

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

December 1, 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 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 centered on how spatial range shifts will
⁹⁸ affect photoperiod (e.g., Saikkonen et al., 2012; Way and Montgomery, 2015). However, shifting phenology—
⁹⁹ especially the large changes seen in spring phenology—will also alter experienced photoperiod, because of the
¹⁰⁰ 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, potentially constraining their
¹³² ability to respond to additional warming (Fu et al., 2019; Vitasse and Basler, 2013; Körner and Basler, 2010a;
¹³³ Morin et al., 2010; Nienstaedt, 1966). Interactions between photoperiod and temperature may therefore re-
¹³⁴ sult in muted phenological shifts, compared to what would be expected based on temperature change alone
¹³⁵ (Körner and Basler, 2010a; Mimura and Aitken, 2007; Wareing, 1956). This has been a topic of much interest
¹³⁶ in the climate change literature because it predicts that as photoperiod becomes limiting, average trends of
¹³⁷ earlier spring phenology (Polgar et al., 2013; Peñuelas et al., 2002; Menzel, 2000) and later autumn senescence
¹³⁸ (Gill et al., 2015; ?) with warming may stop.

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

150 due to underlying genetic differences driven by local adaptation, because photoperiod responses can be under
151 strong genetic control (Bradshaw and Stettler, 1995; Keller et al., 2011; Weih, 2004, see also Boxes 1, 2).
152 Differences in genetic control of photoperiod may be pronounced across spring versus fall events, as work
153 suggests stronger local adaptation in photoperiod cues for budset than budburst (Mimura and Aitken, 2010),
154 though to date much research focuses on spring or fall events separately, making a robust comparison difficult.
155 Valuable advances to the field may be achieved by increased efforts to compare controls on phenological events
156 across the growing season and how they may be connected, through carbon dynamics or other factors (Zani
157 et al., 2020; Ettinger et al., 2018). Further teasing out the relative roles of genetics versus environmental
158 conditions on phenology will be critical to accurate forecasts under climate change (Pau et al., 2011).

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

₁₇₅ Future directions: outstanding questions and incorporating photoperiod into forecasting

₁₇₇ The complexity of photoperiod effects on phenology and how warming alters experienced photoperiod high-lights that future rates of phenological shifts are unlikely to be straightforward extrapolations from past and current rates. Statistical and process-based models—the two broad categories of forecasting approaches—both acknowledge this difficulty, but differ importantly in how they relate phenology to climate change.

₁₈₁ Statistical models relating phenology to climate change typically assume linear relationships between species' responses and environmental variables (e.g., Flynn and Wolkovich, 2018; Ibáñez et al., 2010), whereas process-based models often incorporate nonlinear threshold relationships (e.g. Chuine and Beaubien, 2001; Morin and Thuiller, 2009). Further, statistical models of phenology under climate change frequently ignore photoperiod, focusing instead on seasonal or annual temperature (e.g. Diez et al., 2012; Ibáñez et al., 2010, but see Richardson et al. (2013)), whereas process-based models of phenology more frequently incorporate photoperiod, along with temperature (Lundell et al., 2020; Duputié et al., 2015; Zhao et al., 2013; Morin and Thuiller, 2009). Process-based models may thus seem superior for integrating photoperiod, but they can be challenging to develop, requiring detailed data that are often not readily available (e.g., daily climate data, nonlinear biological responses to fine-scale changes in temperature). Perhaps because of this, statistical models remain more commonly used in climate change forecasts of biological responses (e.g., García-Valdés and Morales-Castilla, 2016; Basler and Körner, 2012; Diez et al., 2012; Zhu et al., 2012; Ibáñez et al., 2010).

₁₉₃ Future modelling of spring plant phenology can incorporate photoperiod by leveraging the large amount of experimental data on photoperiod responses (e.g., for woody plants, see Fig. 3, Table S1, Box 1), especially when process-based approaches are used. Researchers can use these data to first learn whether the study species (or a phylogenetically closely related species) shows a photoperiod effect and, ideally, identify its threshold photoperiod and how it varies by population, ecotype, or other factors (Tobin et al., 2008; Bradshaw and Holzapfel, 2006). If there is evidence of a photoperiod response (e.g., *Fagus grandifolia*, or *Tilia americana* with low chilling, shown in Box 1), daylength should be added to forecasting models. We suggest initial models could use a threshold photoperiod to define short-day and long-day conditions (Fig. 4, Box 1), then test how much the addition alters forecasts. Given the large change in experienced photoperiod with temporal shifts

202 (Fig. 1), this may be particularly important for phenological forecasting. Since spatial shifts are associated
203 with smaller changes in experienced photoperiod, it may be less important for distribution forecasts. Many
204 species, however, may shift in *both* space and time simultaneously. Thus, even though experienced photoperiod
205 changes little as species distributions shift in space, phenology may be altered significantly if the newly
206 expanded portions of the range contain novel environmental conditions (e.g., Martin et al., 2014).

207 For some species, experimental data can be immediately used in forecasting because experiments manipulate
208 photoperiod at relevant scales (e.g., Heide and Sonsteby, 2015; Basler and Körner, 2014, Fig. 3, Box 1,
209 Table S1). For example, photoperiod treatments from growth chamber experiments with *Fagus sylvatica*
210 span the variation in both current and expected future ranges (Box 1, Duputié et al., 2015), and may allow
211 identification of threshold photoperiods (Fig. 4). In other cases, attempting to incorporate photoperiod
212 into forecasts of future phenology will reveal gaps in our understanding of many aspects of photoperiod
213 responses. For example, photoperiod treatments from existing experiments of *Quercus robur* do not accurately
214 represent experienced photoperiods from current or future estimates (Box 1), making fine-scale projections
215 difficult, even for this relatively well-studied species. This gap extends to many species, as most experiments
216 manipulate photoperiod much more dramatically than will occur with climate change (Fig. 3, Box 1).
217 Although these studies can be useful for a mechanistic understanding of photoperiod responses, extrapolating
218 them to climate change models may not be reasonable.

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

²³⁰ constrain carbon sequestration even if warming prolongs leaf senescence (Howe et al., 1996; Bauerle et al.,
²³¹ 2012; Stinziano and Way, 2017)

²³² As researchers more fully integrate experienced photoperiod into forecasting, a critical area of further study
²³³ is understanding *how* photoperiod acts as a cue. For some species, photoperiod responses are qualitative
²³⁴ (that is, there is a threshold photoperiod with long-day responses differing from short-day responses; see
²³⁵ *Glossary*), whereas other species appear to exhibit quantitative responses to photoperiod (Wareing, 1956).
²³⁶ Photoperiod seems to interact with temperature to affect phenology (e.g., Zydlewski et al., 2014); this would
²³⁷ explain the divergent effects of photoperiod observed across studies in woody plants (Box 1). However,
²³⁸ exactly how it interacts with temperature is not well-defined for most taxa. For many species, additional
²³⁹ experimental and physiological research is necessary, since the dormancy-breaking processes that photoperiod
²⁴⁰ affect require detailed physiological approaches to observe. Though the main ecophysiological processes
²⁴¹ involved in regulating phenology of woody plants are relatively well-documented, a mechanistic understanding
²⁴² of the physiological, molecular, and genetic bases of dormancy is lacking (Box 2 Hänninen et al., 2019; Chuine
²⁴³ et al., 2016). In addition, photoperiod and temperature cues can differentially affect the phenology of distinct
²⁴⁴ physiological processes in woody species, decoupling, for example, responses of growth or leaf development and
²⁴⁵ carbon uptake to warming (Stinziano and Way, 2017; Bauerle et al., 2012). Accounting for ecophysiological
²⁴⁶ effects of photoperiod can result in quantifiable declines on modeled global gross primary production (Bauerle
²⁴⁷ et al., 2012), suggesting that temporal and spatial shifts in experienced photoperiod with climate change may
²⁴⁸ also alter global model estimates.

²⁴⁹ Understanding the drivers, as well as the consequences, of variation in photoperiod responses within and across
²⁵⁰ individuals, populations, and species will be critical for forecasting. Incorporating trait and/or phylogenetic
²⁵¹ frameworks may provide useful avenues for improving forecasts (Buckley and Kingsolver, 2012). For example,
²⁵² what traits are associated with photoperiod sensitivity and does variation in photoperiod sensitivity or related
²⁵³ traits have a strong genetic component? If so, are species or populations from some locations or lineages
²⁵⁴ more likely than others to be constrained by photoperiod in their responses to climate change? More accurate
²⁵⁵ forecasts will facilitate improved understanding of the implications of variations in photoperiod constraints
²⁵⁶ for carbon sequestration under climate change at a global scale.

₂₅₇ **Conclusions**

₂₅₈ Organisms may undergo large changes to the photoperiod they experience with climate change, even if they
₂₅₉ do not shift their ranges spatially. Here we have highlighted that these altered photoperiods may stall
₂₆₀ phenological shifts with future warming (e.g., Table S1, Fu et al., 2019; Güsewell et al., 2017; Yu et al.,
₂₆₁ 2010), with cascading effects on growth, fitness, and community composition due to the large variation in
₂₆₂ photoperiod responses across species and populations (Box 1). We have focused on woody plant phenology,
₂₆₃ but shifts in photoperiod with climate change have implications for a variety of plant and animal responses, as
₂₆₄ daylength affects critical activities for diverse species from insects (Bradshaw and Holzapfel, 2006) and salmon
₂₆₅ (Taranger et al., 2003) to birds (Dawson et al., 2001) and marsupials (McAllan et al., 2006). Given what we
₂₆₆ know, incorporating photoperiod into forecasting of climate change responses should improve model accuracy
₂₆₇ (Fig. 4), and will illuminate additional experiments that could improve our mechanistic understanding of
₂₆₈ photoperiod as a critical cue for diverse biological responses.

₂₆₉ **Glossary**

₂₇₀ • budburst: one or more leaf buds has visible green tips.

₂₇₁ • chilling: the intensity and duration of winter temperature, often a certain sum of chilling that is required
₂₇₂ (e.g., some amount of hours or days of cold temperatures, defined by a specific critical temperature or
₂₇₃ range of temperatures, such as between 0 and 7.2 °C, Richardson, 1974), that must be experienced for
₂₇₄ budburst to occur.

₂₇₅ • daylength: the period of time during a 24-hour period during which an organism receives light.

₂₇₆ • dormancy: halted or reduced growth or activity.

₂₇₇ • forcing: warm spring temperatures, often a certain sum of forcing that is required (e.g., some amount
₂₇₈ of hours or days above a specific temperature) before budburst or flowering can occur.

₂₇₉ • green-up: the beginning of a new cycle of plant growth, usually evaluated at the landscape scale.

₂₈₀ • phenology: the timing of life cycle events in organisms.

- 281 • photoperiod: the daily duration of light (daylength) and dark to which an organism is exposed; often
282 used synonymously with daylength.
- 283 • photoperiod sensitivity: the degree to which phenology is controlled by daylength; may be a nonlinear,
284 or ‘threshold’, response in plants (Box 2).
- 285 • photoperiodism: the ability of an organism to assess or respond to length of day or night in its behavior,
286 physiology, growth, development, or reproduction.
- 287 • threshold photoperiod: length of day that causes an organism to switch from a short- to a long-day
288 response (or vice versa). For example, in European larch (*Larix decidua*), budburst development may
289 be constrained under short-day conditions, when daylengths are less than a threshold photoperiod of
290 10-11 hours (Migliavacca et al., 2008). Above this threshold photoperiod, the long-day response of
291 unconstrained budburst development can occur.

292 Acknowledgements

293 We thank the many researchers who conducted the experiments synthesized in this manuscript; H. Kharouba
294 for helpful comments that improved the manuscript; B. Feist for improving the appearance of Fig. 3 dramati-
295 cally; and A. Duputié and I. Chuine for sharing projections from PhenoFit. The National Science Foundation
296 (DBI 14-01854 to AKE), NSERC Discovery Award (RGPIN-05038 to EMW), Canada Research Chair in Tem-
297 poral Ecology (EMW), and Spanish Ministry for Science and Innovation (PID2019/109711RJ-100 to IM-C)
298 provided funding. Any opinion, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are
299 those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation or the Nature
300 Conservancy.

301 References

- 302 Allona, I., A. Ramos, C. Ibáñez, A. Contreras, R. Casado, and C. Aragoncillo. 2008. Molecular control of
303 winter dormancy establishment in trees: a review. Spanish Journal of Agricultural Research **6**:201–210.

- 304 Andrés, F., and G. Coupland. 2012. The genetic basis of flowering responses to seasonal cues. *Nature reviews. Genetics* **13**:627.
- 305
- 306 Ashby, W., et al. 1962. Germination capacity in American Basswood *Tilia americana*. *Transactions of the Illinois State Academy of Science* **55**:120–3.
- 307
- 308 Azeem, A., and A. P. Sane. 2015. Photoperiodic growth control in perennial trees. *Plant signaling & behavior* **10**:e1087631.
- 309
- 310 Basler, D., and C. Körner. 2012. Photoperiod sensitivity of bud burst in 14 temperate forest tree species. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **165**:73–81.
- 311
- 312 Basler, D., and C. Körner. 2014. Photoperiod and temperature responses of bud swelling and bud burst in four temperate forest tree species. *Tree Physiology* **34**:377–388.
- 313
- 314 Bastow, R., and C. Dean. 2002. The molecular basis of photoperiodism. *Developmental cell* **3**:461–462.
- 315 Bauerle, W. L., R. Oren, D. A. Way, S. S. Qian, P. C. Stoy, P. E. Thornton, J. D. Bowden, F. M. Hoffman, and R. F. Reynolds. 2012. Photoperiodic regulation of the seasonal pattern of photosynthetic capacity and the implications for carbon cycling. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **109**:8612–8617.
- 316
- 317
- 318 Block, S., J. Alexander, and J. M. Levine. 2020. Phenological plasticity is a poor predictor of subalpine plant population performance following experimental climate change. *Oikos* **129**:184–193.
- 319
- 320 Bradley, N. L., A. C. Leopold, J. Ross, and W. Huffaker. 1999. Phenological changes reflect climate change in Wisconsin. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **96**:9701–9704.
- 321
- 322 Bradshaw, H., and R. F. Stettler. 1995. Molecular genetics of growth and development in *Populus*. IV. Mapping QTLs with large effects on growth, form, and phenology traits in a forest tree. *Genetics* **139**:963–973.
- 323
- 324
- 325 Bradshaw, W. E., and C. M. Holzapfel. 2006. Evolutionary response to rapid climate change. *Science* **312**:1477–1478.
- 326
- 327 Bradshaw, W. E., and C. M. Holzapfel. 2007. Evolution of animal photoperiodism. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **38**:1–25.
- 328

- 329 Buckley, L. B., and J. G. Kingsolver. 2012. Functional and phylogenetic approaches to forecasting species'
330 responses to climate change. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* **43**.
- 331 Büning, E. 1936. Endogenous daily rhythms as the basis of photoperiodism. *Ber Deut Bot Ges* **54**:590–607.
- 332 Burghardt, L. T., C. J. E. Metcalf, A. M. Wilczek, J. Schmitt, and K. Donohue. 2015. Modeling the
333 Influence of Genetic and Environmental Variation on the Expression of Plant Life Cycles across Landscapes.
334 *American Naturalist* **185**:212–227.
- 335 Caffarra, A., and A. Donnelly. 2011. The ecological significance of phenology in four different tree species:
336 effects of light and temperature on bud burst. *International Journal of Biometeorology* **55**:711–721.
- 337 Caffarra, A., A. Donnelly, and I. Chuine. 2011a. Modelling the timing of *Betula pubescens* budburst. II.
338 Integrating complex effects of photoperiod into process-based models. *Climate Research* **46**:159–170.
- 339 Caffarra, A., A. Donnelly, I. Chuine, and M. B. Jones. 2011b. Modelling the timing of *Betula pubescens*
340 bud-burst. I. Temperature and photoperiod: A conceptual model. *Climate Research* **46**:147.
- 341 Campbell, R. K., and A. I. Sugano. 1975. Phenology of bud burst in Douglas-fir related to provenance,
342 photoperiod, chilling, and flushing temperature. *Botanical Gazette* pages 290–298.
- 343 Chen, I.-C., J. K. Hill, R. Ohlemüller, D. B. Roy, and C. D. Thomas. 2011. Rapid Range Shifts of Species
344 Associated with High Levels of Climate Warming. *Science* **333**:1024–1026.
- 345 Chuine, I., and E. G. Beaubien. 2001. Phenology is a major determinant of tree species range. *Ecology*
346 Letters **4**:500–510.
- 347 Chuine, I., M. Bonhomme, J.-M. Legave, I. García de Cortázar-Atauri, G. Charrier, A. Lacointe, and
348 T. Améglio. 2016. Can phenological models predict tree phenology accurately in the future? The un-
349 revealed hurdle of endodormancy break. *Global Change Biology* **22**:3444–3460.
- 350 Chuine, I., X. Morin, and H. Bugmann. 2010. Warming, photoperiods, and tree phenology. *Science* **329**:277–
351 278.
- 352 Cleland, E. E., J. M. Allen, T. M. Crimmins, J. A. Dunne, S. Pau, S. E. Travers, E. S. Zavaleta, and E. M.
353 Wolkovich. 2012. Phenological tracking enables positive species responses to climate change. *Ecology*
354 **93**:1765–1771.

- 355 Davis, S. J. 2002. Photoperiodism: the coincidental perception of the season. *Current Biology* **12**:R841–R843.
- 356 Dawson, A., V. M. King, G. E. Bentley, and G. F. Ball. 2001. Photoperiodic control of seasonality in birds.
357 *Journal of Biological Rhythms* **16**:365–380.
- 358 Diez, J. M., I. Ibáñez, A. J. Miller-Rushing, S. J. Mazer, T. M. Crimmins, M. A. Crimmins, C. D. Bertelsen,
359 and D. W. Inouye. 2012. Forecasting phenology: from species variability to community patterns. *Ecology
Letters* **15**:545–553.
- 360
- 361 Ding, J., and O. Nilsson. 2016. Molecular regulation of phenology in trees—because the seasons they are
362 a-changin. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology* **29**:73–79.
- 363 Duputié, A., A. Rutschmann, O. Ronce, and I. Chuine. 2015. Phenological plasticity will not help all species
364 adapt to climate change. *Global Change Biology* **21**:3062–3073.
- 365 Erwin, J. E. 1998. Temperature and light effects on stem elongation. *Journal of the Japanese Society for
366 Horticultural Science* **67**:1113–1120.
- 367 Ettinger, A., C. Chamberlain, I. Morales-Castilla, D. Buonaiuto, D. Flynn, T. Savas, J. Samaha, and
368 E. Wolkovich. 2020. Winter temperatures predominate in spring phenological responses to warming.
369 *Nature Climate Change* pages 1–6.
- 370 Ettinger, A., S. Gee, and E. Wolkovich. 2018. Phenological sequences: how early-season events define those
371 that follow. *American Journal of Botany* **105**:1771–1780.
- 372 Falusi, M., and R. Calamassi. 1990. Bud dormancy in beech (*Fagus sylvatica* L.). Effect of chilling and
373 photoperiod on dormancy release of beech seedlings. *Tree Physiology* **6**:429–438.
- 374 Fishman, S., A. Erez, and G. Couvillon. 1987. The temperature dependence of dormancy breaking in plants:
375 mathematical analysis of a two-step model involving a cooperative transition. *Journal of Theoretical
376 Biology* **124**:473–483.
- 377 Flynn, D. F. B., and E. M. Wolkovich. 2018. Temperature and photoperiod drive spring phenology across
378 all species in a temperate forest community. *New Phytologist* **219**:1353–1362.
- 379 Fournier-Level, A., E. O. Perry, J. A. Wang, P. T. Braun, A. Migneault, M. D. Cooper, C. J. E. Metcalf,
380 and J. Schmitt. 2016. Predicting the evolutionary dynamics of seasonal adaptation to novel climates in

- 381 *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America
382 **113**:E2812–E2821.
- 383 Franks, S. J., J. J. Weber, and S. N. Aitken. 2014. Evolutionary and plastic responses to climate change in
384 terrestrial plant populations. *Evolutionary Applications* **7**:123–139.
- 385 Fréjaville, T., B. Fady, A. Kremer, A. Ducouso, and M. Benito Garzón. 2019. Inferring phenotypic plasticity
386 and population responses to climate across tree species ranges using forest inventory data. *Global Ecology*
387 and Biogeography
- 388 **28**:1259–1271.
- 389 Fu, Y. H., S. Piao, X. Zhou, X. Geng, F. Hao, Y. Vitasse, and I. A. Janssens. 2019. Short photoperiod
390 reduces the temperature sensitivity of leaf-out in saplings of *Fagus sylvatica* but not in horse chestnut.
391 *Global Change Biology* **25**:1696–1703.
- 392 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,
393 J. P. Uelas, Y. Song, Y. Vitasse, Z. Z. Zeng, and I. A. Janssens. 2015. Declining global warming effects on
394 the phenology of spring leaf unfolding. *Nature* **526**:104–107.
- 395 Gallinat, A. S., R. B. Primack, and D. L. Wagner. 2015. Autumn, the neglected season in climate change
396 research. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **30**:169–176.
- 397 García-Valdés, R., and I. Morales-Castilla. 2016. Efectos del cambio climático en los ecosistemas forestales:
398 integrando inventarios y modelos. *Ecosistemas* **25**:51–59.
- 399 Gauzere, J., S. Delzon, H. Davi, M. Bonhomme, I. G. de Cortazar-Atauri, and I. Chuine. 2017. Integrating
400 interactive effects of chilling and photoperiod in phenological process-based models. A case study with
401 two European tree species: *Fagus sylvatica* and *Quercus petraea*. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*
244:9–20.
- 402 Gill, A. L., A. S. Gallinat, R. Sanders-DeMott, A. J. Rigden, D. J. Short Gianotti, J. A. Mantooth, and P. H.
403 Templer. 2015. Changes in autumn senescence in northern hemisphere deciduous trees: a meta-analysis of
404 autumn phenology studies. *Annals of botany* **116**:875–888.
- 405 Glover, B. 2014. Understanding flowers and flowering, Second edition. OUP Oxford.

- 406 Gould, P. J., C. A. Harrington, and J. B. St. Clair. 2010. Incorporating genetic variation into a model
407 of budburst phenology of coast Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii* var. *menziesii*). Canadian Journal of
408 Forest Research **41**:139–150.
- 409 Grevstad, F. S., and L. B. Coop. 2015. The consequences of photoperiodism for organisms in new climates.
410 Ecological Applications **25**:1506–1517.
- 411 Gu, L., P. J. Hanson, W. M. Post, D. P. Kaiser, B. Yang, R. Nemani, S. G. Pallardy, and T. Meyers. 2008.
412 The 2007 Eastern US spring freeze: Increased cold damage in a warming world. BioScience **58**:253.
- 413 Güsewell, S., R. Furrer, R. Gehrig, and B. Pietragalla. 2017. Changes in temperature sensitivity of spring
414 phenology with recent climate warming in Switzerland are related to shifts of the preseason. Global Change
415 Biology **23**:5189–5202.
- 416 Hänninen, H., K. Kramer, K. Tanino, R. Zhang, J. Wu, and Y. H. Fu. 2019. Experiments are necessary in
417 process-based tree phenology modelling. Trends in Plant Science **24**:199–209.
- 418 Harsch, M. A., P. E. Hulme, M. S. McGlone, and R. P. Duncan. 2009. Are treelines advancing? A global
419 meta-analysis of treeline response to climate warming. Ecology Letters **12**:1040–1049.
- 420 Hawkins, C. D., and A. Dhar. 2012. Spring bud phenology of 18 *Betula papyrifera* populations in British
421 Columbia. Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research **27**:507–519.
- 422 Heide, O. 1993a. Daylength and thermal time responses of budburst during dormancy release in some
423 northern deciduous trees. Physiologia Plantarum **88**:531–540.
- 424 Heide, O. 1993b. Dormancy release in beech buds (*Fagus sylvatica*) requires both chilling and long days.
425 Physiologia Plantarum **89**:187–191.
- 426 Heide, O. M. 1977. Photoperiod and temperature interactions in growth and flowering of strawberry.
427 Physiologia Plantarum **40**:21–26.
- 428 Heide, O. M. 2008. Interaction of photoperiod and temperature in the control of growth and dormancy of
429 *Prunus* species. Scientia Horticulturae **115**:309–314.
- 430 Heide, O. M. 2011. Temperature rather than photoperiod controls growth cessation and dormancy in *Sorbus*
431 species. Journal of Experimental Botany **62**:5397–5404.

- 432 Heide, O. M., and A. Sønsteby. 2012. Floral initiation in black currant cultivars (*Ribes nigrum* L.): Effects of
433 plant size, photoperiod, temperature, and duration of short day exposure. *Scientia Horticulturae* **138**:64–
434 72.
- 435 Heide, O. M., and A. Sonsteby. 2015. Simultaneous dormancy induction interferes with short day floral
436 induction in black currant (*Ribes nigrum* L.). *Scientia Horticulturae* **185**:228–232.
- 437 Howe, G. T., G. Gardner, W. P. Hackett, and G. R. Furnier. 1996. Phytochrome control of short-day-induced
438 bud set in black cottonwood. *Physiologia Plantarum* **97**:95–103.
- 439 Howe, G. T., W. P. Hackett, G. R. Furnier, and R. E. Klevorn. 1995. Photoperiodic responses of a northern
440 and southern ecotype of black cottonwood. *Physiologia Plantarum* **93**:695–708.
- 441 Hsu, C.-Y., J. P. Adams, H. Kim, K. No, C. Ma, S. H. Strauss, J. Drnevich, L. Vandervelde, J. D. Ellis,
442 B. M. Rice, et al. 2011. FLOWERING LOCUS T duplication coordinates reproductive and vegetative
443 growth in perennial poplar. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **108**:10756–10761.
- 444 Huffeldt, N. P. 2020. Photic Barriers to Poleward Range-shifts. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* .
- 445 Ibáñez, I., R. B. Primack, A. J. Miller-Rushing, E. Ellwood, H. Higuchi, S. D. Lee, H. Kobori, and J. A.
446 Silander. 2010. Forecasting phenology under global warming. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal
447 Society B-Biological Sciences* **365**.
- 448 Inouye, D. W., M. A. Morales, and G. J. Dodge. 2002. Variation in timing and abundance of flowering by
449 *Delphinium barbeyi* Huth (Ranunculaceae): the roles of snowpack, frost, and La Niña, in the context of
450 climate change. *Oecologia* **130**:543–550.
- 451 Johnsen, K. H., and J. R. Seiler. 1996. Growth, shoot phenology and physiology of diverse seed sources
452 of black spruce: I. Seedling responses to varied atmospheric CO₂ concentrations and photoperiods. *Tree
453 Physiology* **16**:367–373.
- 454 Jolly, W. M., R. Nemani, and S. W. Running. 2005. A generalized, bioclimatic index to predict foliar
455 phenology in response to climate. *Global Change Biology* **11**:619–632.

- 456 Keller, S. R., R. Y. Soolanayakanahally, R. D. Guy, S. N. Silim, M. S. Olson, and P. Tiffin. 2011. Climate-
457 driven local adaptation of ecophysiology and phenology in balsam poplar, *Populus balsamifera* L. (Salicaceae). American Journal of Botany **98**:99–108.
- 459 Kobayashi, Y., and D. Weigel. 2007. Move on up, it's time for change—mobile signals controlling photoperiod-
460 dependent flowering. Genes & Development **21**:2371–2384.
- 461 Körner, C., and D. Basler. 2010a. Phenology Under Global Warming. Science **327**:1461–1462.
- 462 Körner, C., and D. Basler. 2010b. Warming, Photoperiods, and Tree Phenology Response. Science **329**:278–
463 278.
- 464 Lagercrantz, U. 2009. At the end of the day: a common molecular mechanism for photoperiod responses in
465 plants? Journal of Experimental Botany **60**:2501–2515.
- 466 Laube, J., T. H. Sparks, N. Estrella, J. Höfler, D. P. Ankerst, and A. Menzel. 2014. Chilling outweighs
467 photoperiod in preventing precocious spring development. Global Change Biology **20**:170–182.
- 468 Linkosalo, T., and M. J. Lechowicz. 2006. Twilight far-red treatment advances leaf bud burst of silver birch
469 (*Betula pendula*). Tree Physiology **26**:1249–1256.
- 470 Lundell, R., H. Hänninen, T. Saarinen, H. Åström, and R. Zhang. 2020. Beyond rest and quiescence
471 (endodormancy and ecodormancy): A novel model for quantifying plant–environment interaction in bud
472 dormancy release. Plant, Cell & Environment **43**:40–54.
- 473 Malyshev, A. V., H. A. Henry, A. Bolte, M. A. A. Khan, and J. Kreyling. 2018. Temporal photoperiod
474 sensitivity and forcing requirements for budburst in temperate tree seedlings. Agricultural and Forest
475 Meteorology **248**:82–90.
- 476 Martin, R. O., L. Sebele, A. Koeslag, O. Curtis, F. Abadi, and A. Amar. 2014. Phenological shifts assist
477 colonisation of a novel environment in a range-expanding raptor. Oikos **123**:1457–1468.
- 478 Mcallan, B. M., C. R. Dickman, and M. S. Crowther. 2006. Photoperiod as a reproductive cue in the
479 marsupial genus *Antechinus*: ecological and evolutionary consequences. Biological Journal of the Linnean
480 Society **87**:365–379.

- 481 Medvigy, D., S.-J. Jeong, K. L. Clark, N. S. Skowronski, and K. V. Schäfer. 2013. Effects of seasonal variation
482 of photosynthetic capacity on the carbon fluxes of a temperate deciduous forest. *Journal of Geophysical*
483 *Research: Biogeosciences* **118**:1703–1714.
- 484 Menzel, A. 2000. Trends in phenological phases in Europe between 1951 and 1996. *International Journal of*
485 *Biometeorology* **44**:76–81.
- 486 Menzel, A., T. H. Sparks, N. Estrella, E. Koch, A. Aasa, R. Ahas, K. Alm-Kuebler, et al. 2006. European
487 phenological response to climate change matches the warming pattern. *Global Change Biology* **12**:1969–
488 1976.
- 489 Migliavacca, M., E. Cremonese, R. Colombo, L. Busetto, M. Galvagno, L. Ganis, M. Meroni, E. Pari,
490 M. Rossini, C. Siniscalco, et al. 2008. European larch phenology in the Alps: can we grasp the role
491 of ecological factors by combining field observations and inverse modelling? *International Journal of*
492 *Biometeorology* **52**:587–605.
- 493 Mimura, M., and S. Aitken. 2007. Adaptive gradients and isolation-by-distance with postglacial migration
494 in *Picea sitchensis*. *Heredity* **99**:224.
- 495 Mimura, M., and S. Aitken. 2010. Local adaptation at the range peripheries of Sitka spruce. *Journal of*
496 *Evolutionary Biology* **23**:249–258.
- 497 Morin, X., J. Roy, L. Sonié, and I. Chuine. 2010. Changes in leaf phenology of three European oak species
498 in response to experimental climate change. *New Phytologist* **186**:900–910.
- 499 Morin, X., and W. Thuiller. 2009. Comparing niche-and process-based models to reduce prediction uncer-
500 tainty in species range shifts under climate change. *Ecology* **90**:1301–1313.
- 501 Muir, W. D., W. S. Zaugg, A. E. Giorgi, and S. McCutcheon. 1994. Accelerating smolt development and
502 downstream movement in yearling chinook salmon with advanced photoperiod and increased temperature.
503 *Aquaculture* **123**:387–399.
- 504 Myking, T., and O. Heide. 1995. Dormancy release and chilling requirement of buds of latitudinal ecotypes
505 of *Betula pendula* and *B. pubescens*. *Tree Physiology* **15**:697–704.
- 506 Nienstaedt, H. 1966. Dormancy and dormancy release in white spruce. *Forest Science* **12**:374–384.

- 507 Parmesan, C. 2006. Ecological and evolutionary responses to recent climate change. Annual Review of
508 Ecology Evolution and Systematics **37**:637–669.
- 509 Parmesan, C., and G. Yohe. 2003. A globally coherent fingerprint of climate change impacts across natural
510 systems. Nature **421**:37.
- 511 Partanen, J., H. Hänninen, and R. Häkkinen. 2005. Bud burst in Norway spruce (*Picea abies*): preliminary
512 evidence for age-specific rest patterns. Trees **19**:66–72.
- 513 Pau, S., E. M. Wolkovich, B. I. Cook, T. J. Davies, N. J. Kraft, K. Bolmgren, J. L. Betancourt, and E. E.
514 Cleland. 2011. Predicting phenology by integrating ecology, evolution and climate science. Global Change
515 Biology **17**:3633–3643.
- 516 Peñuelas, J., and M. Boada. 2003. A global change-induced biome shift in the Montseny mountains (NE
517 Spain). Global Change Biology **9**:131–140.
- 518 Peñuelas, J., I. Filella, and P. Comas. 2002. Changed plant and animal life cycles from 1952 to 2000 in the
519 Mediterranean region. Global Change Biology **8**:531–544.
- 520 Petterle, A., A. Karlberg, and R. P. Bhalerao. 2013. Daylength mediated control of seasonal growth patterns
521 in perennial trees. Current Opinion in Plant Biology **16**:301–306.
- 522 Polgar, C. A., R. B. Primack, E. H. Williams, S. Stichter, and C. Hitchcock. 2013. Climate effects on the
523 flight period of Lycaenid butterflies in Massachusetts. Biological Conservation **160**:25–31.
- 524 Poloczanska, E. S., C. J. Brown, W. J. Sydeman, W. Kiessling, D. S. Schoeman, P. J. Moore, K. Brander,
525 J. F. Bruno, L. B. Buckley, M. T. Burrows, et al. 2013. Global imprint of climate change on marine life.
526 Nature Climate Change **3**:919.
- 527 Richardson, A. D., R. S. Anderson, M. A. Arain, A. G. Barr, G. Bohrer, G. Chen, J. M. Chen, P. Ciais,
528 K. J. Davis, A. R. Desai, et al. 2012. Terrestrial biosphere models need better representation of vegetation
529 phenology: results from the North American Carbon Program Site Synthesis. Global Change Biology
530 **18**:566–584.

- 531 Richardson, A. D., T. F. Keenan, M. Migliavacca, Y. Ryu, O. Sonnentag, and M. Toomey. 2013. Climate
532 change, phenology, and phenological control of vegetation feedbacks to the climate system. Agricultural
533 and Forest Meteorology **169**:156–173.
- 534 Richardson, E. 1974. A model for estimating the completion of rest for ‘Redhaven’ and ‘Elberta’ peach trees.
535 HortScience **9**:331–332.
- 536 Root, T. L., J. T. Price, K. R. Hall, S. H. Schneider, C. Rosenzweig, and J. A. Pounds. 2003. Fingerprints
537 of global warming on wild animals and plants. Nature **421**:57–60.
- 538 Saikkonen, K., K. Taulavuori, T. Hyvönen, P. E. Gundel, C. E. Hamilton, I. Vänninen, A. Nissinen, and
539 M. Helander. 2012. Climate change-driven species’ range shifts filtered by photoperiodism. Nature Climate
540 Change **2**:239.
- 541 Sakai, A. K., and W. Larcher. 1987. Frost Survival of Plants. Ecological Studies, Springer-Verlag.
- 542 Sanz-Perez, V., P. Castro-Diez, and F. Valladares. 2009. Differential and interactive effects of temperature
543 and photoperiod on budburst and carbon reserves in two co-occurring Mediterranean oaks. Plant Biology
544 **11**:142–51.
- 545 Sidaway-Lee, K., E.-M. Josse, A. Brown, Y. Gan, K. J. Halliday, I. A. Graham, and S. Penfield. 2010.
546 SPATULA links daytime temperature and plant growth rate. Current Biology **20**:1493–1497.
- 547 Singh, R. K., T. Svystun, B. AlDahmash, A. M. Jönsson, and R. P. Bhalerao. 2017. Photoperiod-and
548 temperature-mediated control of phenology in trees—a molecular perspective. New Phytologist **213**:511–
549 524.
- 550 Solbakken, V. A., T. Hansen, and S. O. Stefansson. 1994. Effects of photoperiod and temperature on
551 growth and parr-smolt transformation in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) and subsequent performance in
552 seawater. Aquaculture **121**:13–27.
- 553 Spann, T. M., J. G. Williamson, and R. L. Darnell. 2004. Photoperiod and temperature effects on growth
554 and carbohydrate storage in southern highbush blueberry interspecific hybrid. Journal of the American
555 Society for Horticultural Science **129**:294–298.

- 556 Stinziano, J. R., and D. A. Way. 2017. Autumn photosynthetic decline and growth cessation in seedlings of
557 white spruce are decoupled under warming and photoperiod manipulations. *Plant, Cell & Environment*
558 **40**:1296–1316.
- 559 Suárez-López, P., K. Wheatley, F. Robson, H. Onouchi, F. Valverde, and G. Coupland. 2001. CONSTANS
560 mediates between the circadian clock and the control of flowering in *Arabidopsis*. *Nature* **410**:1116.
- 561 Tanino, K. K., L. Kalcsits, S. Silim, E. Kendall, and G. R. Gray. 2010. Temperature-driven plasticity in
562 growth cessation and dormancy development in deciduous woody plants: a working hypothesis suggesting
563 how molecular and cellular function is affected by temperature during dormancy induction. *Plant Molecular*
564 *Biology* **73**:49–65.
- 565 Taranger, G., E. Vikingstad, U. Klenke, I. Mayer, S. Stefansson, B. Norberg, T. Hansen, Y. Zohar, and
566 E. Andersson. 2003. Effects of photoperiod, temperature and GnRHa treatment on the reproductive
567 physiology of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) broodstock. *Fish Physiology and Biochemistry* **28**:403–406.
- 568 Tobin, P. C., S. Nagarkatti, G. Loeb, and M. C. Saunders. 2008. Historical and projected interactions between
569 climate change and insect voltinism in a multivoltine species. *Global Change Biology* **14**:951–957.
- 570 van der Schoot, C., L. K. Paul, and P. L. H. Rinne. 2014. The embryonic shoot: a lifeline through winter.
571 *Journal of Experimental Botany* **65**:1699–1712.
- 572 Viherä-Aarnio, A., R. Häkkinen, and O. Junntila. 2006. Critical night length for bud set and its variation in
573 two photoperiodic ecotypes of *Betula pendula*. *Tree Physiology* **26**:1013–1018.
- 574 Vitasse, Y., and D. Basler. 2013. What role for photoperiod in the bud burst phenology of European beech.
575 *European Journal of Forest Research* **132**:1–8.
- 576 Wareing, P. 1956. Photoperiodism in woody plants. *Annual Review of Plant Physiology* **7**:191–214.
- 577 Way, D. A., and R. A. Montgomery. 2015. Photoperiod constraints on tree phenology, performance and
578 migration in a warming world. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **38**:1725–1736.
- 579 Weih, M. 2004. Intensive short rotation forestry in boreal climates: present and future perspectives. *Canadian*
580 *Journal of Forest Research* **34**:1369–1378.

- 581 Willis, C. G., B. R. Ruhfel, R. B. Primack, A. J. Miller-Rushing, J. B. Losos, and C. C. Davis. 2010. Favorable
582 Climate Change Response Explains Non-Native Species' Success in Thoreau's Woods. Plos One **5**:e8878.
- 583 Wolkovich, E. M., B. I. Cook, J. M. Allen, T. M. Crimmins, J. L. Betancourt, S. E. Travers, S. Pau,
584 J. Regetz, T. J. Davies, N. J. B. Kraft, T. R. Ault, K. Bolmgren, S. J. Mazer, G. J. McCabe, B. J. McGill,
585 C. Parmesan, N. Salamin, M. D. Schwartz, and E. E. Cleland. 2012. Warming experiments underpredict
586 plant phenological responses to climate change. Nature **485**:494–497.
- 587 Wolkovich, E. M., A. K. Ettinger, D. Flynn, T. Savas, C. Chamberlain, D. Buonaiuto, and
588 J. Samaha, 2019. Observed Spring Phenology Responses in Experimental Environments (OSPREE).
589 doi:10.5063/F1QV3JQR.
- 590 Yu, H. Y., E. Luedeling, and J. C. Xu. 2010. Winter and spring warming result in delayed spring phenology
591 on the Tibetan Plateau. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America
592 **107**:22151–22156.
- 593 Zani, D., T. W. Crowther, L. Mo, S. S. Renner, and C. M. Zohner. 2020. Increased growing-season produc-
594 tivity drives earlier autumn leaf senescence in temperate trees. Science **370**:1066–1071.
- 595 Zhao, M., C. Peng, W. Xiang, X. Deng, D. Tian, X. Zhou, G. Yu, H. He, and Z. Zhao. 2013. Plant
596 phenological modeling and its application in global climate change research: overview and future challenges.
597 Environmental Reviews **21**:1–14.
- 598 Zhu, K., C. W. Woodall, and J. S. Clark. 2012. Failure to migrate: lack of tree range expansion in response
599 to climate change. Global Change Biology **18**:1042–1052.
- 600 Zohner, C. M., B. M. Benito, J. C. Svenning, and S. S. Renner. 2016. Day length unlikely to constrain
601 climate-driven shifts in leaf-out times of northern woody plants. Nature Climate Change **6**:1120–1123.
- 602 Zydlowski, G. B., D. S. Stich, and S. D. McCormick. 2014. Photoperiod control of downstream movements
603 of Atlantic salmon *Salmo salar* smolts. Journal of Fish Biology **85**:1023–1041.

604 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).

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

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

612 Experimental growth chamber studies have shown that photoperiod is an important cue for spring budburst
613 phenology in woody plants (e.g., Flynn and Wolkovich, 2018; Basler and Körner, 2014; Heide, 1993*b*). These
614 experiments often manipulate photoperiod in combination with temperature to address basic questions about
615 how these two environmental conditions act as biological cues. Temperature has a dual role in regulating
616 woody plant phenology: chilling—the prolonged exposure to cold temperatures after growth cessation in the
617 fall—is required to initiate budburst, and forcing—prolonged exposure to warm temperatures—is required
618 for budburst to occur. Different photoperiod treatments are typically applied during the forcing treatment
619 phase in growth chamber experiments (e.g., Laube et al., 2014; Spann et al., 2004; Falusi and Calamassi,
620 1990; Heide, 1977; Campbell and Sugano, 1975).

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

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

633 Growth chamber experiments in OSPREE suggest that the dominant photoperiod response in woody plant
634 species is earlier and more rapid budburst with longer days (e.g., Caffarra and Donnelly, 2011). Thirty of
635 the 72 studies in the OSPREE database included two or more different photoperiod treatments. Of these,
636 26 (87%) found significant photoperiod main effects or significant interactive effects with temperature (i.e.,
637 photoperiod x temperature effects), across 176 species (Table S1). Main effects included responses such as
638 growth (e.g., higher growth rates with longer days Ashby et al., 1962) and reproduction (e.g., increased
639 flowering with longer days Heide and Sønsteby, 2012).

640 Growth chamber experiments highlight that responses to photoperiod vary depending on temperature con-
641 ditions. For example, accelerated advances of budburst was observed under long versus short days with low
642 chilling, than with high chilling in *Betula payrifera* (Hawkins and Dhar, 2012, see figure). Similarly, across
643 species, as chilling accumulates from winter to spring, sensitivity to both forcing and photoperiod sensitivity
644 can decrease (Malyshev et al., 2018). Frequently, long photoperiods can compensate for low amounts of
645 chilling (Caffarra et al., 2011b; Myking and Heide, 1995; Heide, 1993a).

646 Woody plant growth chamber experiments also demonstrate that, though photoperiod responses are com-
647 mon, they are variable, as shown in the figure. Responses to photoperiod differ by species (e.g., Flynn and
648 Wolkovich, 2018; Zohner et al., 2016; Basler and Körner, 2014, 2012; Howe et al., 1996; Heide, 1993b). For
649 example, with longer chilling treatments some species seem insensitive to daylength (e.g., *Hammamelis* spp.,
650 *Prunus* spp., Zohner et al., 2016), whereas others seem to be highly sensitive to daylength (e.g. *Fagus* spp.,
651 Fig. Box2A), even with long chilling treatments (Zohner et al., 2016). In addition, some species demonstrate
652 a response to photoperiod opposite to that typically observed: *Tilia*, for example, showed delayed budburst
653 with longer daylengths (see Box 1-1 figure, Ashby et al., 1962). Photoperiod sensitivity also varies by popu-
654 lation and ecotype (e.g., see figure). For example, photoperiod effects on budburst were more significant for
655 lower latitude populations of *Betula pendula* and *B. pubescens* (Partanen et al., 2005).




Figure Box1: **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 Box2: 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.

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

657 **plant phenology**

658 The cues and molecular pathways underlying photoperiod sensitivity are poorly understood for most organ-
659 isms, even in relatively well-studied phenophases and taxa, such as spring budburst in woody plants (Ding
660 and Nilsson, 2016). Decades of growth chamber experiments demonstrate that three main cues—chilling,
661 forcing, and photoperiod—control spring budburst for woody species (Flynn and Wolkovich, 2018; Zohner
662 et al., 2016; Heide, 2008), with many models suggesting a dominant role of forcing in most natural conditions.
663 Forcing requirements, however, appear to increase given shorter photoperiods or lower chilling (Caffarra et al.,
664 2011a; Chuine et al., 2010). Research has yet to fully tease out effects of these three cues, their interactions,
665 and their prevalence; photoperiod responses appear variable across species and populations, as well as with
666 different chilling treatments (see Box 1). Not surprisingly, there is currently little agreement on the under-
667 lying model for how photoperiod affects spring phenology for most species (Chuine et al., 2016; Hänninen
668 et al., 2019). More physiological research will likely be necessary for major advances, as understanding the
669 exact cellular pathways through which chilling, forcing, and photoperiod act appears increasingly critical to
670 accurate modelling (van der Schoot et al., 2014; Hänninen et al., 2019).

671 Additional cellular and molecular studies may quickly advance understanding and scale up to improved
672 photoperiod models. While our understanding of how plants interpret photoperiod at the molecular-level
673 comes from few species, largely from studies of flowering in the model plant *Arabidopsis thaliana* (e.g.,
674 Suárez-López et al., 2001) and fall budset in woody plant species (e.g., Howe et al., 1996), these studies have
675 proved useful across other species. For example, the ‘external coincidence model’ (where plants sense light
676 via blue light receptors and phytochromes, then interpret photoperiod through a coordinated response to
677 light in relation to the time of day, see Lagercrantz, 2009) has been most widely studied in *Arabidopsis*, but
678 appears to be a relevant mechanism for photoperiod responses in diverse perennial and woody plant species
679 (Singh et al., 2017; Petterle et al., 2013; Andrés and Coupland, 2012; Kobayashi and Weigel, 2007; Davis,
680 2002; Bastow and Dean, 2002; Bünning, 1936). The model proposes the existence of a circadian rhythm of
681 light sensitivity, in which the night-phase is sensitive to light and the day-phase is insensitive to light. As days
682 get longer in the spring, daylight illuminates the light sensitive phase, triggering a response. This provides a

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

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

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