

Supplementary Material

Phylogenetic estimates of species-level phenology improve ecological forecasting

June 23, 2023

Authors:

Ignacio Morales-Castilla,¹ T. J. Davies,^{2,3} Geoffrey Legault,³ D. M. Buonaiuto,^{4,5,6} Catherine J. Chamberlain,^{4,5,7} Ailene K. Ettinger,^{5,8} Mira Garner,³ Faith A. M. Jones,^{3,10} Deirdre Loughnan,³ William D. Pearse,¹¹ Darwin S. Sodhi,³ & E. M. Wolkovich^{3,4,5}

Author affiliations:

¹GloCEE - Global Change Ecology and Evolution Group, Department of Life Sciences, University of Alcalá, Alcalá de Henares, Spain

²Botany, Faculty of Sciences, University of British Columbia, 2424 Main Mall, Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z4, Canada

³Forest & Conservation Sciences, Faculty of Forestry, University of British Columbia, 2424 Main Mall, Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z4, Canada

⁴Organismic & Evolutionary Biology, Harvard University, 26 Oxford Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA

⁵Arnold Arboretum of Harvard University, 1300 Centre Street, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

⁶Department of Environmental Conservation, University of Massachusetts-Amherst, 160 Holdsworth Way, Amherst, MA, USA

⁷The Nature Conservancy, 334 Blackwell St Ste 300, Durham, NC, USA

⁸The Nature Conservancy of Washington, 74 Wall Street, Seattle, WA USA

¹⁰Department of Wildlife, Fish and Environmental Studies, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, 901 83 Umeå, Sweden

¹¹Department of Life Sciences, Imperial College London, Silwood Park, Ascot, Berkshire, SL5 7PY, UK

*Corresponding author: ignacio.moralesc@uah.es

Extended Methods

Interpretation of λ_j and σ_j^2 on slopes and intercepts

Most current phylogenetic regression approaches aimed at controlling for phylogenetic non-independence of analysis units (i.e. usually species, see Revell, 2010) assume the λ scaling parameter is constant across the full set of predictors in the model. Thus, λ is estimated as a single parameter based on one single residual term VCV matrix. While useful for correcting for phylogenetic non-independence, this approach does not allow for different tempos and modes of evolution across different predictors.

In models with multiple cues, species responses to all cues are estimated as similarly phylogenetically structured, but this may not be the case. For example, in a PGLS model with three cues, it would be possible to have a high (close to 1) value of λ , due to either a strong phylogenetic signal in the response, but no phylogenetic structuring in the cues, or one or more predictors being strongly phylogenetically structured. In the latter case, phylogenetic structuring of responses to cues could be correlated (i.e., responses to cues evolving in a correlated fashion) or uncorrelated (i.e., independent evolution of responses to cues). Distinguishing among these different situations is challenging, in part because the phylogeny is constant across all data, and also because in practice multiple process affect the evolution of traits that each leave a signature of some kind in the data. Perhaps, in part, due to the complexity of the problem, most modern approaches take the conservative approach of focusing on whether model residuals are phylogenetically structured (i.e. in PGLS) or the amount of model variance attributable to the phylogeny and independent from other sources of variation (i.e., in PMM, see Housworth et al., 2004).

Because we are specifically interested in estimating the phylogenetic structure of each cue, our approach explicitly partitions variance into specific components relative to the model intercept and predictor (cue) slopes (see equation 5). The multivariate normal distributions of the intercept and slope terms each include a variance term (see equation 3), modelled with a λ scaling parameter. The interpretation of λ s in our models are analogous to Pagel's λ (Pagel, 1999) parameter (Housworth et al., 2004), constrained to range from 0 to 1, with values of 0 indicating no phylogenetic signal, and values of 1 phylogenetic signal consistent with Brownian motion evolution (BM).

While the lambdas estimated through our fitting process will resemble those of lambdas estimated from non-phylogenetically informed models, our approach gives a number of benefits. First, the uncertainty associated with estimating parameters across shared data (the phylogeny) is directly incorporated into the fitting process itself: our posterior estimates are joint across that shared data and the uncertainty it introduces to our fitting process. Second, we expect our cues and their evolution to both be correlated, and assessing both simultaneously allows uncertainty in our ability to unpick precise evolutionary process is, again, incorporated into

our uncertainty estimates. Third, this approach adjusts our partial pooling ('random effect' of species) based on evolutionary distance, more strongly pooling closely related species, and only weakly pooling distantly related species (see Gaussian process models in Gelman et al., 2014). This is particularly important for the practising ecologist who, unlike an evolutionary biologist, is not interested in controlling for past evolution *per se*, but is interested in using that past information to predict slopes for (un)measured species on the basis of their evolutionary history.

A traditional interpretation of σ^2 values under Brownian Motion evolution, is an 'evolutionary rate' or phenotypic accumulation over time (Revell et al., 2008). In PGLS, σ_ϵ^2 is estimated for the model error term, which parameterises a multivariate normal with a VCV matrix given by $\sigma_\epsilon^2 \Sigma_i$. Here, similar to our approach to λ , we estimate four σ^2 values, corresponding to each model parameter. In our particular case (i.e., modelling a phenological response to three environmental cues), σ_α^2 for the intercept could be interpreted as the phenological variation across species accumulated along evolution independently from the cues, and is perhaps most comparable to the interpretation of lambda in a PGLS as measuring phylogenetic signal in the residuals. The $\sigma_{\beta_{chill}}^2$, $\sigma_{\beta_{force}}^2$, and $\sigma_{\beta_{photo}}^2$, corresponding to model slopes, would represent the phylogenetic variance linked to species responses to each of the modelled cues. This is, the variability in how species shift their phenology responding to temperature and light, accumulated along the evolutionary process and considered in concert.

Does accounting for phylogenetic relationships affect forecasts?

We forecasted estimated shifts in species phenologies from our phylogenetic and non-phylogenetic models for two species with overlapping European ranges to show the impact of differences across models in a well (*Betula pendula*, $n = 311$) versus poorly sampled (*Acer campestre*, $n = 6$) species. For this, we first fit our phylogenetic and non-phylogenetic models using natural (i.e., not z-scored) units. Second, we projected fitted models to the European geographic range of each species using two climate scenarios within species distributions: a scenario of historical climate (1980-2016) and a scenario of 2°C of warming. These projections yield four predictions for each species: phylogenetic-historical, phylogenetic-warmer, non-phylogenetic-historical and non-phylogenetic-warmer. Third, for each species we compared phylogenetic vs. non-phylogenetic models (see Fig. S6). Finally, for each species we quantified how phenological shifts expected due to warming differ as a result of using a phylogenetic model instead of a non-phylogenetic model.

Species distributional data were extracted from published distributional maps (Caudullo et al., 2017). We extracted climate data corresponding to all grid cells contained within each species' range from daily gridded meteorological datasets. Specifically, we extracted minimum and maximum daily temperatures from the E-OBS dataset v.25 at 0.25 latitudinal degrees (<https://cds.climate.copernicus.eu/cdsapp#!/dataset/insitu-gridded-observations-europe?tab=overview>; last accessed in May 2023). Daily temperatures were used to compute both forcing (mean daily

temperature from March 1st through April 30th) and chilling (Utah units from from 1 September through 30 April). Utah units were calculated using the chillR package in R. We used yearly values of forcing and chilling computed for each location (i.e., grid cell) as inputs in the models to predict date of budburst under each scenario for each 12637 locations for *Betula pendula* and 7537 locations for *Acer campestre*. Lastly, we compared model forecasts from phylogenetic and non-phylogenetic models (i.e., by calculating the difference PMM-HMM) and quantified the change in forecasted phenological shifts due to warming resulting from using non-phylogenetic models instead of phylogenetic ones (i.e., calculating the difference $[PMM_{historical} - PMM_{warming}] - [HMM_{historical} - HMM_{warming}]$).

Our forecasted bias from HMM compared to PMM (Fig. 4) would likely extend to many other species, based on shifts in estimated responses to temperature and daylength (model coefficients) across our studied species. Across all 191 species, accounting for phylogenetic structuring shifted many species estimates (Fig. 3). Not accounting for phylogeny (i.e., assuming $\lambda = 0$ as done in HMM) biased model coefficients on average, particularly so for forcing and somewhat less for chilling (Fig. 3). Specifically, species sensitivities to forcing and chilling were underestimated on average (model slopes shifted by 7.2% and 3.7%, respectively). Sensitivities to photoperiod, which showed weak phylogenetic signal were not biased in non-phylogenetic models (Fig. 3), likely associated to their low estimated λ values.

However, as explained in the main text, these biases do not apply homogeneously to all species. Over represented species (i.e., high number of observations) suffer little to no bias if a non-phylogenetic model is used and underrepresented species can experience large shifts when phylogenetic relationships are ignored (see Fig. S6). Interestingly the bias in forecasts for underrepresented species does not distribute homogeneously across the geography, indicating that ignoring phylogeny can lead to biased forecasts for these species, more so in particular regions (coinciding with coldest locations in our example; Fig. S6b).

References

- Caudullo, G., E. Welk, and J. San-Miguel-Ayanz. 2017. Chorological maps for the main european woody species. *Data in brief* 12:662–666.
- Gelman, A., J. B. Carlin, H. S. Stern, D. B. Dunson, A. Vehtari, and D. B. Rubin. 2014. Bayesian Data Analysis. 3rd ed. CRC Press, New York.
- Housworth, E. A., E. P. Martins, and M. Lynch. 2004. The phylogenetic mixed model. *The American Naturalist* 163:84–96.
- Pagel, M. 1999. Inferring the historical patterns of biological evolution. *Nature* 401:877–884.
- Revell, L. J. 2010. Phylogenetic signal and linear regression on species data. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 1:319–329.
- Revell, L. J., L. J. Harmon, and D. C. Collar. 2008. Phylogenetic signal, evolutionary process, and rate. *Systematic biology* 57:591–601.

Supporting Figures and Tables

Table S1: Model parameters estimated for 191 tree species including mean, standard deviation (sd), 2.5%, 50%, and 97.5% uncertainty intervals (z-scored model, thus predictors are directly comparable to one another), alongside model diagnostics.

Parameter	mean	sd	2.5%	50%	97.5%	n_{eff}	Rhat
μ_α	30.63	3.41	23.94	30.66	37.26	12315.84	1.00
$\mu_{\beta_{force}}$	-6.12	2.11	-10.24	-6.15	-1.85	3989.87	1.00
$\mu_{\beta_{chill}}$	-6.86	2.18	-10.98	-6.91	-2.39	7444.80	1.00
$\mu_{\beta_{photo}}$	-1.22	0.77	-2.73	-1.22	0.36	2482.96	1.00
λ_α	0.34	0.10	0.16	0.34	0.55	7668.82	1.00
$\lambda_{\beta_{force}}$	0.65	0.20	0.22	0.67	0.97	630.96	1.01
$\lambda_{\beta_{chill}}$	0.54	0.15	0.25	0.55	0.82	1834.14	1.00
$\lambda_{\beta_{photo}}$	0.40	0.24	0.03	0.38	0.88	672.39	1.00
σ_α	15.99	1.15	13.98	15.91	18.47	6970.37	1.00
$\sigma_{\beta_{force}}$	5.80	1.01	4.06	5.70	8.01	1043.34	1.00
$\sigma_{\beta_{chill}}$	7.10	0.88	5.53	7.04	8.99	1767.13	1.00
$\sigma_{\beta_{photo}}$	2.36	0.41	1.61	2.34	3.23	636.82	1.01
σ_y	12.58	0.18	12.24	12.58	12.93	10904.90	1.00

Table S2: Model parameters for non-phylogenetic model ($\lambda = 0$) estimated for 191 tree species including mean, standard deviation (sd), 2.5%, 50%, and 97.5% uncertainty intervals (z-scored model, thus predictors are directly comparable to one another), alongside model diagnostics.

Parameter	mean	sd	2.5%	50%	97.5%	n_{eff}	Rhat
μ_α	31.79	1.28	29.29	31.77	34.35	13779.62	1.00
$\mu_{\beta_{force}}$	-7.46	0.89	-9.19	-7.46	-5.71	2960.28	1.00
$\mu_{\beta_{chill}}$	-8.75	0.81	-10.29	-8.76	-7.11	6051.59	1.00
$\mu_{\beta_{photo}}$	-1.21	0.46	-2.10	-1.20	-0.29	2175.88	1.00
σ_α	16.35	1.00	14.46	16.31	18.41	10178.43	1.00
$\sigma_{\beta_{force}}$	5.20	0.82	3.76	5.15	6.93	677.74	1.00
$\sigma_{\beta_{chill}}$	6.84	0.78	5.40	6.80	8.46	1815.10	1.00
$\sigma_{\beta_{photo}}$	2.27	0.35	1.61	2.25	2.99	649.15	1.00
σ_y	12.57	0.18	12.23	12.57	12.94	12887.31	1.00

Table S3: Estimated sensitivities of 191 tree species to three environmental cues: chilling ($\beta_{chill,j}$), forcing ($\beta_{force,j}$) and photoperiod ($\beta_{photo,j}$), along with their corresponding 2.5% (low) and 97.5% (up) uncertainty intervals (UI). Values correspond to the full model accounting for phylogenetic relationships.

<i>Species</i>	$\beta_{chill,j}$	<i>low UI</i>	<i>up UI</i>	$\beta_{force,j}$	<i>low UI</i>	<i>up UI</i>	$\beta_{photo,j}$	<i>low UI</i>	<i>up UI</i>
<i>Populus deltoides</i>	-15.16	-25.05	-5.82	-6.43	-13.73	1.82	-0.97	-5.39	3.23
<i>Populus koreana</i>	-8.65	-18.98	1.84	-7.47	-15.61	1.11	-0.87	-5.03	3.22
<i>Populus tremula</i>	-1.94	-7.35	3.60	-7.41	-10.54	-4.23	0.05	-2.11	2.28
<i>Populus grandidentata</i>	-14.08	-21.56	-6.90	-9.98	-15.90	-4.64	-1.18	-5.12	2.65
<i>Euonymus europaeus</i>	-3.61	-15.78	8.88	-6.23	-17.68	5.35	-1.15	-5.80	3.39
<i>Euonymus latifolius</i>	1.12	-9.12	11.97	-6.32	-17.69	5.22	-1.01	-5.32	3.41
<i>Nothofagus antarctica</i>	-10.16	-22.40	1.95	-6.62	-17.37	4.52	-1.63	-6.10	2.79
<i>Carya cordiformis</i>	-15.52	-25.34	-6.01	-4.51	-14.91	6.16	-2.65	-7.00	1.57
<i>Carya laciniosa</i>	-17.48	-27.47	-7.95	-4.03	-14.28	6.79	-1.72	-6.04	2.60
<i>Alnus incana</i>	-1.73	-5.59	2.12	-10.18	-14.56	-5.96	-0.52	-2.82	1.82
<i>Alnus glutinosa</i>	-5.85	-12.14	0.49	-10.25	-15.37	-5.24	-0.60	-3.06	1.93
<i>Alnus maximowiczii</i>	-5.35	-14.90	4.33	-7.32	-16.89	2.55	-1.05	-5.26	3.15
<i>Betula nana</i>	-5.76	-14.88	3.60	-5.15	-13.97	3.61	-0.92	-4.90	3.08
<i>Betula pendula</i>	-4.33	-5.44	-3.23	-1.38	-3.58	0.76	-0.42	-1.41	0.59
<i>Betula pubescens</i>	-2.13	-3.47	-0.83	-6.64	-9.29	-4.11	-0.75	-1.85	0.33
<i>Betula populifolia</i>	-5.30	-14.54	4.00	-5.48	-14.46	3.60	-0.86	-4.88	3.16
<i>Betula papyrifera</i>	-27.28	-33.48	-21.06	-5.69	-10.02	-1.32	1.25	-2.24	5.13
<i>Betula alleghaniensis</i>	-11.23	-18.21	-4.10	-6.99	-10.69	-3.42	-1.47	-5.48	2.47
<i>Betula lenta</i>	-3.33	-10.33	3.85	-4.84	-12.37	2.89	-0.98	-5.16	2.98
<i>Corylus cornuta</i>	-6.20	-17.60	5.56	-7.24	-15.02	0.13	-1.35	-5.69	2.86
<i>Ostrya carpinifolia</i>	-5.52	-14.52	3.75	-4.92	-14.08	3.93	-0.92	-4.91	3.01
<i>Ostrya virginiana</i>	-11.38	-20.74	-2.10	-4.75	-14.01	4.43	-0.75	-4.80	3.43
<i>Carpinus laxiflora</i>	-8.99	-19.72	1.53	-4.74	-13.68	3.95	-0.91	-5.22	3.32
<i>Carpinus betulus</i>	-12.30	-18.99	-5.82	-2.59	-7.41	2.38	-0.59	-4.06	3.02
<i>Carpinus monbeigiana</i>	-5.66	-14.75	3.82	-4.73	-13.83	4.11	-0.89	-4.97	3.20
<i>Rosa majalis</i>	-4.26	-14.32	5.85	-7.15	-17.85	3.38	-0.94	-5.20	3.37
<i>Rosa rugosa</i>	-6.88	-18.69	5.08	-7.23	-17.86	3.75	-1.03	-5.49	3.50
<i>Aronia melanocarpa</i>	-2.38	-10.96	6.08	-5.07	-12.57	2.62	-0.74	-4.72	3.33
<i>Photinia villosa</i>	-2.92	-11.68	5.92	-5.86	-14.58	2.79	-0.76	-4.64	3.30
<i>Spiraea japonica</i>	-3.74	-12.85	5.42	-6.66	-16.49	3.07	-0.71	-4.74	3.41
<i>Spiraea chamaedryfolia</i>	-4.02	-13.48	5.21	-6.72	-16.37	3.13	-0.73	-4.89	3.58
<i>Spiraea canescens</i>	-5.16	-16.13	5.65	-6.78	-16.48	2.85	-0.79	-5.14	3.64
<i>Prunus tenella</i>	-3.89	-15.10	7.59	-7.19	-16.37	2.29	-0.93	-5.27	3.29
<i>Prunus serrulata</i>	-4.63	-15.76	6.60	-7.08	-15.83	2.23	-0.78	-4.88	3.43
<i>Prunus pensylvanica</i>	-3.85	-14.58	7.26	-7.01	-14.53	0.66	-0.91	-5.02	3.29
<i>Prunus serotina</i>	-7.40	-16.97	2.22	-6.26	-14.41	2.36	-0.83	-4.90	3.31
<i>Prunus padus</i>	-1.76	-7.09	3.46	-10.44	-14.27	-6.74	-0.96	-2.96	1.03
<i>Prunus uniflora</i>	-5.04	-16.35	6.67	-6.97	-16.85	3.27	-0.72	-4.89	3.49
<i>Prunus sinensis</i>	-5.07	-17.10	6.91	-7.03	-16.88	3.01	-0.80	-5.04	3.55
<i>Oemleria cerasiformis</i>	-4.93	-15.87	6.42	-6.84	-16.51	3.03	-0.75	-4.99	3.60
<i>Ulmus minor</i>	-16.20	-20.78	-11.59	-10.39	-14.29	-6.49	-2.57	-6.32	0.98

Continued on next page

Table S3: Estimated sensitivities of 191 tree species to three environmental cues: chilling ($\beta_{chill,j}$), forcing ($\beta_{force,j}$) and photoperiod ($\beta_{photo,j}$), along with their corresponding 2.5% (low) and 97.5% (up) uncertainty intervals (UI). Values correspond to the full model accounting for phylogenetic relationships.

<i>Species</i>	$\beta_{chill,j}$	<i>low UI</i>	<i>up UI</i>	$\beta_{force,j}$	<i>low UI</i>	<i>up UI</i>	$\beta_{photo,j}$	<i>low UI</i>	<i>up UI</i>
<i>Ulmus glabra</i>	-18.61	-25.10	-12.12	-10.25	-17.35	-2.78	-1.49	-5.16	2.38
<i>Ulmus macrocarpa</i>	-17.08	-23.91	-10.39	-10.51	-18.27	-2.82	-1.49	-5.27	2.54
<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-12.48	-17.10	-7.94	-10.68	-14.62	-6.65	-1.81	-5.35	1.76
<i>Ulmus parvifolia</i>	-15.59	-20.21	-10.92	-9.42	-13.49	-5.28	-2.39	-6.08	1.18
<i>Ulmus laevis</i>	-16.26	-25.01	-7.62	-9.63	-17.46	-1.30	-1.64	-5.64	2.43
<i>Ulmus americana</i>	-13.53	-22.09	-4.68	-9.81	-17.57	-1.43	-1.59	-5.51	2.44
<i>Ulmus villosa</i>	-15.74	-20.40	-11.06	-11.92	-15.90	-8.04	-1.94	-5.59	1.65
<i>Caragana pygmaea</i>	-5.09	-16.95	6.79	-4.36	-14.86	6.22	-1.14	-5.42	3.32
<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	-5.49	-15.64	4.60	-0.16	-5.50	5.18	-0.98	-5.30	3.51
<i>Amorpha fruticosa</i>	-1.98	-12.24	8.75	-3.88	-13.42	5.70	-1.04	-5.35	3.42
<i>Cercis chinensis</i>	-0.91	-10.52	9.36	-5.45	-16.53	5.76	-1.86	-6.37	2.54
<i>Cercis canadensis</i>	-4.02	-13.75	5.85	-5.15	-15.95	6.47	-1.45	-6.00	3.10
<i>Tilia japonica</i>	-2.93	-11.73	6.09	-8.03	-16.42	0.99	-1.26	-5.59	3.04
<i>Tilia cordata</i>	-3.70	-8.16	0.93	-9.91	-14.05	-5.82	-2.55	-6.15	0.92
<i>Tilia dasystyla</i>	-7.53	-17.00	1.52	-7.95	-16.41	1.18	-1.28	-5.47	2.95
<i>Tilia platyphyllos</i>	-4.30	-13.23	4.64	-7.95	-16.40	1.33	-1.27	-5.57	3.13
<i>Hibiscus syriacus</i>	0.01	-9.30	10.00	-7.50	-17.14	2.41	-1.26	-5.54	3.08
<i>Aesculus flava</i>	-14.90	-24.42	-5.70	-1.49	-10.89	7.74	-1.45	-5.58	2.77
<i>Aesculus parviflora</i>	-12.63	-21.95	-3.69	-2.00	-11.47	7.49	-2.00	-6.23	2.02
<i>Aesculus hippocastanum</i>	-8.33	-16.34	-0.34	1.57	-4.06	7.72	-1.33	-5.34	2.74
<i>Toona sinensis</i>	-3.77	-13.34	6.19	-4.78	-15.53	6.37	-1.31	-5.70	2.94
<i>Orixa japonica</i>	-5.76	-15.83	4.15	-4.75	-15.49	6.38	-1.21	-5.45	3.25
<i>Ptelea trifoliata</i>	-4.44	-14.20	5.45	-4.60	-15.22	6.67	-1.23	-5.57	3.14
<i>Ribes divaricatum</i>	-11.44	-23.49	0.20	-6.57	-18.06	4.68	-1.25	-5.82	3.30
<i>Ribes glaciale</i>	-7.39	-17.37	2.48	-6.69	-18.49	4.88	-0.96	-5.39	3.52
<i>Ribes alpinum</i>	-9.60	-21.69	2.07	-6.65	-18.27	4.94	-1.07	-5.56	3.50
<i>Hamamelis virginiana</i>	-8.19	-20.19	3.97	-9.99	-19.60	-0.73	-1.60	-6.28	3.08
<i>Hamamelis vernalis</i>	-12.75	-22.86	-2.86	-7.46	-18.49	3.77	-1.08	-5.47	3.33
<i>Hamamelis japonica</i>	-8.81	-18.66	1.17	-7.47	-18.61	3.42	-1.11	-5.53	3.31
<i>Sinowilsonia henryi</i>	-4.90	-15.08	5.12	-7.03	-18.68	4.55	-1.22	-5.58	3.34
<i>Corylopsis sinensis</i>	-7.56	-19.20	4.40	-7.10	-18.43	3.99	-1.33	-5.75	3.21
<i>Corylopsis spicata</i>	-7.91	-20.00	4.03	-7.06	-18.29	4.06	-1.42	-5.81	3.03
<i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i>	-7.91	-17.96	1.79	-6.68	-17.99	4.77	-1.51	-5.92	2.83
<i>Liquidambar orientalis</i>	-2.27	-12.08	7.89	-6.81	-18.31	4.47	-1.21	-5.61	3.23
<i>Cercidiphyllum japonicum</i>	-9.19	-20.49	2.23	-6.65	-17.89	4.96	-1.24	-5.71	3.26
<i>Cercidiphyllum magnificum</i>	-9.91	-19.98	-0.03	-6.58	-17.94	4.98	-1.30	-5.65	3.18
<i>Parrotia persica</i>	-8.06	-20.72	4.46	-6.62	-17.88	4.72	-1.01	-5.32	3.49
<i>Paeonia rockii</i>	-6.41	-18.74	6.05	-6.63	-18.19	5.11	-1.17	-5.66	3.44
<i>Syringa villosa</i>	-5.04	-15.49	5.54	-4.17	-12.82	4.14	-0.89	-5.19	3.46
<i>Syringa vulgaris</i>	-4.55	-13.61	4.73	-1.79	-6.08	2.68	-0.93	-5.22	3.18
<i>Syringa josikaea</i>	-4.34	-14.73	6.34	-4.07	-12.75	4.47	-0.96	-5.36	3.41
<i>Syringa reticulata</i>	-4.51	-15.06	5.98	-4.12	-12.75	4.24	-0.88	-5.17	3.50

Continued on next page

Table S3: Estimated sensitivities of 191 tree species to three environmental cues: chilling ($\beta_{chill,j}$), forcing ($\beta_{force,j}$) and photoperiod ($\beta_{photo,j}$), along with their corresponding 2.5% (low) and 97.5% (up) uncertainty intervals (UI). Values correspond to the full model accounting for phylogenetic relationships.

Species	$\beta_{chill,j}$	low UI	up UI	$\beta_{force,j}$	low UI	up UI	$\beta_{photo,j}$	low UI	up UI
<i>Ligustrum tschonoskii</i>	-4.45	-14.78	5.75	-4.13	-12.79	4.31	-0.88	-5.20	3.49
<i>Forsythia ovata</i>	-4.34	-14.99	6.24	-4.68	-14.36	4.83	-0.88	-5.23	3.38
<i>Forsythia suspensa</i>	-4.40	-13.57	5.01	-4.73	-14.22	4.57	-0.83	-5.14	3.55
<i>Cephalanthus occidentalis</i>	-2.38	-12.22	7.91	-5.37	-16.10	5.42	-1.11	-5.46	3.35
<i>Viburnum buddleifolium</i>	-10.26	-21.58	0.26	-4.75	-13.53	4.42	-0.23	-4.45	4.30
<i>Viburnum carlesii</i>	-7.53	-18.46	2.95	-5.33	-14.31	3.30	-0.86	-5.13	3.60
<i>Viburnum cassinooides</i>	-4.06	-11.31	3.10	-4.63	-10.55	1.19	-1.07	-4.93	2.89
<i>Viburnum lantanoides</i>	-8.43	-15.76	-1.23	-7.04	-12.94	-1.20	-1.27	-5.27	2.77
<i>Viburnum plicatum</i>	-9.13	-20.55	1.66	-5.00	-13.89	4.25	-0.49	-4.90	4.04
<i>Viburnum opulus</i>	-6.20	-15.54	3.42	-5.27	-14.19	3.75	-0.80	-5.10	3.44
<i>Viburnum betulifolium</i>	-7.78	-18.78	3.06	-5.35	-14.50	3.79	-0.99	-5.29	3.27
<i>Weigela coraeensis</i>	-4.55	-14.12	4.95	-4.97	-15.03	5.46	-0.70	-4.94	3.65
<i>Weigela florida</i>	-5.05	-16.05	6.17	-5.02	-15.07	5.15	-0.72	-5.01	3.64
<i>Weigela maximowiczii</i>	-5.99	-15.36	3.50	-4.92	-15.24	5.49	-0.67	-4.88	3.66
<i>Heptacodium miconioides</i>	-4.27	-15.74	7.38	-5.05	-14.97	4.95	-0.78	-5.20	3.75
<i>Symporicarpos albus</i>	-6.84	-16.49	2.74	-3.29	-8.35	1.96	-0.74	-5.02	3.60
<i>Lonicera maximowiczii</i>	-4.60	-16.20	6.94	-5.01	-14.15	4.06	-0.71	-4.96	3.80
<i>Lonicera alpigena</i>	-4.83	-16.11	6.80	-4.91	-14.25	4.31	-0.61	-4.86	3.79
<i>Lonicera canadensis</i>	-4.56	-16.34	7.44	-5.48	-13.30	1.79	-0.87	-5.28	3.53
<i>Lonicera caerulea</i>	-4.96	-17.41	7.31	-5.19	-14.44	3.80	-0.77	-5.21	3.86
<i>Eleutherococcus sieboldianus</i>	-3.08	-12.87	6.67	-5.51	-16.16	5.23	-0.75	-5.07	3.58
<i>Eleutherococcus setchuenensis</i>	-3.74	-15.08	7.72	-5.47	-16.29	5.56	-0.86	-5.32	3.72
<i>Eleutherococcus senticosus</i>	-3.20	-12.73	6.71	-5.45	-16.37	5.49	-0.72	-4.90	3.73
<i>Ilex mucronata</i>	-2.88	-10.53	4.87	-6.00	-12.28	0.16	-1.91	-6.17	2.25
<i>Rhododendron prinophyllum</i>	-3.02	-14.99	9.25	-11.17	-20.26	-2.67	-0.97	-5.49	3.70
<i>Rhododendron canadense</i>	0.00	-9.69	9.99	-10.20	-19.93	-0.41	-0.78	-4.94	3.73
<i>Rhododendron dauricum</i>	-1.90	-13.20	9.95	-10.15	-20.05	0.24	-0.66	-5.05	3.89
<i>Rhododendron mucronulatum</i>	-2.54	-14.20	9.05	-10.38	-20.08	-0.54	-0.78	-5.24	3.88
<i>Kalmia angustifolia</i>	-2.93	-14.96	9.56	-12.80	-21.36	-4.83	-1.53	-6.00	2.93
<i>Vaccinium myrtilloides</i>	-1.69	-13.89	10.77	-9.51	-17.61	-1.70	-0.80	-5.17	3.86
<i>Lyonia ligustrina</i>	-3.56	-15.92	9.13	-11.82	-20.72	-3.04	-0.99	-5.57	3.76
<i>Nyssa sylvatica</i>	-6.22	-19.01	6.72	-8.05	-17.75	1.31	-1.44	-6.02	3.16
<i>Cornus alba</i>	-4.43	-14.38	5.63	2.72	-4.19	9.86	-1.48	-5.75	2.74
<i>Cornus kousa</i>	-2.92	-12.91	6.78	-2.84	-12.93	7.21	-1.30	-5.77	3.02
<i>Cornus mas</i>	-4.83	-14.88	5.25	-2.17	-8.45	4.40	-1.15	-5.51	3.30
<i>Hydrangea arborescens</i>	-8.72	-18.61	0.95	-5.11	-16.13	6.25	-0.91	-5.30	3.50
<i>Hydrangea involucrata</i>	-8.38	-17.92	1.10	-5.18	-16.24	6.18	-0.96	-5.14	3.46
<i>Hydrangea serrata</i>	-7.90	-19.38	3.71	-5.24	-16.55	6.05	-0.95	-5.30	3.43
<i>Deutzia gracilis</i>	-5.33	-16.70	6.09	-5.43	-16.20	5.60	-0.87	-5.24	3.65
<i>Deutzia scabra</i>	-3.84	-13.80	6.13	-5.30	-16.00	5.63	-0.87	-5.16	3.50
<i>Decaisnea fargesii</i>	-8.07	-21.12	4.95	-6.02	-18.26	5.96	-1.05	-5.68	3.54
<i>Berberis dielsiana</i>	-5.03	-18.26	8.40	-6.23	-18.11	6.06	-0.98	-5.72	3.80

Continued on next page

Table S3: Estimated sensitivities of 191 tree species to three environmental cues: chilling ($\beta_{chill,j}$), forcing ($\beta_{force,j}$) and photoperiod ($\beta_{photo,j}$), along with their corresponding 2.5% (low) and 97.5% (up) uncertainty intervals (UI). Values correspond to the full model accounting for phylogenetic relationships.

Species	$\beta_{chill,j}$	low UI	up UI	$\beta_{force,j}$	low UI	up UI	$\beta_{photo,j}$	low UI	up UI
<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>	-12.23	-26.09	1.05	-6.28	-18.58	5.93	-1.57	-6.32	3.20
<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	-10.59	-16.87	-4.06	-9.06	-12.19	-5.96	-1.30	-4.58	2.05
<i>Acer saccharinum</i>	-7.95	-12.05	-3.92	-3.33	-10.91	4.47	-1.20	-5.57	3.07
<i>Acer rubrum</i>	-15.89	-22.63	-9.17	-0.34	-5.01	4.46	-0.42	-4.11	3.53
<i>Acer barbinerve</i>	-9.88	-20.06	0.71	-4.03	-12.65	4.64	-1.19	-5.29	2.92
<i>Acer negundo</i>	-11.88	-21.14	-2.52	-2.89	-10.66	5.24	-1.30	-5.54	2.85
<i>Acer pensylvanicum</i>	-9.42	-16.45	-2.35	-5.80	-11.67	-0.04	-1.97	-5.94	1.83
<i>Acer platanoides</i>	-10.35	-19.35	-1.41	-3.77	-12.18	4.69	-1.21	-5.25	2.80
<i>Acer campestre</i>	-11.25	-20.38	-2.26	-3.71	-12.17	5.09	-1.10	-5.10	3.04
<i>Acer tataricum</i>	-9.05	-18.10	0.14	-2.60	-10.40	5.71	-1.18	-5.31	3.01
<i>Acer ginnala</i>	-9.18	-19.83	1.23	-3.93	-12.38	4.92	-1.22	-5.43	3.05
<i>Amelanchier laevis</i>	-5.13	-15.80	6.01	-5.88	-14.63	2.85	-0.91	-5.08	3.31
<i>Amelanchier florida</i>	-6.02	-15.05	2.89	-5.86	-14.55	3.07	-0.72	-4.73	3.36
<i>Buddleja davidii</i>	-3.03	-15.36	9.46	-5.45	-15.85	5.04	-0.75	-5.13	3.84
<i>Buddleja alternifolia</i>	-2.79	-14.91	9.62	-5.45	-15.69	5.26	-0.83	-5.19	3.75
<i>Buddleja albiflora</i>	-3.35	-15.38	8.66	-5.48	-16.42	4.90	-0.79	-5.21	3.92
<i>Celtis laevigata</i>	-12.47	-22.42	-2.60	-7.60	-18.51	3.47	-1.60	-5.81	2.64
<i>Celtis occidentalis</i>	-7.70	-19.65	3.89	-7.48	-18.18	3.43	-1.40	-5.77	3.03
<i>Celtis caucasica</i>	-10.86	-20.81	-1.13	-7.54	-18.07	2.98	-1.29	-5.60	3.02
<i>Cladrastis lutea</i>	-9.69	-19.88	0.48	-4.68	-15.83	6.43	-1.93	-6.40	2.32
<i>Elaeagnus ebbingei</i>	-7.93	-20.04	4.44	-8.29	-19.52	2.52	-1.09	-5.42	3.40
<i>Fagus crenata</i>	-13.85	-22.96	-4.61	-7.94	-16.59	0.62	-3.49	-8.02	1.21
<i>Fagus engleriana</i>	-13.94	-22.98	-5.04	-7.93	-16.88	0.24	-3.39	-7.90	1.36
<i>Fagus grandifolia</i>	-13.77	-21.02	-6.50	-8.83	-14.77	-2.89	-4.52	-8.88	-0.31
<i>Fagus orientalis</i>	-16.38	-25.68	-7.38	-8.06	-16.89	0.26	-4.00	-8.52	0.42
<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	-14.31	-15.89	-12.74	-2.91	-4.92	-0.92	-9.37	-11.91	-6.71
<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	-6.70	-15.49	1.96	-5.66	-13.56	1.70	-1.34	-5.59	2.76
<i>Fraxinus ornus</i>	-11.44	-20.97	-2.69	-4.07	-12.57	4.71	-0.88	-4.99	3.28
<i>Fraxinus nigra</i>	-6.30	-16.53	4.27	-7.89	-15.98	-0.64	-1.49	-5.81	2.64
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	-4.76	-13.81	4.38	-4.04	-11.90	4.08	-1.06	-5.25	3.18
<i>Fraxinus americana</i>	-7.23	-11.63	-2.76	-3.87	-11.48	4.02	-0.98	-5.27	3.39
<i>Fraxinus latifolia</i>	-7.66	-16.43	1.07	-4.63	-13.19	3.81	-1.45	-5.61	2.74
<i>Fraxinus chinensis</i>	-5.94	-14.92	2.99	-4.40	-12.35	3.60	-0.95	-5.04	3.16
<i>Juglans cinerea</i>	-11.11	-20.91	-1.25	-2.91	-12.33	7.19	-1.45	-5.75	2.70
<i>Juglans ailantifolia</i>	-11.61	-21.18	-2.29	-2.85	-12.14	7.07	-1.51	-5.90	2.77
<i>Parrotiopsis jacquemontiana</i>	-5.83	-15.63	3.89	-7.40	-18.44	3.63	-1.11	-5.55	3.32
<i>Pyrus ussuriensis</i>	-6.05	-16.71	4.34	-5.98	-14.58	2.52	-0.73	-4.74	3.31
<i>Pyrus elaeagnifolia</i>	-6.92	-15.89	1.86	-5.85	-14.48	3.13	-0.80	-4.83	3.31
<i>Quercus faginea</i>	-20.99	-32.47	-10.85	-12.86	-18.58	-7.15	-3.69	-8.03	0.37
<i>Quercus bicolor</i>	-15.08	-23.84	-6.01	-9.69	-16.58	-1.46	-2.31	-6.48	1.89
<i>Quercus alba</i>	-14.33	-24.51	-3.88	-12.84	-19.68	-5.59	-2.69	-6.74	1.39
<i>Quercus coccifera</i>	-21.14	-32.27	-10.79	-12.91	-20.09	-5.50	-2.50	-6.73	1.85

Continued on next page

Table S3: Estimated sensitivities of 191 tree species to three environmental cues: chilling ($\beta_{chill,j}$), forcing ($\beta_{force,j}$) and photoperiod ($\beta_{photo,j}$), along with their corresponding 2.5% (low) and 97.5% (up) uncertainty intervals (UI). Values correspond to the full model accounting for phylogenetic relationships.

<i>Species</i>	$\beta_{chill,j}$	<i>low UI</i>	<i>up UI</i>	$\beta_{force,j}$	<i>low UI</i>	<i>up UI</i>	$\beta_{photo,j}$	<i>low UI</i>	<i>up UI</i>
<i>Quercus rubra</i>	-18.25	-24.21	-12.29	-11.54	-15.11	-7.89	-2.56	-6.10	1.07
<i>Quercus ellipsoidalis</i>	-17.47	-27.04	-7.96	-13.15	-20.62	-5.69	-2.63	-6.89	1.63
<i>Quercus velutina</i>	-14.69	-25.24	-3.81	-13.13	-20.18	-6.08	-2.47	-6.65	1.80
<i>Quercus shumardii</i>	-17.04	-25.91	-8.41	-12.12	-19.62	-4.18	-2.40	-6.36	1.79
<i>Quercus ilex</i>	-23.29	-34.81	-13.14	-17.73	-24.27	-11.90	-2.57	-6.69	1.78
<i>Quercus petraea</i>	-16.47	-22.58	-10.32	-12.45	-15.88	-9.04	-2.64	-6.62	1.38
<i>Quercus pubescens</i>	-14.74	-25.34	-3.62	-16.42	-24.65	-9.56	-2.33	-6.61	2.28
<i>Quercus robur</i>	-13.18	-19.40	-6.83	-11.66	-15.22	-8.02	0.28	-3.49	4.35
<i>Rhamnus cathartica</i>	-4.58	-12.27	3.22	-11.90	-22.38	-2.51	-1.93	-6.12	2.18
<i>Rhamnus alpina</i>	-11.53	-21.67	-2.00	-8.90	-19.55	1.61	-1.14	-5.42	3.13
<i>Rhamnus frangula</i>	-6.98	-18.76	4.88	-10.67	-19.83	-1.62	-1.29	-5.82	3.19
<i>Salix gracilistyla</i>	-7.38	-18.54	3.62	-6.15	-15.42	3.21	-1.03	-5.34	3.26
<i>Salix smithiana</i>	-5.00	-11.20	1.20	-4.71	-10.10	0.96	-1.98	-6.28	2.08
<i>Salix repens</i>	-9.73	-19.17	-0.53	-6.02	-14.86	3.35	-1.16	-5.36	3.15
<i>Sambucus tigranii</i>	-8.12	-20.14	3.49	-5.33	-15.53	5.07	-0.83	-5.23	3.56
<i>Sambucus pubens</i>	-8.30	-20.17	3.35	-5.33	-15.75	5.11	-0.79	-5.26	3.70
<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>	-5.67	-15.28	4.26	-5.60	-10.21	-0.98	-0.80	-4.24	2.58
<i>Sorbus torminalis</i>	-8.15	-17.44	0.37	-6.21	-14.71	2.47	-0.83	-4.46	2.95
<i>Sorbus aria</i>	-8.86	-18.00	0.08	-5.67	-14.08	2.86	-0.86	-4.74	3.09
<i>Sorbus decora</i>	-6.40	-15.18	2.22	-5.78	-14.19	2.78	-0.85	-4.88	3.17
<i>Sorbus commixta</i>	-5.84	-14.68	3.21	-5.88	-14.37	2.63	-0.77	-4.82	3.39
<i>Spirea alba</i>	-2.58	-14.70	10.38	-5.51	-13.84	2.80	-0.99	-5.28	3.46
<i>Stachyurus praecox</i>	-6.22	-18.40	6.27	-6.02	-16.95	5.21	-1.08	-5.46	3.37
<i>Stachyurus sinensis</i>	-6.14	-16.90	4.62	-5.65	-17.01	5.99	-0.97	-5.47	3.62

Table S4: Estimated sensitivities of 191 tree species to three environmental cues: chilling ($\beta_{chill,j}$), forcing ($\beta_{force,j}$) and photoperiod ($\beta_{photo,j}$), along with their corresponding 2.5% (low) and 97.5% (up) uncertainty intervals (UI). Values correspond to the non phylogenetic model.

Species	$\beta_{chill,j}$	lowUI	upUI	$\beta_{force,j}$	lowUI	upUI	$\beta_{photo,j}$	lowUI	upUI
<i>Populus deltoides</i>	-18.11	-28.51	-7.77	-6.23	-15.95	4.03	-1.26	-5.84	3.32
<i>Populus koreana</i>	-7.92	-20.17	4.43	-7.42	-18.36	3.81	-1.10	-5.60	3.35
<i>Populus tremula</i>	-0.58	-6.21	5.09	-7.44	-10.70	-4.20	0.08	-2.10	2.32
<i>Populus grandidentata</i>	-15.62	-23.79	-7.77	-11.33	-17.49	-5.03	-1.32	-5.36	2.76
<i>Euonymus europaeus</i>	-8.27	-20.53	4.41	-7.49	-17.98	2.90	-1.18	-5.65	3.40
<i>Euonymus latifolius</i>	0.39	-10.11	10.84	-7.43	-18.03	3.43	-0.92	-5.14	3.40
<i>Nothofagus antarctica</i>	-10.50	-23.34	2.22	-7.46	-17.74	3.05	-1.38	-5.87	3.14
<i>Carya cordiformis</i>	-14.04	-24.40	-3.93	-7.85	-18.59	2.95	-2.62	-7.25	1.74
<i>Carya laciniosa</i>	-17.27	-27.99	-6.99	-6.61	-17.22	4.39	-1.16	-5.49	3.25
<i>Alnus incana</i>	-1.59	-5.55	2.37	-10.38	-14.59	-6.15	-0.55	-2.95	1.88
<i>Alnus glutinosa</i>	-6.51	-13.31	0.43	-10.42	-15.83	-5.14	-0.61	-3.13	1.88
<i>Alnus maximowiczii</i>	-6.18	-16.56	4.39	-7.15	-17.62	3.58	-1.21	-5.73	3.36
<i>Betula nana</i>	-6.39	-16.31	3.94	-7.15	-17.95	3.49	-1.13	-5.50	3.18
<i>Betula pendula</i>	-4.32	-5.43	-3.24	-1.34	-3.51	0.83	-0.43	-1.41	0.55
<i>Betula pubescens</i>	-2.11	-3.42	-0.79	-6.88	-9.54	-4.20	-0.78	-1.88	0.31
<i>Betula populifolia</i>	-5.25	-15.53	5.25	-7.38	-18.12	3.16	-1.08	-5.38	3.30
<i>Betula papyrifera</i>	-29.62	-35.81	-23.48	-5.80	-10.59	-0.96	1.37	-2.37	5.36
<i>Betula alleghaniensis</i>	-9.92	-17.11	-2.60	-6.93	-10.75	-3.03	-2.03	-6.13	1.95
<i>Betula lenta</i>	-2.29	-9.47	5.25	-5.99	-14.69	2.79	-1.23	-5.54	3.13
<i>Corylus cornuta</i>	-6.37	-19.26	7.06	-9.25	-17.67	-1.12	-1.62	-5.98	2.70
<i>Ostrya carpinifolia</i>	-4.10	-14.33	6.22	-7.40	-18.07	3.12	-1.08	-5.33	3.33
<i>Ostrya virginiana</i>	-13.26	-23.48	-3.08	-6.97	-17.59	3.71	-0.85	-5.04	3.54
<i>Carpinus laxiflora</i>	-9.40	-22.06	3.28	-7.33	-18.04	3.19	-1.13	-5.57	3.27
<i>Carpinus betulus</i>	-13.38	-20.38	-6.35	-2.12	-7.22	3.01	-0.62	-4.38	3.08
<i>Carpinus monbeigiana</i>	-4.43	-14.44	6.14	-7.23	-17.98	3.60	-1.05	-5.41	3.16
<i>Rosa majalis</i>	-4.90	-14.82	5.20	-7.49	-18.17	2.80	-0.91	-5.30	3.54
<i>Rosa rugosa</i>	-8.24	-20.58	4.29	-7.48	-17.98	2.93	-1.01	-5.44	3.50
<i>Aronia melanocarpa</i>	-2.26	-12.02	8.08	-5.30	-13.53	3.41	-1.01	-5.18	3.30
<i>Photinia villosa</i>	-3.69	-13.75	6.68	-7.29	-17.69	3.12	-0.99	-5.24	3.28
<i>Spiraea japonica</i>	-5.62	-15.79	4.68	-7.23	-17.59	3.41	-0.90	-5.24	3.44
<i>Spiraea chamaedryfolia</i>	-6.08	-16.17	4.00	-7.35	-17.96	3.50	-0.90	-5.25	3.53
<i>Spiraea canescens</i>	-8.77	-21.15	3.53	-7.52	-17.64	3.02	-1.05	-5.46	3.37
<i>Prunus tenella</i>	-6.68	-18.91	6.02	-7.50	-18.67	3.50	-1.11	-5.55	3.30
<i>Prunus serrulata</i>	-8.11	-20.34	4.47	-7.26	-17.51	2.93	-0.94	-5.47	3.52
<i>Prunus pensylvanica</i>	-6.31	-18.71	6.34	-6.83	-14.73	1.34	-1.14	-5.66	3.25
<i>Prunus serotina</i>	-10.58	-21.02	-0.14	-5.49	-14.91	4.23	-1.09	-5.41	3.21
<i>Prunus padus</i>	-2.17	-7.46	3.09	-10.81	-14.58	-6.99	-1.02	-3.02	0.93
<i>Prunus uniflora</i>	-7.80	-20.33	4.82	-7.62	-18.52	3.05	-0.96	-5.31	3.54
<i>Prunus sinensis</i>	-8.08	-21.71	5.47	-7.73	-18.30	2.92	-1.03	-5.45	3.47
<i>Oemleria cerasiformis</i>	-7.71	-19.80	4.48	-7.38	-17.76	2.99	-0.89	-5.29	3.44
<i>Ulmus minor</i>	-15.63	-20.50	-10.78	-9.99	-14.32	-5.72	-2.53	-6.44	1.32
<i>Ulmus glabra</i>	-17.95	-25.56	-10.49	-8.23	-17.95	1.42	-0.95	-5.10	3.26
<i>Ulmus macrocarpa</i>	-16.04	-23.67	-8.80	-8.41	-18.61	1.26	-0.98	-5.12	3.21

Continued on next page

Table S4: Estimated sensitivities of 191 tree species to three environmental cues: chilling ($\beta_{chill,j}$), forcing ($\beta_{force,j}$) and photoperiod ($\beta_{photo,j}$), along with their corresponding 2.5% (low) and 97.5% (up) uncertainty intervals (UI). Values correspond to the non phylogenetic model.

Species	$\beta_{chill,j}$	low UI	up UI	$\beta_{force,j}$	low UI	up UI	$\beta_{photo,j}$	low UI	up UI
<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-11.49	-16.11	-6.71	-10.23	-14.42	-6.11	-1.42	-5.28	2.43
<i>Ulmus parvifolia</i>	-15.06	-19.83	-10.22	-8.70	-12.86	-4.46	-2.26	-6.03	1.52
<i>Ulmus laevis</i>	-14.85	-25.33	-4.77	-7.03	-17.89	3.92	-1.09	-5.44	3.11
<i>Ulmus americana</i>	-10.02	-20.18	0.50	-7.25	-17.66	3.23	-1.08	-5.43	3.28
<i>Ulmus villosa</i>	-15.17	-19.92	-10.37	-11.93	-16.26	-7.68	-1.64	-5.41	2.16
<i>Caragana pygmaea</i>	-6.71	-18.99	6.14	-7.62	-17.95	2.61	-1.00	-5.50	3.49
<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	-6.86	-17.21	3.40	-0.60	-5.78	4.61	-0.75	-5.06	3.72
<i>Amorpha fruticosa</i>	-2.88	-13.18	7.81	-6.49	-15.80	3.00	-0.89	-5.06	3.46
<i>Cercis chinensis</i>	-1.56	-11.77	9.06	-7.60	-17.89	2.95	-1.74	-6.21	2.63
<i>Cercis canadensis</i>	-6.58	-16.76	3.84	-7.05	-17.67	3.67	-1.16	-5.52	3.17
<i>Tilia japonica</i>	-4.13	-14.09	6.20	-7.27	-17.82	3.35	-0.92	-5.13	3.38
<i>Tilia cordata</i>	-4.07	-8.65	0.70	-10.14	-14.18	-6.13	-2.80	-6.50	0.72
<i>Tilia dasystyla</i>	-11.94	-21.87	-2.13	-7.08	-17.24	3.43	-0.97	-5.30	3.48
<i>Tilia platyphyllos</i>	-6.54	-16.83	3.82	-7.15	-17.61	3.34	-0.95	-5.30	3.35
<i>Hibiscus syriacus</i>	-0.59	-11.02	10.10	-7.26	-17.56	3.34	-1.01	-5.34	3.55
<i>Aesculus flava</i>	-16.49	-27.49	-6.45	-6.64	-16.97	4.11	-1.19	-5.56	3.16
<i>Aesculus parviflora</i>	-12.49	-22.79	-2.37	-7.72	-18.11	3.24	-2.03	-6.34	2.29
<i>Aesculus hippocastanum</i>	-6.13	-14.54	2.27	0.38	-5.66	6.53	-1.15	-5.18	2.96
<i>Toona sinensis</i>	-4.10	-14.20	6.30	-7.25	-17.75	3.20	-1.17	-5.46	3.17
<i>Orixa japonica</i>	-6.50	-16.39	3.67	-7.19	-18.04	3.52	-1.13	-5.59	3.42
<i>Ptelea trifoliata</i>	-5.10	-15.40	5.25	-7.18	-17.65	3.19	-1.13	-5.31	3.00
<i>Ribes divaricatum</i>	-13.67	-26.45	-1.51	-7.57	-17.79	2.87	-1.34	-5.84	3.10
<i>Ribes glaciale</i>	-6.68	-16.53	3.71	-7.52	-18.12	3.24	-0.93	-5.24	3.38
<i>Ribes alpinum</i>	-10.17	-22.66	2.37	-7.55	-18.28	2.77	-1.09	-5.59	3.36
<i>Hamamelis virginiana</i>	-8.61	-21.51	4.26	-10.91	-20.31	-2.12	-1.71	-6.07	2.63
<i>Hamamelis vernalis</i>	-14.59	-24.87	-4.51	-6.98	-17.43	3.98	-0.99	-5.36	3.38
<i>Hamamelis japonica</i>	-9.15	-19.59	1.08	-7.27	-17.57	2.99	-1.06	-5.29	3.44
<i>Sinowilsonia henryi</i>	-5.24	-15.18	4.75	-7.49	-18.03	2.98	-1.18	-5.49	3.06
<i>Corylopsis sinensis</i>	-8.51	-21.07	3.86	-7.55	-18.23	3.10	-1.28	-5.87	3.26
<i>Corylopsis spicata</i>	-9.18	-22.03	3.41	-7.43	-17.82	3.06	-1.39	-5.73	2.99
<i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i>	-11.04	-21.08	-0.87	-7.33	-17.56	2.99	-1.53	-5.94	2.77
<i>Liquidambar orientalis</i>	-1.35	-11.39	9.46	-7.50	-17.89	2.68	-1.10	-5.42	3.36
<i>Cercidiphyllum japonicum</i>	-9.68	-22.12	2.60	-7.37	-17.85	2.64	-1.21	-5.57	3.14
<i>Cercidiphyllum magnificum</i>	-10.65	-20.75	-0.52	-7.40	-18.14	3.44	-1.26	-5.51	3.06
<i>Parrotia persica</i>	-9.39	-21.92	2.89	-7.29	-17.70	3.04	-0.96	-5.35	3.61
<i>Paeonia rockii</i>	-7.59	-19.89	4.62	-7.50	-17.90	2.67	-1.11	-5.54	3.45
<i>Syringa villosa</i>	-7.83	-20.07	4.59	-7.56	-17.94	3.00	-0.96	-5.47	3.67
<i>Syringa vulgaris</i>	-6.30	-16.36	3.99	-1.65	-6.09	2.84	-1.10	-5.37	3.20
<i>Syringa josikaea</i>	-6.60	-19.15	6.33	-7.45	-18.02	2.72	-1.06	-5.44	3.39
<i>Syringa reticulata</i>	-6.89	-19.47	5.72	-7.39	-17.73	3.23	-0.99	-5.25	3.46
<i>Ligustrum tschonoskii</i>	-6.63	-19.20	6.28	-7.60	-18.30	3.08	-0.97	-5.36	3.50
<i>Forsythia ovata</i>	-6.77	-19.55	5.87	-7.44	-17.72	2.73	-1.05	-5.50	3.29
<i>Forsythia suspensa</i>	-6.12	-16.36	4.09	-7.35	-17.43	3.19	-0.91	-5.26	3.49

Continued on next page

Table S4: Estimated sensitivities of 191 tree species to three environmental cues: chilling ($\beta_{chill,j}$), forcing ($\beta_{force,j}$) and photoperiod ($\beta_{photo,j}$), along with their corresponding 2.5% (low) and 97.5% (up) uncertainty intervals (UI). Values correspond to the non phylogenetic model.

Species	$\beta_{chill,j}$	low UI	up UI	$\beta_{force,j}$	low UI	up UI	$\beta_{photo,j}$	low UI	up UI
<i>Cephalanthus occidentalis</i>	-4.96	-14.92	5.38	-7.24	-17.89	3.24	-1.20	-5.44	3.08
<i>Viburnum buddleifolium</i>	-14.54	-27.32	-2.15	-6.42	-16.75	4.49	-0.33	-4.81	4.32
<i>Viburnum carlesii</i>	-8.95	-21.76	3.97	-7.51	-18.21	3.24	-1.24	-5.64	3.15
<i>Viburnum cassinoides</i>	-3.71	-11.38	3.89	-5.17	-11.27	1.16	-1.47	-5.57	2.67
<i>Viburnum lantanoides</i>	-9.24	-16.57	-1.67	-8.47	-14.62	-2.48	-1.61	-5.72	2.45
<i>Viburnum plicatum</i>	-12.20	-25.12	0.40	-6.78	-16.97	3.77	-0.68	-5.11	3.94
<i>Viburnum opulus</i>	-6.92	-17.13	3.34	-7.13	-17.59	3.54	-1.07	-5.31	3.32
<i>Viburnum betulifolium</i>	-9.67	-21.96	2.29	-7.35	-18.04	2.93	-1.35	-5.71	3.06
<i>Weigela coraeensis</i>	-6.56	-16.50	3.63	-7.28	-17.73	3.12	-0.97	-5.39	3.55
<i>Weigela florida</i>	-7.68	-20.09	4.64	-7.44	-17.87	2.82	-1.02	-5.43	3.48
<i>Weigela maximowiczii</i>	-8.92	-19.08	1.20	-7.17	-17.88	3.39	-0.93	-5.25	3.48
<i>Heptacodium miconioides</i>	-6.82	-19.04	5.69	-7.43	-18.06	3.16	-1.06	-5.51	3.45
<i>Symporicarpos albus</i>	-9.52	-19.78	0.77	-3.21	-8.44	2.01	-0.99	-5.31	3.30
<i>Lonicera maximowiczii</i>	-7.39	-19.31	5.44	-7.68	-18.06	2.94	-0.99	-5.42	3.58
<i>Lonicera alpigena</i>	-7.78	-20.33	4.51	-7.44	-18.17	3.04	-0.91	-5.30	3.73
<i>Lonicera canadensis</i>	-5.93	-18.81	7.24	-6.98	-14.79	0.81	-1.10	-5.56	3.39
<i>Lonicera caerulea</i>	-8.21	-21.52	5.31	-7.69	-18.25	2.78	-1.07	-5.56	3.48
<i>Eleutherococcus sieboldianus</i>	-5.41	-15.51	4.71	-7.38	-17.99	3.12	-0.93	-5.20	3.20
<i>Eleutherococcus setchuenensis</i>	-7.57	-20.49	5.35	-7.35	-17.75	2.96	-1.11	-5.57	3.36
<i>Eleutherococcus senticosus</i>	-5.49	-15.94	5.09	-7.28	-17.96	3.46	-0.85	-5.16	3.48
<i>Ilex mucronata</i>	-3.79	-11.32	3.87	-6.56	-12.55	-0.46	-1.95	-6.21	2.13
<i>Rhododendron prinophyllum</i>	-8.09	-20.84	4.67	-9.26	-18.33	-0.45	-1.15	-5.60	3.14
<i>Rhododendron canadense</i>	-2.62	-12.72	7.74	-7.23	-17.42	3.14	-0.97	-5.29	3.32
<i>Rhododendron dauricum</i>	-6.80	-19.00	5.68	-7.19	-17.73	3.19	-0.78	-5.16	3.84
<i>Rhododendron mucronulatum</i>	-7.40	-20.33	5.50	-7.54	-18.22	3.36	-0.93	-5.24	3.42
<i>Kalmia angustifolia</i>	-7.32	-19.73	5.25	-12.11	-20.86	-4.08	-1.88	-6.36	2.60
<i>Vaccinium myrtilloides</i>	-5.98	-18.81	6.75	-7.41	-15.38	0.43	-0.96	-5.29	3.52
<i>Lyonia ligustrina</i>	-8.15	-21.11	4.80	-10.43	-20.28	-1.38	-1.13	-5.67	3.42
<i>Nyssa sylvatica</i>	-8.31	-20.67	4.49	-9.52	-18.51	-0.80	-1.39	-5.88	3.14
<i>Cornus alba</i>	-6.41	-16.04	3.37	1.92	-5.09	9.28	-1.53	-5.67	2.62
<i>Cornus kousa</i>	-4.68	-14.61	5.57	-7.39	-17.85	2.97	-1.23	-5.54	3.10
<i>Cornus mas</i>	-6.61	-16.98	3.82	-3.77	-10.09	2.70	-1.00	-5.49	3.49
<i>Hydrangea arborescens</i>	-10.58	-20.66	-0.37	-7.14	-17.55	3.55	-1.00	-5.24	3.33
<i>Hydrangea involucrata</i>	-10.15	-20.14	-0.07	-7.34	-18.13	3.41	-1.09	-5.52	3.30
<i>Hydrangea serrata</i>	-9.89	-22.57	2.80	-7.40	-17.99	3.12	-1.05	-5.61	3.29
<i>Deutzia gracilis</i>	-7.60	-20.50	4.96	-7.50	-18.00	2.96	-0.97	-5.22	3.39
<i>Deutzia scabra</i>	-5.07	-15.20	5.25	-7.38	-17.61	2.97	-0.96	-5.33	3.45
<i>Decaisnea fargesii</i>	-9.88	-22.56	2.67	-7.29	-18.05	3.42	-1.04	-5.49	3.53
<i>Berberis dielsiana</i>	-6.59	-19.04	6.31	-7.55	-18.15	3.04	-1.03	-5.46	3.38
<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>	-13.64	-26.59	-1.43	-7.48	-17.99	2.87	-1.54	-6.05	2.97
<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	-9.70	-16.44	-2.92	-9.89	-12.97	-6.82	-1.04	-4.56	2.52
<i>Acer saccharinum</i>	-7.59	-11.67	-3.57	-5.92	-14.96	3.57	-1.10	-5.65	3.47
<i>Acer rubrum</i>	-16.72	-23.81	-9.65	-0.57	-5.33	4.18	-0.11	-3.91	3.89

Continued on next page

Table S4: Estimated sensitivities of 191 tree species to three environmental cues: chilling ($\beta_{chill,j}$), forcing ($\beta_{force,j}$) and photoperiod ($\beta_{photo,j}$), along with their corresponding 2.5% (low) and 97.5% (up) uncertainty intervals (UI). Values correspond to the non phylogenetic model.

Species	$\beta_{chill,j}$	low UI	up UI	$\beta_{force,j}$	low UI	up UI	$\beta_{photo,j}$	low UI	up UI
<i>Acer barbinerve</i>	-8.41	-20.80	4.09	-7.50	-17.88	3.24	-1.09	-5.44	3.39
<i>Acer negundo</i>	-11.74	-22.34	-1.06	-5.75	-15.29	4.11	-1.25	-5.65	3.01
<i>Acer pensylvanicum</i>	-8.87	-16.22	-1.40	-7.87	-13.96	-1.91	-2.06	-6.16	1.94
<i>Acer platanoides</i>	-9.84	-20.42	0.22	-7.16	-17.34	2.95	-1.08	-5.44	3.22
<i>Acer campestre</i>	-10.97	-21.18	-0.77	-7.11	-17.69	3.50	-0.95	-5.30	3.32
<i>Acer tataricum</i>	-7.79	-18.03	2.46	-5.40	-14.64	4.07	-1.15	-5.40	3.14
<i>Acer ginnala</i>	-7.24	-19.58	5.24	-7.49	-18.33	3.43	-1.12	-5.68	3.44
<i>Amelanchier laevis</i>	-8.10	-21.11	5.19	-7.37	-17.58	3.14	-1.20	-5.72	3.31
<i>Amelanchier florida</i>	-8.42	-18.53	1.88	-7.19	-17.84	3.50	-0.98	-5.22	3.36
<i>Buddleja davidii</i>	-6.63	-18.75	5.87	-7.44	-17.88	3.29	-0.89	-5.27	3.52
<i>Buddleja alternifolia</i>	-6.14	-18.70	6.71	-7.50	-17.98	2.95	-0.99	-5.35	3.43
<i>Buddleja albiflora</i>	-6.94	-19.44	5.67	-7.57	-17.97	2.86	-0.92	-5.35	3.61
<i>Celtis laevigata</i>	-12.78	-22.93	-2.58	-7.23	-17.80	3.21	-1.47	-5.78	2.81
<i>Celtis occidentalis</i>	-6.21	-18.44	6.36	-7.09	-17.45	3.03	-1.26	-5.69	3.24
<i>Celtis caucasica</i>	-10.47	-20.58	-0.58	-7.13	-17.53	3.27	-1.10	-5.50	3.24
<i>Cladrastis lutea</i>	-12.14	-22.62	-1.82	-7.49	-17.74	3.05	-1.87	-6.32	2.42
<i>Elaeagnus ebbingei</i>	-7.84	-20.50	4.78	-7.59	-18.36	3.17	-0.94	-5.27	3.50
<i>Fagus crenata</i>	-9.96	-20.36	0.39	-7.46	-17.89	2.82	-1.39	-5.68	2.90
<i>Fagus engleriana</i>	-10.08	-20.42	-0.09	-7.30	-17.89	3.21	-1.29	-5.55	3.13
<i>Fagus grandifolia</i>	-12.35	-20.21	-4.58	-9.72	-16.07	-3.46	-3.14	-7.46	0.95
<i>Fagus orientalis</i>	-14.05	-24.38	-3.82	-7.67	-17.96	2.80	-2.12	-6.56	2.13
<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	-14.21	-15.81	-12.65	-2.65	-4.64	-0.66	-9.51	-12.05	-7.03
<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	-8.32	-18.52	1.93	-8.54	-17.44	0.30	-1.54	-5.89	2.75
<i>Fraxinus ornus</i>	-16.69	-27.23	-6.40	-6.19	-16.38	4.61	-0.79	-5.22	3.63
<i>Fraxinus nigra</i>	-8.33	-21.58	4.78	-11.81	-20.23	-3.87	-1.66	-6.24	2.85
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	-5.37	-15.49	5.02	-6.09	-15.47	3.72	-1.14	-5.50	3.25
<i>Fraxinus americana</i>	-7.61	-12.04	-3.03	-5.48	-14.63	4.13	-1.11	-5.73	3.57
<i>Fraxinus latifolia</i>	-10.54	-20.86	-0.45	-7.26	-17.74	3.42	-1.68	-6.06	2.61
<i>Fraxinus chinensis</i>	-7.27	-17.55	3.05	-6.59	-15.87	3.19	-0.98	-5.29	3.43
<i>Juglans cinerea</i>	-8.76	-19.59	2.18	-6.49	-15.82	2.86	-1.05	-5.29	3.25
<i>Juglans ailantifolia</i>	-9.49	-20.35	1.28	-6.42	-15.56	2.82	-1.17	-5.49	3.22
<i>Parrotiopsis jacquemontiana</i>	-5.61	-15.90	4.64	-7.37	-17.60	2.86	-1.06	-5.36	3.28
<i>Pyrus ussuriensis</i>	-8.49	-21.12	4.01	-7.50	-17.79	3.05	-1.01	-5.40	3.50
<i>Pyrus elaeagnifolia</i>	-9.48	-19.57	0.58	-7.28	-18.02	3.53	-1.07	-5.26	3.22
<i>Quercus faginea</i>	-18.47	-33.56	-5.41	-11.03	-17.86	-4.45	-3.11	-7.94	1.24
<i>Quercus bicolor</i>	-8.94	-19.24	1.46	-6.42	-15.74	3.46	-1.21	-5.63	3.23
<i>Quercus alba</i>	-9.45	-22.53	3.34	-11.13	-20.45	-2.23	-1.97	-6.64	2.55
<i>Quercus coccifera</i>	-18.01	-32.31	-4.98	-8.90	-18.92	0.86	-1.25	-5.73	3.27
<i>Quercus rubra</i>	-16.88	-23.01	-10.62	-10.78	-14.60	-6.94	-2.17	-6.10	1.72
<i>Quercus ellipsoidalis</i>	-13.69	-25.01	-2.52	-7.55	-17.79	2.46	-1.22	-5.78	3.27
<i>Quercus velutina</i>	-9.87	-23.30	3.02	-11.53	-21.17	-2.22	-1.60	-6.14	2.87
<i>Quercus shumardii</i>	-12.36	-22.59	-2.46	-7.18	-17.39	3.45	-1.31	-5.42	3.02
<i>Quercus ilex</i>	-22.78	-36.98	-10.07	-18.72	-25.67	-12.04	-1.40	-5.94	3.15

Continued on next page

Table S4: Estimated sensitivities of 191 tree species to three environmental cues: chilling ($\beta_{chill,j}$), forcing ($\beta_{force,j}$) and photoperiod ($\beta_{photo,j}$), along with their corresponding 2.5% (low) and 97.5% (up) uncertainty intervals (UI). Values correspond to the non phylogenetic model.

<i>Species</i>	$\beta_{chill,j}$	<i>low UI</i>	<i>up UI</i>	$\beta_{force,j}$	<i>low UI</i>	<i>up UI</i>	$\beta_{photo,j}$	<i>low UI</i>	<i>up UI</i>
<i>Quercus petraea</i>	-14.19	-21.05	-7.52	-12.70	-16.43	-9.14	-1.64	-5.91	2.50
<i>Quercus pubescens</i>	-5.83	-19.07	7.80	-15.90	-26.67	-6.44	-0.98	-5.62	3.61
<i>Quercus robur</i>	-10.11	-16.66	-3.51	-11.38	-15.34	-7.53	1.99	-1.51	5.79
<i>Rhamnus cathartica</i>	-4.04	-11.63	3.79	-11.39	-21.57	-1.84	-1.89	-6.25	2.37
<i>Rhamnus alpina</i>	-13.28	-23.56	-3.29	-6.84	-17.38	3.86	-0.92	-5.18	3.57
<i>Rhamnus frangula</i>	-7.45	-20.31	5.55	-9.97	-19.23	-0.83	-1.15	-5.51	3.37
<i>Salix gracilistyla</i>	-7.77	-20.03	5.07	-7.52	-17.74	2.88	-0.98	-5.36	3.50
<i>Salix smithiana</i>	-4.74	-11.00	1.55	-4.61	-10.32	0.93	-2.27	-6.68	2.05
<i>Salix repens</i>	-11.68	-21.88	-1.57	-7.11	-17.62	3.43	-1.11	-5.42	3.22
<i>Sambucus tigranii</i>	-10.43	-22.84	1.55	-7.40	-17.95	3.27	-1.05	-5.56	3.38
<i>Sambucus pubens</i>	-10.68	-23.03	1.36	-7.42	-17.88	3.17	-1.03	-5.39	3.43
<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>	-8.39	-20.03	3.44	-6.35	-11.41	-1.50	-1.11	-4.81	2.58
<i>Sorbus torminalis</i>	-10.89	-21.41	-0.75	-8.01	-18.33	2.39	-1.09	-5.06	2.89
<i>Sorbus aria</i>	-13.07	-23.69	-2.74	-6.98	-17.30	3.44	-1.08	-5.35	3.24
<i>Sorbus decora</i>	-8.57	-18.81	1.94	-7.34	-17.48	2.93	-1.09	-5.39	3.30
<i>Sorbus commixta</i>	-7.51	-17.66	2.70	-7.38	-17.75	3.10	-1.01	-5.41	3.50
<i>Spirea alba</i>	-5.95	-18.47	6.94	-6.51	-14.74	1.51	-1.05	-5.49	3.46
<i>Stachyurus praecox</i>	-7.90	-20.29	4.77	-7.55	-17.73	2.86	-1.05	-5.54	3.43
<i>Stachyurus sinensis</i>	-7.56	-18.17	3.53	-7.03	-17.41	3.35	-0.99	-5.43	3.44




Figure S1: Non-phylogenetic phenological sensitivity to three environmental cues, chilling (a), forcing (b) and photoperiod (c) measured in change in days to budburst per standardized unit (z-transformation) of the cues across 191 tree species. Sensitivity estimates are computed by commonly used hierarchical model where phylogenetic distances are not accounted for ($\lambda = 0$). The same phylogenetic tree is shown in each panel, colored according to an estimation of ancestral character states, being the states at the tips the species' sensitivities to a cue. Species sensitivities are shown along with 50% uncertainty Intervals in the diagrams. Note that the color scale varies in each panel. Total tree depth is 81. My.




Figure S2: Correlations among estimated sensitivities to the environmental cues comparing forcing vs. chilling (a,d), forcing vs. photoperiod (b,e) and chilling vs. photoperiod (c,f). Upper panels show correlations among estimated sensitivities by the phylogenetic model and lower panels show results for the non-phylogenetic model.




Figure S3: Comparison of uncertainty around estimated sensitivities to chilling (a), forcing (b) and photoperiod (c) of individual species between the phylogenetic model with estimated λ (λ_{est}), and the non-phylogenetic model with $\lambda = 0$ (λ_0). The non-phylogenetic model increases uncertainty.




Figure S4: Comparison of overall model accuracy as measured by Bayes R^2 for the phylogenetic model (PMM) and the non-phylogenetic model (HMM). There are no differences in accuracy even if individual species estimates markedly differ between models.




Figure S5: Bias in estimation of sensitivity to chilling (a), forcing (b) and photoperiod (c). Histograms show the difference between the phylogenetic model with estimated λ against the non-phylogenetic model with $\lambda = 0$. Positive values indicate that sensitivities estimated by the non-phylogenetic model are smaller than those estimated by the phylogenetic model.




Figure S6: Maps comparing projections of phylogenetic (PMM) against non-phylogenetic (HMM) models into the European distributions of two overlapping species, one well represented in the dataset *Betula pendula* (a) and one underrepresented *Acer campestre* (b). The color scale shown in maps and histograms reflects budbreak differences between models where days are relative to start of forcing conditions, not calendar days.




Figure S7: Marginal plots contrasting the posterior distributions (in red) of estimated sensitivities to chilling (a), forcing (b) and photoperiod (c) against prior distributions (blue). Lower panels show marginal plots for the posterior distributions of phylogenetic parameter λ fitted for chilling (d), forcing (e) and photoperiod (f). See *Stan code* section below for details on prior and parameter specification of the models.




Figure S8: Estimates of sigmas using our phylogenetic model and simulated data with responses to forcing and photoperiod generated from a delta model of evolution (fastBM in phytools package), with delta set to 2 for forcing and to 0.5 for photoperiod (intercept and chilling generated from lambda model with a lambda of 1).

Stan code

```
functions {
    matrix lambda_vcv(matrix vcv, real lambda, real sigma){
        matrix[rows(vcv),cols(vcv)] local_vcv;
        local_vcv = vcv * lambda;
        for(i in 1:rows(local_vcv))
            local_vcv[i,i] = vcv[i,i];
        return(quad_form_diag(local_vcv, rep_vector(sigma, rows(vcv))));
    }
}

data {
    int<lower=1> N;
    int<lower=1> n_sp;
    int<lower=1, upper=n_sp> sp[N];
    vector[N] y; // response
    vector[N] x1; // predictor (forcing)
    vector[N] x2; // predictor (chilling)
    vector[N] x3; // predictor (photoperiod)
    matrix[n_sp,n_sp] Vphy; // phylogeny
}

parameters {
    real<lower=0> sigma_y;
    real<lower=0, upper=1> lam_interceptsa;
    real<lower=0> sigma_interceptsa;
    real<lower=0, upper=1> lam_interceptsb;
    real<lower=0> sigma_interceptsb;
    real<lower=0, upper=1> lam_interceptsc;
    real<lower=0> sigma_interceptsc;
    real<lower=0, upper=1> lam_interceptsbp;
    real<lower=0> sigma_interceptsbp;
    vector[n_sp] b_force; // slope of forcing effect
    real b_zf;
    vector[n_sp] b_chill; // slope of chilling effect
    real b_zc;
    vector[n_sp] b_photo; // slope of photo effect
    real b_zp;
```

```

vector[n_sp] a; // intercept
real a_z;

}

model {
    real yhat[N];

    matrix[n_sp,n_sp] vcv_a;      // phylogeny
    matrix[n_sp,n_sp] vcv_bf;     // phylogeny
    matrix[n_sp,n_sp] vcv_bc;     // phylogeny
    matrix[n_sp,n_sp] vcv_bp;     // phylogeny

    for(i in 1:N){
        yhat[i] =
        a[sp[i]] + b_force[sp[i]] * x1[i] + b_chill[sp[i]] * x2[i] + b_photo[sp[i]] * x3[i];
    }

    vcv_a = cholesky_decompose(lambda_vcv(Vphy, lam_interceptsa, sigma_interceptsa));
    vcv_bf = cholesky_decompose(lambda_vcv(Vphy, lam_interceptsb, sigma_interceptsb));
    vcv_bc = cholesky_decompose(lambda_vcv(Vphy, lam_interceptsb, sigma_interceptsb));
    vcv_bp = cholesky_decompose(lambda_vcv(Vphy, lam_interceptsb, sigma_interceptsb));

    a ~ multi_normal_cholesky(rep_vector(a_z,n_sp), vcv_a);
    b_force ~ multi_normal_cholesky(rep_vector(b_zf,n_sp), vcv_bf);
    b_chill ~ multi_normal_cholesky(rep_vector(b_zc,n_sp), vcv_bc);
    b_photo ~ multi_normal_cholesky(rep_vector(b_zp,n_sp), vcv_bp);

    y ~ normal(yhat, sigma_y);

    a_z ~ normal(30, 10); // prior
    b_zf ~ normal(-2, 10); // prior
    b_zc ~ normal(-2, 10); // prior
    b_zp ~ normal(0, 5); // prior

    lam_interceptsa ~ beta(1, 1);
    lam_interceptsb ~ beta(1, 1);
    lam_interceptsb ~ beta(1, 1);

```

```
lam_interceptsbp ~ beta(1, 1);

sigma_interceptsa ~ normal(30, 20);
sigma_interceptsbf ~ normal(1, 5);
sigma_interceptsbc ~ normal(1, 5);
sigma_interceptsbp ~ normal(1, 5);

sigma_y ~ normal(10, 10); // prior

}
```