

# Spatial and temporal shifts in photoperiod with climate change

A. K. Ettinger<sup>1,2,a</sup>, D. M. Buonaiuto<sup>2,3</sup>, C. J. Chamberlain<sup>2,3</sup>, I. Morales-Castilla<sup>2,3,4,5</sup>, and

E. M. Wolkovich<sup>2,3,6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Northwest Fisheries Science Center, NOAA, Seattle, Washington, USA

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

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

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

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

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

<sup>a</sup>Corresponding author; email: ailene.ettinger@noaa.gov; phone: 781-296-4821; mailing  
address: Northwest Fisheries Science Center, NOAA, 2725 Montlake Blvd W, Seattle, WA  
98118 USA

**Data Accessibility** The OSPREE database is available at KNB, doi:10.5063/F1QV3JQR (Wolkovich et al., 2019).

**Running head** Shifts in photoperiod with climate change

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

## <sup>1</sup> Abstract

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

## <sup>15</sup> Introduction

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

<sup>24</sup> Spring phenology is not controlled solely by temperature, however. Photoperiod is also a critical cue for  
<sup>25</sup> plants and animals, signaling changes in growth, mating, and reproduction across diverse species (e.g., Flynn  
<sup>26</sup> and Wolkovich, 2018; Howe et al., 1996; Lagercrantz, 2009; Mcallan et al., 2006; Solbakken et al., 1994).  
<sup>27</sup> Photoperiod is a useful cue to synchronize activities with seasonal climatic changes (e.g., Basler and Körner,  
<sup>28</sup> 2012; Hsu et al., 2011; Singh et al., 2017) because it is consistent across years, especially compared to other  
<sup>29</sup> seasonal cues such as temperature and precipitation (Saikkonen et al., 2012). For example, relying on a  
<sup>30</sup> threshold photoperiod (see *Glossary*), rather than temperature alone, may prevent woody plants from leafing  
<sup>31</sup> out during “false spring” events (unusually warm periods during winter that are followed by a return of  
<sup>32</sup> cold temperatures, Gu et al., 2008). With current rapid warming photoperiod may also potentially slow the  
<sup>33</sup> observed trend of advancing spring phenology.

<sup>34</sup> Recent studies offer inconsistent views about whether photoperiod may eventually restrict advances in spring  
<sup>35</sup> phenology in a warmer world. Some studies suggest that, with additional warming, photoperiod will limit  
<sup>36</sup> phenological shifts of certain species such that they will not track rising temperatures (e.g., by leafing out  
<sup>37</sup> earlier in the spring, Körner and Basler, 2010; Way and Montgomery, 2015). Instead, these species’ responses  
<sup>38</sup> will increasingly become constrained by daylength and the trend of ever-earlier springs with warming may  
<sup>39</sup> halt. Other studies, however, suggest that photoperiod will not constrain responses to warming for most  
<sup>40</sup> species (Chuine et al., 2010; Zohner et al., 2016). The extent to which daylength constrains responses will  
<sup>41</sup> depend in part on how rapidly photoperiod cues can acclimate or adapt to new environmental conditions,  
<sup>42</sup> which remains poorly understood (Grevstad and Coop, 2015).

<sup>43</sup> Perhaps because of these variable and uncertain responses, photoperiod is often not included in forecasts of  
<sup>44</sup> biological responses to climate change, especially in the spring, even though it is known to be an important  
<sup>45</sup> cue for biological activity (but see Caffarra et al., 2011a; Duputié et al., 2015; Grevstad and Coop, 2015).  
<sup>46</sup> The exclusion of photoperiod may be problematic: although photoperiod itself is stable over time, the  
<sup>47</sup> photoperiod that species *experience*, as they undergo climate change-induced shifts in space and time, is  
<sup>48</sup> likely to be much less stable. In addition to shifting activity earlier with recent warming, many species have  
<sup>49</sup> shifted their distributions poleward and upward in elevation (i.e., range shifts, Chen et al., 2011; Harsch et al.,  
<sup>50</sup> 2009; Parmesan, 2006; Peñuelas and Boada, 2003). These spatial and temporal shifts alter the photoperiod  
<sup>51</sup> experienced by organisms (Fig. 1); altered photoperiods may have cascading effects on species’ performance,

52 since daylength can affect the timing of development (Grevstad and Coop, 2015; Muir et al., 1994), migration  
53 (Dawbin, 1966), and other important responses.

54 The implications of potential climate change-induced shifts in experienced photoperiod are unclear, since  
55 the magnitude of potential shifts has not been described. Effects of photoperiod shifts may be relatively  
56 minor, especially because there can be substantial year-to-year variation in experienced photoperiod (Fig. 2).  
57 Alternatively, photoperiod may begin to constrain species' responses to climate change (Körner and Basler,  
58 2010).

59 Here, we ask:

- 60 1. How will climate change alter the photoperiod experienced by organisms?
- 61 2. What are the implications of altered photoperiods for biological responses to climate change?
- 62 3. Can research apply experiments that alter photoperiod to forecasting biological implications of climate  
63 change?

64 These questions are broadly relevant for diverse species. Here, we use a case study of spring woody plant  
65 phenology to illustrate our points (Box 1). We focus on spring events, as phenology during this time is one  
66 of the most widely observed and rapidly changing biological responses to climate change (Parmesan, 2006).  
67 Woody species are a useful focal group because they have been the subject of decades of growth chamber  
68 experiments, are at the center of an important and controversial debate on the relative effects of photoperiod  
69 versus temperature on their phenology, and because forecasting effects of climate change on their phenology  
70 (i.e., the length of the growing season) has critical implications for global carbon cycling and feedbacks to the  
71 climate system (Richardson et al., 2013). We use studies included in Observed Spring Phenology Responses  
72 in Experimental Environments (OSPREE), a new database of plant growth chamber studies that manipulate  
73 photoperiod and temperature to measure plant phenological responses, including budburst and flowering  
74 (Wolkovich et al., 2019).

<sup>75</sup> How will climate change alter the photoperiod experienced by or-  
<sup>76</sup> ganisms?

<sup>77</sup> Species experience different photoperiod regimes depending on their location on Earth (Fig. 1, 2), the  
<sup>78</sup> seasonal timing of their activity, and inter-annual variation in climate. The daylength experienced by plants  
<sup>79</sup> on the date that spring “green-up” occurs, for example, varies with latitude (Fig. 2a). This is in part  
<sup>80</sup> because latitudinal variation in green-up date, which occurs earlier toward the equator and later toward the  
<sup>81</sup> north pole, is strongly driven by climatic differences that affect phenology, and in part because of latitudinal  
<sup>82</sup> variation in photoperiod (e.g., at the north pole, the daylength at the summer solstice is 24 hours). A general  
<sup>83</sup> pattern of longer photoperiod at green-up toward the poles is consistent across years (Fig. 2b) and green-  
<sup>84</sup> up does not appear to occur at daylengths less than 10 hours. There is strong spatiotemporal variation in  
<sup>85</sup> experienced photoperiod across years (compare the photoperiod at green-up in “early” versus “late” years, Fig.  
<sup>86</sup> 2): experienced photoperiod at green-up can vary two to three hours from one year to the next in the same  
<sup>87</sup> location (Fig. 2c). Though green-up date corresponds to plant phenology, we expect that spatiotemporal  
<sup>88</sup> patterns of variation in spring phenology would be similar for other organisms (Ovaskainen et al., 2013;  
<sup>89</sup> Peñuelas et al., 2002).

<sup>90</sup> Against this existing background variation, climate change will cause shifts in experienced photoperiod as  
<sup>91</sup> species respond to warming temperatures. Spatial shifts in species’ ranges and temporal shifts in phenology  
<sup>92</sup> will alter the photoperiods experienced by organisms with future climate change. The magnitude of these  
<sup>93</sup> alterations will vary depending on the organism’s location and the type of shift(s) it undergoes. For example,  
<sup>94</sup> poleward shifts in species’ ranges cause organisms to experience a wider range of daylength throughout the  
<sup>95</sup> year (Fig. 1). Elevational shifts, in contrast, cause minimal changes in the range of daylength throughout  
<sup>96</sup> the year.

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

<sup>101</sup> Despite a focus on range shifts, current data suggest that temporal shifts will yield much larger changes in

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

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

## 119 **What are the implications of altered photoperiods for biological 120 responses to climate change?**

121 Daylength can play a role in controlling critical biological functions, including vegetative growth, cell elong-  
122 gation, budburst, and flowering in plants (Ashby et al., 1962; Erwin, 1998; Sidaway-Lee et al., 2010; Heide,  
123 2011; Heide and Sønsteby, 2012; Hsu et al., 2011; Linkosalo and Lechowicz, 2006; Mimura and Aitken, 2007)  
124 and growth rate, maturation, migration, and diapause in animals (Bradshaw and Holzapfel, 2006; Dawbin,  
125 1966; Muir et al., 1994; Saunders and Henderson, 1970; Tobin et al., 2008; Zydlewski et al., 2014). Climate  
126 change-induced shifts in photoperiod are therefore likely to alter these functions. Indeed, growth chamber  
127 studies demonstrate that the magnitude of daylength shifts we can expect with climate change (i.e., 1-2

128 hours of difference in daylength with temporal shifts over the next century) are substantial enough to affect  
129 spring phenology in trees (Table S1). The direction and magnitude of responses will vary, however, because  
130 of variation in photoperiod sensitivity, and because photoperiod often interacts with other environmental  
131 drivers, such as temperature, to affect phenology (Box 1).

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

139 A challenge in understanding the implications of altered photoperiods under climate change, and for force-  
140 casting whether and when the trend of earlier phenology with warming may slow or stop abruptly, is the wide  
141 range of observed photoperiod sensitivity across species (Flynn and Wolkovich, 2018; Sanz-Perez et al., 2009;  
142 Zohner et al., 2016), populations (Tanino et al., 2010), and ecotypes (Howe et al., 1995). How much geno-  
143 type versus environment explain this variation is an active area of research (e.g., Franks et al., 2014; Gould  
144 et al., 2010; Mimura and Aitken, 2010; Fréjaville et al.). Environmental conditions clearly play a role, since  
145 different combinations of ambient temperature and photoperiod may explain some of this variation, because  
146 temperature cues can override photoperiod requirements under certain conditions (e.g., Tanino et al., 2010).  
147 In such cases, climate change-induced phenological shifts may occur at different rates than past shifts with  
148 warming. On the other hand, some of this variation may be due to underlying genetic differences, because  
149 photoperiod responses can be under strong genetic control (Bradshaw and Stettler, 1995; Keller et al., 2011;  
150 Weih, 2004, , see also Box 1). Teasing out the relative roles of genetics versus environmental conditions will  
151 be critical to accurate forecasts of future phenology under climate change.

152 Species- and population-level variation in photoperiod sensitivity may result in altered communities as climate  
153 change progresses. For example, a species or population that is relatively insensitive to photoperiod can take  
154 advantage of warmer springs by having an earlier start to its growing season. Indeed, phenological tracking of  
155 temperature (e.g., earlier flowering, leafout, migration with warming) has been linked with higher performance

156 in plants and animals (Cleland et al., 2012; Muir et al., 1994; Willis et al., 2010). Species or populations  
157 that are sensitive to temperature but relatively insensitive to photoperiod may therefore outcompete slower  
158 growing or later emerging ones that are limited by photoperiod and thus cannot take advantage of longer  
159 growing season conditions. To identify where, when, and how communities may be altered, methods for  
160 incorporating photoperiod into forecasting future phenology are critical.

161 **Future directions: outstanding questions and incorporating pho-**  
162 **toperiod into forecasting**

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

166 Approaches for forecasting can be grouped into two broad categories: statistical models and process-based  
167 models. These two modelling paradigms differ in at least two ways, in terms of relating phenology to  
168 climate change. First, statistical models generally assume linear relationships between species' responses and  
169 environmental variables (e.g., Flynn and Wolkovich, 2018; Van Belle et al., 2007; Ibáñez et al., 2010), instead  
170 process-based models often incorporate nonlinear threshold relationships as well (e.g. Chuine and Beaubien,  
171 2001; Morin and Thuiller, 2009; Xie and Hsieh, 1989). Second, statistical models of phenology under climate  
172 change have typically ignored photoperiod, focusing instead on seasonal or annual temperature (e.g. Diez  
173 et al., 2012; Ibáñez et al., 2010; Van Belle et al., 2007, but see Richardson et al. (2013)). whereas process-  
174 based models of phenology more frequently incorporate photoperiod, along with temperature (Duputié et al.,  
175 2015; Morin and Thuiller, 2009; Xie and Hsieh, 1989; Zhao et al., 2013). A challenge of process-based models is  
176 that they require detailed data that is often not readily available (e.g., daily climate data, nonlinear biological  
177 responses to fine-scale changes in temperature). Perhaps because of this challenge, statistical models remain  
178 more commonly used in climate change forecasts of biological responses (e.g., Basler and Körner, 2012; Diez  
179 et al., 2012; García-Valdés and Morales-Castilla, 2016; Ibáñez et al., 2010; Van Belle et al., 2007; Zhu et al.,  
180 2012).

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

193 For some species, experimental data can be immediately used in forecasting because experiments manipulate  
194 photoperiod at relevant scales (e.g., Basler and Körner, 2014; Heide and Sonstebry, 2015, Figs. 4, 5 A,  
195 Table S1). For example, photoperiod treatments from growth chamber experiments with *Fagus sylvatica*  
196 span the variation in both current and expected future ranges (Fig. 5, Duputié et al., 2015), and may allow  
197 identification of threshold photoperiods (Fig. 6). In other cases, attempting to incorporate photoperiod into  
198 forecasts of future phenology will reveal gaps in our understanding of many aspects of photoperiod responses.  
199 For example, photoperiod treatments from existing experiments of *Quercus robur* do not accurately represent  
200 experienced photoperiods from current or future estimates, making fine scale projections difficult, even for  
201 this relatively well-studied species. This gap extends to many species, as most experiments manipulate  
202 photoperiod much more dramatically than will occur with climate change (Figs. 4, 5). Although these  
203 studies can be useful for understanding mechanistically how photoperiod responses work, extrapolating them  
204 to climate change models may not be reasonable.

205 Photoperiod is not fully integrated into most current forecasts of biological responses to climate change (but  
206 see Tobin et al., 2008), an omission that could affect the accuracy of forecasts. Forecasts from ecosystem mod-  
207 els often incorporate photoperiod, along with other variables such as evaporative demand and temperature  
208 (e.g., ED Jolly et al., 2005; Medvigy et al., 2013), but photoperiod is rarely included in species distribution

209 models (e.g., Morin and Thuiller, 2009; Zhu et al., 2012). The sensitivity of model outcomes to assumptions  
210 made about experienced photoperiod and threshold responses to photoperiod needs further study, including  
211 understanding how variation in photoperiod responses across ecosystems, species, populations, and life stages  
212 impacts forecasts.

213 As researchers more fully integrate photoperiod into forecasting, a critical area of further study is under-  
214 standing *how* photoperiod acts as a cue. Photoperiod seems to interact with temperature to affect phenology  
215 (e.g., Zydlowski et al., 2014); this would explain the divergent effects of photoperiod observed across studies  
216 in woody plants (e.g., Fig. 3). However, exactly how it interacts with temperature is not well-defined for most  
217 species or populations (Boxes 1, S1). Understanding the drivers, as well as the consequences, of variations  
218 in photoperiod responses across species and populations will be particularly beneficial for forecasting. For  
219 example, what traits are associated with photoperiod sensitivity and does variation in photoperiod sensitivity  
220 or related traits have a strong genetic component? If so, are species or populations from some locations or  
221 lineages more likely than others to be constrained by photoperiod in their responses to climate change?

## 222 Conclusions

223 Organisms may undergo large changes to the photoperiod they experience with climate change, even if they  
224 do not shift their ranges spatially. Here we have shown that these altered photoperiods may result in stalled  
225 future advances of woody plant phenology with warming (Table S1, Fig. 4), with cascading effects on growth,  
226 fitness, and community composition due to the large variation in photoperiod responses across species and  
227 populations (Fig. 3). Shifts in photoperiod with climate change have implications for a variety of plant and  
228 animal responses, given that daylength affects critical activities for diverse species from insects (Bradshaw  
229 and Holzapfel, 2006; Linn et al., 1996) and salmon (Solbakken et al., 1994; Taranger et al., 2003) to birds  
230 (Dawson et al., 2001) and marsupials (McCallan et al., 2006; Solbakken et al., 1994). Given what we know,  
231 incorporating photoperiod into forecasting of climate change responses should improve model accuracy, and  
232 will illuminate additional experiments that could improve our mechanistic understanding of photoperiod as  
233 a critical cue for diverse biological responses.

## <sup>234</sup> Glossary

- <sup>235</sup> • budburst: when one or more leaf buds have visible green tips.
- <sup>236</sup> • chilling: the intensity and duration of winter temperature, often a certain sum of chilling that is required (e.g., some amount of hours or days of cold temperatures, defined by a specific critical temperature or range of temperatures, such as between 0 and 7.2 °C, Richardson, 1974), that must be experienced for budburst to occur.
- <sup>240</sup> • daylength: the period of time during a 24-hour period during which an organism receives light.
- <sup>241</sup> • diapause: period of suspended development or growth, usually used to describe invertebrates during unfavorable environmental conditions such as winter
- <sup>243</sup> • dormancy: halted or reduced growth or activity, usually used to describe plants
- <sup>244</sup> • forcing: warm spring temperatures, often a certain sum of forcing that is required (e.g., some amount of hours or days above a specific temperature) for budburst or flowering can occur.
- <sup>246</sup> • green-up: The beginning of a new cycle of plant growth, usually evaluated at the landscape scale
- <sup>247</sup> • phenology: the timing of life cycle events in organisms
- <sup>248</sup> • photoperiod: the daily duration of light (daylength) and dark to which an organism is exposed; often used synonymously with daylength
- <sup>250</sup> • photoperiod sensitivity: the degree to which phenology is controlled by daylength; may be a nonlinear, or “threshold”, response in plants (Box S1) and animals (Tobin et al., 2008; Grevstad and Coop, 2015).
- <sup>252</sup> • photoperiodism: the ability to assess the length of day or night to regulate behavior, physiology, growth, development or reproduction.
- <sup>254</sup> • threshold photoperiod: length of day that causes an organism to switch from a short- to a long-day response (or vice versa). For example, in European larch (*Larix decidua*), budburst development may be constrained under short-day conditions, when daylengths are less than a threshold photoperiod of 10-11 hours (Migliavacca et al., 2008). Above this threshold photoperiod, the long-day response of unconstrained budburst development can occur.

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

260 **plant spring phenology**

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

271 Woody plant growth chamber studies have been conducted for decades, but have only recently been syn-  
272 thesized (Wolkovich et al., 2019), revealing that photoperiod sensitivity is widespread, though with wide  
273 variation across studies and species. Growth chamber experiments in OSPREE suggest that the dominant  
274 photoperiod response in woody plant species is earlier and more rapid budburst with longer days (e.g., Caf-  
275 farra and Donnelly, 2011). Thirty-one of the 85 studies in the OSPREE database included two or more  
276 different photoperiod treatments. Of these, 26 (84%) found significant photoperiod main effects or significant  
277 interactive effects with temperature (i.e., photoperiod x temperature effects), across 176 species (Table S1).  
278 Main effects included responses such as growth (e.g., higher growth rates with longer days Ashby et al., 1962)  
279 and reproduction (e.g., increased flowering with longer days Heide and Sønsteby, 2012).

280 Growth chamber experiments highlight that responses to photoperiod vary depending on temperature con-  
281 ditions. For example, more rapid advancement of budburst was observed under long versus short days with  
282 low chilling, than with high chilling in *Betula paynifera* (Hawkins and Dhar, 2012) (Fig. 3). Frequently, long  
283 photoperiods can compensate for low amounts of chilling, resulting in enhanced cell growth (Heide, 1993a;  
284 Myking and Heide, 1995; Caffarra et al., 2011b).

285 Woody plant growth chamber experiments also demonstrate that, though photoperiod responses are common,

they are variable (Fig. 3). Responses to photoperiod differ by species (e.g., Basler and Körner, 2012, 2014; Flynn and Wolkovich, 2018; Heide, 1993b; Howe et al., 1996; Zohner et al., 2016). For example, with longer chilling treatments some species seem insensitive to daylength (e.g., *Hammamelis* spp., *Prunus* spp., Zohner et al., 2016), whereas others (e.g. *Fagus* spp., Fig. 5A) seem to be highly sensitive to daylength, even with long chilling treatments (Zohner et al., 2016). In addition, some species demonstrated an opposing response to photoperiod than typically observed: *Tilia*, for example, showed delayed budburst with longer daylengths (Fig. 3, Ashby et al., 1962). Photoperiod sensitivity also varies by population and ecotype (e.g., Partanen et al., 2005) (Fig. 3). For example, photoperiod effects on budburst were more significant for lower latitude populations of *Betula pendula* and *B. pubescens* (Partanen et al., 2005).

## 295 Acknowledgements

296 We thank the many researchers who conducted the experiments synthesized in this manuscript; H. Kharouba  
297 for helpful comments that improved the manuscript; B. Feist for improving the appearance of Fig. 4 dramat-  
298 ically; and Anne Duputié and Isabelle Chuine for sharing projections from PhenoFit. The National Science  
299 Foundation (DBI 14-01854 to AKE), NSERC Discovery Award (RGPIN-05038 to EMW) and Canada Re-  
300 search Chair in Temporal Ecology (EMW) provided funding. Any opinion, findings, and conclusions or  
301 recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views  
302 of the National Science Foundation.

## 303 References

- 304 Ashby, W., et al. 1962. Germination capacity in American Basswood *Tilia americana*. Transactions of the  
305 Illinois State Academy of Science 55:120–3.
- 306 Basler, D., and C. Körner. 2012. Photoperiod sensitivity of bud burst in 14 temperate forest tree species.  
307 Agricultural and Forest Meteorology 165:73–81.
- 308 ———. 2014. Photoperiod and temperature responses of bud swelling and bud burst in four temperate forest  
309 tree species. Tree Physiology 34:377–388.

- 310 Bradley, N. L., A. C. Leopold, J. Ross, and W. Huffaker. 1999. Phenological changes reflect climate change  
311 in Wisconsin. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 96:9701–9704.
- 312 Bradshaw, H., and R. F. Stettler. 1995. Molecular genetics of growth and development in *Populus*. IV.  
313 Mapping QTLs with large effects on growth, form, and phenology traits in a forest tree. *Genetics* 139:963–  
314 973.
- 315 Bradshaw, W. E., and C. M. Holzapfel. 2006. Evolutionary response to rapid climate change. *Science*  
316 312:1477–1478.
- 317 Caffarra, A., and A. Donnelly. 2011. The ecological significance of phenology in four different tree species:  
318 effects of light and temperature on bud burst. *International Journal of Biometeorology* 55:711–721.
- 319 Caffarra, A., A. Donnelly, and I. Chuine. 2011a. Modelling the timing of *Betula pubescens* budburst. II.  
320 Integrating complex effects of photoperiod into process-based models. *Climate Research* 46:159–170.
- 321 Caffarra, A., A. Donnelly, I. Chuine, and M. B. Jones. 2011b. Modelling the timing of *Betula pubescens*  
322 bud-burst. I. Temperature and photoperiod: A conceptual model. *Climate Research* 46:147.
- 323 Campbell, R. K., and A. I. Sugano. 1975. Phenology of bud burst in Douglas-fir related to provenance,  
324 photoperiod, chilling, and flushing temperature. *Botanical Gazette* pages 290–298.
- 325 Chen, I.-C., J. K. Hill, R. Ohlemüller, D. B. Roy, and C. D. Thomas. 2011. Rapid range shifts of species  
326 associated with high levels of climate warming. *Science* 333:1024–1026.
- 327 Chuine, I., and E. G. Beaubien. 2001. Phenology is a major determinant of tree species range. *Ecology*  
328 Letters 4:500–510.
- 329 Chuine, I., X. Morin, and H. Bugmann. 2010. Warming, photoperiods, and tree phenology. *Science* 329:277–  
330 278.
- 331 Cleland, E. E., J. M. Allen, T. M. Crimmins, J. A. Dunne, S. Pau, S. E. Travers, E. S. Zavaleta, and E. M.  
332 Wolkovich. 2012. Phenological tracking enables positive species responses to climate change. *Ecology*  
333 93:1765–1771.
- 334 Dawbin, W. H. 1966. The seasonal migratory cycle of humpback whales. *Whales, dolphins and porpoises*  
335 pages 145–170.

- 336 Dawson, A., V. M. King, G. E. Bentley, and G. F. Ball. 2001. Photoperiodic control of seasonality in birds.
- 337 Journal of Biological Rhythms 16:365–380.
- 338 Diez, J. M., I. Ibáñez, A. J. Miller-Rushing, S. J. Mazer, T. M. Crimmins, M. A. Crimmins, C. D. Bertelsen,
- 339 and D. W. Inouye. 2012. Forecasting phenology: from species variability to community patterns. Ecology
- 340 Letters 15:545–553.
- 341 Duputié, A., A. Rutschmann, O. Ronce, and I. Chuine. 2015. Phenological plasticity will not help all species
- 342 adapt to climate change. Global Change Biology 21:3062–3073.
- 343 Erwin, J. E. 1998. Temperature and light effects on stem elongation (plant growth regulation by physical and
- 344 mechanical stimuli, for further development of horticulture in East Asia). Journal of the Japanese Society
- 345 for Horticultural Science 67:1113–1120.
- 346 Falusi, M., and R. Calamassi. 1990. Bud dormancy in beech (*Fagus sylvatica* L.). Effect of chilling and
- 347 photoperiod on dormancy release of beech seedlings. Tree Physiology 6:429–438.
- 348 Flynn, D. F. B., and E. M. Wolkovich. 2018. Temperature and photoperiod drive spring phenology across all
- 349 species in a temperate forest community. New Phytologist 219:1353–1362.
- 350 Franks, S. J., J. J. Weber, and S. N. Aitken. 2014. Evolutionary and plastic responses to climate change in
- 351 terrestrial plant populations. Evolutionary Applications 7:123–139.
- 352 Fréjaville, T., B. Fady, A. Kremer, A. Ducouso, and M. Benito Garzón. ???? Inferring phenotypic plasticity
- 353 and population responses to climate across tree species ranges using forest inventory data. Global Ecology
- 354 and Biogeography .
- 355 García-Valdés, R., and I. Morales-Castilla. 2016. Efectos del cambio climático en los ecosistemas forestales:
- 356 integrando inventarios y modelos. Ecosistemas 25:51–59.
- 357 Gauzere, J., S. Delzon, H. Davi, M. Bonhomme, I. G. de Cortazar-Atauri, and I. Chuine. 2017. Integrating
- 358 interactive effects of chilling and photoperiod in phenological process-based models. A case study with
- 359 two European tree species: *Fagus sylvatica* and *Quercus petraea*. Agricultural and Forest Meteorology
- 360 244:9–20.

- 361 Gould, P. J., C. A. Harrington, and J. B. St. Clair. 2010. Incorporating genetic variation into a model of  
362 budburst phenology of coast douglas-fir (*pseudotsuga menziesii* var. *menziesii*). Canadian journal of forest  
363 research 41:139–150.
- 364 Grevstad, F. S., and L. B. Coop. 2015. The consequences of photoperiodism for organisms in new climates.  
365 Ecological Applications 25:1506–1517.
- 366 Gu, L., P. J. Hanson, W. M. Post, D. P. Kaiser, B. Yang, R. Nemani, S. G. Pallardy, and T. Meyers. 2008.  
367 The 2007 Eastern US spring freeze: Increased cold damage in a warming world. BioScience 58:253.
- 368 Gwinner, E. 1996. Circadian and circannual programmes in avian migration. Journal of Experimental Biology  
369 199:39–48.
- 370 Harsch, M. A., P. E. Hulme, M. S. McGlone, and R. P. Duncan. 2009. Are treelines advancing? A global  
371 meta-analysis of treeline response to climate warming. Ecology Letters 12:1040–1049.
- 372 Hawkins, C. D., and A. Dhar. 2012. Spring bud phenology of 18 *Betula papyrifera* populations in British  
373 Columbia. Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research 27:507–519.
- 374 Heide, O. 1993a. Daylength and thermal time responses of budburst during dormancy release in some  
375 northern deciduous trees. Physiologia Plantarum 88:531–540.
- 376 ———. 1993b. Dormancy release in beech buds (*Fagus sylvatica*) requires both chilling and long days.  
377 Physiologia Plantarum 89:187–191.
- 378 Heide, O. M. 1977. Photoperiod and temperature interactions in growth and flowering of strawberry. Physi-  
379 ologia Plantarum 40:21–26.
- 380 ———. 2011. Temperature rather than photoperiod controls growth cessation and dormancy in *Sorbus*  
381 species. Journal of Experimental Botany 62:5397–5404.
- 382 Heide, O. M., and A. Sønsteby. 2012. Floral initiation in black currant cultivars (*Ribes nigrum* L.): Effects of  
383 plant size, photoperiod, temperature, and duration of short day exposure. Scientia Horticulturae 138:64–72.
- 384 Heide, O. M., and A. Sonsteby. 2015. Simultaneous dormancy induction interferes with short day floral  
385 induction in black currant (*Ribes nigrum* L.). Scientia Horticulturae 185:228–232.

- 386 Howe, G. T., G. Gardner, W. P. Hackett, and G. R. Furnier. 1996. Phytochrome control of short-day-induced  
387 bud set in black cottonwood. *Physiologia Plantarum* 97:95–103.
- 388 Howe, G. T., W. P. Hackett, G. R. Furnier, and R. E. Klevorn. 1995. Photoperiodic responses of a northern  
389 and southern ecotype of black cottonwood. *Physiologia Plantarum* 93:695–708.
- 390 Hsu, C.-Y., J. P. Adams, H. Kim, K. No, C. Ma, S. H. Strauss, J. Drnevich, L. Vandervelde, J. D. Ellis, B. M.  
391 Rice, et al. 2011. FLOWERING LOCUS T duplication coordinates reproductive and vegetative growth in  
392 perennial poplar. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 108:10756–10761.
- 393 Ibáñez, I., R. B. Primack, A. J. Miller-Rushing, E. Ellwood, H. Higuchi, S. D. Lee, H. Kobori, and J. A.  
394 Silander. 2010. Forecasting phenology under global warming. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal  
395 Society B-Biological Sciences* 365.
- 396 Jolly, W. M., R. Nemani, and S. W. Running. 2005. A generalized, bioclimatic index to predict foliar  
397 phenology in response to climate. *Global Change Biology* 11:619–632.
- 398 Keller, S. R., R. Y. Soolanayakanahally, R. D. Guy, S. N. Silim, M. S. Olson, and P. Tiffin. 2011. Climate-  
399 driven local adaptation of ecophysiology and phenology in balsam poplar, *Populus balsamifera* L. (Salicaceae). *American Journal of Botany* 98:99–108.
- 400 Körner, C., and D. Basler. 2010. Warming, photoperiods, and tree phenology response. *Science* 329:278–278.
- 401 Lagercrantz, U. 2009. At the end of the day: a common molecular mechanism for photoperiod responses in  
402 plants? *Journal of Experimental Botany* 60:2501–2515.
- 403 Laube, J., T. H. Sparks, N. Estrella, J. Höfler, D. P. Ankerst, and A. Menzel. 2014. Chilling outweighs  
404 photoperiod in preventing precocious spring development. *Global Change Biology* 20:170–182.
- 405 Linkosalo, T., and M. J. Lechowicz. 2006. Twilight far-red treatment advances leaf bud burst of silver birch  
406 (*Betula pendula*). *Tree Physiology* 26:1249–1256.
- 407 Linn, C. E., M. G. Campbell, K. R. Poole, W.-Q. Wu, and W. L. Roelofs. 1996. Effects of photoperiod on  
408 the circadian timing of pheromone response in male *Trichoplusia ni*: relationship to the modulatory action  
409 of octopamine. *Journal of Insect Physiology* 42:881–891.

- 411 McCallan, B. M., C. R. Dickman, and M. S. Crowther. 2006. Photoperiod as a reproductive cue in the  
412 marsupial genus *Antechinus*: ecological and evolutionary consequences. Biological Journal of the Linnean  
413 Society 87:365–379.
- 414 Medvigy, D., S.-J. Jeong, K. L. Clark, N. S. Skowronski, and K. V. Schäfer. 2013. Effects of seasonal variation  
415 of photosynthetic capacity on the carbon fluxes of a temperate deciduous forest. Journal of Geophysical  
416 Research: Biogeosciences 118:1703–1714.
- 417 Menzel, A. 2000. Trends in phenological phases in Europe between 1951 and 1996. International Journal of  
418 Biometeorology 44:76–81.
- 419 Menzel, A., T. H. Sparks, N. Estrella, E. Koch, A. Aasa, R. Ahas, K. Alm-Kuebler, et al. 2006. European  
420 phenological response to climate change matches the warming pattern. Global Change Biology 12:1969–  
421 1976.
- 422 Migliavacca, M., E. Cremonese, R. Colombo, L. Busetto, M. Galvagno, L. Ganis, M. Meroni, E. Pari,  
423 M. Rossini, C. Siniscalco, et al. 2008. European larch phenology in the alps: can we grasp the role of  
424 ecological factors by combining field observations and inverse modelling? International journal of biome-  
425 teorology 52:587–605.
- 426 Mimura, M., and S. Aitken. 2007. Adaptive gradients and isolation-by-distance with postglacial migration  
427 in *Picea sitchensis*. Heredity 99:224.
- 428 ———. 2010. Local adaptation at the range peripheries of sitka spruce. Journal of evolutionary biology  
429 23:249–258.
- 430 Morin, X., J. Roy, L. Sonié, and I. Chuine. 2010. Changes in leaf phenology of three European oak species  
431 in response to experimental climate change. New Phytologist 186:900–910.
- 432 Morin, X., and W. Thuiller. 2009. Comparing niche-and process-based models to reduce prediction uncertainty  
433 in species range shifts under climate change. Ecology 90:1301–1313.
- 434 Muir, W. D., W. S. Zaugg, A. E. Giorgi, and S. McCutcheon. 1994. Accelerating smolt development and  
435 downstream movement in yearling chinook salmon with advanced photoperiod and increased temperature.  
436 Aquaculture 123:387–399.

- 437 Myking, T., and O. Heide. 1995. Dormancy release and chilling requirement of buds of latitudinal ecotypes  
438 of *Betula pendula* and *B. pubescens*. *Tree physiology* 15:697–704.
- 439 Nienstaedt, H. 1966. Dormancy and dormancy release in white spruce. *Forest Science* 12:374–384.
- 440 Ovaskainen, O., S. Skorokhodova, M. Yakovleva, A. Sukhov, A. Kutenkov, N. Kutenkova, A. Shcherbakov,  
441 E. Meyke, and M. del Mar Delgado. 2013. Community-level phenological response to climate change.  
442 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110:13434–13439.
- 443 Parmesan, C. 2006. Ecological and evolutionary responses to recent climate change. *Annual Review of  
444 Ecology Evolution and Systematics* 37:637–669.
- 445 Parmesan, C., and G. Yohe. 2003. A globally coherent fingerprint of climate change impacts across natural  
446 systems. *Nature* 421:37.
- 447 Partanen, J., H. Hänninen, and R. Häkkinen. 2005. Bud burst in Norway spruce (*Picea abies*): preliminary  
448 evidence for age-specific rest patterns. *Trees* 19:66–72.
- 449 Peñuelas, J., and M. Boada. 2003. A global change-induced biome shift in the Montseny mountains (NE  
450 Spain). *Global Change Biology* 9:131–140.
- 451 Peñuelas, J., I. Filella, and P. Comas. 2002. Changed plant and animal life cycles from 1952 to 2000 in the  
452 mediterranean region. *Global Change Biology* 8:531–544.
- 453 Polgar, C. A., R. B. Primack, E. H. Williams, S. Stichter, and C. Hitchcock. 2013. Climate effects on the  
454 flight period of lycaenid butterflies in Massachusetts. *Biological Conservation* 160:25–31.
- 455 Poloczanska, E. S., C. J. Brown, W. J. Sydeman, W. Kiessling, D. S. Schoeman, P. J. Moore, K. Brander,  
456 J. F. Bruno, L. B. Buckley, M. T. Burrows, et al. 2013. Global imprint of climate change on marine life.  
457 *Nature Climate Change* 3:919.
- 458 Richardson, A. D., T. F. Keenan, M. Migliavacca, Y. Ryu, O. Sonnentag, and M. Toomey. 2013. Climate  
459 change, phenology, and phenological control of vegetation feedbacks to the climate system. *Agricultural  
460 and Forest Meteorology* 169:156–173.
- 461 Richardson, E. 1974. A model for estimating the completion of rest for 'redhaven' and 'elberta' peach trees.  
462 *HortScience* 9:331–332.

- 463 Root, T. L., J. T. Price, K. R. Hall, S. H. Schneider, C. Rosenzweig, and J. A. Pounds. 2003. Fingerprints  
464 of global warming on wild animals and plants. *Nature* 421:57–60.
- 465 Saikkonen, K., K. Taulavuori, T. Hyvönen, P. E. Gundel, C. E. Hamilton, I. Vänninen, A. Nissinen, and  
466 M. Helander. 2012. Climate change-driven species' range shifts filtered by photoperiodism. *Nature Climate  
467 Change* 2:239.
- 468 Sanz-Perez, V., P. Castro-Diez, and F. Valladares. 2009. Differential and interactive effects of temperature  
469 and photoperiod on budburst and carbon reserves in two co-occurring Mediterranean oaks. *Plant Biology  
470* 11:142–51.
- 471 Saunders, R. L., and E. B. Henderson. 1970. Influence of photoperiod on smolt development and growth of  
472 Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*). *Journal of the Fisheries Board of Canada* 27:1295–1311.
- 473 Sidaway-Lee, K., E.-M. Josse, A. Brown, Y. Gan, K. J. Halliday, I. A. Graham, and S. Penfield. 2010.  
474 SPATULA links daytime temperature and plant growth rate. *Current Biology* 20:1493–1497.
- 475 Singh, R. K., T. Svystun, B. AlDahmash, A. M. Jönsson, and R. P. Bhalerao. 2017. Photoperiod-and  
476 temperature-mediated control of phenology in trees—a molecular perspective. *New Phytologist* 213:511–  
477 524.
- 478 Solbakken, V. A., T. Hansen, and S. O. Stefansson. 1994. Effects of photoperiod and temperature on growth  
479 and parr-smolt transformation in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) and subsequent performance in seawater.  
480 *Aquaculture* 121:13–27.
- 481 Spann, T. M., J. G. Williamson, and R. L. Darnell. 2004. Photoperiod and temperature effects on growth  
482 and carbohydrate storage in southern highbush blueberry interspecific hybrid. *Journal of the American  
483 Society for Horticultural Science* 129:294–298.
- 484 Tanino, K. K., L. Kalcsits, S. Silim, E. Kendall, and G. R. Gray. 2010. Temperature-driven plasticity in  
485 growth cessation and dormancy development in deciduous woody plants: a working hypothesis suggesting  
486 how molecular and cellular function is affected by temperature during dormancy induction. *Plant Molecular  
487 Biology* 73:49–65.

- 488 Taranger, G., E. Vikingstad, U. Klenke, I. Mayer, S. Stefansson, B. Norberg, T. Hansen, Y. Zohar, and  
489 E. Andersson. 2003. Effects of photoperiod, temperature and GnRHa treatment on the reproductive  
490 physiology of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) broodstock. Fish Physiology and Biochemistry 28:403–406.
- 491 Tobin, P. C., S. Nagarkatti, G. Loeb, and M. C. Saunders. 2008. Historical and projected interactions between  
492 climate change and insect voltinism in a multivoltine species. Global Change Biology 14:951–957.
- 493 Van Belle, J., J. Shamoun-Baranes, E. Van Loon, and W. Bouten. 2007. An operational model predicting  
494 autumn bird migration intensities for flight safety. Journal of Applied Ecology 44:864–874.
- 495 Viherä-Aarnio, A., R. Häkkinen, and O. Junntila. 2006. Critical night length for bud set and its variation in  
496 two photoperiodic ecotypes of *Betula pendula*. Tree Physiology 26:1013–1018.
- 497 Vittasse, Y., and D. Basler. 2013. What role for photoperiod in the bud burst phenology of European beech.  
498 European Journal of Forest Research 132:1–8.
- 499 Wareing, P. 1956. Photoperiodism in woody plants. Annual Review of Plant Physiology 7:191–214.
- 500 Way, D. A., and R. A. Montgomery. 2015. Photoperiod constraints on tree phenology, performance and  
501 migration in a warming world. Plant, Cell & Environment 38:1725–1736.
- 502 Weih, M. 2004. Intensive short rotation forestry in boreal climates: present and future perspectives. Canadian  
503 Journal of Forest Research 34:1369–1378.
- 504 Willis, C. G., B. R. Ruhfel, R. B. Primack, A. J. Miller-Rushing, J. B. Losos, and C. C. Davis. 2010. Favorable  
505 climate change response explains non-native species' success in Thoreau's woods. Plos One 5:e8878.
- 506 Wolkovich, E. M., B. I. Cook, J. M. Allen, T. M. Crimmins, J. L. Betancourt, S. E. Travers, S. Pau,  
507 J. Regetz, T. J. Davies, N. J. B. Kraft, T. R. Ault, K. Bolmgren, S. J. Mazer, G. J. McCabe, B. J. McGill,  
508 C. Parmesan, N. Salamin, M. D. Schwartz, and E. E. Cleland. 2012. Warming experiments underpredict  
509 plant phenological responses to climate change. Nature 485:494–497.
- 510 Wolkovich, E. M., A. K. Ettinger, D. Flynn, T. Savas, C. Chamberlain, D. Buonaiuto, and  
511 J. Samaha. 2019. Observed Spring Phenology Responses in Experimental Environments (OSPREE).  
512 doi:10.5063/F1QV3JQR.

- 513 Xie, L., and W. W. Hsieh. 1989. Predicting the return migration routes of the Fraser River sockeye salmon  
514 (*Oncorhynchus nerka*). Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 46:1287–1292.
- 515 Zhao, M., C. Peng, W. Xiang, X. Deng, D. Tian, X. Zhou, G. Yu, H. He, and Z. Zhao. 2013. Plant  
516 phenological modeling and its application in global climate change research: overview and future challenges.  
517 Environmental Reviews 21:1–14.
- 518 Zhu, K., C. W. Woodall, and J. S. Clark. 2012. Failure to migrate: lack of tree range expansion in response  
519 to climate change. Global Change Biology 18:1042–1052.
- 520 Zohner, C. M., B. M. Benito, J. C. Svenning, and S. S. Renner. 2016. Day length unlikely to constrain  
521 climate-driven shifts in leaf-out times of northern woody plants. Nature Climate Change 6:1120–1123.
- 522 Zydlowski, G. B., D. S. Stich, and S. D. McCormick. 2014. Photoperiod control of downstream movements  
523 of Atlantic salmon *Salmo salar* smolts. Journal of Fish Biology 85:1023–1041.

<sup>524</sup> **Figures**







Figure 1: **Photoperiod varies with latitude and by day of year**, such that temporal shifts in activity yield larger changes in experienced photoperiod compared with spatial shifts. Here, we show this variation at two latitudes ( $22.5^\circ$ ,  $45^\circ$ ), using hypothetical spatial and temporal shifts. These shifts, based on observed average rates with recent global warming—16.9 kilometers per decade, or approximately 1.5 degrees in 100 years, for spatial shifts (Parmesan, 2006), and 2.3 days per decade, or 23 days in 100 years, for temporal shifts (Chen et al., 2011)—highlight the greater magnitude in daylength changes close to the equinox (e.g., day of year 91), versus close to the summer solstice (e.g., day of year 182).




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



**Figure 3: Nonlinearities in phenological responses to daylength** are apparent in spring woody plant phenology experiments (from the OSPREE database) in which three or more photoperiod treatment levels were applied. The shape of the response curves for *Betula pubescens* (Caffarra et al., 2011b), *Fagus sylvatica* (Heide, 1993b) and *Tilia americana* (Ashby et al., 1962) differ depending on the amount of winter chilling received (measured in Chill portions). Species and chilling levels with multiple lines represent plant material from different populations.



**Figure 4: Experimental photoperiod treatments and their equivalent spatial and temporal shifts** for experiments in the OSPREE database that manipulated photoperiod. See ‘Mapping temporal and spatial shifts in space and time’ in the Supplemental Materials for details on how we calculated the required spatial (lines) or temporal (circles and Xes) shifts to be equivalent to photoperiod treatments in each experiment.



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

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




Figure 6: **Conceptual diagram of how to include photoperiod in forecasting biological responses to climate change.** Current approaches for forecasting spring phenology with climate change frequently rely on linear relationships between historical temperature data and observed dates of spring phenology (left panels). Adding responses to photoperiod, which commonly operate as threshold responses to short days (SD) versus long days (LD, see “photoperiod sensitivity” in the *Glossary*), will alter these forecasts (center panel) in ways that differ across species with divergent threshold photoperiods. Other factors that interact with photoperiod, such as population-level variation in photoperiod responses, can be incorporated into forecasts to further improve their accuracy (right panel).