Title: Sensitivity analysis of tree phenology models reveals increasing sensitivity of their predictions to winter chilling temperature and photoperiod with warming climate

Authors: Gauzere J.^{1,2}, Lucas C.¹, Ronce O.², Davi H.³, Chuine I.¹

Addresses:

¹ CNRS, UMR 5175 CEFE-UM-UPVM3-EPHE-IRD, F-34293 Montpellier, France

² Institut des Sciences de l'Évolution, Université de Montpellier, CNRS, IRD, EPHE Montpellier, France

³ INRA, UR0629 URFM, F-84914 Avignon, France

Corresponding author: Julie Gauzere

E-mail address: Julie.Gauzere@ed.ac.uk

Present address: Institute of Evolutionary Biology, School of Biological Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Charlotte Auerbach Road, Edinburgh EH9 3FL, UK.

1 **Abstract**

2 The phenology of plants is a major driver of agro-ecosystem processes and biosphere feed-
3 backs to the climate system. Phenology models are classically used in ecology and agronomy
4 to project future phenological changes. With our increasing understanding of the environmen-
5 tal cues affecting bud development, phenology models also increase in complexity. But, we
6 expect these cues, and the underlying physiological processes, to have varying influence on bud
7 break date predictions depending on the specific weather patterns in winter and spring. Here,
8 we evaluated the parameter sensitivity of state-of-the-art process-based phenology models that
9 have been widely used to predict forest tree species phenology. We used sensitivity analysis to
10 compare the behavior of models with increasing complexity under specific climatic conditions.
11 We thus assessed whether the influence of the parameters and modeled processes on predictions
12 varies with winter and spring temperatures. We found that the prediction of the bud break date
13 was mainly affected by the response to forcing temperature under current climatic conditions.
14 However, the impact of the parameters driving the response to chilling temperatures and to pho-
15 toperiod on the prediction of the models increased with warmer winter and spring temperatures.
16 Interaction effects between parameters played an important role on the prediction of models,
17 especially for the most complex models, but did not affect the relative influence of parameters
18 on bud break dates. Our results highlighted that a stronger focus should be given to the char-
19 acterization of the reaction norms to both forcing and chilling temperature to predict accurately
20 bud break dates in a larger range of climatic conditions and evaluate the evolutionary potential
21 of phenological traits with climate change.

22

23 **Key words:** Sensitivity analysis; Process-based modeling; Bud development; Forcing temper-
24 ature; Chilling temperature; Photoperiod

25 1 Introduction

26 Bud break is a key phenological event that affects plant performance by defining the period
27 during which plants are able to grow, photosynthesize and produce their seeds. Therefore, the
28 phenology of plants is a major driver of agro-ecosystem processes (Cleland *et al.*, 2007) and
29 biosphere feedbacks to the climate system (Richardson *et al.*, 2013). It drives ecosystem pro-
30 ductivity (Richardson *et al.*, 2012), carbon (Delpierre *et al.*, 2009), water (Hogg *et al.*, 2000)
31 and nutrient (Cooke & Weih, 2005) cycling processes, as well as energy balance (Wilson &
32 Baldocchi, 2000). Moreover, plant phenology critically affects yield and organoleptic quality
33 of crop harvest (Nissanka *et al.*, 2015) as well as species distributions (Chuine, 2010). The
34 onset of plant activity has been reported to advance by 2.5 days per decade on average dur-
35 ing the last 50 years (Menzel *et al.*, 2006), potentially increasing the risk of frost damages on
36 flowers and leaves (Vitasse *et al.*, 2018a). These rapid responses have been shown to be highly
37 species-specific and are expected to have major consequences on species interactions, species
38 distributions, ecosystem functioning and forest carbon uptake (Cleland *et al.*, 2007; Chuine,
39 2010; Richardson *et al.*, 2013). Therefore, accurately predicting plant species phenology at
40 both large and local scales is of key importance for assessing the impact of global change on
41 agro-ecosystems and the multiple services they provide, as well as species range shift and pop-
42 ulations' local extinction.

43

44 Fu *et al.* (2015b) showed however that the linear trend towards earlier spring onset had been
45 slowing down significantly during the last two decades. One of the hypothesis put forward by
46 the authors to explain this slowdown is the warming of winters. And indeed, recently, Asse
47 *et al.* (2018) documented the negative effect of the warming of winter on the leaf unfolding and

flowering date of several tree species. Air temperature is the major environmental factor regulating the dates of budburst and flowering of plants (Rathcke & Lacey, 1985; Polgar & Primack, 2011). In perennial species, temperature has an antagonistic effect on bud development depending on the season: low temperature (called chilling) are required to release the endodormancy of buds during winter, which is characterized by the inability of bud cells to growth despite optimal growing conditions, while higher temperature (called forcing) are required to promote bud cell elongation in spring. Recently, the effect of long photoperiod in compensating the lack of chilling temperature has also been reported for some tree species (Laube *et al.*, 2014; Way & Montgomery, 2015; Zohner *et al.*, 2016).

Our understanding of the environmental cues affecting species-specific bud break dates has been increasing thanks to the compilation of large phenological datasets (Menzel *et al.*, 2006; Fu *et al.*, 2015b), and to experimental work in controlled conditions using growth chambers (e.g. Caffarra & Donnelly 2011; Zohner *et al.* 2016). This empirical knowledge has been essential for the development and calibration of process-based phenology models (Chuine & Regniere, 2017), that are used to predict spring phenology over large spatial and temporal scales (e.g. Chuine *et al.* 2016; Gauzere *et al.* 2017). While the relative contribution of environmental cues in driving spring phenological responses in current and future climatic conditions is still debated for most species (Chuine & Regniere, 2017; Laube *et al.*, 2014; Fu *et al.*, 2015a,b), the recent declining of the response of spring onset to global warming suggests that the relative influence of environmental cues driving the endodormancy phase varies with climatic conditions. Since climate change is likely to generate non-equilibrium conditions, the relative influence of the environmental cues might also not remain constant over time. Overall, a strong expectation is that the environmental cues releasing endodormancy should have an increasing influence in warmer

environmental conditions. Yet, comprehensive analysis of the behavior of phenology models in different climates are still lacking, while pioneer modeling studies in crops have shown that it is expected to change depending on ecological conditions (*e.g.* Yin *et al.* 2005; Zhang *et al.* 2014).

Recently, Huber *et al.* (2018) highlighted the importance of improving our understanding of models behavior, and identifying key parameters and processes that have the strongest effects on model predictions under different ecological conditions. It is a major stage to enhance model applications across large spatial and temporal scales, as well as the robustness of model projections. We embrace this view and acknowledge here the usefulness of sensitivity analysis to reach this general objective. Sensitivity analyses are interesting statistical tools to address the impact of parameters variations on the outputs of models (Cariboni *et al.*, 2007), allowing to evaluate both intrinsic (*i.e.* model structure and parameters) and extrinsic (*i.e.* model inputs) sources of variation. They can also highlight model limitations and directions for further improvements (Saltelli *et al.*, 2000; Cariboni *et al.*, 2007). Therefore, they represent an important step in the modeling cycle (Saltelli *et al.*, 2000; Cariboni *et al.*, 2007; Augustiak *et al.*, 2014; Courbaud *et al.*, 2015).

For forest tree species, most studies in phenology modeling have focused on the analysis of extrinsic sources of variation, *e.g.* investigating the uncertainty of climatic inputs on simulations (Morin & Chuine, 2005; Migliavacca *et al.*, 2012). Ecological studies interested in intrinsic sources of variation most often evaluate the effect of the variation of single parameters on the model outputs, other parameters remaining fixed at a given default value (*e.g.* Lange *et al.* 2016). The major disadvantage of this approach is to neglect possible interactions among parameters and to be unreliable in presence of non-linear relationships between the parameters

96 and the model predictions (Coutts & Yokomizo, 2014). At the opposite, sensitivity analyses
97 varying all parameters simultaneously allow to account for parameter interactions and non-
98 linear relationships and providing robust sensitivity measures for complex simulation models.
99 While phenology model complexity is increasing with our understanding of the physiological
100 responses involved in bud development, these interaction effects and non-linear relationships
101 can no more be overlooked. A first originality and aim of this study was thus to compare the
102 behavior of phenology models with increasing complexity, and to disentangle the main and in-
103 teraction effects of parameters on bud break date predictions.

104

105 The most commonly used phenology models are process-based, meaning that they describe
106 known or suspected cause-effect relationships between physiological processes and some driv-
107 ing factors in the organism's environment to predict the precise occurrence in time of various
108 phenology events (see for review Chuine & Regniere 2017). The parameters of these models are
109 either defined using parameter values measured in experimental controlled conditions, or statis-
110 tically inferred from phenological and meteorological data using inverse modeling techniques.
111 Since they describe causal relationships derived from experimental work, the sensitivity analy-
112 sis of process-based models is supposed to reflect the sensitivity of the real processes (Saltelli
113 *et al.*, 2000). Therefore, we can expect the sensitivity of phenology models to specific param-
114 eters, *e.g.* driving the endodormancy phase, to change with varying climatic conditions. The
115 impact of climate on observed and simulated bud break dates is expected to be complex, be-
116 cause of the cumulative and antagonistic effects of temperature depending on the season on bud
117 development (Chuine & Regniere, 2017). For this reason, we also aimed at testing the param-
118 eter sensitivity of phenology models to climatic conditions. We thus analyzed model behavior
119 under specific patterns of winter and spring temperatures, that produced either particularly early

120 or late bud break date. This study thus differ from that of Lange *et al.* (2016) which explored
121 the behavior of phenology models in uniformly warmer or colder conditions all along the year.
122 In the present study we used different observed climatically contrasted years with their specific
123 weather patterns.

124

125 Using a sensitivity analysis approach, we aimed at evaluating the parameter sensitivity of
126 state-of-the-art process-based phenology models that have been widely used to predict bud
127 break dates of forest tree species. The main originalities of this study are to (i) compare the
128 behavior of models with increasing complexity; and, (ii) perform this analysis under realistic
129 and contrasted climatic conditions in order to better estimate how the relative influence of pa-
130 rameters on model prediction varies with specific weather patterns in winter and spring. To
131 perform this study we used historical climatic conditions encountered at different elevations in
132 the Pyrenees Mountains, to cover a large range of temperature variation, without variation of the
133 day length between sites. More specifically, we propose here to: 1) evaluate whether increasing
134 model complexity is related to higher interaction effects between parameters; 2) identify key
135 parameters and processes that cause the highest variability in the output of the models under
136 different climatic regimes; 3) assess the physiological plausibility of this sensitivity; 4) discuss
137 our outcome for future studies that will use phenology models to address key question in ecol-
138 ogy and evolution. In particular, we expect parameters related to physiological responses to
139 spring forcing temperatures to have a stronger impact on the prediction of the bud break date
140 in cold environmental conditions, and more generally in historical climatic conditions in West-
141 ern Europe. On the opposite, we expect parameters related to endodormancy release (requiring
142 chilling conditions during winter) to have an increasing influence on the prediction of models in
143 warmer environmental conditions. Finally, we expect parameter interactions to have a greater

influence on the prediction of models with increasing model complexity.

2 Material and methods

2.1 Process-based phenology models

Process-based phenology models (see for review Chuine & Regnier 2017) are deeply grounded on experimental results which have accumulated over the last 50 years and describe how the development of buds, from dormancy induction in fall to bud break in spring, is determined by the individual or interactive effects of different environmental cues, notably temperature and photoperiod. Most of these models are based on the same framework (see Chuine & Regnier 2017). Each development phase (*e.g.* endodormancy, ecodormancy) is described by a sub-model determining its reaction norms to various cues. Several response functions describing the reaction norms to various cues can combine by addition, multiplication, or composition. Development phases either are sequential (follow each other in time) or overlap (a phase can start before the end of the previous one).

We chose three different kinds of model within this framework that represent the three main types of environmental regulation of bud break (of either vegetative or reproductive buds) in perennial species and are the most widely used in phenology studies: UniForc (Chuine, 2000), UniChill (Chuine, 2000) and PGC (Gauzere *et al.*, 2017). These models differ by their complexity and by the environmental cues they account for. While UniForc and UniChill are thermal ecodormancy and endo-ecodormancy models respectively, PGC is a photothermal endo-ecodormancy model. In the three models described below, t_0 defines the beginning of the endo- or ecodormant phase depending on the model, t_f the bud break date and F^* the critical amount

167 of forcing units to reach bud break.

168

169 **UNIFORC** - The UniForc model is an one-phase model, describing the cumulative effect of
170 forcing temperatures on the development of buds during the ecodormancy phase. This model
171 thus assumes that the endodormancy phase is always fully released and that there is no dynamic
172 effects of chilling and photoperiod on forcing requirements. Bud break occurs when the rate of
173 forcing, R_f (Eqn. 7), accumulated since t_0 , reaches the critical state of forcing F^* :

$$\sum_{t_0}^{t_f} R_f(T) \geq F^* \quad (1)$$

174 with T the daily average temperature.

175

176 **UNICHILL** – The UniChill model is a sequential two-phases model describing the cumula-
177 tive effect of chilling temperatures on the development of buds during the endodormancy phase
178 (first phase) and the cumulative effect of forcing temperatures during the ecodormancy phase.
179 Like in the Uniforc model, bud break occurs when the accumulated rate of forcing, R_f , reaches
180 F^* (Eqn. 1).

181 The start of the ecodormancy phase corresponds to the end of the endodormancy phase, t_c ,
182 which occurs when the accumulated rate of chilling R_c (Eqn. 8) has reached the critical state of
183 chilling C^* :

$$\sum_{t_0}^{t_c} R_c(T) \geq C^* \quad (2)$$

184 **PGC** – The PGC model has been designed to explain bud break date of photosensitive
185 species, which might represent about 30 % of the species (Zohner *et al.*, 2016). It has been

186 shown to be particular relevant to simulate the bud break date of beech (*Fagus sylvatica*) which
 187 is one of the most photosensitive species for bud break (Gauzere *et al.*, 2017). This is a pho-
 188 tothermal model that integrates the compensatory effect of photoperiod on insufficient chilling
 189 accumulation through a growth competence function (GC ; Gauzere *et al.* 2017). The growth
 190 competence function describes the ability of buds to respond to forcing temperatures. It modu-
 191 lates the rate of forcing (R_f) through a multiplicative function to define the actual daily forcing
 192 units accumulated by the bud until bud break as:

$$\sum_{t_0}^{t_f} (GC(P)R_f(T)) \geq F^* \quad (3)$$

193 with P and T the daily photoperiod and average temperature respectively.

194

195 The growth competence (GC) is related to the daily photoperiod through a sigmoid function:

$$GC(P) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-d_P(P-P_{50}(t))}} \quad (4)$$

196 with P_{50} the mid-response photoperiod and d_P the positive slope of the sigmoid function.

197 P_{50} is not constant and depends on the state of chilling (CS): the greater the accumulated rate
 198 of chilling, the shorter the mid-response photoperiod, i.e. buds become sensitive to shorter
 199 photoperiod when they have accumulated chilling:

$$P_{50}(CS) = (12 - P_r) + \frac{2P_r}{1 + e^{-d_C(CS(t)-C_{50})}} \quad (5)$$

200 with P_r the range boundaries of the parameter P_{50} , so that $P_{50} \in [12-P_r; 12+P_r]$, d_C the
 201 negative slope of the sigmoid function, and C_{50} is the mid-response parameter if the sigmoid

202 function, reflecting chilling requirements under short-day length.

203 Finally, chilling units accumulated as:

$$CS(t) = \sum_{t_0}^t R_c(T) \quad (6)$$

204

205

206 For the sake of comparison, the version of the models used for this study have the same type
207 of response functions to forcing and to chilling temperatures. The response function to forcing
208 temperature, R_f , was defined as a sigmoid function as it has been shown to be the most realistic
209 experimentally (Hanninen *et al.*, 1990; Caffarra & Donnelly, 2011):

$$R_f(T_d) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-d_T(T_d - T_{50})}} \quad (7)$$

210 with d_T the positive slope and T_{50} the mid-response temperature of the sigmoid function.

211 We defined the rate of chilling, R_c , as a threshold function (Caffarra *et al.*, 2011b):

$$R_c(T_d) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } T_d < T_b \\ 0 & \text{if } T_d \geq T_b \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

212 with T_d , the mean temperature of day d and T_b , the threshold temperature (also called base tem-
213 perature) of the function.

214

215 As defined here, the UniForc model has 4 parameters (t_0 , d_T , T_{50} , F^*), the UniChill model
216 6 parameters (t_0 , T_b , C^* , d_T , T_{50} , F^*), the PGC model 9 parameters (t_0 , T_b , C_{50} , P_r , d_C , d_P , d_T ,
217 T_{50} , F^* ; Table 1).

218

219 **2.2 Model calibration and validation**

220 In order to set up the sensitivity analysis design, we first calibrated and validated the studied
221 phenology models for three emblematic tree species in European forests: common beech (*Fagus*
222 *sylvatica* L.), sessile oak (*Quercus petraea* L.) and silver fir (*Abies alba* Mill.). These results
223 were used to (i) define the natural parameter variation among tree species (Table 1) and (ii)
224 identify contemporary climatic years that produced particularly early and late spring phenology
225 (Appendix D). The three models were parametrized for the three different species using obser-
226 vations of the bud break date in the Pyrenees and corresponding weather data from 2005 to 2012.
227

228 The phenology of several populations located at different elevations following the Gave and
229 Ossau valleys in the Pyrenees have been yearly monitored since 2005. The studied populations
230 ranged from 131 to 1604 m (9 sites) for beech, from 131 to 1630 m (13 sites) for oak, and from
231 840 to 1604 m (6 sites) for fir (for further details about these populations, see Vitasse *et al.*
232 2009). Data used for this study consisted in the bud break date (BBCH 9) monitored from 2005
233 to 2012 in these populations. Models were parametrized using daily weather data since 2004
234 from Prosensor HOBO Pro (RH/Temp, Onset Computer Corporation, Bourne, MA 02532) that
235 have been placed at the core of each monitored population (Vitasse *et al.*, 2009). Day length was
236 calculated according to the latitude of the meteorological stations (see Caffarra *et al.* 2011a).
237 Using these datasets, the three studied models were parametrized for each species following
238 Gauzere *et al.* (2017). The models *RMSE* varied from 5.85 to 10 days, with mean *RMSE* of
239 6.28 for beech, 6.92 for oak, 9.39 for fir (Appendix C).

240

241 2.3 Sensitivity analysis

242 To perform the sensitivity analysis we sampled 1,000,000 parameters combinations for each
243 model, to fully capture each parameter space. To sample each parameter, we used beta distri-
244 butions for the slope parameter of the sigmoid functions (equations 4, 5 and 7) and uniform
245 distributions for other parameters (Appendix E). The beta distribution was chosen to account
246 for the fact that variations in shape parameters have differential effects on sigmoid responses
247 (variation in extreme shape values have a lowest impact on the global shape of the sigmoid
248 function). The bounds of the sampling distributions were defined according to two criteria: (i)
249 the sampled values needed to be biologically relevant, *i.e.* make sense according to the empiri-
250 cal knowledge about the physiological responses and the adjusted values for the three species,
251 and (ii) produce positioned dates, *i.e.* dates different from the last day of the year ($\text{DOY} \neq 365$).
252 Due to these constraints, all parameters do not have the same variance (coefficient of variation
253 ranging from 0.05 to 0.18). Appendix E details the parameter values adjusted for each species
254 in the parameter space explored for the sensitivity analysis.

255

256 Two different sensitivity indexes, describing the proportion of variance of the model's output
257 Y (here bud break date) explained by the variation of a given parameter X_i , were calculated
258 from the "Sobol" and "Sobol-Jansen" methods implemented in the package "sensitivity" of the
259 R software. These two methods implement the Monte Carlo estimation of the variance-based
260 method for sensitivity analysis proposed by Sobol (1993). More precisely, these functions allow
261 estimating the first-order and total-effect indexes from the variance decomposition, sometimes
262 referred to as functional ANOVA decomposition. The first-order index is defined as:

$$S_i = \frac{Var_{X_i}(E_{X \sim i}(Y|X_i))}{Var(Y)} \quad (9)$$

263 with

$$\sum_{i=1}^n S_i = 1 \quad (S_i > 0) \quad (10)$$

264 Y is the prediction and X_i the i^{th} parameter of the model. The notation $(X \sim i)$ indicates the
 265 set of all variables except X_i . The numerator represents the contribution of the main effect of X_i
 266 to the variation in the output, i.e. the effect of varying X_i alone, but averaged over variations in
 267 other input parameters. S_i is standardized by the total variance to provide the fractional contri-
 268 bution of each parameter i .

269

270 And total-effect index as:

$$S_{Ti} = \frac{E_{X \sim i}(Var_{X_i}(Y|X_{\sim i}))}{Var(Y)} = 1 - \frac{Var_{X \sim i}(E_{X_i}(Y|X_{\sim i}))}{Var(Y)} \quad (11)$$

271 with

$$\sum_{i=1}^n S_{Ti} \geq 1 \quad (S_{Ti} > 0) \quad (12)$$

272 due to the interaction effect, e.g. X_i and X_j both counted in S_{Ti} and S_{Tj} . S_{Ti} thus measures
 273 the contribution of X_i to the variation in the output, including all variances caused by its inter-
 274 actions with any other input variables.

275

276 2.4 Climatic data used for the sensitivity analysis

277 To perform the sensitivity analysis, we used the climate simulated at different elevations, over
278 a gradient of 1000 m, for the period from 1956 to 2012, in order to explore a large range
279 of climatic conditions. To study the response of the models to realistic climate at different
280 elevations, we used measurements taken with local weather stations on three forest sites, at
281 627 m, 1082 m and 1630 m a.s.l., along the Gave valley (Prosensur HOB0 Pro; Vitasse *et al.*
282 2009). As this weather dataset only covered the period from 2004 to 2012, we also used Météo
283 France measurements at other stations located close to these sites, and data from the SAFRAN
284 reanalysis on the points of the systematic grid located in the valley, to simulate the climate at
285 the forest sites over a larger period (1959-2012). The temperature data recorded with the local
286 HOB0 sensors were linearly correlated to the climatic data derived by the SAFRAN model of
287 Météo France (Quintana-Segui *et al.*, 2008) for the same period. Daily minimum and maximum
288 temperature data from 1960 to 2012 were generated based on the long-term SAFRAN outputs
289 using the following equation:

$$T(X) = \beta_t(X) + \alpha_t(X) \cdot T_{SAFRAN} \quad (13)$$

290 with X the targeted site, β_t and α_t the intercept and the slope of the linear regression be-
291 tween T_{SAFRAN} and T_{HOB0} for the period 2004-2012. The coefficients used for this equation are
292 provided in Appendix A. Day length was calculated according to the latitude of the forest sites
293 (see Caffarra *et al.* 2011a).

294

295 Over this large simulated period, we chose three climatically contrasted years, that corre-
296 sponded to (1) a year with winter and spring mean temperatures close to their global mean over

297 the 1960-2012 period ("normal climatic year"; year 1966), (2) a year expected to produce early
298 spring phenology, *i.e.* with cooler winter and warmer spring temperatures than normal ("early
299 climatic year"; year 2011) and (3) a year expected to produce late spring phenology, *i.e.* with
300 warmer winter and cooler spring temperatures than normal ("late climatic year"; year 1975;
301 Table 2; Appendix B). We checked that the three years selected indeed generated early, average
302 and late bud break dates using the adjusted models for different tree species (Appendix D). This
303 range of climatic conditions allowed us to credibly investigate the impact of specific weather
304 patterns in winter and spring on the behavior of the models.

305

Parameter	Models	Description	Units	Species parameter range	Sampling distribution
t_0	UniForc	starting date of ecodormancy	DOY	[22; 90]	$\mathcal{U}$ [-31; 92]
t_0	UniChill, PGC	starting date of endodormancy	DOY	[-120; -62]	$\mathcal{U}$ [-122; -31]
F^*	UniForc, UniChill, PGC	critical state of forcing	DU	[16.3; 106.8]	$\mathcal{U}$ [1; 30]
T_{50}	UniForc, UniChill, PGC	mid-response temperature to forcing	°C	[2.8; 15.7]	$\mathcal{U}$ [0; 14]
d_T	UniForc, UniChill, PGC	slope of the forcing response	DR/°C	[0.051; 0.44]	$\mathcal{B}_{\{\alpha=20; \beta=1.3\}}$
C^*	UniChill	critical state of chilling	DU	[1.1; 116.7]	$\mathcal{U}$ [1; 60]
T_b	UniChill, PGC	threshold chilling temperature	°C	[10.7; 14.9]	$\mathcal{U}$ [7; 13]
C_{50}	PGC	mid-response parameter of the photoperiod sensitivity	DU	[5.7; 192.3]	$\mathcal{U}$ [1; 60]
P_r	PGC	range boundaries of the mid-response photoperiod	hours	[0.9; 1.5]	$\mathcal{U}$ [1; 6]
d_C	PGC	slope of photoperiod sensitivity response	hours/units	[-40; -0.64]	$\mathcal{B}_{\{\alpha=20; \beta=1.3\}}$ [-10; -10 ⁻⁵]
d_P	PGC	slope of the growth competence	DR/hours	[0.26; 11.9]	$\mathcal{B}_{\{\alpha=20; \beta=1.3\}}$ [10 ⁻⁵ ; 10]

Table 1: Description and sampling distribution of the parameters of the three models used to perform the sensitivity analysis. For all parameters, except slope parameters, values were drawn in uniform distributions $\mathcal{U}$. For slope parameters d , values were drawn in beta distributions $\mathcal{B}_{\{\alpha=20; \beta=1.3\}}$. The species parameter range provides the variation range of the adjusted parameters for three major European tree species (*F. sylvatica*, *Q. petraea*, *A. alba*). More details about the sampling distributions choices, based on the model calibration and the empirical knowledge of about the physiological responses, are provided in Appendix E). DOY = day of the year; DU = developmental units; DR = developmental rate.

Elevation	Year	T_{NovDec}	T_{JanFeb}	$T_{MarAprMay}$
627 m	1966	7.18	6.37	11.45
	1975	8.97	7.46	10.23
	2011	5.72	6.99	14.52
1082 m	1966	5.85	5.12	9.44
	1975	7.42	6.018	8.40
	2011	4.64	5.72	12.02
1630 m	1966	3.20	2.50	6.54
	1975	4.67	3.33	5.56
	2011	2.07	3.07	8.94

Table 2: Detail of the climatic conditions used to perform the sensitivity analysis of the phenological models. With T_{NovDec} the average temperature of November and December of the previous year (in $^{\circ}\text{C}$), T_{JanFeb} the average temperature of January and February of the focal year (in $^{\circ}\text{C}$) and $T_{MarAprMay}$ the average temperature of March, April and May of the focal year (in $^{\circ}\text{C}$).

306 3 Results

307 3.1 Main trends in parameter sensitivity of phenology models

308 For the three models, the mid-response temperature during the ecodormancy (T_{50}) had the great-
309 est influence on the predictions of the models in most of the climatic conditions explored, except
310 in the cool winter-warm spring conditions producing early phenology (Figure 1, and see Ap-
311 pendices F, G and H for detailed results). This strong influence is both due to the main effect of
312 T_{50} and its interaction with other parameters, and especially with d_T , $T_{50} \times d_T$ defining the shape
313 of the forcing response during the ecodormancy phase. Under the conditions producing early
314 phenology, the main parameters affecting the predicted bud break date were t_0 , T_{50} and F^* for
315 UniForc, UniChill and PGC respectively (Figure 1a). Note that the influence of the parameters
316 on the predictions of the models was significantly affected by their coefficient of variation (*i.e.*
317 parameters that had the highest variation also had the highest influence; Figure 2). However,
318 this effect only explained a small proportion of the total variation in the total-effect of the pa-
319 rameters ($R^2 = 0.29$).

320

321 3.2 The sensitivity to model parameters varies with model complexity

322 The sensitivity of model predictions to the variation in model parameters highly depended on
323 the phases and processes modeled (Figure 1). Predictions of the ecodormancy model UniForc
324 were more sensitive to the t_0 parameter, *i.e.* the model starting date, than the predictions of
325 the endo-ecodormancy models UniChill and PGC, particularly under the climatic conditions
326 producing early phenology (Figure 1a and b). Predictions of the thermal model UniChill were
327 more sensitive to the critical amount of chilling to release dormancy (C^* parameter) than the

328 predictions of the photothermal model PGC to the equivalent parameter (C_{50}). Predictions of
329 this latter photothermal model was more sensitive to the critical amount of forcing (F^*) than
330 that of the thermal models UniForc and UniChill. Finally, predictions of the UniChill model
331 were more sensitive to the mid-response temperature during ecodormancy (T_{50}) than that of the
332 UniForc and PGC models, which presented similar sensitivity to this parameter (Figure 1).
333 Depending on the model complexity, the uncertainty in the predictions will thus reply in the
334 accurate calibration of different key parameters.

335

336 3.3 The sensitivity to model parameters varies with climate

337 The sensitivity of the model predictions to the variation in model parameters also changed ac-
338 cording to the climatic conditions experienced during winter and spring (Figure 3). In the three
339 models, the sensitivity of the predictions to the mid-response temperature during ecodormancy
340 (T_{50}) decreased with warming temperature (Figure 3), while the sensitivity to the parameters
341 driving the endodormancy phase (e.g. t_0 in the UniForc model, C^* in the UniChill model, d_p
342 and C_{50} in the PGC model) increased with warming temperature (Figure 3). The sensitivity of
343 the endo-ecodormancy models to the critical amount of forcing to reach bud break (F^*) was
344 also higher in warmer conditions. This is probably because, even if forcing accumulation be-
345 comes less limiting with warming temperature, F^* still represents the minimum duration of the
346 ecodormancy phase and thus strongly drives bud break date.

347

348 The sensitivity of the predictions of the PGC model to both the critical amount of chilling
349 (C_{50}) and the parameter determining the sensitivity to photoperiod (d_p) increased with warming
350 temperature (Figure 3). But, in such conditions, the sensitivity of PGC model predictions to

the photoperiod related parameter was higher than that to chilling related parameters (C_{50} and T_b ; Figure 3). Finally, the sensitivity of PGC model predictions to the starting date of endodormancy (t_0) tended to increase with warming temperature conditions, while that of the Unichill model remained constant and low (Figure 3). This result may be explained by the differences in growth competence modeling between these two models. The growth competence function of the PGC model is not null in autumn but decreases with the decreasing day length, and induces endodormancy. If temperature conditions are particularly favorable, some forcing units can be accumulated before endodormancy is fully induced contrary to the Unichill model. This therefore gives an increasing importance to t_0 in driving bud break dates in warmer temperature conditions.

For the three models, the increasing influence of the endodormancy vs ecodormancy related parameters on bud break date predictions can already be noticed in warm winter conditions.

3.4 Main and interaction effects

In the results above, we describe the influence of the parameters on the predictions of the models based on their total effect, which include both main and second-order interaction effects. However, it is also interesting to decompose these effects to understand their relative contributions to the variation of bud break dates. For most parameters, the total effects were mainly due to main (or first-order) effects, and in a lesser extend to interaction effects between parameters (or second-order effects; Figures 1). Second-order effects always explained less than 15 % of the predictions variation (while the largest first-order effect explained more than 50 % of the output variation ; Figure 4 and Appendix I). Interestingly, interaction effects did not modify the relative influence of the parameters on the predictions of the models (Figures 1). Nevertheless,

374 total interaction effects represented an important source of variation in the predicted bud break
375 dates (Figure 4), in particular for the most complex models.

376

377 The total influence of interaction effects on model predictions also varied with the specific
378 weather patterns in winter and spring. For UniForc, total interaction effects were found to be
379 more important in the warm winter-cool spring conditions, producing late phenology, while for
380 PGC, these effects were more important in the cool winter-warm spring conditions, producing
381 early phenology (Figure 4a and c). The interaction between the parameters T_{50} and d_T had the
382 largest effect on the predicted bud break date, notably in the coldest temperature conditions
383 ($d_T \times T_{50}$; Appendices I). These two parameters define the shape of the response to temper-
384 ature during ecodormancy in the three models. For the PGC model in the warmest climatic
385 conditions, the interaction between the endodormancy starting date (t_0) and the photoperiod
386 sensitivity (d_P) also had an impact on the predicted bud break date ($t_0 \times d_P$; Appendix I).
387 The influence of interaction effects thus tended to increase with model complexity, but also
388 varied with specific weather patterns in winter and spring.

Figure 1: Main and total effects of the parameters on the predictions of the three studied models in the most contrasted climatic conditions. The main effect (or first-order effect) quantifies the individual effect of a parameter, *i.e.* without interactions. The total effect represents the first- and second-order effects (*i.e.* with second-order interaction effects). These effects quantify the proportion of variance of the model's prediction explained by the variation of a given parameter. *a.* "Early conditions" corresponds to climatic conditions at 627 m in 2011, producing the earliest phenology, *b.* "standard conditions" to climatic conditions at 1082 m in 1966, producing intermediate phenology, and *c.* "late conditions" to climatic conditions at 1603 m in 1975, producing the latest phenology over the range of conditions explored. The details of the results for each site and year are given in Appendix H.

Figure 2: Variation in the total-effect of parameters on the predictions of all models according to their coefficients of variation (CV). The coefficient of variation of each parameter was estimated from its sampling distribution. The R-squared was estimated using a linear model. The parameters with the highest CV were also the most influential on models prediction.

Figure 3: Variation in the total effect of the most biologically relevant parameters on the predictions of the three studied models according to climatic variables (see also Appendix G). The total effect quantifies the proportion of variance in the model's prediction explained by the variation of a given parameter (considering its main and interaction effects). We chose to represent the average temperature of January and February because it is known to be involved in endodormancy release, and the average temperature of March, April and May because it is known to be involved in bud growth during ecodormancy. The climatic gradient corresponds to the nine contrasted climatic conditions used to perform the sensitivity analyses.

Figure 4: Proportion of the variation in model predictions explained by the main individual parameter effect and the total interaction effect for each model under the three most contrasted climatic conditions. The main parameter individual effects is the proportion of variance in the predictions explained by the most influential parameter (T_{50} in most cases). The total interaction effects is the cumulative influence of the second-order interaction effects on models prediction. *a.* "Early conditions" corresponds to climatic conditions at 627 m in 2011, *b.* "standard conditions" to climatic conditions at 1082 m in 1966, and *c.* "late conditions" to climatic conditions at 1603 m in 1975.

389 4 Discussion

390 4.1 Bud break date predictions mainly depend on the forcing response under current 391 climatic conditions

392 The sensitivity analysis of the studied process-based models showed that the mid-response tem-
393 perature of the ecodormancy phase (called here T_{50}) plays a critical role in the prediction of bud
394 break date under current climatic conditions. This result applies whether models account or not
395 for an endodormancy phase or a photoperiodic control of bud development. It therefore suggests
396 that the response to forcing temperature during the ecodormancy (defined by both T_{50} and d_T in
397 the studied phenological models) is a major physiological response driving the variation of bud
398 break dates in temperate plant species in historical and current climatic conditions. This finding
399 is consistent with previous correlative modeling studies showing that bud break date variation
400 was mainly driven by the mean temperature of the two preceding months, which roughly corre-
401 sponds to the ecodormancy phase (*e.g.* Menzel *et al.* 2006). It is also consistent with previous
402 process-based modeling studies showing that models simulating only the ecodormancy phase
403 explained as much variance in bud break dates as models simulating both the endo- and ecodor-
404 mancy phases (Linkosalo *et al.*, 2006; Gauzere *et al.*, 2017). The similar performance of the
405 two types of model suggested either that the fulfillment of chilling requirements had not been
406 a limiting factor so far, or that the endodormancy phase is not accurately modeled (Linkosalo
407 *et al.*, 2006; Chuine *et al.*, 2016). Our results support the first hypothesis, *i.e.* winter chilling
408 temperature have played a minor role in bud break variations so far, which also explains why
409 the response of plant species to climate warming has so far resulted in an advancement of the
410 bud break dates (Menzel *et al.*, 2006). A methodological consequence of this is that phenolog-
411 ical records in natural populations may not allow estimating accurately endodormancy model

412 parameters (Chuine *et al.*, 2016).

413

414 **4.2 Bud break date predictions are increasingly dependent on chilling temperatures and** 415 **photoperiod as climate warms**

416 We found that the effect of the reaction norm to forcing temperature on the prediction of the
417 bud break date decreased with warming spring conditions, while the effect of chilling accu-
418 mulation during the endodormancy phase increased with warming winter temperature for the
419 thermal endo-ecodormancy models UniChill and PGC. This suggests that in warmer environ-
420 mental conditions reaction norms to temperature during both bud endodormancy and ecodor-
421 mancy are critical in determining bud break dates. This result is supported by several recent
422 experimental studies showing that temperature sensitivity of the bud break dates was currently
423 decreasing, likely due to an increasing influence of warming winters on bud endodormancy (Fu
424 *et al.*, 2015a,b; Vitasse *et al.*, 2018b; Asse *et al.*, 2018). In particular, Vitasse *et al.* (2018b)
425 showed that a differential response to chilling temperatures between trees living at low and high
426 elevations may explain the difference in the temporal trends of bud break date advancement
427 observed at different elevations with warming conditions during the last decade. Overall, these
428 results highlight that the influence of chilling temperatures on bud development can no longer
429 be overlooked, and that the correct estimation of the parameters governing the endodormancy
430 phase is required to accurately predict bud break.

431

432 The sensitivity analysis of the photothermal endo-ecodormancy model PGC showed that the
433 influence of the photoperiodic response (through the d_P parameter) on the prediction of the bud
434 break date increased in warmer environmental conditions. A growing number of studies suggest

435 that the phenology of up to 30 % of tree species might be sensitive to photoperiod at various
436 degrees (Laube *et al.*, 2014; Zohner *et al.*, 2016). Understanding how this increasing effect of
437 the photoperiodic cue will affect the variation of bud break dates in future climatic conditions
438 is an issue still debated (Fu *et al.*, 2015b; Gauzere *et al.*, 2017). However, in the most sensitive
439 species, such as beech, it has been suggested that this sensitivity may counteract the negative
440 effect of insufficient chilling during winter (Gauzere *et al.*, 2017). Our results thus highlight
441 that a stronger focus should be given to the modeling of the reaction norm to photoperiod to
442 be able to accurately predict bud break dates of up to 30 % of tree species in future climatic
443 conditions.

444

445 **4.3 Originality and limits of the study**

446 Only a few studies have performed sensitivity analysis of phenology models so far. They ei-
447 ther analyzed the behavior of phenology models, identified the main sources of uncertainties in
448 bud break date predictions, or assessed the consequences of phenological uncertainties on re-
449 lated processes (*e.g.* Morin & Chuine 2005; Migliavacca *et al.* 2012; Zhang *et al.* 2014; Lange
450 *et al.* 2016). A key results from these previous studies is that uncertainty in climate conditions,
451 notably generated by climate scenarios, was a greater source of variation in phenological date
452 projections than uncertainty in phenology models (Migliavacca *et al.*, 2012).

453

454 To our knowledge, this study is the first to have compared the behavior of different phenol-
455 ogy models, with increasing complexity, and to perform this analysis under different weather
456 patterns in winter and spring. The results found here are in line with a recent sensitivity anal-
457 ysis of species-specific phenology models, which found an increasing importance of chilling

requirements and photoperiod in warm climatic conditions for temperate tree species (Lange *et al.*, 2016). The consistency of our results with the sensitivity analysis of other phenology models strengthens the scope of our study, and thus further stress the importance of investigating the behavior of phenology models in contrasted climatic conditions in order to fully embrace their robustness.

While the climate we used to perform the sensitivity analyses covers a small geographical region, it still explores a large range of variation in winter and spring average temperatures ($T_{NovDec} \in [2.07; 8.97]$, $T_{MarAprMay} \in [5.56; 14.52]$). This temperature variation is less important than in other sensitivity analyses (*e.g.* Lange *et al.* 2016), but it is large enough to allow extrapolating the results of this study at larger spatial scales. The aim of the present study was not to investigate the behavior of phenology models under climate change scenarios. Nevertheless, by extrapolating our results on the impact of warming conditions on parameter sensitivity, we can expect the influence of the parameters governing the endodormancy to overall have more influence on bud break date predictions in the future.

Due to the high computational requirement of sensitivity analyses, most studies usually neglect, partially or completely, interaction effects between model parameters as a source of output variation (*e.g.* Lange *et al.* 2016). However, the complexity of process-based phenology models tends to increase as we gain better knowledge about the physiological processes involved in bud development. With increasing model complexity and realism, we can expect interaction effects to have non-negligible influence on the prediction of the models, and thus local sensitivity analysis to partially reveal the effect of parameters on output variance. Our results also suggest that model complexity would result in higher uncertainty in bud break dates because of interaction

482 effects. Moreover, increasing model complexity would generate higher uncertainty in model
483 outputs because of parameter compensation during the statistical adjustment, notably if models
484 are used to perform predictions outside of the range of the climatic conditions used to adjust
485 them (Gauzere *et al.*, 2017).

486

487 Here, we showed that sensitivity analysis of process-based phenology models are relevant
488 to identify key parameters and processes that have the largest effect on phenology (Migliavacca
489 *et al.*, 2012; Lange *et al.*, 2016). However, the choice of the parameter variation range likely
490 affects the results of such analyses. Since for most plant species, the range limits or shape of the
491 distributions of the physiological parameters in natural populations are unknown, such sensitiv-
492 ity analyses rely on assumptions that cannot be tested. Here, we might have overestimated the
493 real contribution of T_{50} and F^* to the variation of the bud break date due to uneven variances in
494 parameter sampling distributions. This effect of parameter variation on the outcome of sensitiv-
495 ity analyses should be more acknowledged. To improve the scope and relevance of sensitivity
496 analyses, more attention should be given to the characterization of the natural variation of the
497 physiological parameters described in process-based models (*e.g.* Burghardt *et al.* 2015).

498

499 **4.4 Implications for the adaptive potential of phenological traits**

500 While the sensitivity analysis of phenology models has direct implications for ecological and
501 climate change studies, we wanted to highlight also here their usefulness for evolutionary stud-
502 ies. The bud break date is among the most genetically differentiated trait across species dis-
503 tribution ranges (De Kort *et al.*, 2013), suggesting that it is strongly involved in the process of
504 local genetic adaptation. Evolutionary response of the bud break date is expected to depend on

505 which parameters present genetic variation and how this variation impacts the bud break date,
506 *i.e.* the expressed trait variation. Sensitivity analysis outputs can be used to address this second
507 issue. For example, our results show that the mid-response temperature of the ecodormancy
508 phase (T_{50}) has the highest impact on the variation of the bud break date in most conditions.
509 We thus suggest that future experimental research consider measuring the genetic variation of
510 this key physiological trait in natural populations and crops to evaluate their adaptive potential.
511 This can be done by monitoring bud break of several genotypes either in varying controlled
512 conditions (*e.g.* Caffarra *et al.* 2011b), or by monitoring growth transcriptor factors in natura
513 or in the field using new transcriptomic technics (*e.g.* Nagano *et al.* 2012), or even better by
514 combining both approaches (*e.g.* Satake *et al.* 2013). Given the increasing importance of the
515 response to chilling temperatures during the endodormancy phase to determine the bud break
516 date in warming conditions, future experimental research might additionally consider measur-
517 ing the genetic variation in chilling requirement and reaction norms to chilling temperature,
518 especially in species requiring large amount of chilling. Finally, future experimental research
519 should consider measuring the genetic variation in the reaction norm to photoperiod in most
520 sensitive species, and notably beech (Goyne *et al.* 1989 for example in crops).

521

522 **5 Conclusions**

523 The identification of the physiological responses underlying the bud break date variation in cur-
524 rent environmental conditions is an important on-going experimental research field (Fu *et al.*,
525 2015a,b; Vitasse *et al.*, 2018b). Assuming that process-based phenology models reflect real
526 physiological responses and processes, the analysis of their behavior under contrasted climatic
527 conditions can provide valuable information about this issue. Our results highlighted the ma-

528 jor influence of the response to forcing temperature on the prediction of the bud break date,
529 but also an increasing importance of the responses to chilling temperature and photoperiod in
530 warming environmental conditions. Changes in the sensitivity of the prediction of phenology
531 models to their parameters with climatic conditions highlights that we need to better take into
532 account the temporal and spatial variation of environmental conditions when analyzing pheno-
533 logical changes (Vitasse *et al.*, 2018b). More generally, we acknowledge here that the sensitivity
534 analysis of process-based models is a useful tool to understand the relative contributions of envi-
535 ronmental cues in driving phenotypic traits variation and their evolutionary potential (Donohue
536 *et al.*, 2015; Burghardt *et al.*, 2015; Lange *et al.*, 2016).

537

538 **Acknowledgements**

539 We thank Claude Bruchou and Guillaume Marie for helpful discussions on the approach and
540 results of this manuscript. We thank also two anonymous reviewers for their constructive com-
541 ments which helped us improving previous versions of this article. This study was founded by
542 the ANR-13-ADAP-0006 project MeCC. The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

543 References

- 544 Asse, D., Chuine, I., Vitasse, Y., Yoccoz, N.G., Delpierre, N., Badeau, V., Delestrade, A. &
 545 Randin, C.F. (2018) Warmer winters reduce the advance of tree spring phenology induced by
 546 warmer springs in the Alps. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, **252**, 220–230.
- 547 Augusiak, J., Van den Brink, P.J. & Grimm, V. (2014) Merging validation and evaluation of
 548 ecological models to ‘evaluation’: A review of terminology and a practical approach. *Eco-*
 549 *logical Modelling*, **280**, 117–128.
- 550 Burghardt, L.T., Metcalf, C.J.E., Wilczek, A.M., Schmitt, J. & Donohue, K. (2015) Modeling
 551 the Influence of Genetic and Environmental Variation on the Expression of Plant Life Cycles
 552 across Landscapes. *American Naturalist*, **185**, 212–227.
- 553 Caffarra, A. & Donnelly, A. (2011) The ecological significance of phenology in four different
 554 tree species: effects of light and temperature on bud burst. *International Journal of Biomete-*
 555 *orology*, **55**, 711–721.
- 556 Caffarra, A., Donnelly, A. & Chuine, I. (2011a) Modelling the timing of *Betula pubescens*
 557 budburst. II. Integrating complex effects of photoperiod into process-based models. *Climate*
 558 *Research*, **46**, 159–170.
- 559 Caffarra, A., Donnelly, A., Chuine, I. & Jones, M.B. (2011b) Modelling the timing of *Betula*
 560 *pubescens* budburst. I. Temperature and photoperiod: a conceptual model. *Climate Research*,
 561 **46**, 147–157.
- 562 Cariboni, J., Gatelli, D., Liska, R. & Saltelli, A. (2007) The role of sensitivity analysis in eco-
 563 logical modelling. *Ecological Modelling*, **203**, 167–182. 4th Conference of the International-
 564 Society-for-Ecological-Informatics, Busan, SOUTH KOREA, OCT 24-28, 2004.
- 565 Chuine, I. (2000) A unified model for budburst of trees. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, **207**,
 566 337–347.
- 567 Chuine, I., Bonhomme, M., Legave, J.M., Garcia de Cortazar, A., Charrier, G., Lacointe, A. &
 568 Améglio, T. (2016) Can phenological models predict tree phenology accurately in the future?
 569 the unrevealed hurdle of endodormancy break. *Global Change Biology*, **22**, 3444–3460.
- 570 Chuine, I. (2010) Why does phenology drive species distribution? *Philosophical Transactions*
 571 *of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*, **365**, 3149–3160.
- 572 Chuine, I. & Regniere, J. (2017) Process-Based Models of Phenology for Plants and Animals.
 573 Futuyma, DJ, ed., *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, volume 48 of
 574 *Annual Review of Ecology Evolution and Systematics*, pp. 159–182.
- 575 Cleland, E.E., Chuine, I., Menzel, A., Mooney, H.A. & Schwartz, M.D. (2007) Shifting plant
 576 phenology in response to global change. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **22**, 357–365.
- 577 Cooke, J. & Weih, M. (2005) Nitrogen storage and seasonal nitrogen cycling in *Populus*: bridg-
 578 ing molecular physiology and ecophysiology. *New Phytologist*, **167**, 19–30.

579 Courbaud, B., Lafond, V., Lagarrigues, G., Vieilledent, G., Cordonnier, T., Jabot, F. & de Col-
580 igny, F. (2015) Applying ecological model evaluation: Lessons learned with the forest dy-
581 namics model Samsara2. *Ecological Modelling*, **314**, 1–14.

582 Coutts, S.R. & Yokomizo, H. (2014) Meta-models as a straightforward approach to the sensi-
583 tivity analysis of complex models. *Population Ecology*, **56**, 7–19.

584 De Kort, H., Vandepitte, K. & Honnay, O. (2013) A meta-analysis of the effects of plant traits
585 and geographical scale on the magnitude of adaptive differentiation as measured by the dif-
586 ference between Q(ST) and F-ST. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **27**, 1081–1097.

587 Delpierre, N., Dufrene, E., Soudani, K., Ulrich, E., Cecchini, S., Boe, J. & Francois, C. (2009)
588 Modelling interannual and spatial variability of leaf senescence for three deciduous tree
589 species in France. *Agricultural And Forest Meteorology*, **149**, 938–948.

590 Donohue, K., Burghardt, L.T., Runcie, D., Bradford, K.J. & Schmitt, J. (2015) Applying de-
591 velopmental threshold models to evolutionary ecology. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **30**,
592 66–77.

593 Fu, Y.H., Piao, S., Vitasse, Y., Zhao, H., De Boeck, H.J., Liu, Q., Yang, H., Weber, U., Han-
594 ninen, H. & Janssens, I.A. (2015a) Increased heat requirement for leaf flushing in temper-
595 ate woody species over 1980–2012: effects of chilling, precipitation and insolation. *Global*
596 *Change Biology*, **21**, 2687–2697.

597 Fu, Y.H., Zhao, H., Piao, S., Peaucelle, M., Peng, S., Zhou, G., Ciais, P., Huang, M., Menzel,
598 A., Uelas, J.P., Song, Y., Vitasse, Y., Zeng, Z. & Janssens, I.A. (2015b) Declining global
599 warming effects on the phenology of spring leaf unfolding. *Nature*, **526**, 104+.

600 Gauzere, J., Delzon, S., Davi, H., Bonhomme, M., Garcia de Cortazar, A. & Chuine, I. (2017)
601 Integrating interactive effects of chilling and photoperiod in phenological process-based mod-
602 els. a case study with two european tree species: *Fagus sylvatica* and *quercus petraea*. *Agri-*
603 *cultural and Forest Meteorology*, **244**, 9–20.

604 Goyne, P., Schneider, A., Cleary, K., Creelman, R., Stegmeier, W. & Wooding, F. (1989) Sun-
605 flower genotype response to photoperiod and temperature in field environments. *Agronomy*
606 *Journal*, **81**, 826–831.

607 Hanninen, H., Hakkinen, R., Hari, P. & Koski, V. (1990) Timing of growth cessation in relation
608 to climatic adaptation of northern woody-plants. *Tree Physiology*, **6**, 29–39.

609 Hogg, E., Price, D. & Black, T. (2000) Postulated feedbacks of deciduous forest phenology on
610 seasonal climate patterns in the western Canadian interior. *Journal of Climate*, **13**, 4229–
611 4243.

612 Huber, N., Bugmann, H. & Lafond, V. (2018) Global sensitivity analysis of a dynamic vegeta-
613 tion model: Model sensitivity depends on successional time, climate and competitive inter-
614 actions. *Ecological Modelling*, **368**, 377–390.

615 Lange, M., Schaber, J., Marxn A. abd Jäckel, G., Badeck, F., Seppelt, R. & Doktor, D. (2016)
616 Simulation of forest tree species bud burst dates for different climate scenarios: chilling
617 requirements and photo-period may limit bud burst advancement. *International Journal of*
618 *Biometeorology*, DOI: 10.1007/s00484-016-1161-8.

- 619 Laube, J., Sparks, T.H., Estrella, N., Hoefler, J., Ankerst, D.P. & Menzel, A. (2014) Chilling
620 outweighs photoperiod in preventing precocious spring development. *Global Change Biol-*
621 *ogy*, **20**, 170–182.
- 622 Linkosalo, T., Hakkinen, R. & Hanninen, H. (2006) Models of the spring phenology of boreal
623 and temperate trees: is there something missing? *Tree Physiology*, **26**, 1165–1172.
- 624 Menzel, A., Sparks, T.H., Estrella, N., Koch, E., Aasa, A., Ahas, R., Alm-Kuebler, K., Bissolli,
625 P., Braslavska, O., Briede, A., Chmielewski, F.M., Crepinsek, Z., Curnel, Y., Dahl, A., Defila,
626 C., Donnelly, A., Filella, Y., Jactza, K., Mage, F., Mestre, A., Nordli, O., Penuelas, J., Pirinen,
627 P., Remisova, V., Scheifinger, H., Striz, M., Susnik, A., Van Vliet, A.J.H., Wielgolaski, F.E.,
628 Zach, S. & Zust, A. (2006) European phenological response to climate change matches the
629 warming pattern. *Global Change Biology*, **12**, 1969–1976.
- 630 Migliavacca, M., Sonnentag, O., Keenan, T.F., Cescatii, A., Keefe, J.O. & Richardson, A.D.
631 (2012) On the uncertainty of phenological responses to climate change, and implications for
632 a terrestrial biosphere model. *Biogeosciences*, **9**, 2063–2083.
- 633 Morin, X. & Chuine, I. (2005) Sensitivity analysis of the tree distribution model PHENOFIT
634 to climatic input characteristics: implications for climate impact assessment. *Global Change*
635 *Biology*, **11**, 1493–1503.
- 636 Nagano, A.J., Sato, Y., Mihara, M., Antonio, B.A., Motoyama, R., Itoh, H., Nagamura, Y. &
637 Izawa, T. (2012) Deciphering and Prediction of Transcriptome Dynamics under Fluctuating
638 Field Conditions. *Cell*, **151**, 1358–1369.
- 639 Nissanka, S.P., Karunaratne, A.S., Perera, R., Weerakoon, W.M.W., Thorburn, P.J. & Wallach,
640 D. (2015) Calibration of the phenology sub-model of APSIM-Oryza: Going beyond goodness
641 of fit. *Environmental Modelling & Software*, **70**, 128–137.
- 642 Polgar, C.A. & Primack, R.B. (2011) Leaf-out phenology of temperate woody plants: from
643 trees to ecosystems. *New Phytologist*, **191**, 926–941.
- 644 Quintana-Segui, P., Le Moigne, P., Durand, Y., Martin, E., Habets, F., Baillon, M., Canellas, C.,
645 Franchisteguy, L. & Morel, S. (2008) Analysis of near-surface atmospheric variables: Valid-
646 ation of the SAFRAN analysis over France. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*,
647 **47**, 92–107.
- 648 Rathcke, B. & Lacey, E. (1985) Phenological patterns of terrestrial plants. *Annual Review of*
649 *Ecology and Systematics*, **16**, 179–214.
- 650 Richardson, A.D., Anderson, R.S., Arain, M.A., Barr, A.G., Bohrer, G., Chen, G., Chen, J.M.,
651 Ciais, P., Davis, K.J., Desai, A.R., Dietze, M.C., Dragoni, D., Garrity, S.R., Gough, C.M.,
652 Grant, R., Hollinger, D.Y., Margolis, H.A., McCaughey, H., Migliavacca, M., Monson, R.K.,
653 Munger, J.W., Poulter, B., Raczka, B.M., Ricciuto, D.M., Sahoo, A.K., Schaefer, K., Tian, H.,
654 Vargas, R., Verbeeck, H., Xiao, J. & Xue, Y. (2012) Terrestrial biosphere models need better
655 representation of vegetation phenology: results from the North American Carbon Program
656 Site Synthesis. *Global Change Biology*, **18**, 566–584.
- 657 Richardson, A.D., Keenan, T.F., Migliavacca, M., Ryu, Y., Sonnentag, O. & Toomey, M. (2013)
658 Climate change, phenology, and phenological control of vegetation feedbacks to the climate
659 system. *Agricultural And Forest Meteorology*, **169**, 156–173.

660 Saltelli, A., Tarantola, S. & Campolongo, F. (2000) Sensitivity analysis as an ingredient of
661 modeling. *Statistical Science*, **15**, 377–395.

662 Satake, A., Kawagoe, T., Saburi, Y., Chiba, Y., Sakurai, G. & Kudoh, H. (2013) Forecast-
663 ing flowering phenology under climate warming by modelling the regulatory dynamics of
664 flowering-time genes. *Nature Communications*, **4**.

665 Sobol, I. (1993) Sensitivity estimates for nonlinear mathematical models. *MMCE*, **1**, 407–414.

666 Vitasse, Y., Porte, A.J., Kremer, A., Michalet, R. & Delzon, S. (2009) Responses of canopy du-
667 ration to temperature changes in four temperate tree species: relative contributions of spring
668 and autumn leaf phenology. *Oecologia*, **161**, 187–198.

669 Vitasse, Y., Schneider, L., Rixen, C., Christen, D. & Rebetez, M. (2018a) Increase in the risk of
670 exposure of forest and fruit trees to spring frosts at higher elevations in Switzerland over the
671 last four decades. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, **248**, 60–69.

672 Vitasse, Y., Signarbieux, C. & Fu, Y.H. (2018b) Global warming leads to more uniform spring
673 phenology across elevations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science of the United*
674 *States of America*, **115**, 1004–1008.

675 Way, D.A. & Montgomery, R.A. (2015) Photoperiod constraints on tree phenology, perfor-
676 mance and migration in a warming world. *Plant Cell and Environment*, **38**, 1725–1736.

677 Wilson, K. & Baldocchi, D. (2000) Seasonal and interannual variability of energy fluxes over
678 a broadleaved temperate deciduous forest in North America. *Agricultural and Forest Meteo-*
679 *rology*, **100**, 1–18.

680 Yin, X., Struik, P., Tang, J., Qi, C. & Liu, T. (2005) Model analysis of flowering phenology in
681 recombinant inbred lines of barley. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, **56**, 959–965.

682 Zhang, S., Tao, F. & Shi, R. (2014) Modeling the rice phenology and production in China
683 with SIMRIW: sensitivity analysis and parameter estimation. *Frontiers of Earth Science*, **8**,
684 505–511.

685 Zohner, C.M., Benito, B.M., Svenning, J.C. & Renner, S.S. (2016) Day length unlikely to
686 constrain climate-driven shifts in leaf-out times of northern woody plants. *Nature Climate*
687 *Change*, **6**, 1120+.

688 Appendix A

689 Coefficients of the equation used to reconstruct maximum and minimum temperatures at the
 690 three study sites. β_T and α_T are the intercept and the slope of the linear relationship linking the
 691 recorded HOBO temperatures at the study site and the SAFRAN climatic data (from 2006 to
 692 2012).

693

Elevation (m)	β_{Tmax}	α_{Tmax}	β_{Tmin}	α_{Tmin}
627	0.96	1.17	1.07	0.96
1082	3.98	0.93	1.74	0.99
1630	2.95	1.04	0.81	0.97

694 **Appendix B**

695 Yearly mean temperatures for the months (1) November-December ("meanND"), (2) January-February
696 ("meanJF") and (3) March-April-May ("meanMAM") relatively to their historic mean (period 1960-
697 2012) for the three studied sites at low (627 m), intermediate (1082 m) and high (1630 m) elevations
698 in the Pyrenees valley. Year 1966 was considered as an "average" climatic year, year 1975 as a "late"
climatic year and year 2011 as an "early" climatic year for the global sensitivity analysis.

699 **Appendix C**

700 RMSE (days) and AIC of the three models for the three species calculated with all available bud break
 701 date data for each species. Number of data for each species were 142 for *Fagus sylvatica*, 145 for *Quer-*
 702 *cus petraea* and 95 for *Abies alba*.

703

	<i>Fagus</i>		<i>Quercus</i>		<i>Abies</i>	
	RMSE	AIC	RMSE	AIC	RMSE	AIC
UniForc	6.29	530.4	7.03	690.4	10.00	445.5
UniChill	6.72	553.0	6.98	692.2	9.07	430.9
PGC	5.85	519.6	6.76	686.8	9.45	444.8

704 **Appendix D**

705 Variation in the bud break dates predicted by the best model calibrated and validated for *F. sylvatica*
706 (PGC) , *Q. petraea* (UniChill) and *A. alba* (UniChill). The best model for each species was chosen based
707 on its statistical performance (RMSE) and the biological realism of its adjusted parameters (for more
708 details see Gauzere *et al.* 2017). These projections were made using the climate corresponding to the 3
709 focus years and along the studied elevation gradient of the Pyrenees. As expected, the climatic conditions
710 in year 1975 generated on average late bud break dates, the conditions in year 2011 generated on average
711 early bud break dates, and the conditions in year 1966 generated intermediate bud break dates.

712 Appendix E

713 Sampling distributions of the parameters of the three models used to perform the global sensitivity analy-
714 sis. For all parameters, except slope parameters, values were drawn in uniform distribution $\mathcal{U}$. For slope
715 parameters d , values were drawn in beta distribution $\mathcal{B}_{\{\alpha=20;\beta=1.3\}}$. On the graphic, the grey rectangles
716 represent the range of parameter values explored by our simulations for the three studied models. The
717 red symbols represent the parameters adjusted for *Fagus sylvatica* (dots), *Quercus petraea* (triangles)
718 and *Abies alba* (stars) using bud break date observations in the Pyrenees. Most of the parameters values
719 adjusted for the species were found in the range of variation explored by the sensitivity analysis. A no-
720 table exception is for the critical amount of forcing and chilling rates, F^* and C^* (or C_{50}) respectively.
721 For F^* , many experiments in controlled environmental conditions have shown that the amount of days
722 to reach bud break under optimal conditions was rarely over 30 days. But, in most cases, the adjust-
723 ment of F^* is not constrained, which can lead to the adjustment of a parameter value with low biological
724 realism. For C^* (and C_{50}), the range of values explored by our simulations is lower than the adjusted
725 range of C^* values because of methodological constraints. Indeed, sampling C^* values over 60 generated
726 non-positioned bud break dates in warm conditions. So, we had to restrain the range of parameter values
727 explored by the sensitivity analysis.

728 Appendix F

729 Total effect (eq. 12) of each parameter on the prediction of three studied models for the nine contrasted
 730 climatic conditions. This coefficient reflects the contribution of each parameter to the prediction of the
 731 bud break date, including all variances caused by its interactions with other parameters.

732

Elevation	Year	Method	e	t0	Tb	Pr	dP	Fcrit	Ccrit
627	1966	UniForc	0.275	0.601	-	-	-	0.197	-
627	1966	UniChill	0.433	0.101	0.104	-	-	0.236	0.259
627	1966	PGC	0.332	0.211	0.027	0.062	0.161	0.381	0.076
627	1975	UniForc	0.337	0.573	-	-	-	0.177	-
627	1975	UniChill	0.344	0.126	0.249	-	-	0.157	0.250
627	1975	PGC	0.376	0.183	0.092	0.057	0.133	0.300	0.097
627	2011	UniForc	0.253	0.637	-	-	-	0.200	-
627	2011	UniChill	0.450	0.096	0.072	-	-	0.270	0.243
627	2011	PGC	0.281	0.260	0.022	0.063	0.192	0.410	0.072
1082	1966	UniForc	0.427	0.442	-	-	-	0.192	-
1082	1966	UniChill	0.576	0.103	0.045	-	-	0.200	0.137
1082	1966	PGC	0.478	0.179	0.021	0.044	0.083	0.314	0.059
1082	1975	UniForc	0.463	0.429	-	-	-	0.175	-
1082	1975	UniChill	0.583	0.129	0.049	-	-	0.175	0.118
1082	1975	PGC	0.541	0.157	0.020	0.045	0.058	0.264	0.053
1082	2011	UniForc	0.367	0.512	-	-	-	0.205	-
1082	2011	UniChill	0.513	0.116	0.053	-	-	0.230	0.191
1082	2011	PGC	0.386	0.235	0.021	0.050	0.124	0.367	0.074
1630	1966	UniForc	0.588	0.222	-	-	-	0.192	-
1630	1966	UniChill	0.628	0.101	0.010	-	-	0.168	0.069
1630	1966	PGC	0.587	0.134	0.006	0.025	0.037	0.242	0.038
1630	1975	UniForc	0.567	0.256	-	-	-	0.168	-
1630	1975	UniChill	0.662	0.089	0.002	-	-	0.150	0.045
1630	1975	PGC	0.622	0.108	0.001	0.031	0.028	0.218	0.025
1630	2011	UniForc	0.526	0.276	-	-	-	0.211	-
1630	2011	UniChill	0.547	0.142	0.028	-	-	0.192	0.123
1630	2011	PGC	0.495	0.200	0.016	0.031	0.056	0.294	0.063

733 **Appendix G**

734 Variation in the total effect (i.e. first and second-order effects) of all parameters on the prediction of
735 the three studied models according to the climatic conditions. Only the parameter's total effect on the
736 prediction is represented. The climate was here described by the average temperature in January and
737 February (known to be important to release dormancy), and average temperature in March, April and
738 May (important during the ecodormancy). The climatic gradient is thus described by the 9 contrasted
739 climates we used to perform the sensitivity analyses.

740 **Appendix H**

741 Main and total effects of the parameters on the prediction of the models for the nine contrasted climatic
742 conditions. From left to right and top to down are ranked the earlier to the later climatic years, with 2011
743 the early climatic year, 1966 the average climatic year and 1975 the late climatic year.

UniChill model

PGC model

744 **Appendix I**

745 Second-order effects on the prediction of the models for the three elevation sites the average climatic
746 year 1966. These second-order effects quantify the impact of pairwise interactions between parameters
747 on model's output.
748

UniChill model

[illegible]