Cook, J. M. Allen, T. M. Crimmins, J. L. Betancourt, S. E. Travers, S. Pau,  
505 J. Regetz, T. J. Davies, N. J. B. Kraft, T. R. Ault, K. Bolmgren, S. J. Mazer, G. J. McCabe, B. J. McGill,  
506 C. Parmesan, N. Salamin, M. D. Schwartz, and E. E. Cleland. 2012. Warming experiments underpredict  
507 plant phenological responses to climate change. *Nature* 485:494–497.
- 508 Wolkovich, E. M., A. K. Ettinger, D. Flynn, T. Savas, C. Chamberlain, D. Buonaiuto, and  
509 J. Samaha. 2019. Observed Spring Phenology Responses in Experimental Environments (OSPREE).  
510 doi:10.5063/F1QV3JQR.
- 511 Xie, L., and W. W. Hsieh. 1989. Predicting the return migration routes of the Fraser River sockeye salmon  
512 (*Oncorhynchus nerka*). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 46:1287–1292.
- 513 Zhao, M., C. Peng, W. Xiang, X. Deng, D. Tian, X. Zhou, G. Yu, H. He, and Z. Zhao. 2013. Plant  
514 phenological modeling and its application in global climate change research: overview and future challenges.  
515 *Environmental Reviews* 21:1–14.
- 516 Zhu, K., C. W. Woodall, and J. S. Clark. 2012. Failure to migrate: lack of tree range expansion in response  
517 to climate change. *Global Change Biology* 18:1042–1052.
- 518 Zohner, C. M., B. M. Benito, J. C. Svenning, and S. S. Renner. 2016. Day length unlikely to constrain  
519 climate-driven shifts in leaf-out times of northern woody plants. *Nature Climate Change* 6:1120–1123.
- 520 Zydlowski, G. B., D. S. Stich, and S. D. McCormick. 2014. Photoperiod control of downstream movements  
521 of Atlantic salmon *Salmo salar* smolts. *Journal of Fish Biology* 85:1023–1041.

<sub>522</sub> **Figures**







Figure 1: **Photoperiod varies with latitude and by day of year**, such that temporal shifts in activity yield larger changes in experienced photoperiod compared with spatial shifts. Here, we show this variation at two latitudes ( $22.5^\circ$ ,  $45^\circ$ ), using hypothetical spatial and temporal shifts. These shifts, based on observed rates with recent global warming—6–17 kilometers per decade, or approximately 0.5–1.5 degrees 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)—highlight the greater magnitude in daylength changes close to the equinox (e.g., day of year 91), versus close to the summer solstice (e.g., day of year 182).




**Figure 2: Photoperiod on the “green-up” date varies over space and between years** “Green-up” is the beginning of seasonal greening, identified by satellite remote sensing measurements taken regularly throughout the year of the 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 ‘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: 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). Species and chilling levels with multiple lines represent plant material from different populations.



**Figure 5: Experienced photoperiods in experiments differ from those in the natural world,** shown here by latitude (left panels) and by day of budburst (right panels) for *Fagus sylvatica* (A, upper panels) and *Quercus robur* (B, lower panels). Triangles show experimental treatments of photoperiod in the OSPREE database. To illuminate potential gaps between experiments and the natural world, we show the photoperiod when budburst occurs in its current (1981-2000) and projected ranges (2081-2100, using the A1Fi Phenofit scenario, see Duputié et al., 2015). We scaled the days to budburst for all OSPREE data points by adding the day of budburst from the first Phenofit observation. See Supplemental Materials and Duputié et al. (2015) for additional details.

Accounting for photoperiod to improve forecasts of biological responses to climate change




Figure 6: **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*), 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).