

# Spatial and temporal shifts in photoperiod with climate change

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

March 22, 2020

**Statement of authorship** All authors conceived of this manuscript and each contributed data analysis and figures. AKE wrote the manuscript, and all authors contributed revisions to the manuscript.

**Data Accessibility** Should the manuscript be accepted in Ecology Letters, the data supporting our results will be archived in an appropriate public repository. The OSPREE database will be publicly archived at KNB, doi:10.5063/F1QV3JQR (Wolkovich et al., 2019).

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

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

**Paper type** Review and Synthesis

**Number of words in abstract** 196

**Number of words in main text** 3,449 (UPDATE!)

**Number of references** 138

**Number of tables** 0

**Number of figures** 6

**Number of text boxes** 2

## **1 Abstract**

2 Climate change causes both temporal (e.g., advancing spring phenology) and geographic shifts (e.g., range  
3 expansion poleward) in species; these shifts affect the photoperiod experienced. As photoperiod is a com-  
4 mon trigger of seasonal biological responses—affecting plant phenology in 84% of reviewed studies that  
5 manipulated photoperiod)—shifts in experienced photoperiod may have important implications for future  
6 distributions and fitness. However, photoperiod has not been a focus of climate change forecasting to date,  
7 especially for early-season ('spring') events often assumed to be driven by temperature. We synthesize pub-  
8 lished studies to show that impacts on experienced photoperiod from temporal shifts could be orders of  
9 magnitude larger than from spatial shifts (1.6 hours of change for expected temporal versus one minute for  
10 latitudinal shifts). Incorporating these effects into forecasts is possible by leveraging existing experimental  
11 data. For example, growth chamber experiments on woody plant spring phenology often have data relevant  
12 for climate change impacts, and suggest that shifts in experienced photoperiod may increasingly constrain  
13 responses to additional warming. We highlight how combining modeling approaches and empirical work on  
14 when, where, and how much photoperiod affects spring phenology could rapidly advance our understanding  
15 and predictions of future spatio-temporal shifts from climate change.

## <sup>16</sup> Introduction

<sup>17</sup> Photoperiod (daylength) is a critical cue for the onset of spring in plants and animals, signaling changes in  
<sup>18</sup> growth, migration, and reproduction across diverse species (e.g., Flynn and Wolkovich, 2018; Howe et al.,  
<sup>19</sup> 1996; Lagercrantz, 2009; Bradshaw and Holzapfel, 2007; Mcallan et al., 2006; Solbakken et al., 1994; Barker  
<sup>20</sup> and Herman, 1976; Farner, 1964). Photoperiod is a useful cue for diverse species to synchronize activities  
<sup>21</sup> with seasonal climatic changes (e.g., Singh et al., 2017; Basler and Körner, 2012; Hsu et al., 2011) because it  
<sup>22</sup> is consistent across years, especially compared to other seasonal cues such as temperature and precipitation  
<sup>23</sup> (Saikkonen et al., 2012). In addition to being consistent over time, photoperiod reflects annual cycles at a  
<sup>24</sup> broad spatial scale, filtering out noise in local conditions (Winkler et al., 2014).

<sup>25</sup> For many organisms, spring phenology— i.e., the timing of spring events, including flowering, bird arrival, egg  
<sup>26</sup> hatching and myriad other biological activities—is thought to be determined by photoperiod interactively  
<sup>27</sup> with temperature (Fu et al., 2019; Winkler et al., 2014, see also Box 1). The strong role of temperature  
<sup>28</sup> is apparent in recent advances in spring phenology. Across taxa, from plants and insects to mollusks and  
<sup>29</sup> mammals, spring phenology is occurring earlier as temperatures warm, with average shifts of 1.2 to 5.1 days  
<sup>30</sup> earlier per decade (Bradley et al., 1999; Parmesan and Yohe, 2003; Poloczanska et al., 2013; Root et al.,  
<sup>31</sup> 2003) or 1.3 to 5.6 days earlier per °C of warming (Polgar et al., 2013; Wolkovich et al., 2012). These changes  
<sup>32</sup> are some of the largest climate change-induced shifts observed, with early spring phenology shifting more  
<sup>33</sup> rapidly than later season phenology in most cases (Bradley et al., 1999; Menzel et al., 2006). These shifts  
<sup>34</sup> occur while, at a given location on Earth, annual patterns in photoperiod have not changed as climates have  
<sup>35</sup> warmed.

<sup>36</sup> Recent studies suggest that photoperiod cues may eventually restrict advances in spring phenology in a warmer  
<sup>37</sup> world. With additional climate change, photoperiod will limit phenological shifts of certain species such that  
<sup>38</sup> they will not track rising temperatures (Fu et al., 2015; Way and Montgomery, 2015; Basler and Körner,  
<sup>39</sup> 2012; Körner and Basler, 2010a). Instead, these species' responses will increasingly become constrained by  
<sup>40</sup> daylength and the trend of ever-earlier springs with warming may halt. The idea of photoperiod constraints is  
<sup>41</sup> controversial, however, as other studies suggest that photoperiod will not constrain responses to warming for  
<sup>42</sup> most species (Chuine et al., 2010; Zohner et al., 2016). The extent to which daylength constrains phenology

<sup>43</sup> will depend in part on how rapidly photoperiod responses can acclimate or adapt to new environmental  
<sup>44</sup> conditions, which remains poorly understood (Grevstad and Coop, 2015; Bradshaw and Holzapfel, 2007).

<sup>45</sup> Perhaps because of these variable and uncertain responses, photoperiod is often not included in forecasts of  
<sup>46</sup> biological responses to climate change, especially in the spring, even though it is known to be an important  
<sup>47</sup> cue for biological activity (but see Duputié et al., 2015; Grevstad and Coop, 2015; Caffarra et al., 2011a).

<sup>48</sup> The exclusion of photoperiod may be problematic: although photoperiod itself is stable over time, the  
<sup>49</sup> photoperiod that species *experience*, as they undergo climate change-induced shifts in space and time, is  
<sup>50</sup> likely to be much less stable. In addition to shifting activity earlier with recent warming, many species have  
<sup>51</sup> shifted their distributions poleward and upward in elevation (i.e., range shifts, Chen et al., 2011; Harsch et al.,  
<sup>52</sup> 2009; Parmesan, 2006; Peñuelas and Boada, 2003). These spatial and temporal shifts alter the photoperiod  
<sup>53</sup> experienced by organisms (Fig. 1); altered photoperiods may have cascading effects on species' performance,  
<sup>54</sup> since daylength can affect the timing of development (Grevstad and Coop, 2015; Muir et al., 1994; Tauber  
<sup>55</sup> and Tauber, 1975), migration (Dawbin, 1966), reproduction (Dunn, 2019; Dardente, 2012; Ben-David, 1997),  
<sup>56</sup> and other important responses.

<sup>57</sup> The implications of potential climate change-induced shifts in experienced photoperiod are unclear, as the  
<sup>58</sup> magnitude of potential shifts has not been described. Effects of photoperiod shifts may be relatively mi-  
<sup>59</sup> nor, especially because there can be substantial year-to-year variation in experienced photoperiod (Fig. 2).  
<sup>60</sup> Alternatively, photoperiod may begin to constrain species' responses to climate change (Körner and Basler,  
<sup>61</sup> 2010b).

<sup>62</sup> Here, we ask:

- <sup>63</sup> 1. How will climate change alter the photoperiod experienced by organisms?
- <sup>64</sup> 2. What are the implications of altered photoperiods for biological responses to climate change?
- <sup>65</sup> 3. Can researchers apply data from experiments that alter photoperiod to aid in forecasting biological  
<sup>66</sup> implications of climate change?

<sup>67</sup> We focus on spring events, as phenology during this time is one of the most widely observed and rapidly  
<sup>68</sup> changing biological responses to climate change (Parmesan, 2006). In addition, the role of photoperiod is

69 less understood in spring phenology compared with autumn phenophases (reviewed in, e.g., Azeez and Sane,  
70 2015; Gallinat et al., 2015; Lagercrantz, 2009; Allona et al., 2008), but recent studies showing declines in  
71 responses of spring budburst to warming (e.g., Fu et al., 2019; Güsewell et al., 2017; Yu et al., 2010) suggest  
72 that photoperiod constraints may be imminent. While our questions are broadly relevant for diverse species,  
73 we use a case study of spring woody plant phenology to illustrate some of our points(Boxes 1, 2).

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

76 Species experience different photoperiod regimes depending on their location on Earth, the seasonal timing  
77 of their activity, and inter-annual variation in climate (Fig. 1, 2). Consider, as an example, the daylength  
78 experienced by plants on the date that spring “green-up” occurs. Spring green-up varies with latitude (Fig.  
79 2a), in part because latitudinal variation in green-up date, which occurs earlier toward the equator and later  
80 toward the poles, is strongly driven by climatic differences that affect phenology, and in part because of  
81 latitudinal variation in photoperiod (e.g., at the poles, the daylength at the summer solstice is 24 hours; see  
82 also Fig. 1).

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

87 Despite these consistent broad-scale patterns, there is also strong spatiotemporal variation in experienced  
88 photoperiod across years. Comparing the photoperiod at green-up in an “early” versus an “average” year (Fig.  
89 2) shows that experienced photoperiod at green-up can vary by two to three hours from one year to the next  
90 in the same location (Fig. 2c). We use green-up date as an example here because it is an available dataset  
91 and represents an important biological event, signalling the start of the growing season. Though green-up  
92 date corresponds to plant phenology, we expect that spatiotemporal patterns are similarly heterogeneous in  
93 spring phenology of other organisms (Ovaskainen et al., 2013; Peñuelas et al., 2002).

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

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

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

114 In many cases organisms may shift both their ranges and their phenology simultaneously (i.e., due to new  
115 climatic conditions, Duputié et al., 2015; Grevstad and Coop, 2015). In addition, photoperiod sensitivity  
116 (see *Glossary*) can vary with latitude, likely due to population-level differences in sensitivity (Gauzere et al.,  
117 2017; Saikkonen et al., 2012; Caffarra et al., 2011b; Bradshaw and Holzapfel, 2007; Viherä-Aarnio et al., 2006;  
118 Partanen et al., 2005; Howe et al., 1996). With future climate change, it is unclear how these complexities  
119 will affect the photoperiod experienced by organisms and whether these shifts in photoperiod will have im-  
120 portant implications for biological responses. This lack of clarity stems, in part, from the fact that phenology  
121 both affects and is affected by experienced photoperiod: climate change-induced shifts in phenology alter

<sup>122</sup> experienced photoperiod, which in turn affects phenology.

<sup>123</sup> **What are the implications of altered photoperiods for biological  
124 responses to climate change?**

<sup>125</sup> Daylength, often in combination with temperature, can play a role in controlling critical biological functions,  
<sup>126</sup> including vegetative growth, cell elongation, budburst, and flowering in plants (Fu et al., 2019; Heide and  
<sup>127</sup> Sønsteby, 2012; Heide, 2011; Hsu et al., 2011; Sidaway-Lee et al., 2010; Mimura and Aitken, 2007; Linkosalo  
<sup>128</sup> and Lechowicz, 2006; Erwin, 1998; Ashby et al., 1962) and growth rate, maturation, reproduction, migration,  
<sup>129</sup> and diapause in animals (Dunn, 2019; Winkler et al., 2014; Zydlowski et al., 2014; Dardente, 2012; Tobin  
<sup>130</sup> et al., 2008; Bradshaw and Holzapfel, 2006; Ben-David, 1997; Muir et al., 1994; Saunders and Henderson, 1970;  
<sup>131</sup> Dawbin, 1966). Climate change-induced shifts in photoperiod are therefore likely to alter these functions.  
<sup>132</sup> Indeed, growth chamber studies demonstrate that the magnitude of daylength shifts we can expect with  
<sup>133</sup> climate change (i.e., 1-2 hours of difference in daylength with temporal shifts over the next century) are  
<sup>134</sup> substantial enough to affect spring phenology in trees (Table S1). The direction and magnitude of responses  
<sup>135</sup> will vary, however, because of variation in photoperiod sensitivity, and because photoperiod often interacts  
<sup>136</sup> with other environmental drivers, such as temperature, to affect phenology (Box 1).

<sup>137</sup> The climate change-induced trend toward ever-earlier springs means that experienced photoperiod may in-  
<sup>138</sup> creasingly approach threshold photoperiods (see *Glossary*) for many species, constraining their ability to  
<sup>139</sup> respond to additional warming (Fu et al., 2019; Vitasse and Basler, 2013; Körner and Basler, 2010b; Morin  
<sup>140</sup> et al., 2010; Nienstaedt, 1966). Interactions between photoperiod and temperature may therefore result in  
<sup>141</sup> muted phenological shifts, compared to what would be expected based on temperature change alone (Körner  
<sup>142</sup> and Basler, 2010b; Mimura and Aitken, 2007; Wareing, 1956). If photoperiod does become limiting, the  
<sup>143</sup> average trend of earlier phenology with warming (Ovaskainen et al., 2013; Polgar et al., 2013; Peñuelas et al.,  
<sup>144</sup> 2002; Menzel, 2000) may stop.

<sup>145</sup> A challenge in understanding the implications of altered photoperiods under climate change, and for force-  
<sup>146</sup> casting whether and when the trend of earlier phenology with warming may slow or stop abruptly, is the

<sup>147</sup> wide range of observed photoperiod sensitivity across species (Flynn and Wolkovich, 2018; Sanz-Perez et al.,  
<sup>148</sup> 2009; Zohner et al., 2016), populations (Tanino et al., 2010), and ecotypes (Howe et al., 1995). How much  
<sup>149</sup> genotype versus environment explain this variation is an active area of research (e.g., Franks et al., 2014;  
<sup>150</sup> Gould et al., 2010; Mimura and Aitken, 2010; Fréjaville et al., 2019). Environmental conditions clearly play a  
<sup>151</sup> role, since different combinations of ambient temperature and photoperiod may explain some of this variation  
<sup>152</sup> and because temperature cues can override photoperiod requirements under certain conditions (e.g., Tanino  
<sup>153</sup> et al., 2010). In such cases, climate change-induced phenological shifts may occur at different rates than past  
<sup>154</sup> shifts with warming. On the other hand, some of this variation may be due to underlying genetic differences,  
<sup>155</sup> because photoperiod responses can be under strong genetic control (Bradshaw and Stettler, 1995; Keller et al.,  
<sup>156</sup> 2011; Weih, 2004, see also Box 1). Teasing out the relative roles of genetics versus environmental conditions  
<sup>157</sup> will be critical to accurate forecasts of future phenology under climate change.

<sup>158</sup> Species- and population-level variation in photoperiod sensitivity may result in altered communities as climate  
<sup>159</sup> change progresses. For example, a species or population that is relatively insensitive to photoperiod can take  
<sup>160</sup> advantage of warmer springs by having an earlier start to its growing season. Indeed, phenological tracking of  
<sup>161</sup> temperature (e.g., earlier flowering, leafout, migration with warming) has been linked with higher performance  
<sup>162</sup> in plants and animals (Cleland et al., 2012; Muir et al., 1994; Willis et al., 2010). Species or populations  
<sup>163</sup> that are sensitive to temperature but relatively insensitive to photoperiod may therefore outcompete slower-  
<sup>164</sup> growing or later-emerging ones that are limited by photoperiod and thus cannot take advantage of longer  
<sup>165</sup> growing season conditions. Not all studies however, find links between performance and high sensitivity  
<sup>166</sup> to temperature (e.g., Block et al., 2019), and early-season species in most temperature zones risk losing to  
<sup>167</sup> tissue to frost (Sakai and Larcher, 1987). Thus, the advantages of tracking warming may depend on how  
<sup>168</sup> quickly mean temperatures versus last frost dates shift (e.g., Inouye et al., 2002), such that in some systems  
<sup>169</sup> photoperiod cues could prevent species from starting growth or reproduction too early and thus losing their  
<sup>170</sup> investments in new tissue or offspring. To identify where, when, and how communities may be altered thus  
<sup>171</sup> requires quantifying species-specific temperature and photoperiod sensitivities, and developing methods that  
<sup>172</sup> incorporate both photoperiod and environmental events that impact fitness (such as frosts).

<sub>173</sub> Future directions: outstanding questions and incorporating pho-  
<sub>174</sub> toperiod into forecasting

<sub>175</sub> Incorporating photoperiod into forecasting is complex for a few major reasons. Future rates of phenological  
<sub>176</sub> shifts are unlikely to be straightforward extrapolations from past and current rates. In addition, an organism's  
<sub>177</sub> experienced photoperiod is both a driver and an effect of phenological shifts.

<sub>178</sub> Approaches for forecasting can be grouped into two broad categories: statistical models and process-based  
<sub>179</sub> models. These two modelling paradigms differ in how they relate phenology to climate change. Statistical  
<sub>180</sub> models relating phenology to climate change generally assume linear relationships between species' responses  
<sub>181</sub> and environmental variables (e.g., Flynn and Wolkovich, 2018; Van Belle et al., 2007; Ibáñez et al., 2010),  
<sub>182</sub> while process-based models often incorporate nonlinear threshold relationships (e.g. Chuine and Beaubien,  
<sub>183</sub> 2001; Morin and Thuiller, 2009; Xie and Hsieh, 1989). Further, statistical models of phenology under climate  
<sub>184</sub> change have typically ignored photoperiod, focusing instead on seasonal or annual temperature (e.g. Diez  
<sub>185</sub> et al., 2012; Ibáñez et al., 2010; Van Belle et al., 2007, but see Richardson et al. (2013)), whereas process-  
<sub>186</sub> based models of phenology more frequently incorporate photoperiod, along with temperature (Lundell et al.,  
<sub>187</sub> 2020; Duputié et al., 2015; Zhao et al., 2013; Morin and Thuiller, 2009; Xie and Hsieh, 1989). Process-based  
<sub>188</sub> models may thus seem superior for integrating photoperiod, but they can be challenging to develop, requiring  
<sub>189</sub> detailed data that are often not readily available (e.g., daily climate data, nonlinear biological responses to  
<sub>190</sub> fine-scale changes in temperature). Perhaps because of this, statistical models remain more commonly used  
<sub>191</sub> in climate change forecasts of biological responses (e.g., García-Valdés and Morales-Castilla, 2016; Basler and  
<sub>192</sub> Körner, 2012; Diez et al., 2012; Zhu et al., 2012; Ibáñez et al., 2010; Van Belle et al., 2007).

<sub>193</sub> Future modelling of spring woody plant phenology can incorporate photoperiod by leveraging the large  
<sub>194</sub> amount of experimental data on photoperiod responses (e.g., Fig. 3, Table S1, Box 2), especially when  
<sub>195</sub> process-based approaches are used. Researchers can use these data to first learn whether the study species  
<sub>196</sub> (or a phylogenetically closely related species) shows a photoperiod effect and, ideally, identify its threshold  
<sub>197</sub> photoperiod and how it varies by population, ecotype, or other factors (Tobin et al., 2008; Bradshaw and  
<sub>198</sub> Holzapfel, 2006; Gwinner, 1996). If there is evidence of a photoperiod response (e.g., *Fagus grandifolia*,  
<sub>199</sub> or *Tilia americana* with low chilling in Fig. 4), daylength should be added to forecasting models, using

200 the threshold photoperiod to define short-day and long-day conditions (Fig. 6). Given the large change in  
201 experienced photoperiod with temporal shifts (Fig. 1), this may be particularly important for phenological  
202 forecasting. Since spatial shifts are associated with smaller changes in experienced photoperiod, it may be less  
203 important for distribution forecasts. Many species, however, may shift in *both* space and time simultaneously.  
204 Thus, even though experienced photoperiod changes little as species distributions shift in space, phenology  
205 may be altered significantly.

206 For some species, experimental data can be immediately used in forecasting because experiments manipulate  
207 photoperiod at relevant scales (e.g., Heide and Sonsteby, 2015; Basler and Körner, 2014, Figs. 3, 5 A, Table  
208 S1). For example, photoperiod treatments from growth chamber experiments with *Fagus sylvatica* span  
209 the variation in both current and expected future ranges (Fig. 5A, Duputié et al., 2015), and may allow  
210 identification of threshold photoperiods (Fig. 6). In other cases, attempting to incorporate photoperiod  
211 into forecasts of future phenology will reveal gaps in our understanding of many aspects of photoperiod  
212 responses. For example, photoperiod treatments from existing experiments of *Quercus robur* do not accurately  
213 represent experienced photoperiods from current or future estimates (Fig. 5B), making fine-scale projections  
214 difficult, even for this relatively well-studied species. This gap extends to many species, as most experiments  
215 manipulate photoperiod much more dramatically than will occur with climate change (Figs. 3, 5). Although  
216 these studies can be useful for understanding mechanistically how photoperiod responses work, extrapolating  
217 them to climate change models may not be reasonable.

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

226 As researchers more fully integrate photoperiod into forecasting, a critical area of further study is under-  
227 standing *how* photoperiod acts as a cue. Photoperiod seems to interact with temperature to affect phenology

(e.g., Zytlewski et al., 2014); this would explain the divergent effects of photoperiod observed across studies in woody plants (e.g., Fig. 4). However, exactly how it interacts with temperature is not well-defined for most species or populations (Boxes 1, 2). For many species, additional experimental and physiological research is necessary, since the dormancy-breaking processes that photoperiod affects often require detailed physiological approaches to observe (Hänninen et al., 2019; Chuine et al., 2016). Understanding the drivers, as well as the consequences, of variations in photoperiod responses across species and populations will be particularly beneficial for forecasting. For example, what traits are associated with photoperiod sensitivity and does variation in photoperiod sensitivity or related traits have a strong genetic component? If so, are species or populations from some locations or lineages more likely than others to be constrained by photoperiod in their responses to climate change?

## Conclusions

Organisms may undergo large changes to the photoperiod they experience with climate change, even if they do not shift their ranges spatially. Here we have shown that these altered photoperiods may result in stalled future advances of woody plant phenology with warming (e.g., Table S1, Fig. 5, Fu et al., 2019; Güsewell et al., 2017; Yu et al., 2010), with cascading effects on growth, fitness, and community composition due to the large variation in photoperiod responses across species and populations (Fig. 4). Shifts in photoperiod with climate change have implications for a variety of plant and animal responses, given that daylength affects critical activities for diverse species from insects (Bradshaw and Holzapfel, 2006; Linn et al., 1996) and salmon (Taranger et al., 2003; Solbakken et al., 1994) to birds (Dawson et al., 2001) and marsupials (McAllan et al., 2006; Solbakken et al., 1994). Given what we know, incorporating photoperiod into forecasting of climate change responses should improve model accuracy, and will illuminate additional experiments that could improve our mechanistic understanding of photoperiod as a critical cue for diverse biological responses.

## Glossary

- budburst: when one or more leaf buds have visible green tips.

- 252     ● chilling: the intensity and duration of winter temperature, often a certain sum of chilling that is required  
253                 (e.g., some amount of hours or days of cold temperatures, defined by a specific critical temperature or  
254                 range of temperatures, such as between 0 and 7.2 °C, Richardson, 1974), that must be experienced for  
255                 budburst to occur.
- 256     ● daylength: the period of time during a 24-hour period during which an organism receives light.
- 257     ● diapause: period of suspended development or growth, usually used to describe invertebrates during  
258                 unfavorable environmental conditions such as winter.
- 259     ● dormancy: halted or reduced growth or activity, usually used to describe plants.
- 260     ● forcing: warm spring temperatures, often a certain sum of forcing that is required (e.g., some amount  
261                 of hours or days above a specific temperature) for budburst or flowering can occur.
- 262     ● green-up: The beginning of a new cycle of plant growth, usually evaluated at the landscape scale.
- 263     ● phenology: the timing of life cycle events in organisms
- 264     ● photoperiod: the daily duration of light (daylength) and dark to which an organism is exposed; often  
265                 used synonymously with daylength.
- 266     ● photoperiod sensitivity: the degree to which phenology is controlled by daylength; may be a nonlinear,  
267                 or “threshold”, response in plants (Box 2) and animals (Grevstad and Coop, 2015; Tobin et al., 2008).
- 268     ● photoperiodism: the ability to assess the length of day or night to regulate behavior, physiology, growth,  
269                 development or reproduction.
- 270     ● threshold photoperiod: length of day that causes an organism to switch from a short- to a long-day  
271                 response (or vice versa). For example, in European larch (*Larix decidua*), budburst development may  
272                 be constrained under short-day conditions, when daylengths are less than a threshold photoperiod of  
273                 10-11 hours (Migliavacca et al., 2008). Above this threshold photoperiod, the long-day response of  
274                 unconstrained budburst development can occur.

<sup>275</sup> **Box 1. Are photoperiod effects widespread? A case study of woody**

<sup>276</sup> **plant spring phenology**

<sup>277</sup> **Focal examples from spring woody plant phenology**

<sup>278</sup> Photoperiod responses are particularly well-studied in woody plant phenology, making this a useful case study  
<sup>279</sup> to consider climate change-induced shifts in photoperiod. Spring woody plant phenology in particular has  
<sup>280</sup> critical implications for global carbon cycling and feedbacks to the climate system (Richardson et al., 2013),  
<sup>281</sup> and has been at the center of an important and controversial debate on the relative effects of photoperiod  
<sup>282</sup> versus temperature on phenology (e.g., Fu et al., 2019; Chuine et al., 2010; Körner and Basler, 2010*a,b*).

<sup>283</sup> Decades of experimental growth chamber studies have shown that photoperiod is an important cue for  
<sup>284</sup> spring budburst phenology in woody plants (e.g., Flynn and Wolkovich, 2018; Basler and Körner, 2014;  
<sup>285</sup> Heide, 1993*b*). These experiments often manipulate photoperiod in combination with temperature to address  
<sup>286</sup> basic questions about how these two environmental conditions act as biological cues. Temperature has a  
<sup>287</sup> dual role in regulating woody plant phenology: chilling—the prolonged exposure to cold temperatures after  
<sup>288</sup> growth cessation in the fall—is required to initiate budburst; and forcing—prolonged exposure to warm  
<sup>289</sup> temperatures—is required for budburst to occur. Different photoperiod treatments are typically applied  
<sup>290</sup> during the forcing treatment phase in growth chamber experiments (e.g., Laube et al., 2014; Spann et al.,  
<sup>291</sup> 2004; Falusi and Calamassi, 1990; Heide, 1977; Campbell and Sugano, 1975).

<sup>292</sup> Woody plant growth chamber studies have been conducted for decades, but have only recently been syn-  
<sup>293</sup>thesized to show that photoperiod sensitivity is widespread, with wide variation across studies and species.  
<sup>294</sup> We synthesized these studies in Observed Spring Phenology Responses in Experimental Environments (OS-  
<sup>295</sup> PREE), a new database of plant growth chamber studies that manipulate photoperiod and temperature  
<sup>296</sup> to measure plant phenological responses, including budburst and flowering (Wolkovich et al., 2019). The  
<sup>297</sup> database includes studies that manipulate photoperiod (by applying treatments with different daylength du-  
<sup>298</sup> rations, applying long-day versus short-day conditions for different lengths of time, and/or applying varying  
<sup>299</sup> vs constant photoperiods) and temperature (by imposing different chilling and/or forcing treatments). The  
<sup>300</sup> OSPREE database spans 201 woody plant species; all experiments in the database use dormant plant tis-

<sup>301</sup> sue (grown in greenhouses or taken directly from the field) exposed to experimental conditions (*Wolkovich*  
<sup>302</sup> *et al.*, 2019) for which we could identify forcing, photoperiod, and chilling treatments quantitatively. See  
<sup>303</sup> Supplemental Methods and Wolkovich et al. (2019) for details.

<sup>304</sup> Growth chamber experiments in OSPREE suggest that the dominant photoperiod response in woody plant  
<sup>305</sup> species is earlier and more rapid budburst with longer days (e.g., Caffarra and Donnelly, 2011). Thirty-one  
<sup>306</sup> of the 85 studies in the OSPREE database included two or more different photoperiod treatments. Of these,  
<sup>307</sup> 26 (84%) found significant photoperiod main effects or significant interactive effects with temperature (i.e.,  
<sup>308</sup> photoperiod x temperature effects), across 176 species (Table S1). Main effects included responses such as  
<sup>309</sup> growth (e.g., higher growth rates with longer days Ashby et al., 1962) and reproduction (e.g., increased  
<sup>310</sup> flowering with longer days Heide and Sønsteby, 2012).

<sup>311</sup> Growth chamber experiments highlight that responses to photoperiod vary depending on temperature con-  
<sup>312</sup> ditions. For example, more rapid advancement of budburst was observed under long versus short days with  
<sup>313</sup> low chilling, than with high chilling in *Betula payrifera* (Hawkins and Dhar, 2012) (Fig. 4). Similarly, across  
<sup>314</sup> species, as chilling accumulates from winter to spring, sensitivity to forcing and photoperiod sensitivity can  
<sup>315</sup> decrease (Malyshev et al., 2018). Frequently, long photoperiods can compensate for low amounts of chilling,  
<sup>316</sup> resulting in enhanced cell growth (Caffarra et al., 2011b; Myking and Heide, 1995; Heide, 1993a).

<sup>317</sup> Woody plant growth chamber experiments also demonstrate that, though photoperiod responses are common,  
<sup>318</sup> they are variable (Fig. 4). Responses to photoperiod differ by species (e.g., Flynn and Wolkovich, 2018;  
<sup>319</sup> Zohner et al., 2016; Basler and Körner, 2014, 2012; Howe et al., 1996; Heide, 1993b). For example, with  
<sup>320</sup> longer chilling treatments some species seem insensitive to daylength (e.g., *Hammamelis* spp., *Prunus* spp.,  
<sup>321</sup> Zohner et al., 2016), whereas others seem to be highly sensitive to daylength (e.g. *Fagus* spp., Fig. 5A),  
<sup>322</sup> even with long chilling treatments (Zohner et al., 2016). In addition, some species demonstrate a response  
<sup>323</sup> to photoperiod opposite to that typically observed: *Tilia*, for example, showed delayed budburst with longer  
<sup>324</sup> daylengths (Fig. 4, Ashby et al., 1962). Photoperiod sensitivity also varies by population and ecotype (e.g.,  
<sup>325</sup> Partanen et al., 2005) (Fig. 4). For example, photoperiod effects on budburst were more significant for lower  
<sup>326</sup> latitude populations of *Betula pendula* and *B. pubescens* (Partanen et al., 2005).

<sup>327</sup> **Box 2. Dominant models of how photoperiod affects spring woody**

<sup>328</sup> **plant phenology**

<sup>329</sup> The cues and molecular pathways underlying photoperiod sensitivity are poorly understood for most organ-  
<sup>330</sup> isms, even in relatively well-studied phenophases and taxa, such as spring budburst in woody plants (Ding  
<sup>331</sup> and Nilsson, 2016). Decades of growth chamber experiments suggest three main cues—chilling, forcing, and  
<sup>332</sup> photoperiod—control spring budburst for many woody species (Flynn and Wolkovich, 2018; Heide, 2008;  
<sup>333</sup> Zohner et al., 2016), with many models suggesting a dominant role of forcing in most natural conditions.  
<sup>334</sup> Forcing requirements, however, appear to increase given shorter photoperiods or lower chilling (Chuine et al.,  
<sup>335</sup> 2010; Caffarra et al., 2011a). Research has yet to fully tease out effects of these three cues, their interactions  
<sup>336</sup> and prevalence, and photoperiod responses appear variable across species and populations, and with different  
<sup>337</sup> chilling treatments (see Fig. 4). Not surprisingly then, there is currently little agreement on the underlying  
<sup>338</sup> model for how photoperiod affects spring phenology for most species (Chuine et al., 2016; Hänninen et al.,  
<sup>339</sup> 2019). More physiological research will likely be necessary for major advances, as understanding the exact  
<sup>340</sup> cellular pathways through which chilling, forcing and photoperiod act appears increasingly critical to accurate  
<sup>341</sup> models (van der Schoot et al., 2014; Hänninen et al., 2019).

<sup>342</sup> Increased cellular and molecular studies may quickly advance understanding and scale up to improved pho-  
<sup>343</sup> toperiod models. While our understanding of how plants interpret photoperiod at the molecular-level comes  
<sup>344</sup> from fewer species, largely from studies of flowering in the model plant *Arabidopsis thaliana* (e.g., Suárez-  
<sup>345</sup> López et al., 2001) and fall budset in woody plant species (e.g., Howe et al., 1996), these studies have  
<sup>346</sup> proved useful across other species. For example, the “external coincidence model” (where plants sense light  
<sup>347</sup> via blue light receptors and phytochromes, then interpret photoperiod through a coordinated response to  
<sup>348</sup> light in relation to the time of day, see Lagercrantz, 2009) has been most widely studied in *Arabidopsis*, but  
<sup>349</sup> appears to be a relevant mechanism for photoperiod responses in diverse perennial and woody plant species  
<sup>350</sup> (Bünning, 1936; Davis, 2002; Bastow and Dean, 2002; Kobayashi and Weigel, 2007; Andrés and Coupland,  
<sup>351</sup> 2012; Petterle et al., 2013; Singh et al., 2017). The model proposes the existence of a circadian rhythm of  
<sup>352</sup> light sensitivity, in which the night-phase is sensitive to light and the day-phase is insensitive to light. As days  
<sup>353</sup> get longer in the spring, daylight illuminates the light sensitive phase, triggering a response. This provides a

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

355 We expect progress on spring phenology will benefit from similar physiological research that spans the molec-  
356 ular to whole-plant levels. To date, little is known about the genetic pathways responsible for the light-sensing  
357 apparatuses involved in spring budburst, and how they may vary across species or populations. Some genes  
358 have been identified that play a role in coordinating budburst in poplar (*Populus* spp.), and may occur in  
359 other woody species as well. Many similarities exist between the proposed regulatory networks of vegeta-  
360 tive growth in *Populus* and those controlling floral initiation in *Arabidopsis*, (Ding and Nilsson, 2016). For  
361 example, vegetative growth and inhibition of budset are promoted by the FLOWERING LOCUS T2 (FT2)  
362 gene, a homolog of *Arabidopsis thaliana* gene FLOWERING LOCUS (FT). FT2 expression appears to be  
363 controlled by a pathway that is effective in long days and warm temperatures, marking the onset of the  
364 growing season (?). Its loss of expression in autumn, when the days are getting shorter, is associated with  
365 the onset of dormancy (Glover, 2014).

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

## 371 Acknowledgements

372 We thank the many researchers who conducted the experiments synthesized in this manuscript; H. Kharouba  
373 for helpful comments that improved the manuscript; B. Feist for improving the appearance of Fig. 3 dramat-  
374 ically; and Anne Duputié and Isabelle Chuine for sharing projections from PhenoFit. The National Science  
375 Foundation (DBI 14-01854 to AKE), NSERC Discovery Award (RGPIN-05038 to EMW) and Canada Re-  
376 search Chair in Temporal Ecology (EMW) provided funding. Any opinion, findings, and conclusions or  
377 recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views  
378 of the National Science Foundation.

379    **References**

- 380    Allona, I., A. Ramos, C. Ibáñez, A. Contreras, R. Casado, and C. Aragoncillo. 2008. Molecular control of  
381    winter dormancy establishment in trees: a review. Spanish Journal of Agricultural Research 6:201–210.
- 382    Andrés, F., and G. Coupland. 2012. The genetic basis of flowering responses to seasonal cues. Nature reviews.  
383    Genetics 13:627.
- 384    Ashby, W., et al. 1962. Germination capacity in American Basswood *Tilia americana*. Transactions of the  
385    Illinois State Academy of Science 55:120–3.
- 386    Azeez, A., and A. P. Sane. 2015. Photoperiodic growth control in perennial trees. Plant signaling & behavior  
387    10:e1087631.
- 388    Barker, J. F., and W. S. Herman. 1976. Effect of photoperiod and temperature on reproduction of the  
389    monarch butterfly, *danaus plexippus*. Journal of Insect Physiology 22:1565–1568.
- 390    Basler, D., and C. Körner. 2012. Photoperiod sensitivity of bud burst in 14 temperate forest tree species.  
391    Agricultural and Forest Meteorology 165:73–81.
- 392    ———. 2014. Photoperiod and temperature responses of bud swelling and bud burst in four temperate forest  
393    tree species. Tree Physiology 34:377–388.
- 394    Bastow, R., and C. Dean. 2002. The molecular basis of photoperiodism. Developmental cell 3:461–462.
- 395    Ben-David, M. 1997. Timing of reproduction in wild mink: the influence of spawning Pacific salmon. Canadian  
396    Journal of Zoology 75:376–382.
- 397    Block, S., J. Alexander, and J. M. Levine. 2019. Phenological plasticity is a poor predictor of subalpine plant  
398    population performance following experimental climate change. Oikos page 10.1111/oik.06667.
- 399    Bradley, N. L., A. C. Leopold, J. Ross, and W. Huffaker. 1999. Phenological changes reflect climate change  
400    in Wisconsin. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 96:9701–9704.
- 401    Bradshaw, H., and R. F. Stettler. 1995. Molecular genetics of growth and development in *Populus*. IV.  
402    Mapping QTLs with large effects on growth, form, and phenology traits in a forest tree. Genetics 139:963–  
403    973.

- 404 Bradshaw, W. E., and C. M. Holzapfel. 2006. Evolutionary response to rapid climate change. *Science*  
405 312:1477–1478.
- 406 ———. 2007. Evolution of animal photoperiodism. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 38:1–25.
- 407 Büning, E. 1936. Endogenous daily rhythms as the basis of photoperiodism. *Ber Deut Bot Ges* 54:590–607.
- 408 Burghardt, L. T., C. J. E. Metcalf, A. M. Wilczek, J. Schmitt, and K. Donohue. 2015. Modeling the influence  
409 of genetic and environmental variation on the expression of plant life cycles across landscapes. *American*  
410 *Naturalist* 185:212–227.
- 411 Caffarra, A., and A. Donnelly. 2011. The ecological significance of phenology in four different tree species:  
412 effects of light and temperature on bud burst. *International Journal of Biometeorology* 55:711–721.
- 413 Caffarra, A., A. Donnelly, and I. Chuine. 2011a. Modelling the timing of *Betula pubescens* budburst. II.  
414 Integrating complex effects of photoperiod into process-based models. *Climate Research* 46:159–170.
- 415 Caffarra, A., A. Donnelly, I. Chuine, and M. B. Jones. 2011b. Modelling the timing of *Betula pubescens*  
416 bud-burst. I. Temperature and photoperiod: A conceptual model. *Climate Research* 46:147.
- 417 Campbell, R. K., and A. I. Sugano. 1975. Phenology of bud burst in Douglas-fir related to provenance,  
418 photoperiod, chilling, and flushing temperature. *Botanical Gazette* pages 290–298.
- 419 Chen, I.-C., J. K. Hill, R. Ohlemüller, D. B. Roy, and C. D. Thomas. 2011. Rapid range shifts of species  
420 associated with high levels of climate warming. *Science* 333:1024–1026.
- 421 Chuine, I., and E. G. Beaubien. 2001. Phenology is a major determinant of tree species range. *Ecology*  
422 Letters 4:500–510.
- 423 Chuine, I., M. Bonhomme, J.-M. Legave, I. García de Cortázar-Atauri, G. Charrier, A. Lacointe, and  
424 T. Améglio. 2016. Can phenological models predict tree phenology accurately in the future? The un-  
425 revealed hurdle of endodormancy break. *Global Change Biology* 22:3444–3460.
- 426 Chuine, I., X. Morin, and H. Bugmann. 2010. Warming, photoperiods, and tree phenology. *Science* 329:277–  
427 278.

- 428 Cleland, E. E., J. M. Allen, T. M. Crimmins, J. A. Dunne, S. Pau, S. E. Travers, E. S. Zavaleta, and E. M.  
429 Wolkovich. 2012. Phenological tracking enables positive species responses to climate change. Ecology  
430 93:1765–1771.
- 431 Dardente, H. 2012. Melatonin-dependent timing of seasonal reproduction by the pars tuberalis: pivotal roles  
432 for long daylengths and thyroid hormones. Journal of Neuroendocrinology 24:249–266.
- 433 Davis, S. J. 2002. Photoperiodism: the coincidental perception of the season. Current Biology 12:R841–R843.
- 434 Dawbin, W. H. 1966. The seasonal migratory cycle of humpback whales, pages 145–170. University of  
435 California Press Berkeley.
- 436 Dawson, A., V. M. King, G. E. Bentley, and G. F. Ball. 2001. Photoperiodic control of seasonality in birds.  
437 Journal of Biological Rhythms 16:365–380.
- 438 Diez, J. M., I. Ibáñez, A. J. Miller-Rushing, S. J. Mazer, T. M. Crimmins, M. A. Crimmins, C. D. Bertelsen,  
439 and D. W. Inouye. 2012. Forecasting phenology: from species variability to community patterns. Ecology  
440 Letters 15:545–553.
- 441 Ding, J., and O. Nilsson. 2016. Molecular regulation of phenology in trees—because the seasons they are  
442 a-changin. Current Opinion in Plant Biology 29:73–79.
- 443 Dunn, P. O. 2019. Changes in timing of breeding and reproductive success in birds. Effects of Climate Change  
444 on Birds page 108.
- 445 Duputié, A., A. Rutschmann, O. Ronce, and I. Chuine. 2015. Phenological plasticity will not help all species  
446 adapt to climate change. Global Change Biology 21:3062–3073.
- 447 Erwin, J. E. 1998. Temperature and light effects on stem elongation. Journal of the Japanese Society for  
448 Horticultural Science 67:1113–1120.
- 449 Falusi, M., and R. Calamassi. 1990. Bud dormancy in beech (*Fagus sylvatica* L.). Effect of chilling and  
450 photoperiod on dormancy release of beech seedlings. Tree Physiology 6:429–438.
- 451 Farner, D. S. 1964. The photoperiodic control of reproductive cycles in birds. American Scientist 52:137–156.

- 452 Fishman, S., A. Erez, and G. Couvillon. 1987. The temperature dependence of dormancy breaking in plants:  
453 mathematical analysis of a two-step model involving a cooperative transition. *Journal of Theoretical  
454 Biology* 124:473–483.
- 455 Flynn, D. F. B., and E. M. Wolkovich. 2018. Temperature and photoperiod drive spring phenology across all  
456 species in a temperate forest community. *New Phytologist* 219:1353–1362.
- 457 Fournier-Level, A., E. O. Perry, J. A. Wang, P. T. Braun, A. Migneault, M. D. Cooper, C. J. E. Metcalf,  
458 and J. Schmitt. 2016. Predicting the evolutionary dynamics of seasonal adaptation to novel climates in  
459 *arabidopsis thaliana*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*  
460 113:E2812–E2821.
- 461 Franks, S. J., J. J. Weber, and S. N. Aitken. 2014. Evolutionary and plastic responses to climate change in  
462 terrestrial plant populations. *Evolutionary Applications* 7:123–139.
- 463 Fréjaville, T., B. Fady, A. Kremer, A. Ducousoo, and M. Benito Garzón. 2019. Inferring phenotypic plasticity  
464 and population responses to climate across tree species ranges using forest inventory data. *Global Ecology  
465 and Biogeography* 28:1259–1271.
- 466 Fu, Y. H., S. Piao, X. Zhou, X. Geng, F. Hao, Y. Vitasse, and I. A. Janssens. 2019. Short photoperiod  
467 reduces the temperature sensitivity of leaf-out in saplings of *Fagus sylvatica* but not in horse chestnut.  
468 *Global Change Biology* 25:1696–1703.
- 469 Fu, Y. S. H., H. F. Zhao, S. L. Piao, M. Peaucelle, S. S. Peng, G. Y. Zhou, P. Ciais, M. T. Huang, A. Menzel,  
470 J. P. Uelas, Y. Song, Y. Vitasse, Z. Z. Zeng, and I. A. Janssens. 2015. Declining global warming effects on  
471 the phenology of spring leaf unfolding. *Nature* 526:104–107.
- 472 Gallinat, A. S., R. B. Primack, and D. L. Wagner. 2015. Autumn, the neglected season in climate change  
473 research. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 30:169–176.
- 474 García-Valdés, R., and I. Morales-Castilla. 2016. Efectos del cambio climático en los ecosistemas forestales:  
475 integrando inventarios y modelos. *Ecosistemas* 25:51–59.
- 476 Gauzere, J., S. Delzon, H. Davi, M. Bonhomme, I. G. de Cortazar-Atauri, and I. Chuine. 2017. Integrating  
477 interactive effects of chilling and photoperiod in phenological process-based models. A case study with

- 478 two European tree species: *Fagus sylvatica* and *Quercus petraea*. Agricultural and Forest Meteorology  
479 244:9–20.
- 480 Glover, B. 2014. Understanding flowers and flowering, Second edition. OUP Oxford.
- 481 Gould, P. J., C. A. Harrington, and J. B. St. Clair. 2010. Incorporating genetic variation into a model of  
482 budburst phenology of coast Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii* var. *menziesii*). Canadian journal of forest  
483 research 41:139–150.
- 484 Grevstad, F. S., and L. B. Coop. 2015. The consequences of photoperiodism for organisms in new climates.  
485 Ecological Applications 25:1506–1517.
- 486 Güsewell, S., R. Furrer, R. Gehrig, and B. Pietragalla. 2017. Changes in temperature sensitivity of spring  
487 phenology with recent climate warming in switzerland are related to shifts of the preseason. Global Change  
488 Biology 23:5189–5202.
- 489 Gwinner, E. 1996. Circadian and circannual programmes in avian migration. Journal of Experimental Biology  
490 199:39–48.
- 491 Hänninen, H., K. Kramer, K. Tanino, R. Zhang, J. Wu, and Y. H. Fu. 2019. Experiments are necessary in  
492 process-based tree phenology modelling. Trends in Plant Science 24:199–209.
- 493 Harsch, M. A., P. E. Hulme, M. S. McGlone, and R. P. Duncan. 2009. Are treelines advancing? A global  
494 meta-analysis of treeline response to climate warming. Ecology Letters 12:1040–1049.
- 495 Hawkins, C. D., and A. Dhar. 2012. Spring bud phenology of 18 *Betula papyrifera* populations in British  
496 Columbia. Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research 27:507–519.
- 497 Heide, O. 1993a. Daylength and thermal time responses of budburst during dormancy release in some  
498 northern deciduous trees. Physiologia Plantarum 88:531–540.
- 499 ———. 1993b. Dormancy release in beech buds (*Fagus sylvatica*) requires both chilling and long days.  
500 Physiologia Plantarum 89:187–191.
- 501 Heide, O. M. 1977. Photoperiod and temperature interactions in growth and flowering of strawberry. Physi-  
502 ologia Plantarum 40:21–26.

- 503 ———. 2008. Interaction of photoperiod and temperature in the control of growth and dormancy of *Prunus*  
504 species. *Scientia Horticulturae* 115:309–314.
- 505 ———. 2011. Temperature rather than photoperiod controls growth cessation and dormancy in *Sorbus*  
506 species. *Journal of Experimental Botany* 62:5397–5404.
- 507 Heide, O. M., and A. Sønsteby. 2012. Floral initiation in black currant cultivars (*Ribes nigrum* L.): Effects of  
508 plant size, photoperiod, temperature, and duration of short day exposure. *Scientia Horticulturae* 138:64–72.
- 509 Heide, O. M., and A. Sonsteby. 2015. Simultaneous dormancy induction interferes with short day floral  
510 induction in black currant (*Ribes nigrum* L.). *Scientia Horticulturae* 185:228–232.
- 511 Howe, G. T., G. Gardner, W. P. Hackett, and G. R. Furnier. 1996. Phytochrome control of short-day-induced  
512 bud set in black cottonwood. *Physiologia Plantarum* 97:95–103.
- 513 Howe, G. T., W. P. Hackett, G. R. Furnier, and R. E. Klevorn. 1995. Photoperiodic responses of a northern  
514 and southern ecotype of black cottonwood. *Physiologia Plantarum* 93:695–708.
- 515 Hsu, C.-Y., J. P. Adams, H. Kim, K. No, C. Ma, S. H. Strauss, J. Drnevich, L. Vandervelde, J. D. Ellis, B. M.  
516 Rice, et al. 2011. FLOWERING LOCUS T duplication coordinates reproductive and vegetative growth in  
517 perennial poplar. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 108:10756–10761.
- 518 Ibáñez, I., R. B. Primack, A. J. Miller-Rushing, E. Ellwood, H. Higuchi, S. D. Lee, H. Kobori, and J. A.  
519 Silander. 2010. Forecasting phenology under global warming. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal  
520 Society B-Biological Sciences* 365.
- 521 Inouye, D. W., M. A. Morales, and G. J. Dodge. 2002. Variation in timing and abundance of flowering by  
522 *Delphinium barbeyi* Huth (Ranunculaceae): the roles of snowpack, frost, and La Niña, in the context of  
523 climate change. *Oecologia* 130:543–550. Inouye, David/C-2997-2011 Inouye, David/0000-0003-2076-7834.
- 524 Jolly, W. M., R. Nemani, and S. W. Running. 2005. A generalized, bioclimatic index to predict foliar  
525 phenology in response to climate. *Global Change Biology* 11:619–632.
- 526 Keller, S. R., R. Y. Soolanayakanahally, R. D. Guy, S. N. Silim, M. S. Olson, and P. Tiffin. 2011. Climate-  
527 driven local adaptation of ecophysiology and phenology in balsam poplar, *Populus balsamifera* L. (Salicaceae). *American Journal of Botany* 98:99–108.

- 529 Kobayashi, Y., and D. Weigel. 2007. Move on up, it's time for change—mobile signals controlling photoperiod-  
530 dependent flowering. *Genes & Development* 21:2371–2384.
- 531 Körner, C., and D. Basler. 2010a. Phenology under global warming. *Science* 327:1461–1462.
- 532 ———. 2010b. Warming, photoperiods, and tree phenology response. *Science* 329:278–278.
- 533 Lagercrantz, U. 2009. At the end of the day: a common molecular mechanism for photoperiod responses in  
534 plants? *Journal of Experimental Botany* 60:2501–2515.
- 535 Laube, J., T. H. Sparks, N. Estrella, J. Höfler, D. P. Ankerst, and A. Menzel. 2014. Chilling outweighs  
536 photoperiod in preventing precocious spring development. *Global Change Biology* 20:170–182.
- 537 Linkosalo, T., and M. J. Lechowicz. 2006. Twilight far-red treatment advances leaf bud burst of silver birch  
538 (*Betula pendula*). *Tree Physiology* 26:1249–1256.
- 539 Linn, C. E., M. G. Campbell, K. R. Poole, W.-Q. Wu, and W. L. Roelofs. 1996. Effects of photoperiod on  
540 the circadian timing of pheromone response in male *trichoplusia ni*: relationship to the modulatory action  
541 of octopamine. *Journal of Insect Physiology* 42:881–891.
- 542 Lundell, R., H. Hänninen, T. Saarinen, H. Åström, and R. Zhang. 2020. Beyond rest and quiescence (endodorm-  
543 ency and ecodormancy): A novel model for quantifying plant–environment interaction in bud dormancy  
544 release. *Plant, Cell & Environment* 43:40–54.
- 545 Malyshev, A. V., H. A. Henry, A. Bolte, M. A. A. Khan, and J. Kreyling. 2018. Temporal photoperiod  
546 sensitivity and forcing requirements for budburst in temperate tree seedlings. *Agricultural and Forest  
547 Meteorology* 248:82–90.
- 548 Mcallan, B. M., C. R. Dickman, and M. S. Crowther. 2006. Photoperiod as a reproductive cue in the  
549 marsupial genus *Antechinus*: ecological and evolutionary consequences. *Biological Journal of the Linnean  
550 Society* 87:365–379.
- 551 Medvigy, D., S.-J. Jeong, K. L. Clark, N. S. Skowronski, and K. V. Schäfer. 2013. Effects of seasonal variation  
552 of photosynthetic capacity on the carbon fluxes of a temperate deciduous forest. *Journal of Geophysical  
553 Research: Biogeosciences* 118:1703–1714.

- 554 Menzel, A. 2000. Trends in phenological phases in Europe between 1951 and 1996. International Journal of  
555 Biometeorology 44:76–81.
- 556 Menzel, A., T. H. Sparks, N. Estrella, E. Koch, A. Aasa, R. Ahas, K. Alm-Kuebler, et al. 2006. European  
557 phenological response to climate change matches the warming pattern. Global Change Biology 12:1969–  
558 1976.
- 559 Migliavacca, M., E. Cremonese, R. Colombo, L. Busetto, M. Galvagno, L. Ganis, M. Meroni, E. Pari,  
560 M. Rossini, C. Siniscalco, et al. 2008. European larch phenology in the Alps: can we grasp the role  
561 of ecological factors by combining field observations and inverse modelling? International Journal of  
562 Biometeorology 52:587–605.
- 563 Mimura, M., and S. Aitken. 2007. Adaptive gradients and isolation-by-distance with postglacial migration  
564 in *Picea sitchensis*. Heredity 99:224.
- 565 ———. 2010. Local adaptation at the range peripheries of Sitka spruce. Journal of evolutionary biology  
566 23:249–258.
- 567 Morin, X., J. Roy, L. Sonié, and I. Chuine. 2010. Changes in leaf phenology of three European oak species  
568 in response to experimental climate change. New Phytologist 186:900–910.
- 569 Morin, X., and W. Thuiller. 2009. Comparing niche-and process-based models to reduce prediction uncertainty  
570 in species range shifts under climate change. Ecology 90:1301–1313.
- 571 Muir, W. D., W. S. Zaugg, A. E. Giorgi, and S. McCutcheon. 1994. Accelerating smolt development and  
572 downstream movement in yearling chinook salmon with advanced photoperiod and increased temperature.  
573 Aquaculture 123:387–399.
- 574 Myking, T., and O. Heide. 1995. Dormancy release and chilling requirement of buds of latitudinal ecotypes  
575 of *Betula pendula* and *B. pubescens*. Tree Physiology 15:697–704.
- 576 Nienstaedt, H. 1966. Dormancy and dormancy release in white spruce. Forest Science 12:374–384.
- 577 Ovaskainen, O., S. Skorokhodova, M. Yakovleva, A. Sukhov, A. Kutenkov, N. Kutenkova, A. Shcherbakov,  
578 E. Meyke, and M. del Mar Delgado. 2013. Community-level phenological response to climate change.  
579 Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 110:13434–13439.

- 580 Parmesan, C. 2006. Ecological and evolutionary responses to recent climate change. Annual Review of  
581 Ecology Evolution and Systematics 37:637–669.
- 582 Parmesan, C., and G. Yohe. 2003. A globally coherent fingerprint of climate change impacts across natural  
583 systems. Nature 421:37.
- 584 Partanen, J., H. Hänninen, and R. Häkkinen. 2005. Bud burst in Norway spruce (*Picea abies*): preliminary  
585 evidence for age-specific rest patterns. Trees 19:66–72.
- 586 Peñuelas, J., and M. Boada. 2003. A global change-induced biome shift in the Montseny mountains (NE  
587 Spain). Global Change Biology 9:131–140.
- 588 Peñuelas, J., I. Filella, and P. Comas. 2002. Changed plant and animal life cycles from 1952 to 2000 in the  
589 Mediterranean region. Global Change Biology 8:531–544.
- 590 Petterle, A., A. Karlberg, and R. P. Bhalerao. 2013. Daylength mediated control of seasonal growth patterns  
591 in perennial trees. Current Opinion in Plant Biology 16:301–306.
- 592 Polgar, C. A., R. B. Primack, E. H. Williams, S. Stichter, and C. Hitchcock. 2013. Climate effects on the  
593 flight period of Lycaenid butterflies in Massachusetts. Biological Conservation 160:25–31.
- 594 Poloczanska, E. S., C. J. Brown, W. J. Sydeman, W. Kiessling, D. S. Schoeman, P. J. Moore, K. Brander,  
595 J. F. Bruno, L. B. Buckley, M. T. Burrows, et al. 2013. Global imprint of climate change on marine life.  
596 Nature Climate Change 3:919.
- 597 Richardson, A. D., T. F. Keenan, M. Migliavacca, Y. Ryu, O. Sonnentag, and M. Toomey. 2013. Climate  
598 change, phenology, and phenological control of vegetation feedbacks to the climate system. Agricultural  
599 and Forest Meteorology 169:156–173.
- 600 Richardson, E. 1974. A model for estimating the completion of rest for ‘Redhaven’ and ‘Elberta’ peach trees.  
601 HortScience 9:331–332.
- 602 Root, T. L., J. T. Price, K. R. Hall, S. H. Schneider, C. Rosenzweig, and J. A. Pounds. 2003. Fingerprints  
603 of global warming on wild animals and plants. Nature 421:57–60.

- 604 Saikkonen, K., K. Taulavuori, T. Hyvönen, P. E. Gundel, C. E. Hamilton, I. Vännen, A. Nissinen, and  
605 M. Helander. 2012. Climate change-driven species' range shifts filtered by photoperiodism. *Nature Climate  
606 Change* 2:239.
- 607 Sakai, A. K., and W. Larcher. 1987. Frost Survival of Plants. *Ecological Studies*. Springer-Verlag.
- 608 Sanz-Perez, V., P. Castro-Diez, and F. Valladares. 2009. Differential and interactive effects of temperature  
609 and photoperiod on budburst and carbon reserves in two co-occurring Mediterranean oaks. *Plant Biology  
610* 11:142–51.
- 611 Saunders, R. L., and E. B. Henderson. 1970. Influence of photoperiod on smolt development and growth of  
612 Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*). *Journal of the Fisheries Board of Canada* 27:1295–1311.
- 613 Sidaway-Lee, K., E.-M. Josse, A. Brown, Y. Gan, K. J. Halliday, I. A. Graham, and S. Penfield. 2010.  
614 SPATULA links daytime temperature and plant growth rate. *Current Biology* 20:1493–1497.
- 615 Singh, R. K., T. Svystun, B. AlDahmash, A. M. Jönsson, and R. P. Bhalerao. 2017. Photoperiod-and  
616 temperature-mediated control of phenology in trees—a molecular perspective. *New Phytologist* 213:511–  
617 524.
- 618 Solbakken, V. A., T. Hansen, and S. O. Stefansson. 1994. Effects of photoperiod and temperature on growth  
619 and parr-smolt transformation in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) and subsequent performance in seawater.  
620 *Aquaculture* 121:13–27.
- 621 Spann, T. M., J. G. Williamson, and R. L. Darnell. 2004. Photoperiod and temperature effects on growth  
622 and carbohydrate storage in southern highbush blueberry interspecific hybrid. *Journal of the American  
623 Society for Horticultural Science* 129:294–298.
- 624 Suárez-López, P., K. Wheatley, F. Robson, H. Onouchi, F. Valverde, and G. Coupland. 2001. CONSTANS  
625 mediates between the circadian clock and the control of flowering in *Arabidopsis*. *Nature* 410:1116.
- 626 Tanino, K. K., L. Kalcsits, S. Silim, E. Kendall, and G. R. Gray. 2010. Temperature-driven plasticity in  
627 growth cessation and dormancy development in deciduous woody plants: a working hypothesis suggesting  
628 how molecular and cellular function is affected by temperature during dormancy induction. *Plant Molecular  
629 Biology* 73:49–65.

- 630 Taranger, G., E. Vikingstad, U. Klenke, I. Mayer, S. Stefansson, B. Norberg, T. Hansen, Y. Zohar, and  
631 E. Andersson. 2003. Effects of photoperiod, temperature and GnRHa treatment on the reproductive  
632 physiology of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) broodstock. Fish Physiology and Biochemistry 28:403–406.
- 633 Tauber, M. J., and C. A. Tauber. 1975. Natural daylengths regulate insect seasonality by two mechanisms.  
634 Nature 258:711–712.
- 635 Tobin, P. C., S. Nagarkatti, G. Loeb, and M. C. Saunders. 2008. Historical and projected interactions between  
636 climate change and insect voltinism in a multivoltine species. Global Change Biology 14:951–957.
- 637 Van Belle, J., J. Shamoun-Baranes, E. Van Loon, and W. Bouten. 2007. An operational model predicting  
638 autumn bird migration intensities for flight safety. Journal of Applied Ecology 44:864–874.
- 639 van der Schoot, C., L. K. Paul, and P. L. H. Rinne. 2014. The embryonic shoot: a lifeline through winter.  
640 Journal of Experimental Botany 65:1699–1712.
- 641 Viherä-Aarnio, A., R. Häkkinen, and O. Junntila. 2006. Critical night length for bud set and its variation in  
642 two photoperiodic ecotypes of *Betula pendula*. Tree Physiology 26:1013–1018.
- 643 Vitasse, Y., and D. Basler. 2013. What role for photoperiod in the bud burst phenology of European beech.  
644 European Journal of Forest Research 132:1–8.
- 645 Wareing, P. 1956. Photoperiodism in woody plants. Annual Review of Plant Physiology 7:191–214.
- 646 Way, D. A., and R. A. Montgomery. 2015. Photoperiod constraints on tree phenology, performance and  
647 migration in a warming world. Plant, Cell & Environment 38:1725–1736.
- 648 Weih, M. 2004. Intensive short rotation forestry in boreal climates: present and future perspectives. Canadian  
649 Journal of Forest Research 34:1369–1378.
- 650 Willis, C. G., B. R. Ruhfel, R. B. Primack, A. J. Miller-Rushing, J. B. Losos, and C. C. Davis. 2010. Favorable  
651 climate change response explains non-native species' success in Thoreau's woods. Plos One 5:e8878.
- 652 Winkler, D. W., C. Jørgensen, C. Both, A. I. Houston, J. M. McNamara, D. J. Levey, J. Partecke, A. Fudickar,  
653 A. Kacelnik, D. Roshier, et al. 2014. Cues, strategies, and outcomes: how migrating vertebrates track  
654 environmental change. Movement Ecology 2:10.

- 655 Wolkovich, E. M., B. I. Cook, J. M. Allen, T. M. Crimmins, J. L. Betancourt, S. E. Travers, S. Pau,  
656 J. Regetz, T. J. Davies, N. J. B. Kraft, T. R. Ault, K. Bolmgren, S. J. Mazer, G. J. McCabe, B. J. McGill,  
657 C. Parmesan, N. Salamin, M. D. Schwartz, and E. E. Cleland. 2012. Warming experiments underpredict  
658 plant phenological responses to climate change. *Nature* 485:494–497.
- 659 Wolkovich, E. M., A. K. Ettinger, D. Flynn, T. Savas, C. Chamberlain, D. Buonaiuto, and  
660 J. Samaha. 2019. Observed Spring Phenology Responses in Experimental Environments (OSPREE).  
661 doi:10.5063/F1QV3JQR.
- 662 Xie, L., and W. W. Hsieh. 1989. Predicting the return migration routes of the Fraser River sockeye salmon  
663 (*Oncorhynchus nerka*). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 46:1287–1292.
- 664 Yu, H. Y., E. Luedeling, and J. C. Xu. 2010. Winter and spring warming result in delayed spring phenology  
665 on the Tibetan Plateau. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*  
666 107:22151–22156.
- 667 Zhao, M., C. Peng, W. Xiang, X. Deng, D. Tian, X. Zhou, G. Yu, H. He, and Z. Zhao. 2013. Plant  
668 phenological modeling and its application in global climate change research: overview and future challenges.  
669 *Environmental Reviews* 21:1–14.
- 670 Zhu, K., C. W. Woodall, and J. S. Clark. 2012. Failure to migrate: lack of tree range expansion in response  
671 to climate change. *Global Change Biology* 18:1042–1052.
- 672 Zohner, C. M., B. M. Benito, J. C. Svenning, and S. S. Renner. 2016. Day length unlikely to constrain  
673 climate-driven shifts in leaf-out times of northern woody plants. *Nature Climate Change* 6:1120–1123.
- 674 Zydlowski, G. B., D. S. Stich, and S. D. McCormick. 2014. Photoperiod control of downstream movements  
675 of Atlantic salmon *Salmo salar* smolts. *Journal of Fish Biology* 85:1023–1041.

676 **Figures**







Figure 1: **Temporal (i.e., phenological) shifts in activity yield larger changes in experienced photoperiod compared to spatial (i.e., latitudinal) shifts** on the same day of year, due to patterns in photoperiod variation with latitude and by day of year. Here, we show this variation at two latitudes ( $22.5^\circ$ ,  $45^\circ$ ), using hypothetical spatial and temporal shifts. These shifts are based on observed rates with recent global warming: 6-17 kilometers per decade, or approximately 0.5-1.5 degrees in 100 years, for spatial shifts (Parmesan and Yohe, 2003; Parmesan, 2006), and 2-3 days per decade, or 30 days in 100 years, for temporal shifts (Parmesan, 2006; Chen et al., 2011). They highlight the greater magnitude in daylength changes in the early spring, close to the vernal equinox (e.g., day of year 91), versus close to the summer solstice (e.g., day of year 182).




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



**Figure 3: Experimental photoperiod treatments and their equivalent spatial and temporal shifts** for experiments in the OSPREE database that manipulated photoperiod (see Box 2). See ‘Mapping temporal and spatial shifts in space and time’ in the Supplemental Materials for details on how we calculated the required spatial (lines) or temporal (circles and Xes) shifts to be equivalent to photoperiod treatments in each experiment.



**Figure 4: Nonlinearities in phenological responses to daylength** are apparent in spring woody plant phenology experiments (from the OSPREE database, described in Box 2) in which three or more photoperiod treatment levels were applied. The shape of the response curves for *Betula pubescens* (Caffarra et al., 2011b), *Fagus sylvatica* (Heide, 1993b) and *Tilia americana* (Ashby et al., 1962) differ depending on the amount of winter chilling received (measured in Chill portions Fishman et al., 1987). Species and chilling levels with multiple lines represent plant material from different populations.



**Figure 5: Experienced photoperiods in growth chamber experiments differ from those in the natural world**, shown here by latitude (left panels) and by day of budburst (right panels) for *Fagus sylvatica* (A, upper panels) and *Quercus robur* (B, lower panels). Triangles show experimental treatments of photoperiod in the OSPREE database (Box 2). 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).