Daylength helps temperate deciduous trees to leaf-out at the optimal time

Short title: Daylength guarantees leaf-out at right time

Authors: Yongshuo H. Fu^{1,2,*}, Xuan Zhang¹, Shilong Piao^{3,4,5}, Fanghua Hao¹, Xiaojun Geng¹,
 Yann Vitasse⁶, Constantin Zohner⁷, Josep Peñuelas^{8,9}, Ivan A. Janssens²

Affiliations:

¹Beijing Key Laboratory of Urban Hydrological Cycle and Sponge City Technology, College
 of water sciences, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China

²Department of biology, University of Antwerp, Antwerp, Belgium

³Sino-French Institute for Earth System Science, College of Urban and Environmental Sciences,
 Peking University, Beijing 100871, China

⁴ Key Laboratory of Alpine Ecology and Biodiversity, Institute of Tibetan Plateau Research,
 Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100085, China

⁵ Center for Excellence in Tibetan Earth Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100085,
 China

⁶ Forest Dynamics Unit, Swiss Federal Institute for Forest, Snow and Landscape Research,
 WSL, Birmensdorf, Switzerland

⁷ Institute of Integrative Biology, ETH Zurich (Swiss Federal Institute of Technology), 8092
 Zurich, Switzerland

⁸ CREAM, Cerdanyola del Vallès, Barcelona 08193, Catalonia, Spain

⁹ CSIC, Global Ecology Unit CREAM-CSIC-UAB, Bellaterra, Barcelona 08193, Catalonia, Spain

Keywords: spring phenology, climate change, daylength, temperature response, deciduous trees

Revised manuscript for *Global change biology*

March 15, 2019

Abstract:

Global warming has led to substantially earlier spring leaf-out in temperate-zone deciduous trees. The interactive effects of temperature and daylength underlying this warming response remain unclear, yet need to be accurately represented by Earth System models to improve projections of the carbon and energy balances of temperate forests and the associated feedbacks to the Earth's climate system. We studied the control of leaf-out by daylength and temperature using data from six tree species across 2377 European phenology observation sites (www.pep725.eu), each with at least 30 years of observations. We found that, in addition to- and independent of the known effect of chilling, daylength correlates negatively with the heat requirement for leaf-out in all studied species. In warm springs when leaf out is early, days are short and the heat requirement is higher than in an average spring, which mitigates the warming-induced advancement of leaf-out and protects the tree against precocious leaf-out and the associated risks of late frosts. In contrast, longer-than-average daylength (in cold springs when leaf-out is late) reduce the heat requirement for leaf-out, ensuring that trees do not leaf-out too late and miss out on large amounts of solar energy. These results provide the first large-scale empirical evidence of a widespread daylength effect on the temperature sensitivity of leaf-out phenology in temperate deciduous trees.

Introduction

The timing of leaf-out co-determines the growth, reproductive success and competitiveness of temperate deciduous trees and thus strongly affects their fitness and distribution (Chaine, 2010). Global warming has led to substantially earlier spring leaf-out (Menzel *et al.*, 2006, Parmesan & Yohe, 2003, Peñuelas & Filella, 2001), although this advance is declining (Fu *et al.*, 2015). These changes in spring phenology may influence terrestrial ecosystem fluxes of carbon, water, nutrient and energy in a short term (Keenan *et al.*, 2014, Myneni *et al.*, 1997, Piao *et al.*, 2017). Mechanistic understanding of the leaf-out process is, however, far from complete (Chaine *et al.*, 2010, Flynn & Wolkovich, 2018, Körner & Basler, 2010, Laube *et al.*, 2014, Zohner *et al.*, 2016), which challenges the projected impacts of climate change on ecosystems by dynamic global vegetation models (Richardson *et al.*, 2012). A better understanding of the ecophysiological processes controlling leaf-out phenology is thus essential for improving our understanding of the responses of ecosystems to the ongoing climate change and the subsequent feedbacks to the climate system, as well as explaining the slow-down of the warming-induced advance in leaf out.

A species' optimal leaf-out date results from natural selection that optimizes the species' fitness under given environmental conditions, such as avoiding freezing damage (Lenz *et al.*, 2016), ensuring flowering synchrony among species (Elzinga, Atlan and Biere, 2007; Zohner, Mo & Renner, 2018) and maximizing the length of the remaining season for light and nutrient resources (competition with other trees) as

well as for tissues maturation (Körner *et al.*, 2016). In temperate and boreal regions, temperature, including both cold winter temperatures (chilling requirement) and warm spring temperatures (heat requirement), and daylength interact to realize leaf out around the optimal date (Flynn & Wolkovich, 2018, Körner & Basler, 2010). Chilling accumulates over autumn and winter, and when the accumulated chilling exceeds the chilling requirement, endodormancy (the first stage of dormancy (Lang, 1987)) is broken and buds enter the second dormancy stage: ecodormancy (Chuine & Régnière, 2017, Hänninen, 2016). During ecodormancy, meristem cells begin to grow, a process that is accelerated by warm temperatures and a gradually increasing daylength (Hänninen, 2016). Inter-annual variation of these three environmental drivers is strongly correlated (e.g. a warm winter reduces chilling and increases heat supply, and the earlier leaf-out associates with short daylength). As a result, the direct effect of daylength on spring phenology and its eventual interactions with chilling and the heat requirement remain unclear and highly debated (Chuine *et al.*, 2010, Flynn & Wolkovich, 2018, Körner & Basler, 2010, Laube *et al.*, 2014, Zohner *et al.*, 2016). In this study, based on a large set of in situ phenology observations across Europe (www.pep725.eu), we propose a framework to unravel the effect of daylength on leaf-out phenology of temperate-zone deciduous trees and test the hypothesis that daylength affects the leaf-out process by altering the heat requirement at any given chilling accumulation.

We start by assuming that trees are characterized by an optimal, climate-dependent, daylength (Figure. 1). Occasional late frost events give a competitive disadvantage to individuals that leaf-out earlier than the species' optimal daylength, while reduced light harvesting gives a competitive disadvantage to individuals that leaf-out later than the optimum period. As such, an optimal date of leaf-out exists for a given species, determined by a trade-off between maximizing annual carbon and nutrient uptake to ensure competitive advantage by lengthening the duration of the ground cover period (earlier leaf out is preferred) and reducing the risk of late frost damage after leaf out (later leaf out gives more security and is thus preferred (Allstadt *et al.*, 2015, Liu *et al.*, 2018) (Figure. 1a). In the long term, carbon assimilation and competitiveness are determined by the lowest of these two cost functions, and the optimal leaf out date occurs where the minimum cost yields the highest carbon assimilation and competitiveness. Experimental studies have revealed a nonlinear relation between accumulated chilling and the heat required for leaves to flush (typically quantified as growing degree day units, GDD) (Figure. 1b). Daylength is hypothesized to act as a cue controlling the sensitivity of meristem cell growth to warm temperatures, thereby altering the apparent relationship between chilling and GDD requirement. Their nonlinear relation becomes steeper when days are shorter than optimal (short daylength, Figure. 1c) and less steep when days are longer than optimal (long daylength, Figure. 1d).

Two substantially different impacts of sub-optimal daylength on leaf-out date are thus theoretically possible: (i) Shorter than optimal daylength reduces the temperature sensitivity (increases the GDD requirement), thereby avoiding precocious leaf-out that would increase the risk of frost damage, (*i.e.* the short daylength effect, Figure. 1c). (ii) Longer than optimal daylength increases the temperature sensitivity (reduces the GDD requirement), effectively avoiding belated leaf-out at a time when solar radiation is high and thus ideal for photosynthesis (*i.e.* the long daylength effect, Figure. 1d).

Figure 1. (a) Conceptual scheme depicting why an optimal daylength for tree leaf-out exists within which the competitiveness of a species is maximized and how this is realized. Tree competitiveness is increased by earlier start of the growing season, which maximizes annual carbon and nutrient uptake and reduces that of the neighbors, but is subject to a trade-off with avoiding the risk of late frost-induced damage for which a later start of growing season is preferred. The green filled area represents the leaf-out period that ensures the most secure, high competitiveness and carbon uptake. This study provides evidence that the spring leaf-out process requires less warm temperatures (lower heat requirement; GDD), and thus becomes more temperature responsive, as daylength increases. As such, daylength aids in constraining leaf-out within the optimal period in both cold and warm springs. **(b)** In very warm springs, when leaf-out is early, trees minimize the advance of leaf-out because their temperature sensitivity is low under short daylength. This is reflected in an increased GDD requirement and results in trees being protected against late frost events, i.e. the “short daylength effect”: **(c)** Under optimal daylength the GDD required for leaf-out is mainly determined by the chilling accumulated during endodormancy; **(d)** In very cold springs, when leaf-out is late, trees minimize the delay of leaf-out because their temperature sensitivity becomes greater under increasing daylength. This high temperature sensitivity is reflected in the reduced GDD requirement, and protects trees against leafing-out too late, i.e. the “long daylength effect”.

These two postulated consequences of daylength impacts have not been strongly supported by empirical evidence. The short daylength effect in early spring, to our knowledge, has not yet been empirically documented, whereas the long daylength effect in late spring has been experimentally evidenced in earlier studies, albeit only on cut twigs or saplings (Flynn & Wolkovich, 2018, Körner & Basler, 2010, Laube *et al.*, 2014, Malyshev *et al.*, 2018) and not yet on mature trees. We therefore set out to show the consequences of both a short and a long daylength on spring leaf-out of mature trees of temperate deciduous tree species, to assess how widespread these two effects are across these species, to quantify the sensitivities of the GDD requirement to sub- and supra-optimal daylength and, last, to determine the relative importance of chilling and daylength as controls of the leaf-out process.

Materials and methods

We tested the daylength effect on mature trees using data from 2377 sites of the European phenological network (<http://www.pep725.eu/>) (Templ *et al.*, 2018). The date of leaf-out had been recorded at each site for at least 30 years between 1950 to 2016, but in most cases observations were available for many more years. Six deciduous tree species were selected (for which sufficient observational data were available): *Fagus sylvatica* (beech), *Aesculus hippocastanum* (horse chestnut), *Betula pendula* (birch), *Fraxinus excelsior* (ash), *Quercus robur* (oak) and *Tilia cordata* (lime). In total 509,284 individual observations from 12348 site-species combinations at 2377 sites were used. The sites mainly occurred in moderate climates in Central Europe (Supplementary

Figure 1 and 2). The leaf-out dates were defined based on the BBCH code (Biologische Bundesanstalt, Bundessortenamt und Chemische Industrie, BBCH = 11, first visible leaf stalk) (Templ *et al.*, 2018). We first determined the preseason length for each species at each site as the period before leaf-out for which the partial correlation coefficient between leaf-out and air temperature was highest (Fu *et al.*, 2015). Using this optimal preseason, we then calculated the GDD requirement for each species at each site and in each year. We defined the GDD requirement as an integration of daily mean temperature (Tt) above a temperature threshold (Tth) throughout the preseason with the mean leaf-out dates as the end:

$$GDD = Tt - Tth, \quad \text{if } Tt > Tth \quad (1)$$

where Tth is the threshold temperature for GDD accumulation and Tt is the mean daily temperature. We used a threshold Tth of 5 °C. We also tested a temperature threshold of 0 °C, which produced very similar results. To best the robustness of the results, we further calculated the GDD from the 1st December to the date of leaf-out for each species at each site, and found very similar results (Supplementary Figure 3). We therefore only report results using the threshold of 5 °C and the preseason

Chilling occurs at low, yet non-freezing temperatures and the number of days with mean temperature between 0 and 5 °C was suggested as a good proxy for chilling accumulation, although inter-species variation in the chilling efficiency of different temperatures is probably high. Chilling requirement is a physiological parameter that corresponds to the amount of chilling needed to break endodormancy and enter the ecodormancy. In the present study, chilling was calculated as the number of days (CD)

when daily temperature was between 0 and 5 °C from 1 September in the previous year until the day of leaf-out. We also tested another approach, using 0 °C and 10 °C as temperature thresholds counting all days with mean temperatures between these thresholds, which produced very similar results. Similar results were also obtained when below-freezing temperatures were included, calculating as the number of days when daily temperature below 5 °C (Supplementary Figure 4) or 7 °C (Supplementary Figure 5), and similar results were obtained. We therefore only report the results based on the chilling accumulation using the 0 °C - 5 °C temperature range.

Daylength at the day of leaf-out (DL) was calculated as a function of latitude and DOY:

$$DL = 24 - \frac{24}{\pi} \cos^{-1} \left[\frac{\sin \frac{0.8333\pi}{180} + \sin \frac{L\pi}{180} \sin \varphi}{\cos \frac{L\pi}{180} * \cos \varphi} \right] \quad (2)$$

$$\varphi = \sin^{-1}(0.29795 * \cos \theta) \quad (3)$$

$$\theta = 0.2163108 + 2 * \tan^{-1}(0.9671396 * \tan(0.0086 * (DOY - 186))) \quad (4)$$

where L is the latitude of the phenological site.

The daily mean air temperature at each site was derived from a gridded climatic data set of daily mean temperature at 0.25 °spatial resolution (approximately 25 km, ERA-WATCH) (Fu *et al.*, 2014).

The sensitivity of GDD requirement to chilling and daylength

202 We calculated cumulative chilling, the GDD requirement and daylength at the day of
 203 leaf-out for each year at each site. For each individual tree, we divided the data into
 204 four subsets according to chilling accumulation, *i.e.* case 1: lowest chilling
 205 accumulation: $CD < CD_{mean} - 1 \text{ standard deviation of } CD (CD_{sd})$; case 2: low
 206 chilling accumulation: $CD_{mean} - CD_{sd} < CD < CD_{mean}$; case 3: high chilling
 207 accumulation: $CD_{mean} < CD < CD_{mean} + CD_{sd}$, and case 4: highest chilling
 208 accumulation: $CD > CD_{mean} + CD_{sd}$. Within each CD subset, we subsequently
 209 calculated the GDD requirement for three daylength conditions, *i.e.* leaf-out under
 210 short-daylength conditions ($DL < DL_{mean} - 0.75 DL_{sd}$), under long-daylength
 211 conditions ($DL > DL_{mean} + 0.75 DL_{sd}$) and under average-daylength conditions
 212 ($DL_{mean} - 0.5 DL_{sd} < DL < DL_{mean} + 0.5 DL_{sd}$). The differences in mean GDD
 213 requirement for leaf-out among the DL groups were tested using independent t-tests
 214 for each chilling case and each species. Furthermore, we calculated the daylength
 215 sensitivity of GDD as the slope of the linear regression between GDD and DL, and
 216 then the average of the four daylength sensitivities was determined for each species at
 217 each site. Using similar methodology, we divided the data into four subsets according
 218 to DL for each individual tree, *i.e.* case 1: shortest daylength: $DL < DL_{mean} - DL_{sd}$;
 219 case 2: short daylength: $DL_{mean} - DL_{sd} < DL < DL_{mean}$; case 3: long daylength:
 220 $DL_{mean} < DL < DL_{mean} + DL_{sd}$, and case 4: longest daylength: $DL > DL_{mean} +$
 221 DL_{sd} , and then calculated the chilling sensitivity of GDD for each species at each
 222 site. To compare the relative importance of chilling versus that of daylength as

determinants of the GDD requirement for leaf-out, we first normalized the daylength and chilling sensitivity, respectively, using a min-max normalization for each species:

$$S_i = \frac{(S_i - S_{min})}{(S_{max} - S_{min})} \quad (5)$$

Where S_i is the daylength or chilling sensitivity at site i , S_{min} and S_{max} are the minimum and maximum observed values of the daylength - or chilling sensitivity across all trees of that species. Then, the mean and standard deviation of all normalized sensitivities was calculated for each species. Histograms were used to show the distribution of sensitivities across all trees for each species.

Results and discussion

In agreement with a multitude of previous studies (Cannell & Smith, 1983, Fu *et al.*, 2016, Laube *et al.*, 2014), we found that all studied tree species showed lower GDD requirement under higher chilling conditions (Figure 2 and Supplementary Table 1). Interestingly, we also observed that in all six species and within each CD group, the GDD requirement for leaf-out was statistically significantly higher under short- than average-daylength conditions, and significantly lower under long- than average-daylength conditions (using paired t test, $P < 0.001$, Figure 2, and Supplementary Figure 6 and Supplementary Table 2 as an example at high chilling accumulation). Contrasting results of the photoperiod effect were reported in experimental studies (Heide 1993; Laube *et al.*, 2014). However, almost all of these studies are based on cuttings or saplings in manipulative experiments, and using constant day length rather than natural continuous changes in day length (e.g. Zohner *et al.*, 2016; Laube *et al.*,

2014)., and young trees often behave opportunistically and exhibit earlier leaf-out than mature trees of the same species. Using trees of different ontogenetic stages might thus explain part of the differences among previous studies. In the present study, we selected six species that belong to five families (Fagaceae, Betulaceae, Malaceae, Sapindaceae, Oleaceae), some of which phylogenetically quite distinct (Supplementary Figure 4). Because every tested species (all six species for which sufficient observations were available) exhibited very similar daylength responses, we postulate the widespread existence of a daylength effect among temperate zone deciduous tree species, at least among European temperate-zone tree species. In line with our findings, a recent study found consistent daylength effects on leaf-out phenology exists across 28 woody species in a North American temperate forest (Flynn & Wolkovich, 2018).

For each individual tree, we calculated the sensitivity of the GDD requirement for leaf-out to changes in daylength. On average across all species and averaged over four different chilling intensities, compared to the GDD requirement under average daylength conditions, each one-hour decrease in daylength (comparable to the observed inter-annual range) increased GDD by 37°C-days, *i.e.* by 26% (Supplementary Figure 8a and b), while a 1-h increase in daylength decreased the GDD requirement by 31°C-days, *i.e.* by 22% (Supplementary Figures 8a and b). We further compared the relative sensitivity of the GDD requirement for leaf-out to chilling and daylength (comparing the GDD response to one standard deviation of the

observed variation in either chilling or daylength), and observed species-specific sensitivity differences among the six study species (Figure. 3).

Figure 2. Dependence of GDD requirement of leaf-out on daylength under constant chilling conditions for six tree species. Dependencies are shown for four different chilling intensities (see Methods).

In detail, sensitivity to daylength was larger than the sensitivity to chilling in four out of six species: *Betula pendula*, *Aesculus hippocastanum*, *Tilia cordata* and *Fraxinus excelsior*, while no difference was detected in *Quercus robur*. *Fagus sylvatica* also exhibited a pronounced sensitivity to daylength, but its sensitivity to chilling was even greater (Figure. 3). *Fagus sylvatica* is indeed known as a highly chilling-sensitive species (Kramer, 1994, Malyshev *et al.*, 2018). Our findings thus confirm that daylength is an important co-regulator of leaf-out in mature temperate deciduous trees

(Flynn & Wolkovich, 2018, Körner & Basler, 2010), and further suggest that daylength likely affects the leaf-out process indirectly by altering the non-linear relationship between chilling and GDD requirement. These results also support the hypothesis that the shorter daylength due to earlier leaf-out in spring contributes to the declining apparent temperature sensitivity of leaf-out in European temperate deciduous trees (Fu *et al.* 2015). These mechanisms are conceptualized in Figure. 4. With climate warming, the GDD requirement increases due to reduced chilling, but GDD supply increases more (Figure. 4, panel a). As a result, GDD supply equals GDD requirement earlier in the year (visualized as an excess GDD supply in Figure 4, panel a), which drives earlier leaf-out. The associated shorter daylength, however, further increases the GDD requirement and thereby restricts the advance of leaf-out (Figure. 4, panel b) and reduces the temperature sensitivity of leaf-out with climate warming.

292 **Figure 3.** Histograms of the Growing Degree Day (GDD) sensitivity to changes in
 293 daylength (DL, in red) and in chilling (CD, in blue) across all individual trees of six
 294 deciduous tree species. Sensitivity was calculated as the change in GDD per one
 295 standard deviation in the observed DL and CD, respectively, and is therefore coined
 296 ‘normalized sensitivity’. mean sensitivities and standard deviations (in brackets) are
 297 provided.

Figure. 4. Conceptual scheme summarizing how daylength helps deciduous trees to leaf-out within or close to the optimal period. (a) Leaf-out occurs when the supply of warm temperatures (GDD supply: accumulated daily growing degree days, GDD; black line) equals the GDD requirement (physiological parameter to trigger leaf-out). Note that the X axes indicate the climate from cold to warm spring. The more chilling is accumulated, the lower the GDD requirement (green dashed line; for simplicity reasons we here assume a linear relation). In cold springs, the deficit in GDD supply drives a delay in leaf-out date (blue areas in panels a and b). (b) The associated increasing daylength, however, increases the temperature sensitivity and thereby causes a decline in the GDD requirement, with leaf-out occurring when GDD supply

equals the declining GDD requirement. In contrast, in warm springs (red areas in panels a and b), GDD supply typically exceeds the chilling-induced GDD requirement earlier in the year, but the short daylength earlier in spring induces a low temperature sensitivity and thereby an increased GDD requirement, which minimizes the warming-induced advance of leaf-out. Note that the X axes indicate the leaf-out timing from early to late.

Daylength thus acts as an environmental cue, counteracting the advancing impact of global warming, and helping trees to leaf-out close to their optimal date. As daylength increases from early to late spring, we observed that the GDD requirement also decreases under similar chilling conditions. Similar responses, supporting our findings, were previously reported in experimental studies using cuttings, although the daylength difference among treatments was very large in these studies (Zohner *et al.*, 2016). There are also other studies that reported a decreased photoperiod effect with increasing chilling accumulation (Laube *et al.*, 2014; Hänninen 2016), which may be because the increasing chilling ensures leaf out at the optimal daylength, when the photoperiod effect is minimal. We observed that the GDD requirement decreases consistently from very short to very long daylength, suggesting that one single physiological mechanism may suffice to explain the protective effect of daylength against both early as well as late leaf-out. We speculate that daylength directly impacts on the temperature sensitivity of cell development to warming. By keeping the calculation of GDD constant with daylength, the increase in temperature

sensitivity with increasing daylength is mathematically translated into a reduced GDD requirement. However, we acknowledge that the heat signal required by the meristems to initiate leaf-out may not be directly altered by daylength, but that the heat signal reception may become more efficient with increasing daylength. Our data, unfortunately, do not allow unraveling the underlying physiological mechanism.

We further speculate that the daylength control over the GDD requirement depends on the start date of the ecodormancy phase relative to the date when optimal daylength thresholds are reached or passed. When ecodormancy begins late relative to the optimum daylength thresholds, the temperature sensitivity of cell development is elevated, resulting in reduced GDD requirement to force leaf-out. In contrast, when ecodormancy starts earlier than the target daylength threshold, the temperature sensitivity of cell development may remain low, but not zero, until the date when the optimal daylength threshold is passed. The starting date of ecodormancy, however, cannot easily be determined empirically and is therefore typically ignored in phenology studies, explaining why the relation between daylength and the start of ecodormancy remains poorly understood (Chuine *et al.*, 2016), despite their importance for pushing the field beyond the state of the art (Hänninen, 2016). To our knowledge, neither the start date of ecodormancy, *i.e.* the start date of GDD accumulation, nor the optimal daylength thresholds have been well studied (but see Chuine *et al.*, 2016). As long as dormancy remains poorly understood, also the estimations of chilling and forcing units remain uncertain. For example, the duration

of the chilling accumulation period and the start date of the heat accumulation period, as well as their interactions are still unclear. Similarly, the optimal temperature ranges for chilling accumulation and the temperature threshold above which GDD's start to accumulate, as well as the length of GDD accumulation are poorly understood. Different assumptions can, however, lead to contrasting and sometimes illogical results. For example, an increased GDD requirement is obtained when leaf out is very late and the GDD is calculated over a fixed number of days prior to leaf out (see Supplementary Figure 9). Studies focusing on ecophysiological experiments are thus urgently needed to fully understand spring phenology and enable the development of reliable phenology synthesis studies and –models (Chuine & Régnière, 2017, Hänninen *et al.*, 2019).

Climate warming-induced spring phenology advances substantially alter regional and global biogeochemical cycles and climate systems (Forzieri *et al.*, 2017, Myneni *et al.*, 1997, Peñuelas & Filella, 2009). However, as the daylength effect reduces the temperature sensitivity of leaf-out in warmer years, slowing down the advancing rate of leaf-out, it thereby also reduces the warming-induced extension of ground cover, and the carbon uptake, evapotranspiration and albedo. This study found that all investigated temperate-zone deciduous tree species (the six species for which sufficient observational data were available) use daylength as a signal to help ensuring that leaf-out occurs close to a species-dependent optimal time of the year, by

increasing the GDD requirement for leaf-out when daylength is too short, and
reducing the GDD requirement as daylength becomes too long.

References

- Allstadt AJ, Vavrus SJ, Heglund PJ, Pidgeon AM, Thogmartin WE, Radeloff VC (2015) Spring plant phenology and false springs in the conterminous US during the 21st century. *Environmental Research Letters*, **10**, 104008.
- Cannell M, Smith R (1983) Thermal time, chill days and prediction of budburst in *Picea sitchensis*. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 951-963.
- Chuine I (2010) Why does phenology drive species distribution? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **365**, 3149-3160.
- Chuine I, Bonhomme M, Legave JM, García De Cortázar-Atauri I, Charrier G, Lacointe A, Améglio T (2016) Can phenological models predict tree phenology accurately in the future? The unrevealed hurdle of endodormancy break. *Global Change Biology*, **22**, 3444-3460.
- Chuine I, Morin X, Bugmann H (2010) Warming, Photoperiods, and Tree Phenology. *Science*, **329**, 277-278.
- Chuine I, Régnière J (2017) Process-Based Models of Phenology for Plants and Animals. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, **48**, 159-182.
- Elzinga JA, Atlan A, Biere A, Gigord L, Weis AE, Bernasconi G. 2007. Time after time: flowering phenology and biotic interactions. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **22**, 432-439.
- Flynn DFB, Wolkovich EM (2018) Temperature and photoperiod drive spring phenology across all species in a temperate forest community. *New Phytologist*, **219**, 1353-1362.
- Forzieri G, Alkama R, Miralles DG, Cescatti A (2017) Satellites reveal contrasting responses of regional climate to the widespread greening of Earth. *Science*, **356**, 1180-1184.
- Fu YH, Campioli M, Vitasse Y *et al.* (2014) Variation in leaf flushing date influences autumnal senescence and next year's flushing date in two temperate tree species. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **111**, 7355-7360.
- Fu YH, Liu Y, De Boeck HJ *et al.* (2016) Three times greater weight of daytime than of night-time temperature on leaf unfolding phenology in temperate trees. *New Phytologist*, **212**, 590-597.

407 Fu YH, Zhao HF, Piao SL *et al.* (2015) Declining global warming effects on the phenology of
 408 spring leaf unfolding. *Nature*, **526**, 104-107.

409 Hänninen H (2016) Boreal and temperate trees in a changing climate. Netherlands, Springer
 410 Business Media, Dordrecht.

411 Hänninen H, Kramer K, Tanino K, Zhang R, Wu J, Fu YH (2019) Experiments are necessary in
 412 process-based tree phenology modelling. *Trends in Plant Science*, **24**, 199-209.

413 Heide O.M. (1993) Day length and thermal time responses of budburst during dormancy
 414 release in some northern deciduous trees, *Physiologia plantarum*, **88**, 531–540.

415 Keenan TF, Gray J, Friedl MA *et al.* (2014) Net carbon uptake has increased through
 416 warming-induced changes in temperate forest phenology. *Nature Climate Change*, **4**,
 417 598.

418 Körner C, Basler D (2010) Phenology Under Global Warming. *Science*, **327**, 1461-1462.

419 Körner C, Basler D, Hoch G, Kollas C, Lenz A, Randin CF, Vitasse Y, Zimmermann NE (2016)
 420 Where, why and how? Explaining the low-temperature range limits of temperate
 421 tree species. *Journal of Ecology*, **104**, 1076-1088

422 Kramer K (1994) Selecting a model to predict the onset of growth of *Fagus sylvatica*. *Journal*
 423 *of Applied Ecology*, **31**, 172-181.

424 Lang GA (1987) Dormancy: a new universal terminology. *HortScience*, **22**, 817-820.

425 Laube J, Sparks TH, Estrella N, Höfler J, Ankerst DP, Menzel A (2014) Chilling outweighs
 426 photoperiod in preventing precocious spring development. *Global Change Biology*,
 427 **20**, 170-182.

428 Lenz A, Hoch G, Körner C, Vitasse Y (2016) Convergence of leaf-out towards minimum risk of
 429 freezing damage in temperate trees, *Functional Ecology*, **9**, 1480-1490.

430 Liu Q, Piao S, Janssens IA *et al.* (2018) Extension of the growing season increases vegetation
 431 exposure to frost. *Nature Communications*, **9**, 426.

432 Malyshev AV, Henry HA, Bolte A, Khan MaA, Kreyling J (2018) Temporal photoperiod
 433 sensitivity and forcing requirements for budburst in temperate tree seedlings.
 434 *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, **248**, 82-90.

435 Menzel A, Sparks TH, Estrella N *et al.* (2006) European phenological response to climate
 436 change matches the warming pattern. *Global Change Biology*, **12**, 1969-1976.

437 Myneni RB, Keeling C, Tucker CJ, Asrar G, Nemani RR (1997) Increased plant growth in the
 438 northern high latitudes from 1981 to 1991. *Nature*, **386**, 698.

439 Parmesan C, Yohe G (2003) A globally coherent fingerprint of climate change impacts across
 440 natural systems. *Nature*, **421**, 37-42.

441 Peñuelas J, Filella I (2001) Responses to a warming world. *Science*, **294**, 793-795.

442 Peñuelas J, Filella I (2009) Phenology feedbacks on climate change. *Science*, **324**, 887-888.

443 Piao S, Liu Z, Wang T *et al.* (2017) Weakening temperature control on the interannual
444 variations of spring carbon uptake across northern lands. *Nature Climate Change*, **7**,
445 359.

446 Richardson AD, Anderson RS, Arain MA *et al.* (2012) Terrestrial biosphere models need
447 better representation of vegetation phenology: results from the North American
448 Carbon Program Site Synthesis. *Global Change Biology*, **18**, 566-584.

449 Templ B, Koch E, Bolmgren K, Ungersbock M, Paul A, Scheifinger H (2018) Pan European
450 Phenological database (PEP725): a single point of access for European data.
451 *International journal of biometeorology*, **62**, 1-5.

452 Vitasse Y, Basler D (2013) What role for photoperiod in the bud burst phenology of European
453 beech. *European Journal of Forest Research*, **132**, 1-8.

454 Vitasse Y (2013) Ontogenic changes rather than difference in temperature cause understory
455 trees to leaf out earlier. *New phytologist*, **198**, 149-155.

456 Zohner CM, Benito BM, Svenning J-C, Renner SS (2016) Day length unlikely to constrain
457 climate-driven shifts in leaf-out times of northern woody plants. *Nature Climate*
458 *Change*, **6**, 1120-1123.

459 Zohner, C. M., Mo, L., & Renner, S. S. (2018). Global warming reduces leaf-out and
460 flowering synchrony among individuals. *eLife*, **7**, e40214.

Acknowledgments

This study was supported support by the National Key Research and Development Program of China (2017YFA06036001), the General program of National Nature science foundation of China (No. 31770516) and the 111 Project (B18006) and Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (2018EYT05). Ivan A Janssens and Josep Peñuelas acknowledge support from the European Research Council through Synergy grant ERC-2013-SyG-610028 “IMBALANCE-P”. Ivan A Janssens acknowledges support from the Research Council of the University of Antwerp (Methusalem) and the “ECOPROPHET” project funded by BELSPO (Belgian Science Policy Office; Contract SR/00/334). Constantin M. Zohner acknowledges support from the ETH Zurich Postdoctoral Fellowship Program and the Crowther lab. Our deepest gratitude goes to Dr. Christian Körner and the anonymous reviewers for their careful work and thoughtful suggestions that have helped improve this paper substantially. The authors gratefully acknowledge all members of the PEP725 project for providing the phenological data. Y.H.F. and I.A.J. designed the research and drafted the paper; Y.H.F. and X. Z performed the analysis and all authors contributed to the interpretation of the results and to the text.

Supplementary Materials

Supplementary Legends:

Supplementary Table1. The mean GDD requirement of leaf-out in different daylength conditions, *i.e.* DLearly, short daylength effect, DLmid, average length in daylength and DLlate, long daylength effect, under same chilling accumulation conditions (case) for six tree species. Four chilling condition were studies, *e.g.* case01, chilling lowest; case02, chilling low, case03, chilling high and case04, chilling highest (see Methods for details). n indicates the number of trees.

Supplementary Table 2. The difference in mean GDD requirement of leaf-out between the daylength treatments, *e.g.* under short daylength: GDDshort DL; under optimal daylength: GDDavgDL; under long daylength: GDDlongDL) under the same chilling conditions in the low chilling accumulation group.

Supplementary figure 1. Distribution of the selected phenological sites.

Supplementary figure 2. (a) The climate of selected phenological sites. One circle indicates one site. (b) and (c) the annual temperature and precipitation across all selected sites.

Supplementary figure 3. Dependence of GDD requirement of leaf-out on daylength under constant chilling conditions for six tree species. Dependencies are shown for four different chilling intensities (see Methods). The GDD was calculated as daily sum of the daily temperature above 50C over the period from 1st September to the date of leaf-out

Supplementary figure 4. Dependence of GDD requirement of leaf-out on daylength under constant chilling conditions for six tree species. Dependencies are shown for four different chilling intensities (see Methods). The chilling was calculated as day

when the daily temperature below 50C over the period from 1st September to the date of leaf-out.

Supplementary figure 5. Dependence of GDD requirement of leaf-out on daylength under constant chilling conditions for six tree species. Dependencies are shown for four different chilling intensities (see Methods). The chilling was calculated as day when the daily temperature below 70C over the period from 1st September to the date of leaf-out.

Supplementary figure 6. Mean GDD requirement of leaf-out in the daylength treatments (left panels) and under the same chilling (days) conditions (right panels) in the low chilling accumulation group. The numbers in the right panels are the mean chilling days in each of the three daylength regimes in the left panels (using the same colors). The GDD requirement was calculated as explained in Methods. Letters, *i.e.* a, b and c, indicate statistically significant differences (at $P < 0.001$).

Supplementary figure 7. Phylogenetic tree of European forest tree species and the family names were provided with different color. The figure was modified from study of Sardans *et al.*, 2015. The species that selected in the present study were marked with pink boxes.

Supplementary figure 8. Changes in absolute and relative values of GDD requirement for spring leaf-out (across all chilling conditions) under one hour shorter (black) and longer (white) daylengths for each and all of the six studied species.

Supplementary figure 9. Dependence of GDD requirement of leaf-out on daylength under constant chilling conditions for six tree species. The GDD was calculated using a fixed length prior to leaf-out for each species at each site. Dependencies are shown for four different chilling intensities (see Methods).

Supplementary Table 1. The mean GDD requirement of leaf-out in different daylength conditions, *i.e.* DLearly, short daylength effect, DLmid, average length in daylength and DLlate, long daylength effect, under same chilling accumulation conditions (case) for six tree species. Four chilling condition were studies, *e.g.* case01, chilling lowest; case02, chilling low, case03, chilling high and case04, chilling highest (see Methods for details). n indicates the number of trees.

Species (n)	Chilling conditions	DLearly	DLmid	DLlate	DLearly		DLmid		DLlate	
		(hours)	(hours)	(hours)	mean	std	mean	std	mean	std
Aesculus hippocastanum (2069)	case01	12.9	13.5	14.0	160.1	60.6	131.3	52.5	85.9	48.1
	case02	13.1	13.6	14.1	138.9	48.9	107.5	39.3	74.9	36.3
	case03	13.0	13.6	14.1	133.9	44.9	99.4	35.6	72.3	34.0
	case04	13.2	13.7	14.1	133.0	49.8	81.6	35.7	66.4	34.1
Betula pendula (2052)	case01	12.8	13.4	14.0	153.3	60.4	131	50.9	79.8	44.4
	case02	13.1	13.7	14.1	134.0	48.9	77.0	32.4	60.8	29.4
	case03	13.1	13.6	14.1	128.9	42.2	94.2	32.6	66.2	30.3
	case04	13	13.6	14.1	132.6	45.3	103.4	35.7	68.9	32.2
Fagus sylvatica (1588)	case01	13.3	13.8	14.2	182.4	77.9	146.8	63.2	113.9	55.2
	case02	13.4	13.9	14.3	162.6	59.5	127.4	49.4	96.2	44.7
	case03	13.5	13.9	14.3	159.8	54.5	122.0	43.8	92.5	42.3
	case04	13.5	14	14.3	143.7	60.2	102.8	42.8	85.3	41.8
Fraxinus excelsior (1044)	case01	13.7	14.2	14.6	229.0	87.1	199.4	70.4	164.5	62.9
	case02	13.7	14.2	14.6	217.7	67.1	187.1	58.7	146.7	55.0
	case03	13.8	14.3	14.6	214.6	65.9	179.6	55.5	144.7	53.7
	case04	13.9	14.3	14.6	181.4	65.6	156.2	54.4	135.3	54.7
Quercus robur (1686)	case01	13.5	14.1	14.5	215.9	72.9	179.5	58	144.5	55.3
	case02	13.6	14.1	14.5	203.3	58.0	159.6	46.9	123.5	43.6
	case03	13.7	14.2	14.5	201.5	62.1	163.7	48.7	124.3	46.8
	case04	13.9	14.2	14.6	176.3	60.2	135.8	46.8	113.2	46
Tilia cordata (438)	case01	13.2	13.9	14.3	231.0	69.4	179.4	61.4	140.0	57.4
	case02	13.4	14.0	14.4	214.3	62.3	159.7	51.4	123.9	46.9
	case03	13.5	14.0	14.4	195.4	55.3	153.2	46.2	122.8	46.5
	case04	13.5	14.0	14.3	191.7	61.2	138.6	49.2	116.9	51.2

Supplementary Table 2. The difference in mean GDD requirement of leaf-out between the daylength treatments, e.g. under short daylength: GDDshort DL; under optimal daylength: GDDavgDL; under long daylength: GDDlongDL) under the same chilling conditions in the low chilling accumulation group.

Species	GDD shortDL vs. GDDavgDL			GDD longDL vs. GDDavgDL		
	t	P	df	t	P	df
<i>Aesculus hippocastanum</i>	32.986	<0.001	1928	-45.943	<0.001	1928
<i>Betula pendula</i>	33.118	<0.001	970	-32.853	<0.001	970
<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	31.793	<0.001	1491	-36.568	<0.001	1491
<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	19.682	<0.001	970	-32.853	<0.001	970
<i>Quercus robur</i>	33.999	<0.001	1569	-40.378	<0.001	1569
<i>Tilia cordata</i>	22.646	<0.001	396	-18.238	<0.001	396

538 **Supplementary figure 1.** Distribution of the selected phenological sites.

539 **Supplementary figure 2.** (a) The climate of selected phenological sites. One circle
540 indicates one site. (b) and (c) the annual temperature and precipitation across all
541 selected sites.

Supplementary figure 3. Dependence of GDD requirement of leaf-out on daylength under constant chilling conditions for six tree species. Dependencies are shown for four different chilling intensities (see Methods). The chilling was calculated as day when the daily temperature below 5⁰C over the period from 1st September to the date of leaf-out.

Supplementary figure 4. Dependence of GDD requirement of leaf-out on daylength under constant chilling conditions for six tree species. Dependencies are shown for four different chilling intensities (see Methods). The chilling was calculated as day when the daily temperature below 7⁰C over the period from 1st September to the date of leaf-out.

Supplementary figure 4. Dependence of GDD requirement of leaf-out on daylength under constant chilling conditions for six tree species. Dependencies are shown for four different chilling intensities (see Methods). The GDD was calculated as daily sum of the daily temperature above 5⁰C over the period from 1st December to the date of leaf-out

Supplementary figure 6. Mean GDD requirement of leaf-out in the daylength treatments (left panels) and under the same chilling (days) conditions (right panels) in the low chilling accumulation group. The numbers in the right panels are the mean chilling days in each of the three daylength regimes in the left panels (using the same colors). The GDD requirement was calculated as explained in Methods. Letters, *i.e.* a, b and c, indicate statistically significant differences (at $P < 0.001$).

Supplementary figure 7. Phylogenetic tree of European forest tree species and the family names were provided with different color. The figure was modified from study of Sardans *et al.*, 2015. The species that selected in the present study were marked with boxes.

Supplementary figure 8. Changes in absolute (a) and relative (b) values of GDD requirement for spring leaf-out (across all chilling conditions) under one hour shorter (black) and longer (white) daylength for each and all of the six studied species.

Supplementary figure 9. The distribution of normalized daylength (DL, in red) and chilling (CD, in blue) sensitivity of GDD requirement for leaf-out for all study species. The histograms show the distribution across all sites and the mean sensitivities and standard deviations (in brackets) are provided. The GDD was calculated from the 1st Jan to the date of leaf-out for each year of each species at each site.