

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

November 25, 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 is publicly archived at KNB, doi:10.5063/F1CZ35KB. (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 woody plant spring phenology in 87% of reviewed studies that manipulated photoperiod—shifts in expe-
6 rienced photoperiod may have important implications for future plant distributions and fitness. However,
7 photoperiod has not been a focus of climate change forecasting to date, especially for early-season ('spring')
8 events, often assumed to be driven by temperature. Synthesizing published studies, we find that impacts on
9 experienced photoperiod from temporal shifts could be orders of magnitude larger than from spatial shifts (1.6
10 hours of change for expected temporal versus one minute for latitudinal shifts). Incorporating these effects
11 into forecasts is possible by leveraging existing experimental data; we show that results from growth chamber
12 experiments on woody plants often have data relevant for climate change impacts, and suggest that shifts
13 in experienced photoperiod may increasingly constrain responses to additional warming. Further, combining
14 modeling approaches and empirical work on when, where, and how much photoperiod affects phenology could
15 rapidly advance our understanding and predictions of future spatio-temporal shifts from climate change.

¹⁶ Introduction

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

²⁵ 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). Even spring phenology, which
²⁸ is highly temperature-sensitive, is thought to be determined interactively by photoperiod and temperature
²⁹ (Fu et al., 2019, see also Box 1). Photoperiod is a useful cue to synchronize activities with seasonal climatic
³⁰ changes (e.g., Singh et al., 2017; Basler and Körner, 2012; Hsu et al., 2011) because it is consistent across
³¹ years, especially compared to other cues such as temperature and precipitation (Saikkonen et al., 2012). For
³² example, relying on a threshold photoperiod (see *Glossary*), rather than temperature alone, may prevent
³³ woody plants from leafing out during ‘false spring’ events (unusually warm periods during winter and early
³⁴ spring that are followed by a return to cold temperatures, Gu et al., 2008).

³⁵ Recent studies suggest that photoperiod cues may eventually restrict phenology in a warmer world. With
³⁶ additional climate change, photoperiod may limit phenological shifts of certain species such that they will
³⁷ not track rising temperatures (Fu et al., 2015; Way and Montgomery, 2015; Basler and Körner, 2012; Körner
³⁸ and Basler, 2010a). The idea of photoperiod constraints is controversial, however, as other studies suggest
³⁹ that photoperiod will not slow responses to warming for most species (Chuine et al., 2010; Zohner et al.,
⁴⁰ 2016). Resolving this debate requires a greater understanding of the extent to which daylength constrains
⁴¹ phenology and how rapidly photoperiod responses can acclimate or adapt to new environmental conditions
⁴² (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 (Huffeldt, 2020; Fu
⁵⁶ et al., 2015; Way 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 forecasts of biological
⁶¹ implications of climate change?

⁶² Our questions are broadly relevant for diverse species and seasonal events. We use a case study of spring
⁶³ woody plant phenology to illustrate several of our points (Boxes 1-2). We focus on spring events, as phenology
⁶⁴ during this time is one of the most widely observed and rapidly changing biological responses to climate change
⁶⁵ (Parmesan, 2006). In addition, the role of photoperiod is less understood in spring phenology compared
⁶⁶ with autumn phenophases (reviewed in, e.g., Azeez and Sane, 2015; Gallinat et al., 2015; Gill et al., 2015;
⁶⁷ Lagercrantz, 2009; Allona et al., 2008), but recent studies showing declines in responses of spring budburst
⁶⁸ to warming (e.g., Fu et al., 2019; Güsewell et al., 2017; Yu et al., 2010) suggest that photoperiod constraints
⁶⁹ may be imminent.

70 How will climate change alter experienced photoperiod for plants?

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). 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. Photoperiod on green-up date varies with latitude (Fig. 2A), in part because latitudinal variation
76 in green-up date, which occurs earlier toward the equator and later toward the poles, is strongly driven by
77 climatic differences that affect phenology, and in part because of latitudinal variation in photoperiod (e.g., at
78 the poles, the daylength at the summer solstice is 24 hours; see also Fig. 1). (See “Quantifying and mapping
79 differences in green-up across the United States and Europe” in the *Supplemental Materials* for additional
80 details of this analysis.)

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

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

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 plants to experience a wider range of daylength throughout the year
94 (Fig. 1), which may pose challenges to organisms undergoing temperature-induced poleward range shifts
95 (Huffeldt, 2020). Elevational shifts, in contrast, cause minimal change to the range of daylength throughout
96 the year.

⁹⁷ To date, most focus on shifts in photoperiod with climate change has been centered on how spatial range
⁹⁸ shifts will affect photoperiod (e.g., Saikkonen et al., 2012; Way and Montgomery, 2015). However, shifting
⁹⁹ phenology—especially the large changes seen in spring phenology—will also alter experienced photoperiod,
¹⁰⁰ because of the seasonal patterns of daylength (Fig. 1).

¹⁰¹ Current data suggest that temporal shifts will yield much larger changes in experienced photoperiod than
¹⁰² latitudinal shifts (Fig. 1). Consider a tree species that bursts its buds at latitude 45° , on average around
¹⁰³ day of year 91 (April 2), when daylength is 12.8 hours. If the species' phenology shifts 30 days earlier over
¹⁰⁴ the next century (i.e., a rate of 3 days per decade, as has been observed, Parmesan and Yohe, 2003), it will
¹⁰⁵ experience a daylength that is 1.6 hours shorter. This 1.6 hour decrease in daylength is equivalent to moving
¹⁰⁶ 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.,
¹⁰⁷ 60 km over the next century, comparable to observed rates, Chen et al., 2011; Parmesan and Yohe, 2003), it
¹⁰⁸ will experience a daylength that differs by less than a minute on the same day of year.

¹⁰⁹ Temporal shifts in temperate areas are likely to yield larger changes in experienced photoperiod for autumn
¹¹⁰ phenology, as well. Consider again the tree species at latitude 45° , which may senescence on day of year
¹¹¹ 300 (October 27), on average (Gill et al., 2015), when daylength is 10.5 hours. If senescence shifts 33 days
¹¹² later over the next century (i.e., a rate of 3.3 days per decade, as has been observed, Gill et al., 2015), it
¹¹³ will experience, at the end of the growing season, a daylength that is 1.3 hours shorter. This is equivalent to
¹¹⁴ moving up 16° in latitude on this day of year.

¹¹⁵ **What are the implications of altered photoperiods for plant re- 116 responses to climate change?**

¹¹⁷ Climate change alters the experienced photoperiod, but the implications of this change for plants are currently
¹¹⁸ unclear, in part, because phenology both affects and is affected by experienced photoperiod: climate change-
¹¹⁹ induced shifts in phenology alter experienced photoperiod, which in turn affects phenology. Daylength,
¹²⁰ often in combination with temperature, can play a role in controlling critical biological functions, including
¹²¹ vegetative growth, cell elongation, budburst, and flowering in plants (Fu et al., 2019; Heide and Sønsteby, 2012;

¹²² Heide, 2011; Hsu et al., 2011; Sidaway-Lee et al., 2010; Mimura and Aitken, 2007; Linkosalo and Lechowicz,
¹²³ 2006; Erwin, 1998; Ashby et al., 1962). Climate change-induced shifts in photoperiod are therefore likely to
¹²⁴ alter these functions.

¹²⁵ Growth chamber studies show that the magnitude of daylength shifts expected with climate change (i.e., 1-2
¹²⁶ hours of difference in daylength with temporal shifts over the next century) are substantial enough to affect
¹²⁷ spring phenology in trees (Table S1). The direction and magnitude of responses will vary, however, because
¹²⁸ of variation in photoperiod sensitivity, and because photoperiod often interacts with other environmental
¹²⁹ drivers, such as temperature, to affect phenology (Box 1).

¹³⁰ The climate change-induced trend toward ever-earlier springs means that experienced photoperiod may in-
¹³¹ creasingly approach threshold photoperiods (see *Glossary*) for many species, constraining their ability to
¹³² respond to additional warming (Fu et al., 2019; Vitasse and Basler, 2013; Körner and Basler, 2010a; Morin
¹³³ et al., 2010; Nienstaedt, 1966). Interactions between photoperiod and temperature may therefore result in
¹³⁴ muted phenological shifts, compared to what would be expected based on temperature change alone (Körner
¹³⁵ and Basler, 2010a; Mimura and Aitken, 2007; Wareing, 1956). This has been a topic of much interest in
¹³⁶ the climate change literature because it predicts that as photoperiod becomes limiting, the average trend of
¹³⁷ earlier spring phenology with warming (Polgar et al., 2013; Peñuelas et al., 2002; Menzel, 2000) may stop.

¹³⁸ A challenge in predicting if or when the trend of earlier phenology with warming may slow or stop abruptly
¹³⁹ is the wide range of observed photoperiod sensitivity (see *Glossary*) across species (Flynn and Wolkovich,
¹⁴⁰ 2018; Zohner et al., 2016; Sanz-Perez et al., 2009), latitudes (Ettinger et al., 2020; Partanen et al., 2005;
¹⁴¹ Johnsen and Seiler, 1996), populations (Gauzere et al., 2017; Saikkonen et al., 2012; Caffarra et al., 2011b;
¹⁴² Bradshaw and Holzapfel, 2007; Viherä-Aarnio et al., 2006), and ecotypes (Howe et al., 1995). How much
¹⁴³ genotype versus environment explain this variation is an active area of research (e.g., Fréjaville et al., 2019;
¹⁴⁴ Franks et al., 2014; Gould et al., 2010; Mimura and Aitken, 2010). Environmental conditions clearly play
¹⁴⁵ a role: different combinations of ambient temperature and photoperiod may explain some of this variation,
¹⁴⁶ and temperature cues can override photoperiod requirements under certain conditions (e.g., Tanino et al.,
¹⁴⁷ 2010). In such cases, future climate change-induced phenological shifts may occur at different rates than
¹⁴⁸ past shifts with warming. On the other hand, some of this variation may be due to underlying genetic
¹⁴⁹ differences driven by local adaptation, because photoperiod responses can be under strong genetic control

150 (Bradshaw and Stettler, 1995; Keller et al., 2011; Weih, 2004, see also Boxes 1, 2). Teasing out the relative
151 roles of genetics versus environmental conditions will be critical to accurate forecasts of future phenology
152 under climate change (Pau et al., 2011).

153 Species- and population-level variation in photoperiod sensitivity may scale up to alter communities as climate
154 change progresses. For example, a species or population that is relatively insensitive to photoperiod can
155 take advantage of warmer springs by having an earlier start to its growing season. Indeed, phenological
156 tracking of temperature (e.g., earlier flowering, leafout or migration with warming) has been linked with
157 higher performance in plants and animals (Cleland et al., 2012; Muir et al., 1994; Willis et al., 2010). Species
158 or populations that are sensitive to temperature but relatively insensitive to photoperiod may therefore
159 outcompete slower-growing or later-emerging ones that are limited by photoperiod and thus cannot take
160 advantage of longer growing season conditions. Not all studies, however, find links between performance and
161 high sensitivity to temperature (e.g., Block et al., 2020), and early-season species in most temperate zones risk
162 losing tissue to frost (Sakai and Larcher, 1987). Thus, the advantages of tracking warming may depend on how
163 quickly mean temperatures versus last frost dates shift (e.g., Inouye et al., 2002), such that in some systems
164 photoperiod cues could prevent species from starting growth or reproduction too early (when they risk losing
165 their investments in new tissue). To identify where, when, and how communities may be altered therefore
166 requires quantifying species-specific temperature and photoperiod sensitivities, and developing methods that
167 incorporate both photoperiod and environmental events that impact fitness (such as frosts).

168 Future directions: outstanding questions and incorporating photoperiod into forecasting

170 The complexity of photoperiod effects on phenology and how warming alters experienced photoperiod high-
171 lights that future rates of phenological shifts are unlikely to be straightforward extrapolations from past and
172 current rates. Statistical and process-based models—the two broad categories of forecasting approaches—
173 both acknowledge this difficulty, but differ importantly in how they relate phenology to climate change.
174 Statistical models relating phenology to climate change typically assume linear relationships between species'
175 responses and environmental variables (e.g., Flynn and Wolkovich, 2018; Ibáñez et al., 2010), whereas

176 process-based models often incorporate nonlinear threshold relationships (e.g. Chuine and Beaubien, 2001;
177 Morin and Thuiller, 2009). Further, statistical models of phenology under climate change frequently ignore
178 photoperiod, focusing instead on seasonal or annual temperature (e.g. Diez et al., 2012; Ibáñez et al., 2010,
179 but see Richardson et al. (2013)), whereas process-based models of phenology more frequently incorporate
180 photoperiod, along with temperature (Lundell et al., 2020; Duputié et al., 2015; Zhao et al., 2013; Morin
181 and Thuiller, 2009). Process-based models may thus seem superior for integrating photoperiod, but they
182 can be challenging to develop, requiring detailed data that are often not readily available (e.g., daily climate
183 data, nonlinear biological responses to fine-scale changes in temperature). Perhaps because of this, statistical
184 models remain more commonly used in climate change forecasts of biological responses (e.g., García-Valdés
185 and Morales-Castilla, 2016; Basler and Körner, 2012; Diez et al., 2012; Zhu et al., 2012; Ibáñez et al., 2010).

186 Future modelling of spring plant phenology can incorporate photoperiod by leveraging the large amount of
187 experimental data on photoperiod responses (e.g., for woody plants, see Fig. 3, Table S1, Box 1), especially
188 when process-based approaches are used. Researchers can use these data to first learn whether the study
189 species (or a phylogenetically closely related species) shows a photoperiod effect and, ideally, identify its
190 threshold photoperiod and how it varies by population, ecotype, or other factors (Tobin et al., 2008; Bradshaw
191 and Holzapfel, 2006). If there is evidence of a photoperiod response (e.g., *Fagus grandifolia*, or *Tilia americana*
192 with low chilling, shown in Box 1), daylength should be added to forecasting models, using the threshold
193 photoperiod to define short-day and long-day conditions (Fig. 4). Given the large change in experienced
194 photoperiod with temporal shifts (Fig. 1), this may be particularly important for phenological forecasting.
195 Since spatial shifts are associated with smaller changes in experienced photoperiod, it may be less important
196 for distribution forecasts. Many species, however, may shift in *both* space and time simultaneously. Thus,
197 even though experienced photoperiod changes little as species distributions shift in space, phenology may be
198 altered significantly if the newly expanded portions of the range contain novel environmental conditions (e.g.,
199 Martin et al., 2014).

200 For some species, experimental data can be immediately used in forecasting because experiments manipulate
201 photoperiod at relevant scales (e.g., Heide and Sonsteby, 2015; Basler and Körner, 2014, Fig. 3, Box 1,
202 Table S1). For example, photoperiod treatments from growth chamber experiments with *Fagus sylvatica*
203 span the variation in both current and expected future ranges (Box 1, Duputié et al., 2015), and may allow

identification of threshold photoperiods (Fig. 4). In other cases, attempting to incorporate photoperiod into forecasts of future phenology will reveal gaps in our understanding of many aspects of photoperiod responses. For example, photoperiod treatments from existing experiments of *Quercus robur* do not accurately represent experienced photoperiods from current or future estimates (Box 1), making fine-scale projections difficult, even for this relatively well-studied species. This gap extends to many species, as most experiments manipulate photoperiod much more dramatically than will occur with climate change (Figs. 3, Box 1). Although these studies can be useful for a mechanistic understanding of photoperiod responses, extrapolating them to climate change models may not be reasonable.

Photoperiod is not fully integrated into most forecasts of biological responses to climate change (but see Tobin et al., 2008, for an example in insects); this omission could affect forecast accuracy. Photoperiod is incorporated into some ecosystem models (e.g., the Ecosystem Demography model Jolly et al., 2005; Medvigy et al., 2013) used for forecasting but not others (e.g., Richardson et al., 2012), and is rarely included in species distribution models (e.g., Morin and Thuiller, 2009; Zhu et al., 2012). The sensitivity of model outcomes to assumptions made about experienced photoperiod and threshold responses to photoperiod needs further study, including understanding how variation in photoperiod responses across ecosystems, species, populations, and life stages impacts forecasts. We have focused here on spring phenology, but future work could also address the sensitivity of model outcomes to shifts in experienced photoperiod at the end of the growing season (e.g., leaf senescence and onset of dormancy). Autumn photoperiod affects photosynthesis, growth, and budset in woody plant species, and photoperiod-induced declines in photosynthetic capacity may constrain carbon sequestration even if warming prolongs leaf senescence (Howe et al., 1996; Bauerle et al., 2012; Stinziano and Way, 2017)

As researchers more fully integrate experienced photoperiod into forecasting, a critical area of further study is understanding *how* photoperiod acts as a cue. Photoperiod seems to interact with temperature to affect phenology (e.g., Zydlewski et al., 2014); this would explain the divergent effects of photoperiod observed across studies in woody plants (Box 1). However, exactly how it interacts with temperature is not well-defined for most taxa. For many species, additional experimental and physiological research is necessary, since the dormancy-breaking processes that photoperiod affect require detailed physiological approaches to observe. Though the main ecophysiological processes involved in regulating phenology of woody plants are

²³² relatively well-documented, a mechanistic understanding of the physiological, molecular, and genetic bases
²³³ of dormancy is lacking (Box 2 Hänninen et al., 2019; Chuine et al., 2016). In addition, photoperiod and
²³⁴ temperature cues can differentially affect the phenology of distinct physiological processes in woody species,
²³⁵ decoupling, for example, responses of growth or leaf development and carbon uptake to warming (Stinziano
²³⁶ and Way, 2017; Bauerle et al., 2012). Accounting for ecophysiological effects of photoperiod can result in
²³⁷ quantifiable declines on modeled global gross primary production (Bauerle et al., 2012), suggesting that
²³⁸ temporal and spatial shifts in experienced photoperiod with climate change may also alter global model
²³⁹ estimates.

²⁴⁰ Understanding the drivers, as well as the consequences, of variation in photoperiod responses within and
²⁴¹ across individuals, populations, and species will be critical for forecasting. For example, what traits are
²⁴² associated with photoperiod sensitivity and does variation in photoperiod sensitivity or related traits have a
²⁴³ strong genetic component? If so, are species or populations from some locations or lineages more likely than
²⁴⁴ others to be constrained by photoperiod in their responses to climate change? What are the implications of
²⁴⁵ variations in photoperiod constraints for carbon sequestration under climate change at a global scale?

²⁴⁶ Conclusions

²⁴⁷ Organisms may undergo large changes to the photoperiod they experience with climate change, even if they
²⁴⁸ do not shift their ranges spatially. Here we have highlighted that these altered photoperiods may result in
²⁴⁹ stalled future advances of spring phenology with warming (e.g., Table S1, Fu et al., 2019; Güsewell et al.,
²⁵⁰ 2017; Yu et al., 2010), with cascading effects on growth, fitness, and community composition due to the
²⁵¹ large variation in photoperiod responses across species and populations (Box 1). We have focused on woody
²⁵² plant spring phenology, but shifts in photoperiod with climate change have implications for a variety of plant
²⁵³ and animal responses, as daylength affects critical activities for diverse species from insects (Bradshaw and
²⁵⁴ Holzapfel, 2006) and salmon (Taranger et al., 2003) to birds (Dawson et al., 2001) and marsupials (McAllan
²⁵⁵ et al., 2006). Given what we know, incorporating photoperiod into forecasting of climate change responses
²⁵⁶ should improve model accuracy (Fig. 4), and will illuminate additional experiments that could improve our
²⁵⁷ mechanistic understanding of photoperiod as a critical cue for diverse biological responses.

258 Glossary

- 259 ● budburst: one or more leaf buds has visible green tips.
- 260 ● chilling: the intensity and duration of winter temperature, often a certain sum of chilling that is required
261 (e.g., some amount of hours or days of cold temperatures, defined by a specific critical temperature or
262 range of temperatures, such as between 0 and 7.2 °C, Richardson, 1974), that must be experienced for
263 budburst to occur.
- 264 ● daylength: the period of time during a 24-hour period during which an organism receives light.
- 265 ● dormancy: halted or reduced growth or activity.
- 266 ● forcing: warm spring temperatures, often a certain sum of forcing that is required (e.g., some amount
267 of hours or days above a specific temperature) before budburst or flowering can occur.
- 268 ● green-up: the beginning of a new cycle of plant growth, usually evaluated at the landscape scale.
- 269 ● phenology: the timing of life cycle events in organisms.
- 270 ● photoperiod: the daily duration of light (daylength) and dark to which an organism is exposed; often
271 used synonymously with daylength.
- 272 ● photoperiod sensitivity: the degree to which phenology is controlled by daylength; may be a nonlinear,
273 or ‘threshold’, response in plants (Box 2).
- 274 ● photoperiodism: the ability of an organism to assess or respond to length of day or night in its behavior,
275 physiology, growth, development, or reproduction.
- 276 ● threshold photoperiod: length of day that causes an organism to switch from a short- to a long-day
277 response (or vice versa). For example, in European larch (*Larix decidua*), budburst development may
278 be constrained under short-day conditions, when daylengths are less than a threshold photoperiod of
279 10-11 hours (Migliavacca et al., 2008). Above this threshold photoperiod, the long-day response of
280 unconstrained budburst development can occur.

²⁸¹ **Acknowledgements**

²⁸² We thank the many researchers who conducted the experiments synthesized in this manuscript; H. Kharouba
²⁸³ for helpful comments that improved the manuscript; B. Feist for improving the appearance of Fig. 3 dramati-
²⁸⁴ cally; and A. Duputié and I. Chuine for sharing projections from PhenoFit. The National Science Foundation
²⁸⁵ (DBI 14-01854 to AKE), NSERC Discovery Award (RGPIN-05038 to EMW) and Canada Research Chair
²⁸⁶ in Temporal Ecology (EMW) provided funding. Any opinion, findings, and conclusions or recommendations
²⁸⁷ expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National
²⁸⁸ Science Foundation or the Nature Conservancy.

²⁸⁹ **References**

- ²⁹⁰ Allona, I., A. Ramos, C. Ibáñez, A. Contreras, R. Casado, and C. Aragoncillo. 2008. Molecular control of
²⁹¹ winter dormancy establishment in trees: a review. Spanish Journal of Agricultural Research **6**:201–210.
- ²⁹² Andrés, F., and G. Coupland. 2012. The genetic basis of flowering responses to seasonal cues. Nature reviews.
²⁹³ Genetics **13**:627.
- ²⁹⁴ Ashby, W., et al. 1962. Germination capacity in American Basswood *Tilia americana*. Transactions of the
²⁹⁵ Illinois State Academy of Science **55**:120–3.
- ²⁹⁶ Azeez, A., and A. P. Sane. 2015. Photoperiodic growth control in perennial trees. Plant signaling & behavior
²⁹⁷ **10**:e1087631.
- ²⁹⁸ Basler, D., and C. Körner. 2012. Photoperiod sensitivity of bud burst in 14 temperate forest tree species.
²⁹⁹ Agricultural and Forest Meteorology **165**:73–81.
- ³⁰⁰ Basler, D., and C. Körner. 2014. Photoperiod and temperature responses of bud swelling and bud burst in
³⁰¹ four temperate forest tree species. Tree Physiology **34**:377–388.
- ³⁰² Bastow, R., and C. Dean. 2002. The molecular basis of photoperiodism. Developmental cell **3**:461–462.
- ³⁰³ Bauerle, W. L., R. Oren, D. A. Way, S. S. Qian, P. C. Stoy, P. E. Thornton, J. D. Bowden, F. M. Hoffman,

- 304 and R. F. Reynolds. 2012. Photoperiodic regulation of the seasonal pattern of photosynthetic capacity and
305 the implications for carbon cycling. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **109**:8612–8617.
- 306 Block, S., J. Alexander, and J. M. Levine. 2020. Phenological plasticity is a poor predictor of subalpine plant
307 population performance following experimental climate change. *Oikos* **129**:184–193.
- 308 Bradley, N. L., A. C. Leopold, J. Ross, and W. Huffaker. 1999. Phenological changes reflect climate change
309 in Wisconsin. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **96**:9701–9704.
- 310 Bradshaw, H., and R. F. Stettler. 1995. Molecular genetics of growth and development in *Populus*. IV.
311 Mapping QTLs with large effects on growth, form, and phenology traits in a forest tree. *Genetics* **139**:963–
312 973.
- 313 Bradshaw, W. E., and C. M. Holzapfel. 2006. Evolutionary response to rapid climate change. *Science*
314 **312**:1477–1478.
- 315 Bradshaw, W. E., and C. M. Holzapfel. 2007. Evolution of animal photoperiodism. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol.
316 Syst.* **38**:1–25.
- 317 Bünning, E. 1936. Endogenous daily rhythms as the basis of photoperiodism. *Ber Deut Bot Ges* **54**:590–607.
- 318 Burghardt, L. T., C. J. E. Metcalf, A. M. Wilczek, J. Schmitt, and K. Donohue. 2015. Modeling the
319 Influence of Genetic and Environmental Variation on the Expression of Plant Life Cycles across Landscapes.
320 *American Naturalist* **185**:212–227.
- 321 Caffarra, A., and A. Donnelly. 2011. The ecological significance of phenology in four different tree species:
322 effects of light and temperature on bud burst. *International Journal of Biometeorology* **55**:711–721.
- 323 Caffarra, A., A. Donnelly, and I. Chuine. 2011a. Modelling the timing of *Betula pubescens* budburst. II.
324 Integrating complex effects of photoperiod into process-based models. *Climate Research* **46**:159–170.
- 325 Caffarra, A., A. Donnelly, I. Chuine, and M. B. Jones. 2011b. Modelling the timing of *Betula pubescens*
326 bud-burst. I. Temperature and photoperiod: A conceptual model. *Climate Research* **46**:147.
- 327 Campbell, R. K., and A. I. Sugano. 1975. Phenology of bud burst in Douglas-fir related to provenance,
328 photoperiod, chilling, and flushing temperature. *Botanical Gazette* pages 290–298.

- 329 Chen, I.-C., J. K. Hill, R. Ohlemüller, D. B. Roy, and C. D. Thomas. 2011. Rapid Range Shifts of Species
330 Associated with High Levels of Climate Warming. *Science* **333**:1024–1026.
- 331 Chuine, I., and E. G. Beaubien. 2001. Phenology is a major determinant of tree species range. *Ecology*
332 Letters **4**:500–510.
- 333 Chuine, I., M. Bonhomme, J.-M. Legave, I. García de Cortázar-Atauri, G. Charrier, A. Lacointe, and
334 T. Améglio. 2016. Can phenological models predict tree phenology accurately in the future? The un-
335 revealed hurdle of endodormancy break. *Global Change Biology* **22**:3444–3460.
- 336 Chuine, I., X. Morin, and H. Bugmann. 2010. Warming, photoperiods, and tree phenology. *Science* **329**:277–
337 278.
- 338 Cleland, E. E., J. M. Allen, T. M. Crimmins, J. A. Dunne, S. Pau, S. E. Travers, E. S. Zavaleta, and E. M.
339 Wolkovich. 2012. Phenological tracking enables positive species responses to climate change. *Ecology*
340 **93**:1765–1771.
- 341 Davis, S. J. 2002. Photoperiodism: the coincidental perception of the season. *Current Biology* **12**:R841–R843.
- 342 Dawson, A., V. M. King, G. E. Bentley, and G. F. Ball. 2001. Photoperiodic control of seasonality in birds.
343 *Journal of Biological Rhythms* **16**:365–380.
- 344 Diez, J. M., I. Ibáñez, A. J. Miller-Rushing, S. J. Mazer, T. M. Crimmins, M. A. Crimmins, C. D. Bertelsen,
345 and D. W. Inouye. 2012. Forecasting phenology: from species variability to community patterns. *Ecology*
346 Letters **15**:545–553.
- 347 Ding, J., and O. Nilsson. 2016. Molecular regulation of phenology in trees—because the seasons they are
348 a-changin. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology* **29**:73–79.
- 349 Duputié, A., A. Rutschmann, O. Ronce, and I. Chuine. 2015. Phenological plasticity will not help all species
350 adapt to climate change. *Global Change Biology* **21**:3062–3073.
- 351 Erwin, J. E. 1998. Temperature and light effects on stem elongation. *Journal of the Japanese Society for*
352 *Horticultural Science* **67**:1113–1120.

- 353 Ettinger, A., C. Chamberlain, I. Morales-Castilla, D. Buonaiuto, D. Flynn, T. Savas, J. Samaha, and
354 E. Wolkovich. 2020. Winter temperatures predominate in spring phenological responses to warming.
355 Nature Climate Change pages 1–6.
- 356 Falusi, M., and R. Calamassi. 1990. Bud dormancy in beech (*Fagus sylvatica* L.). Effect of chilling and
357 photoperiod on dormancy release of beech seedlings. Tree Physiology **6**:429–438.
- 358 Fishman, S., A. Erez, and G. Couvillon. 1987. The temperature dependence of dormancy breaking in plants:
359 mathematical analysis of a two-step model involving a cooperative transition. Journal of Theoretical
360 Biology **124**:473–483.
- 361 Flynn, D. F. B., and E. M. Wolkovich. 2018. Temperature and photoperiod drive spring phenology across
362 all species in a temperate forest community. New Phytologist **219**:1353–1362.
- 363 Fournier-Level, A., E. O. Perry, J. A. Wang, P. T. Braun, A. Migneault, M. D. Cooper, C. J. E. Metcalf,
364 and J. Schmitt. 2016. Predicting the evolutionary dynamics of seasonal adaptation to novel climates in
365 *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America
366 **113**:E2812–E2821.
- 367 Franks, S. J., J. J. Weber, and S. N. Aitken. 2014. Evolutionary and plastic responses to climate change in
368 terrestrial plant populations. Evolutionary Applications **7**:123–139.
- 369 Fréjaville, T., B. Fady, A. Kremer, A. Ducouso, and M. Benito Garzón. 2019. Inferring phenotypic plasticity
370 and population responses to climate across tree species ranges using forest inventory data. Global Ecology
371 and Biogeography **28**:1259–1271.
- 372 Fu, Y. H., S. Piao, X. Zhou, X. Geng, F. Hao, Y. Vitasse, and I. A. Janssens. 2019. Short photoperiod
373 reduces the temperature sensitivity of leaf-out in saplings of *Fagus sylvatica* but not in horse chestnut.
374 Global Change Biology **25**:1696–1703.
- 375 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,
376 J. P. Uelas, Y. Song, Y. Vitasse, Z. Z. Zeng, and I. A. Janssens. 2015. Declining global warming effects on
377 the phenology of spring leaf unfolding. Nature **526**:104–107.

- 378 Gallinat, A. S., R. B. Primack, and D. L. Wagner. 2015. Autumn, the neglected season in climate change
379 research. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **30**:169–176.
- 380 García-Valdés, R., and I. Morales-Castilla. 2016. Efectos del cambio climático en los ecosistemas forestales:
381 integrando inventarios y modelos. *Ecosistemas* **25**:51–59.
- 382 Gauzere, J., S. Delzon, H. Davi, M. Bonhomme, I. G. de Cortazar-Atauri, and I. Chuine. 2017. Integrating
383 interactive effects of chilling and photoperiod in phenological process-based models. A case study with
384 two European tree species: *Fagus sylvatica* and *Quercus petraea*. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*
385 **244**:9–20.
- 386 Gill, A. L., A. S. Gallinat, R. Sanders-DeMott, A. J. Rigden, D. J. Short Gianotti, J. A. Mantooth, and P. H.
387 Templer. 2015. Changes in autumn senescence in northern hemisphere deciduous trees: a meta-analysis of
388 autumn phenology studies. *Annals of botany* **116**:875–888.
- 389 Glover, B. 2014. Understanding flowers and flowering, Second edition. OUP Oxford.
- 390 Gould, P. J., C. A. Harrington, and J. B. St. Clair. 2010. Incorporating genetic variation into a model
391 of budburst phenology of coast Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii* var. *menziesii*). *Canadian Journal of*
392 *Forest Research* **41**:139–150.
- 393 Grevstad, F. S., and L. B. Coop. 2015. The consequences of photoperiodism for organisms in new climates.
394 *Ecological Applications* **25**:1506–1517.
- 395 Gu, L., P. J. Hanson, W. M. Post, D. P. Kaiser, B. Yang, R. Nemani, S. G. Pallardy, and T. Meyers. 2008.
396 The 2007 Eastern US spring freeze: Increased cold damage in a warming world. *BioScience* **58**:253.
- 397 Güsewell, S., R. Furrer, R. Gehrig, and B. Pietragalla. 2017. Changes in temperature sensitivity of spring
398 phenology with recent climate warming in Switzerland are related to shifts of the preseason. *Global Change*
399 *Biology* **23**:5189–5202.
- 400 Hänninen, H., K. Kramer, K. Tanino, R. Zhang, J. Wu, and Y. H. Fu. 2019. Experiments are necessary in
401 process-based tree phenology modelling. *Trends in Plant Science* **24**:199–209.
- 402 Harsch, M. A., P. E. Hulme, M. S. McGlone, and R. P. Duncan. 2009. Are treelines advancing? A global
403 meta-analysis of treeline response to climate warming. *Ecology Letters* **12**:1040–1049.

- 404 Hawkins, C. D., and A. Dhar. 2012. Spring bud phenology of 18 *Betula papyrifera* populations in British
405 Columbia. Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research **27**:507–519.
- 406 Heide, O. 1993a. Daylength and thermal time responses of budburst during dormancy release in some
407 northern deciduous trees. *Physiologia Plantarum* **88**:531–540.
- 408 Heide, O. 1993b. Dormancy release in beech buds (*Fagus sylvatica*) requires both chilling and long days.
409 *Physiologia Plantarum* **89**:187–191.
- 410 Heide, O. M. 1977. Photoperiod and temperature interactions in growth and flowering of strawberry.
411 *Physiologia Plantarum* **40**:21–26.
- 412 Heide, O. M. 2008. Interaction of photoperiod and temperature in the control of growth and dormancy of
413 *Prunus* species. *Scientia Horticulturae* **115**:309–314.
- 414 Heide, O. M. 2011. Temperature rather than photoperiod controls growth cessation and dormancy in *Sorbus*
415 species. *Journal of Experimental Botany* **62**:5397–5404.
- 416 Heide, O. M., and A. Sønsteby. 2012. Floral initiation in black currant cultivars (*Ribes nigrum* L.): Effects of
417 plant size, photoperiod, temperature, and duration of short day exposure. *Scientia Horticulturae* **138**:64–
418 72.
- 419 Heide, O. M., and A. Sonsteby. 2015. Simultaneous dormancy induction interferes with short day floral
420 induction in black currant (*Ribes nigrum* L.). *Scientia Horticulturae* **185**:228–232.
- 421 Howe, G. T., G. Gardner, W. P. Hackett, and G. R. Furnier. 1996. Phytochrome control of short-day-induced
422 bud set in black cottonwood. *Physiologia Plantarum* **97**:95–103.
- 423 Howe, G. T., W. P. Hackett, G. R. Furnier, and R. E. Klevorn. 1995. Photoperiodic responses of a northern
424 and southern ecotype of black cottonwood. *Physiologia Plantarum* **93**:695–708.
- 425 Hsu, C.-Y., J. P. Adams, H. Kim, K. No, C. Ma, S. H. Strauss, J. Drnevich, L. Vandervelde, J. D. Ellis,
426 B. M. Rice, et al. 2011. FLOWERING LOCUS T duplication coordinates reproductive and vegetative
427 growth in perennial poplar. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **108**:10756–10761.
- 428 Huffeldt, N. P. 2020. Photic Barriers to Poleward Range-shifts. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* .

- 429 Ibáñez, I., R. B. Primack, A. J. Miller-Rushing, E. Ellwood, H. Higuchi, S. D. Lee, H. Kobori, and J. A.
430 Silander. 2010. Forecasting phenology under global warming. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal
431 Society B-Biological Sciences **365**.
- 432 Inouye, D. W., M. A. Morales, and G. J. Dodge. 2002. Variation in timing and abundance of flowering by
433 *Delphinium barbeyi* Huth (Ranunculaceae): the roles of snowpack, frost, and La Niña, in the context of
434 climate change. Oecologia **130**:543–550.
- 435 Johnsen, K. H., and J. R. Seiler. 1996. Growth, shoot phenology and physiology of diverse seed sources
436 of black spruce: I. Seedling responses to varied atmospheric CO₂ concentrations and photoperiods. Tree
437 Physiology **16**:367–373.
- 438 Jolly, W. M., R. Nemani, and S. W. Running. 2005. A generalized, bioclimatic index to predict foliar
439 phenology in response to climate. Global Change Biology **11**:619–632.
- 440 Keller, S. R., R. Y. Soolanayakanahally, R. D. Guy, S. N. Silim, M. S. Olson, and P. Tiffin. 2011. Climate-
441 driven local adaptation of ecophysiology and phenology in balsam poplar, *Populus balsamifera* L. (Salicaceae). American Journal of Botany **98**:99–108.
- 443 Kobayashi, Y., and D. Weigel. 2007. Move on up, it's time for change—mobile signals controlling photoperiod-
444 dependent flowering. Genes & Development **21**:2371–2384.
- 445 Körner, C., and D. Basler. 2010a. Phenology Under Global Warming. Science **327**:1461–1462.
- 446 Körner, C., and D. Basler. 2010b. Warming, Photoperiods, and Tree Phenology Response. Science **329**:278–
447 278.
- 448 Lagercrantz, U. 2009. At the end of the day: a common molecular mechanism for photoperiod responses in
449 plants? Journal of Experimental Botany **60**:2501–2515.
- 450 Laube, J., T. H. Sparks, N. Estrella, J. Höfler, D. P. Ankerst, and A. Menzel. 2014. Chilling outweighs
451 photoperiod in preventing precocious spring development. Global Change Biology **20**:170–182.
- 452 Linkosalo, T., and M. J. Lechowicz. 2006. Twilight far-red treatment advances leaf bud burst of silver birch
453 (*Betula pendula*). Tree Physiology **26**:1249–1256.

- 454 Lundell, R., H. Hänninen, T. Saarinen, H. Åström, and R. Zhang. 2020. Beyond rest and quiescence
455 (endodormancy and ecodormancy): A novel model for quantifying plant–environment interaction in bud
456 dormancy release. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **43**:40–54.
- 457 Malyshev, A. V., H. A. Henry, A. Bolte, M. A. A. Khan, and J. Kreyling. 2018. Temporal photoperiod
458 sensitivity and forcing requirements for budburst in temperate tree seedlings. *Agricultural and Forest
459 Meteorology* **248**:82–90.
- 460 Martin, R. O., L. Sebele, A. Koeslag, O. Curtis, F. Abadi, and A. Amar. 2014. Phenological shifts assist
461 colonisation of a novel environment in a range-expanding raptor. *Oikos* **123**:1457–1468.
- 462 McCallan, B. M., C. R. Dickman, and M. S. Crowther. 2006. Photoperiod as a reproductive cue in the
463 marsupial genus *Antechinus*: ecological and evolutionary consequences. *Biological Journal of the Linnean
464 Society* **87**:365–379.
- 465 Medvigy, D., S.-J. Jeong, K. L. Clark, N. S. Skowronski, and K. V. Schäfer. 2013. Effects of seasonal variation
466 of photosynthetic capacity on the carbon fluxes of a temperate deciduous forest. *Journal of Geophysical
467 Research: Biogeosciences* **118**:1703–1714.
- 468 Menzel, A. 2000. Trends in phenological phases in Europe between 1951 and 1996. *International Journal of
469 Biometeorology* **44**:76–81.
- 470 Menzel, A., T. H. Sparks, N. Estrella, E. Koch, A. Aasa, R. Ahas, K. Alm-Kuebler, et al. 2006. European
471 phenological response to climate change matches the warming pattern. *Global Change Biology* **12**:1969–
472 1976.
- 473 Migliavacca, M., E. Cremonese, R. Colombo, L. Busetto, M. Galvagno, L. Ganis, M. Meroni, E. Pari,
474 M. Rossini, C. Siniscalco, et al. 2008. European larch phenology in the Alps: can we grasp the role
475 of ecological factors by combining field observations and inverse modelling? *International Journal of
476 Biometeorology* **52**:587–605.
- 477 Mimura, M., and S. Aitken. 2007. Adaptive gradients and isolation-by-distance with postglacial migration
478 in *Picea sitchensis*. *Heredity* **99**:224.

- 479 Mimura, M., and S. Aitken. 2010. Local adaptation at the range peripheries of Sitka spruce. *Journal of*
480 *Evolutionary Biology* **23**:249–258.
- 481 Morin, X., J. Roy, L. Sonié, and I. Chuine. 2010. Changes in leaf phenology of three European oak species
482 in response to experimental climate change. *New Phytologist* **186**:900–910.
- 483 Morin, X., and W. Thuiller. 2009. Comparing niche-and process-based models to reduce prediction uncer-
484 tainty in species range shifts under climate change. *Ecology* **90**:1301–1313.
- 485 Muir, W. D., W. S. Zaugg, A. E. Giorgi, and S. McCutcheon. 1994. Accelerating smolt development and
486 downstream movement in yearling chinook salmon with advanced photoperiod and increased temperature.
487 *Aquaculture* **123**:387–399.
- 488 Myking, T., and O. Heide. 1995. Dormancy release and chilling requirement of buds of latitudinal ecotypes
489 of *Betula pendula* and *B. pubescens*. *Tree Physiology* **15**:697–704.
- 490 Nienstaedt, H. 1966. Dormancy and dormancy release in white spruce. *Forest Science* **12**:374–384.
- 491 Parmesan, C. 2006. Ecological and evolutionary responses to recent climate change. *Annual Review of*
492 *Ecology Evolution and Systematics* **37**:637–669.
- 493 Parmesan, C., and G. Yohe. 2003. A globally coherent fingerprint of climate change impacts across natural
494 systems. *Nature* **421**:37.
- 495 Partanen, J., H. Hänninen, and R. Häkkinen. 2005. Bud burst in Norway spruce (*Picea abies*): preliminary
496 evidence for age-specific rest patterns. *Trees* **19**:66–72.
- 497 Pau, S., E. M. Wolkovich, B. I. Cook, T. J. Davies, N. J. Kraft, K. Bolmgren, J. L. Betancourt, and E. E.
498 Cleland. 2011. Predicting phenology by integrating ecology, evolution and climate science. *Global Change*
499 *Biology* **17**:3633–3643.
- 500 Peñuelas, J., and M. Boada. 2003. A global change-induced biome shift in the Montseny mountains (NE
501 Spain). *Global Change Biology* **9**:131–140.
- 502 Peñuelas, J., I. Filella, and P. Comas. 2002. Changed plant and animal life cycles from 1952 to 2000 in the
503 Mediterranean region. *Global Change Biology* **8**:531–544.

- 504 Petterle, A., A. Karlberg, and R. P. Bhalerao. 2013. Daylength mediated control of seasonal growth patterns
505 in perennial trees. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology* **16**:301–306.
- 506 Polgar, C. A., R. B. Primack, E. H. Williams, S. Stichter, and C. Hitchcock. 2013. Climate effects on the
507 flight period of Lycaenid butterflies in Massachusetts. *Biological Conservation* **160**:25–31.
- 508 Poloczanska, E. S., C. J. Brown, W. J. Sydeman, W. Kiessling, D. S. Schoeman, P. J. Moore, K. Brander,
509 J. F. Bruno, L. B. Buckley, M. T. Burrows, et al. 2013. Global imprint of climate change on marine life.
510 *Nature Climate Change* **3**:919.
- 511 Richardson, A. D., R. S. Anderson, M. A. Arain, A. G. Barr, G. Bohrer, G. Chen, J. M. Chen, P. Ciais,
512 K. J. Davis, A. R. Desai, et al. 2012. Terrestrial biosphere models need better representation of vegetation
513 phenology: results from the North American Carbon Program Site Synthesis. *Global Change Biology*
514 **18**:566–584.
- 515 Richardson, A. D., T. F. Keenan, M. Migliavacca, Y. Ryu, O. Sonnentag, and M. Toomey. 2013. Climate
516 change, phenology, and phenological control of vegetation feedbacks to the climate system. *Agricultural
517 and Forest Meteorology* **169**:156–173.
- 518 Richardson, E. 1974. A model for estimating the completion of rest for ‘Redhaven’ and ‘Elberta’ peach trees.
519 *HortScience* **9**:331–332.
- 520 Root, T. L., J. T. Price, K. R. Hall, S. H. Schneider, C. Rosenzweig, and J. A. Pounds. 2003. Fingerprints
521 of global warming on wild animals and plants. *Nature* **421**:57–60.
- 522 Saikkonen, K., K. Taulavuori, T. Hyvönen, P. E. Gundel, C. E. Hamilton, I. Vänninen, A. Nissinen, and
523 M. Helander. 2012. Climate change-driven species’ range shifts filtered by photoperiodism. *Nature Climate
524 Change* **2**:239.
- 525 Sakai, A. K., and W. Larcher. 1987. Frost Survival of Plants. Ecological Studies, Springer-Verlag.
- 526 Sanz-Perez, V., P. Castro-Diez, and F. Valladares. 2009. Differential and interactive effects of temperature
527 and photoperiod on budburst and carbon reserves in two co-occurring Mediterranean oaks. *Plant Biology*
528 **11**:142–51.

- 529 Sidaway-Lee, K., E.-M. Josse, A. Brown, Y. Gan, K. J. Halliday, I. A. Graham, and S. Penfield. 2010.
530 SPATULA links daytime temperature and plant growth rate. *Current Biology* **20**:1493–1497.
- 531 Singh, R. K., T. Svystun, B. AlDahmash, A. M. Jönsson, and R. P. Bhalerao. 2017. Photoperiod-and
532 temperature-mediated control of phenology in trees—a molecular perspective. *New Phytologist* **213**:511–
533 524.
- 534 Solbakken, V. A., T. Hansen, and S. O. Stefansson. 1994. Effects of photoperiod and temperature on
535 growth and parr-smolt transformation in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) and subsequent performance in
536 seawater. *Aquaculture* **121**:13–27.
- 537 Spann, T. M., J. G. Williamson, and R. L. Darnell. 2004. Photoperiod and temperature effects on growth
538 and carbohydrate storage in southern highbush blueberry interspecific hybrid. *Journal of the American
539 Society for Horticultural Science* **129**:294–298.
- 540 Stinziano, J. R., and D. A. Way. 2017. Autumn photosynthetic decline and growth cessation in seedlings of
541 white spruce are decoupled under warming and photoperiod manipulations. *Plant, Cell & Environment*
542 **40**:1296–1316.
- 543 Suárez-López, P., K. Wheatley, F. Robson, H. Onouchi, F. Valverde, and G. Coupland. 2001. CONSTANS
544 mediates between the circadian clock and the control of flowering in *Arabidopsis*. *Nature* **410**:1116.
- 545 Tanino, K. K., L. Kalcsits, S. Silim, E. Kendall, and G. R. Gray. 2010. Temperature-driven plasticity in
546 growth cessation and dormancy development in deciduous woody plants: a working hypothesis suggesting
547 how molecular and cellular function is affected by temperature during dormancy induction. *Plant Molecular
548 Biology* **73**:49–65.
- 549 Taranger, G., E. Vikingstad, U. Klenke, I. Mayer, S. Stefansson, B. Norberg, T. Hansen, Y. Zohar, and
550 E. Andersson. 2003. Effects of photoperiod, temperature and GnRHa treatment on the reproductive
551 physiology of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) broodstock. *Fish Physiology and Biochemistry* **28**:403–406.
- 552 Tobin, P. C., S. Nagarkatti, G. Loeb, and M. C. Saunders. 2008. Historical and projected interactions between
553 climate change and insect voltinism in a multivoltine species. *Global Change Biology* **14**:951–957.

- 554 van der Schoot, C., L. K. Paul, and P. L. H. Rinne. 2014. The embryonic shoot: a lifeline through winter.
- 555 Journal of Experimental Botany **65**:1699–1712.
- 556 Viherä-Aarnio, A., R. Häkkinen, and O. Junntila. 2006. Critical night length for bud set and its variation in
- 557 two photoperiodic ecotypes of *Betula pendula*. Tree Physiology **26**:1013–1018.
- 558 Vitasse, Y., and D. Basler. 2013. What role for photoperiod in the bud burst phenology of European beech.
- 559 European Journal of Forest Research **132**:1–8.
- 560 Wareing, P. 1956. Photoperiodism in woody plants. Annual Review of Plant Physiology **7**:191–214.
- 561 Way, D. A., and R. A. Montgomery. 2015. Photoperiod constraints on tree phenology, performance and
- 562 migration in a warming world. Plant, Cell & Environment **38**:1725–1736.
- 563 Weih, M. 2004. Intensive short rotation forestry in boreal climates: present and future perspectives. Canadian
- 564 Journal of Forest Research **34**:1369–1378.
- 565 Willis, C. G., B. R. Ruhfel, R. B. Primack, A. J. Miller-Rushing, J. B. Losos, and C. C. Davis. 2010. Favorable
- 566 Climate Change Response Explains Non-Native Species' Success in Thoreau's Woods. Plos One **5**:e8878.
- 567 Wolkovich, E. M., B. I. Cook, J. M. Allen, T. M. Crimmins, J. L. Betancourt, S. E. Travers, S. Pau,
- 568 J. Regetz, T. J. Davies, N. J. B. Kraft, T. R. Ault, K. Bolmgren, S. J. Mazer, G. J. McCabe, B. J. McGill,
- 569 C. Parmesan, N. Salamin, M. D. Schwartz, and E. E. Cleland. 2012. Warming experiments underpredict
- 570 plant phenological responses to climate change. Nature **485**:494–497.
- 571 Wolkovich, E. M., A. K. Ettinger, D. Flynn, T. Savas, C. Chamberlain, D. Buonaiuto, and
- 572 J. Samaha, 2019. Observed Spring Phenology Responses in Experimental Environments (OSPREE).
- 573 doi:10.5063/F1QV3JQR.
- 574 Yu, H. Y., E. Luedeling, and J. C. Xu. 2010. Winter and spring warming result in delayed spring phenology
- 575 on the Tibetan Plateau. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America
- 576 **107**:22151–22156.
- 577 Zhao, M., C. Peng, W. Xiang, X. Deng, D. Tian, X. Zhou, G. Yu, H. He, and Z. Zhao. 2013. Plant
- 578 phenological modeling and its application in global climate change research: overview and future challenges.
- 579 Environmental Reviews **21**:1–14.

- 580 Zhu, K., C. W. Woodall, and J. S. Clark. 2012. Failure to migrate: lack of tree range expansion in response
581 to climate change. *Global Change Biology* **18**:1042–1052.
- 582 Zohner, C. M., B. M. Benito, J. C. Svenning, and S. S. Renner. 2016. Day length unlikely to constrain
583 climate-driven shifts in leaf-out times of northern woody plants. *Nature Climate Change* **6**:1120–1123.
- 584 Zydlowski, G. B., D. S. Stich, and S. D. McCormick. 2014. Photoperiod control of downstream movements
585 of Atlantic salmon *Salmo salar* smolts. *Journal of Fish Biology* **85**:1023–1041.

586 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: for spatial shifts, 6–17 kilometers per decade, or approximately 0.5–1.5° in 100 years (Parmesan and Yohe, 2003; Parmesan, 2006); for temporal shifts, 3 days per decade, or 30 days in 100 years (Parmesan, 2006; Chen et al., 2011). These potential, plausible shifts 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) at temperate latitudes. It is also apparent that early spring temporal shifts at high latitudes result in more extreme changes in daylength than shifts at lower latitudes (e.g., a temporal shift 30 days earlier results in a reduction in daylength of 94.5 minutes at 45° versus 39.5 minutes at 22.5°).




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 are shown 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 additional details.




Figure 3: **A map of experimental photoperiod treatments and their equivalent spatial and temporal shifts** demonstrates that many experiments manipulate photoperiod more dramatically than will occur with climate change. Mapped points (circles and Xes) are locations of experiments in Wolkovich et al. (2019) that manipulated photoperiod (30 total experiments; see Box 1). In 11 out of 30 cases, the difference between experimental treatments exceeded the range in photoperiod experienced across the entire year at the study latitude (Xs; circles mark temporal shifts within a possible range). Note that many studies occur at high latitudes, which experience a wide range of photoperiod across the year. In 13 out of 30 cases, the experimental treatment differences exceeded the photoperiod change that would be experienced with a latitudinal shift of up to 40° (red lines, black lines represent spatial shifts within a possible range). See “Mapping temporal and spatial shifts in space and time” in the *Supplemental Materials* for additional details.

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




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 may 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).

587 **Box 1. Are photoperiod effects widespread? A case study of woody**

588 **plant spring phenology**

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

594 Experimental growth chamber studies have shown that photoperiod is an important cue for spring budburst
595 phenology in woody plants (e.g., Flynn and Wolkovich, 2018; Basler and Körner, 2014; Heide, 1993*b*). These
596 experiments often manipulate photoperiod in combination with temperature to address basic questions about
597 how these two environmental conditions act as biological cues. Temperature has a dual role in regulating
598 woody plant phenology: chilling—the prolonged exposure to cold temperatures after growth cessation in the
599 fall—is required to initiate budburst, and forcing—prolonged exposure to warm temperatures—is required
600 for budburst to occur. Different photoperiod treatments are typically applied during the forcing treatment
601 phase in growth chamber experiments (e.g., Laube et al., 2014; Spann et al., 2004; Falusi and Calamassi,
602 1990; Heide, 1977; Campbell and Sugano, 1975).

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

614 in the *Supplemental Materials*, Ettinger et al. (2020), and Wolkovich et al. (2019) for details.

615 Growth chamber experiments in OSPREE suggest that the dominant photoperiod response in woody plant
616 species is earlier and more rapid budburst with longer days (e.g., Caffarra and Donnelly, 2011). Thirty of
617 the 72 studies in the OSPREE database included two or more different photoperiod treatments. Of these,
618 26 (87%) found significant photoperiod main effects or significant interactive effects with temperature (i.e.,
619 photoperiod x temperature effects), across 176 species (Table S1). Main effects included responses such as
620 growth (e.g., higher growth rates with longer days Ashby et al., 1962) and reproduction (e.g., increased
621 flowering with longer days Heide and Sønsteby, 2012).

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

628 Woody plant growth chamber experiments also demonstrate that, though photoperiod responses are com-
629 mon, they are variable, as shown in the figure. Responses to photoperiod differ by species (e.g., Flynn and
630 Wolkovich, 2018; Zohner et al., 2016; Basler and Körner, 2014, 2012; Howe et al., 1996; Heide, 1993b). For
631 example, with longer chilling treatments some species seem insensitive to daylength (e.g., *Hammamelis* spp.,
632 *Prunus* spp., Zohner et al., 2016), whereas others seem to be highly sensitive to daylength (e.g. *Fagus* spp.,
633 Fig. A), even with long chilling treatments (Zohner et al., 2016). In addition, some species demonstrate a re-
634 sponse to photoperiod opposite to that typically observed: *Tilia*, for example, showed delayed budburst with
635 longer daylengths (see Box 1-1 figure, Ashby et al., 1962). Photoperiod sensitivity also varies by population
636 and ecotype (e.g., see figure). For example, photoperiod effects on budburst were more significant for lower
637 latitude populations of *Betula pendula* and *B. pubescens* (Partanen et al., 2005).




Figure: Box 1-1: **Nonlinearities in phenological responses to daylength** are apparent in spring woody plant phenology experiments. Shown are responses from all experiments from Wolkovich et al. (2019) 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. See “Nonlinearities in phenological responses to daylength” in the *Supplemental Materials* for additional details.




Figure: Box 1-2: **Experienced photoperiods in growth chamber 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 Wolkovich et al. (2019). 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 data points in Wolkovich et al. (2019) by adding the day of budburst from the first Phenofit observation. See “Comparing shifts in experienced photoperiod in experiments to those in the natural world with climate change” in *Supplemental Materials* and Duputié et al. (2015) for additional details.

638 **Box 2. Dominant models of how photoperiod affects spring woody**

639 **plant phenology**

640 The cues and molecular pathways underlying photoperiod sensitivity are poorly understood for most organ-
641 isms, even in relatively well-studied phenophases and taxa, such as spring budburst in woody plants (Ding
642 and Nilsson, 2016). Decades of growth chamber experiments demonstrate that three main cues—chilling,
643 forcing, and photoperiod—control spring budburst for woody species (Flynn and Wolkovich, 2018; Zohner
644 et al., 2016; Heide, 2008), with many models suggesting a dominant role of forcing in most natural conditions.
645 Forcing requirements, however, appear to increase given shorter photoperiods or lower chilling (Caffarra et al.,
646 2011a; Chuine et al., 2010). Research has yet to fully tease out effects of these three cues, their interactions,
647 and their prevalence; photoperiod responses appear variable across species and populations, as well as with
648 different chilling treatments (see Box 1). Not surprisingly, there is currently little agreement on the under-
649 lying model for how photoperiod affects spring phenology for most species (Chuine et al., 2016; Hänninen
650 et al., 2019). More physiological research will likely be necessary for major advances, as understanding the
651 exact cellular pathways through which chilling, forcing, and photoperiod act appears increasingly critical to
652 accurate modelling (van der Schoot et al., 2014; Hänninen et al., 2019).

653 Additional cellular and molecular studies may quickly advance understanding and scale up to improved
654 photoperiod models. While our understanding of how plants interpret photoperiod at the molecular-level
655 comes from few species, largely from studies of flowering in the model plant *Arabidopsis thaliana* (e.g.,
656 Suárez-López et al., 2001) and fall budset in woody plant species (e.g., Howe et al., 1996), these studies have
657 proved useful across other species. For example, the ‘external coincidence model’ (where plants sense light
658 via blue light receptors and phytochromes, then interpret photoperiod through a coordinated response to
659 light in relation to the time of day, see Lagercrantz, 2009) has been most widely studied in *Arabidopsis*, but
660 appears to be a relevant mechanism for photoperiod responses in diverse perennial and woody plant species
661 (Singh et al., 2017; Petterle et al., 2013; Andrés and Coupland, 2012; Kobayashi and Weigel, 2007; Davis,
662 2002; Bastow and Dean, 2002; Bünning, 1936). The model proposes the existence of a circadian rhythm of
663 light sensitivity, in which the night-phase is sensitive to light and the day-phase is insensitive to light. As days
664 get longer in the spring, daylight illuminates the light sensitive phase, triggering a response. This provides a

665 clear mechanistic pathway to build into models (Burghardt et al., 2015).

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

677 Efforts to better map the genetic and cellular pathways of spring phenology combined with common garden
678 studies can provide a powerful method to test mechanistic understanding and improve models (e.g., Burghardt
679 et al., 2015; Fournier-Level et al., 2016). Here we have mainly outlined how to combine growth chamber studies
680 with long-term data to improve models and forecasting; a greater physiological understanding of at least a
681 few species will likely also be necessary for generating robust predictions with climate change.