

High Arctic plant phenology is determined by snowmelt patterns but duration of phenological periods is fixed: an example of periodicity

This content has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text.

2016 Environ. Res. Lett. 11 125006

(<http://iopscience.iop.org/1748-9326/11/12/125006>)

View [the table of contents for this issue](#), or go to the [journal homepage](#) for more

Download details:

IP Address: 210.77.64.106

This content was downloaded on 11/04/2017 at 06:15

Please note that [terms and conditions apply](#).

You may also be interested in:

[High Arctic flowering phenology and plant-pollinator interactions in response to delayed snow melt and simulated warming](#)

Mark A K Gillespie, Nanna Baggesen and Elisabeth J Cooper

[Deepened winter snow increases stem growth and alters stem 13C and 15N in evergreen dwarf shrub Cassiope tetragona in high-arctic Svalbard tundra](#)

Daan Blok, Stef Weijers, Jeffrey M Welker et al.

[Short-term herbivory has long-term consequences in warmed and ambient high Arctic tundra](#)

Chelsea J Little, Helen Cutting, Juha Alatalo et al.

[Long-term increases in snow pack elevate leaf N and photosynthesis in Salix arctica: responses to a snow fence experiment in the High Arctic of NW Greenland](#)

A Joshua Leffler and Jeffery M Welker

[Snow season variability in a boreal-Arctic transition area monitored by MODIS data](#)

Eirik Malnes, Stein Rune Karlsen, Bernt Johansen et al.

[Reindeer grazing increases summer albedo by reducing shrub abundance in Arctic tundra](#)

Mariska te Beest, Judith Sitters, Cécile B Ménard et al.

[Water track distribution and effects on carbon dioxide flux in an eastern Siberian upland tundra landscape](#)

Salvatore R Curasi, Michael M Loranty and Susan M Natali

[More frequent burning increases vulnerability of Alaskan boreal black spruce forests](#)

Elizabeth E Hoy, Merritt R Turetsky and Eric S Kasischke

Environmental Research Letters



LETTER

High Arctic plant phenology is determined by snowmelt patterns but duration of phenological periods is fixed: an example of periodicity

OPEN ACCESS

RECEIVED
1 June 2016REVISED
13 October 2016ACCEPTED FOR PUBLICATION
14 October 2016PUBLISHED
29 November 2016

Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 licence](#).

Any further distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s) and the title of the work, journal citation and DOI.

Philipp R Semenchuk^{1,5}, Mark A K Gillespie^{1,2}, Sabine B Rumpf³, Nanna Baggesen¹, Bo Elberling⁴ and Elisabeth J Cooper¹¹ Institute for Arctic and Marine Biology, Faculty for Biosciences, Fisheries and Economics, UiT—The Arctic University of Norway, NO-9037 Tromsø, Norway² Department of Engineering & Natural Sciences, Sogn & Fjordane University College, University College, PO Box 133, NO-6851 Sogndal, Norway³ Department of Botany & Biodiversity Research, University of Vienna, Rennweg 14, A-1030 Wien, Austria⁴ Center for Permafrost (CENPERM), Department of Geosciences and Natural Resource Management, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark⁵ Author to whom any correspondence should be addressed.E-mail: philipp.semenchuk@tutaimail.com**Keywords:** Spitsbergen, Svalbard, phenology, phenophase, phenoperiod, growing-season length, floweringSupplementary material for this article is available [online](#)**Abstract**

The duration of specific periods within a plant's life cycle are critical for plant growth and performance. In the High Arctic, the start of many of these phenological periods is determined by snowmelt date, which may change in a changing climate. It has been suggested that the end of these periods during late-season are triggered by external cues, such as day length, light quality or temperature, leading to the hypothesis that earlier or later snowmelt dates will lengthen or shorten the duration of these periods, respectively, and thereby affect plant performance. We tested whether snowmelt date controls phenology and phenological period duration in High Arctic Svalbard using a melt timing gradient from natural and experimentally altered snow depths. We investigated the response of early- and late-season phenophases from both vegetative and reproductive phenological periods of eight common species. We found that all phenophases follow snowmelt patterns, irrespective of timing of occurrence, vegetative or reproductive nature. Three of four phenological period durations based on these phenophases were fixed for most species, defining the studied species as periodic. Periodicity can thus be considered an evolutionary trait leading to disadvantages compared with aperiodic species and we conclude that the mesic and heath vegetation types in Svalbard are at risk of being outcompeted by invading, aperiodic species from milder biomes.

Introduction

Phenological timing of key life-cycle events (phenophases) in relation to climatic constraints is crucial for individual plant growth and performance. Recent climate change has led to considerable temporal shifts of both the start and end of the growing-season and has been accompanied by phenological responses across tundra and other ecosystems (Parmesan and Yohe 2003, Menzel *et al* 2006, Oberbauer *et al* 2013). Climate change is especially pronounced in high-latitude areas (IPCC 2013), and its effects on phenology may have severe consequences for Arctic tundra

ecosystems, because at the limits of terrestrial plant life, small changes in growing-season length constitute a large proportion of the extremely short season. Here, snowmelt determines growing-season start (Wipf and Rixen 2010, Cooper *et al* 2011), and observed shifts towards both earlier (Bulygina *et al* 2009, Brown *et al* 2010, Wang *et al* 2015, Boike *et al* 2016) and later snowmelt dates (Bhatt *et al* 2013, Bieniek *et al* 2015, Bjorkman *et al* 2015) represent key challenges for Arctic plant communities (Cooper 2014). In this study, we investigate the influence of snowmelt date on the phenology of eight common high-Arctic plant species.

Table 1. Average snow melt timing in mean day of year across all snow regimes and years. Where missing, data were not collected for this study.

| Snow regime | Year | | | | | | Average |
|----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---------|
| | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2015 | |
| <i>Shallow</i> | | | 132 | 149 | 150 | | 144 |
| <i>Ambient</i> | 159 | 154 | 142 | 155 | 158 | 152 | 153 |
| <i>Medium</i> | | | 162 | 163 | 169 | 156 | 163 |
| <i>Deep</i> | 175 | 170 | 167 | 166 | 172 | 165 | 169 |
| Average | 167 | 162 | 151 | 158 | 162 | 158 | |

Previous studies on the effects of snowmelt date have paid most attention to the timing of phenophase occurrence, often with a focus on early-season events (Arft *et al* 1999, Wipf 2010, Wipf and Rixen 2010, Bjorkman *et al* 2015, Livensperger *et al* 2016), while studies on durations of phenological periods (hereafter called ‘phenoperiods’) are rare and mainly focus on plant growth (Rumpf *et al* 2014, Livensperger *et al* 2016). However, the duration of specific phenoperiods are of particular importance for high-Arctic plant performance. For instance, the duration of the active growing period from green-up to senescence can determine the amount of flowers produced during the following season (Inouye *et al* 2002, Saavedra *et al* 2003, Høye *et al* 2007, Semenchuk *et al* 2013), and the seed maturation period from flower senescence to seed dispersal can determine propagule viability (Cooper *et al* 2011, Mallik *et al* 2011). In general, early-season phenophases, such as green-up or flower emergence, have been shown to closely follow snowmelt dates (Arft *et al* 1999, Wipf 2010, Wipf and Rixen 2010, Livensperger *et al* 2016), while late-season phases seem to be triggered by environmental thresholds of factors such as day length, light quality, temperature, and soil moisture (McGraw *et al* 1983, Arft *et al* 1999, Marchand *et al* 2004, Tsegay *et al* 2005, Fracheboud *et al* 2009). In Arctic ecosystems this means that the duration of many phenoperiods may be constrained by the timing of snowmelt, and shifts towards earlier or later snowmelt could elongate or shorten some of them.

To date, many plant phenology studies in the Arctic have concentrated on a few or single species and have often either assumed or found that species sharing common traits, such as growth form or relative time of flower emergence, react similarly to snowmelt date (Starr *et al* 2000, Inouye *et al* 2002, Saavedra *et al* 2003, Høye *et al* 2007, Wipf 2010, Bjorkman *et al* 2015, Rosa *et al* 2015). However, this assumption is often based on limited data where, for example, growth forms are often represented by only two species. Further, meta-analyses have shown that this connection does not necessarily hold when taking a greater number of species into account (Menzel *et al* 2006, Oberbauer *et al* 2013, but see Wipf and Rixen 2010). This indicates that the phenology response to snowmelt date may be species-specific

depending on the phenophase and species’ niche within a given ecosystem.

Here, we test how the duration of two vegetative and two reproductive phenoperiods of eight common plant species respond to a variety of snow regimes by recording six early and late-season phenophases in a long-term snow fence experiment in High Arctic Svalbard. We present the most complete multi-year and multi-species whole growing-season cycle phenological data we are aware of, and test the following hypotheses:

- (1) Phenoperiod durations are shorter in late-melting than in early-melting snow regimes, because:
 - a. Late-melting snow regimes delay the onset of early-season phenophases, such as green-up and flower emergence, and
 - b. Late-season phenophases, such as senescence and seed dispersal, occur simultaneously independent of snow regime.
- (4) A shortened seed maturation period will lead to decreased seed viability.
- (5) Species’ responses will be species-specific, i.e. response patterns cannot be assigned to traits or growth forms.
- (6) Inter-annual differences in snowmelt timing elicit similar responses to our snow regimes (early melting years are equivalent to early melting snow regimes and vice versa).

Methods

Study site and experimental setup

Detailed site and experimental design descriptions can be found in Cooper *et al* (2011) and Morgner *et al* (2010). A short summary is given below.

To study the effects of snow regime on plant phenology and seed viability, we used a snow depth manipulation experiment with snow fences in a mesic meadow and dry heath low-land tundra in Adventdalen on the island of Spitsbergen, Svalbard. Situated in the maritime High Arctic, the average ambient growing-season lasts from early June to mid-September.

For this study, we used two natural and two manipulated snow regimes, together forming a snow depth and corresponding snowmelt timing gradient (see table 1) from *Shallow* (slightly elevated landscape features with snow depth of about 10 cm, melts out on average 24 May) through *Ambient* (most common snow depth over the study site, about 30 cm deep, melts out on average 2 June) and *Medium* (manipulated snow depth with snow fences, about 1 m deep, melts out on average 12 June) to *Deep* (snow fences, about 1.5 m deep, melts out on average 19 June). The increased snow depth in *Medium* and *Deep* was manipulated with 1.5 m high and 6 m long fences which collect snow drifts on their lee side. *Deep* is situated in the deepest point of the snow drift, while *Medium* is situated a few meters further away from the fences. Inter-annual snowmelt date variability is considerable, see Semenchuk *et al* (2013) for more details.

Four blocks were selected within 2 km² to represent the variation in soil moisture in the landscape. Each block contains three plots within a few 100 meters in a design where all four snow regimes are present in each plot. Sub-plots used for phenology observations (75 cm × 75 cm) consisted of *Ambient* and *Deep* plots ($n = 6$ per plot and snow regime), *Medium* plots ($n = 3$), and *Shallow* plots ($n = 2$), summing up to a total of 181 sub-plots.

Data

Phenology data used for this article were collected from 2007 to 2012 and in 2015 in *Ambient* and *Deep*, while *Shallow* and *Medium* were observed from 2010 to 2012 only. Additionally, *Medium* was also observed in 2015.

Phenology in each plot was surveyed every 7 days (once a week) for the 8 most common species of the study site representing important circum-Arctic species (*Alopecurus magellanicus*, *Bistorta vivipara*, *Cassiope tetragona*, *Dryas octopetala*, *Luzula arcuata*, *Pedicularis hirsuta*, *Salix polaris*, *Stellaria crassipes*), except in 2015 when it was observed twice a week. A description of the 6 recorded phenophases can be found in table 2.

To answer our hypothesis on phenoperiod duration, two phenophases were always summarized to one period defined as the duration from the start to the end of two consecutive phases (in number of days), resulting in the four periods *Startup* (from snowmelt to green-up), *Active* (green-up to senescence), *Flowering* (flower emergence to flower senescence) and *Seed-ripening* (flower senescence to seed dispersal) (table 1).

To connect phenophase occurrence with temperature, thawing degree day (TDD) thresholds to reach each phenophase were calculated from air temperature data from Longyearbyen airport, about 12 km from the study site in the same valley (Norwegian meteorological institute, www.eklima.no). Thawing

Table 2. Overview of phenophases and phenological periods (phenoperiods) used in this study. Phenoperiods are defined as periods between two distinct phenophases.

| Periods | Phenophase | |
|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <i>Startup</i> | <i>Snow melt</i> | Start of exposure to direct daylight |
| | <i>Green-up</i> | Start of photosynthetic period |
| <i>Active</i> | <i>Senescence</i> | End of photosynthetic period |
| | <i>Flower emergence</i> | First flower visible |
| <i>Flowering</i> | <i>Flower senescence</i> | First flower senescences |
| | <i>Seed dispersal</i> | Seeds disperse |


degree day was defined as the sum of average temperature of each day from snowmelt until occurrence of a phenophase and is a good measure to characterize a period's temperature, because it incorporates the daily temperature fluctuations.

To test viability of propagules, seeds and bulbils were collected upon ripeness, i.e. as soon as they reached the seed dispersal phase, in 2008–2011 in close proximity to the phenology sub-plots. 150 propagules of all but two species (*Stellaria crassipes* and *Pedicularis hirsuta* which were not abundant enough to harvest enough seeds) were germinated in three batches with 50 seeds each on moist filter paper under a 24 h light regime at 18 °C for 12 weeks. For more details see Cooper *et al* (2011).

Statistical analyses

We used linear mixed-effects models (LMEs) for all phenology related data (i.e. day of year of occurrence, duration of periods, and TDD demands) and generalized LMEs with a binomial link for the germination data (i.e. proportions of germinated propagules), both from the lme4 package (Bates *et al* 2015) in R (R Core Team 2016). All models were fitted with random effects reflecting the spatial arrangement of sub-plots nested in plots nested in blocks.

To tackle the complexity of our data, we divided the statistical analyses into three separate parts where basically the combination of fixed and random effects in the models vary, with response variable being either phenophase timing (start and end of each phenoperiod), phenoperiod duration or propagule viability. The combination of fixed effects were (a) 'snow regime' alone, (b) 'species' by 'snow regime' interaction, and (c) 'year' by 'snow regime' interaction. In all cases, the omitted fixed effects terms were included in the random effects. To simplify the dataset, the 'species' by 'snow regime' interaction was analyzed on data from *Ambient* and *Deep* only. The 'year' by 'snow



regime' interaction was repeated once with data from *Ambient* and *Deep* only, and once with all four snow regimes including years 2010–2012 only.

After fitting, the distribution of each model's residuals in each model parameter was observed visually and no deviation from normality was detected. None of the generalized LMEs were over-dispersed (using RVAideMemoire package (Hervé 2016)).

95% Confidence intervals (CIs) of each models' fixed effects factors and p -values for pairwise comparisons of all contrast combinations adjusted with the Tukey method were calculated with the multcomp (Hothorn *et al* 2008) and lsmeans (Lenth 2016) packages and presented in graphs as letters denoting significant differences ($p \leq 0.05$). For a better overview of the phenology models with the 'species' by 'snow regime' interaction in the fixed effects, effect sizes and 95% CIs of each contrast were calculated and each species' snow regime contrast presented in figures, to be interpreted as the difference between *Ambient* and *Deep* snow regimes, and a lack of overlap with zero considered as statistically significant.

Results

Overall snow regime effects

Across all species and years, both the start and end of each phenoperiod were affected by snow regime, with deeper snow regimes leading to significantly later occurrences of all phenophases (figures 1 and 2). Phenophase occurrences in *Deep* were delayed between 11 and 25 days compared to *Shallow* regardless of the start or the end of any phase. Such a marked

delay is well captured by the temporal resolution of our field observations of 7 days.


Period durations followed the snow regime pattern closely for the *Startup* period only (shorter duration with deeper snow), while durations of the other periods showed only minor effects (figure 2). The difference between *Shallow* and *Deep* duration was 5 days in one comparison (*Active* period) but otherwise never larger than 2 days, except for the *Startup* duration where it was 9 days.

Thawing degree days to reach the start of each period were generally higher in deeper snow regimes, especially for the *Active* period (figure 2), although the maximum difference between *Shallow* and *Deep* was never more than 36 TDDs. To reach the end of the *Active* and *Seedripening* periods (i.e. late-season phenophases), TDDs did not differ across snow regimes, except for a small effect of less than 16 TDDs in *Shallow* during the *Active* period, and less than 33 TDDs in *Deep* during the *Seedripening* period. Deeper snow regimes needed 30 more TDDs to reach the end of *Flowering*.

Propagule viability followed snow regime patterns, with significantly lower viability in deeper snow regimes. Since data of all species were averaged, the effect, however, was small and not significant across all snow regimes (see supporting material figure S3).

Snow regime effects on individual species

The effects of the *Deep* compared to the *Ambient* snow regime on the start and end of most phenoperiods were in the same direction across species (earlier in *Ambient*), the only exception being the end of the *Seedripening* period where *Stellaria* and *Cassiope*



showed no significant difference between snow regimes. The *Startup* period was shortened by deeper snow for the majority of species. The effect on *Active*, *Flowering* and *Seedripening* durations, however, varied across species, with many species not reacting to snow regime (figure 3). Shorter durations were found in *Active* for *Alopecurus* and *Stellaria*, in *Flowering* for *Stellaria* and in *Seedripening* for *Cassiope* and *Luzula*.

Many species did not alter their TDD demand to reach certain phases (figure 3). *Bistorta*, *Cassiope* and *Pedicularis* did not alter their TDD demands in any of the periods' phases and no species' TDD demand was altered to reach the end of the *Seedripening* period. Lower TDDs were recorded for both start and end of *Active* period for *Salix*, and for *Flowering* period in *Luzula* and *Salix*. For absolute values on each species' timing and TDD demands, see figure S1.

Three out of six species had a significantly lower germination proportion (and as such lower viability) of propagules in *Deep* than in *Ambient*, even though the effect for *Bistorta* was ecologically negligible given its high germination rate of over 87% (figure 4). The shrubs, *Cassiope* and *Dryas*, had particularly reduced germination at deep snow regimes.

Modulation of snow regime effects by years

Even though there was significant across-year variation of duration, timing and TDD demand for each period, the overall snow regime effect remained intact each year (figure 5). Similarly, the intra-annual variation of each variable was retained across all snow regimes.

The seasonal pattern of phenophase occurrence and most period durations were generally retained throughout all phenophases and snow regimes (i.e.

some years were always earlier or later than others throughout all phenophases), even though the pattern became less clear with later phases (figure 5 and S2). For instance, 2008 and 2012 were rather late years, while 2010 and 2011 were often the earlier years. This was often also the case with TDD demands, although in individual years the pattern was reversed in later phases (i.e. years which needed more TDDs in early phases needed fewer TDDs in late phases). For instance in 2012, TDD demands were among the highest to reach many phenophases, while they were lowest to reach the end of the *Seedripening* period.

The timing and TDD demand patterns did not fit together very well, i.e. a late year did not necessarily have a higher or lower TDD demand and vice versa. For instance, while 2008 was in many cases among the late years, it was not among the years with the highest TDD demand to reach a particular phenophase. For further details on this and exceptions from the general patterns, we refer the reader to figures 5 and S2.

Seed viability was generally lower in deeper snow regimes, however, inter-annual variability was larger than the snow regime effect (figure 6).

Discussion

Species-specific responses

We present the responses to snow melt timing combined and for each species. Comparisons between figure 2 and 3, and also between figure 4 and S3 clearly show improved understanding comes from exploring the individual species responses, rather than only averaging of the response of all eight species. A later snow melt resulted in shorter period durations for two





Figure 3. Effect sizes of contrasts of Deep in relation to Ambient snow regime and 95% confidence intervals (CI) of duration, start and end of each phenological period (phenoperiod) for each species averaged over all years (Species*Snow regime interaction) in days (left) and thawing degree days (right) from linear mixed-effects models (see methods section for details). Positive values indicate longer duration or later occurrence or higher TDD thresholds in the Deep snow regime. If CIs overlap zero (dotted line), the effect size is considered statistically non-significant. Effect sizes were estimated for each Species by Snow regime combination and CIs adjusted for multiple hypothesis testing for a total of 120 contrasts. For overview, we here only present the within-species contrasts. Please note that duration, start and end were modeled independently for each period. Also note that the start of the Startup period is basically representing the contrast of snow melt date between Deep and Ambient and is, hence, the same for each species.



species in *Active* (*Alopecurus* and *Stellaria*), one in *Flowering* (*Stellaria*) and one in *Seedripening* (*Luzula*), but none throughout all periods. Likewise only half of the study species (*Cassiope*, *Dryas* and *Bistorta*) showed reduced propagule germination with later snow melt.

Periodicity

It has been shown at other high-latitude sites that the timing of early-season phenophases is triggered by snow-melt date (Bjorkman *et al* 2015, Livensperger *et al* 2016), and this study confirms these findings. However, we also show that late-season phases occur after a given amount of time after snow melt, irrespective of time of year. Thus, the species at our study site are so-called periodic, a term rarely used in the literature (Sørensen and Glerup 1941, Starr *et al* 2000, Wookey *et al* 2009). Periodicity is a concept suggesting that the time to reach late-season phenophases (i.e. the duration of phenoperiods) is genetically fixed rather than cued by environmental factors such as day length, temperature or soil moisture thresholds signaling that environmental conditions become unfavorable (Sørensen and Glerup 1941, Starr *et al* 2000, Wookey *et al* 2009). We speculate that a potential mechanism driving periodicity could be an internal clock or program, the pace of which depends on a variety of climate and weather factors such as temperature (here represented by thawing degree days, TDDs) or moisture (Oberbauer *et al* 2013), rather than an external cue (see below). This implies that in a future warmer growing-season climate, the phenology of periodic species might be advanced and period

durations accelerated rather than stretched, independent of snowmelt date, because physiological processes such as cell division and growth might proceed faster. This is similar to the suggestion made by Bjorkman *et al* (2015), who found that background warming could offset later snowmelt date, perhaps by accelerating the seed maturation and other periods. Few studies directly or indirectly report periodicity of high-latitude species (Starr *et al* 2000, Oberbauer *et al* 2013) and here we show that all studied species show periodicity in either vegetative and reproductive periods or both.

Periodicity might represent internal constraints limiting the studied species' responses to snow regimes and growing-season durations, where the age of a certain organ (e.g. flowers or leaves) determines its senescence (Oberbauer *et al* 1998, Starr *et al* 2000). This is contradictory to other studies where the occurrence of late-season phenophases was found to be controlled by thresholds of external environmental cues such as day length, light quality, temperature, or soil moisture (McGraw *et al* 1983, Arft *et al* 1999, Marchand *et al* 2004, Tsegay *et al* 2005, Fracheboud *et al* 2009). This indicates that periodicity might be an adaptation to our study site's generally short and cold growing-seasons or to other factors connected to its high latitude (e.g. lack of day length cues during late-season or highly variable inter annual conditions but comparatively predictable long-term conditions) compared to many other study areas. This is supported by a meta-analysis showing differential phenological responses of tundra plants from colder





Figure 5. Estimates and 95% confidence intervals (CI) of duration, start and end of each phenological period in each snow regime and year averaged over all species (Year*Snow regime interaction) in days (left) and thawing degree days (right) from linear mixed-effects models (see Methods section for details). Letters denote statistically significant differences across each set of duration, start or end, with the same letter meaning that the group contrasts are not significant (Tukey contrasts, p -value threshold 0.05). Please note that duration, start and end were modeled independently for each period.



compared to warmer sites (Prevéy *et al* submitted), suggesting that regional adaptations to growing-season temperatures or other long term conditions could control phenology.

Impacts of period durations

If *Active* period duration was the only predictor of plant productivity (Myneni *et al* 1997, Wang *et al* 2004), our results suggest that two of the studied species (*Alopecurus* and *Stellaria*) are likely to react to deeper snow regimes with reduced growth. However, this is not the case (see Rumpf *et al* 2014 for a study on growth), which strongly suggests that other factors such as soil moisture and/or nutrient availability, both of which are increased in *Deep* (Semenchuk *et al* 2015), are likely to play a more important role in plant growth and productivity than *Active* period duration alone. The lack of dependence of plant size on growing-season length is also in line with other studies (Jonas *et al* 2008, Livensperger *et al* 2016), but has yet to be incorporated in models based on remotely sensed data (Park *et al* 2016).

The duration of the *Flowering* period, representing flower longevity, was also unaffected by snow regime for all but one species. This is similar to findings from other studies (Wipf 2010, Rosa *et al* 2015, Gillespie *et al* 2016), and Høye *et al* (2013) demonstrated that flowering duration is more closely linked to temperature, with shorter flowering-seasons occurring with increasing temperatures. The implications of our findings for the reproduction of insect pollinated plants will depend on the response of the key insect species and other weather variables. As with the flowers of many species, the emergence of Arctic pollinators is closely linked to the timing of snowmelt (Høye and

Forchhammer 2008), and a delayed emergence with late snowmelt may maintain the synchrony between flower and insect emergence (Gillespie *et al* 2016). However, it is not clear how the flight period length of Arctic insects will respond when the growing-season is effectively shortened by late snowmelt because the cues for the end of adult activity are not well known for many Arctic species (Iler *et al* 2013). Wind-pollinated plants may be unaffected by snowmelt delays, although shorter seasons in a warmer climate may limit opportunities for fertilization.

Propagule viability could not be explained by the duration of the *Seedripening* period for two out of four species (*Dryas* had lower viability in spite of a periodic *Seedripening* period, while *Luzula* showed no effect to an aperiodic, shortened *Seedripening* period). Neither could the duration of the *Active* or *Flowering* periods explain viability, so the species appear to have different sensitivities to phenophase duration. The effects of reduced growing-season length on germination has only previously been studied for a few High Arctic species, but *Dryas*, *Cassiope* and *Bistorta* all responded with lower viability (Cooper *et al* 2011, Mallik *et al* 2011). In fact, average germination (i.e. mean of all species combined, shown in figure 6), correlated with the TDD needed to reach the end of the *Active* period (of the year studied, see figure S2) with an $r^2 = 0.5$ (data not shown), and was most likely driven by the response of the thermally most sensitive species, *Dryas* and *Cassiope*. *Dryas* experienced generally low TDDs in *Active* and *Flowering* periods in the late melting treatment, and is likely to be particularly sensitive to a reduced growing season temperature. Other Arctic studies have shown that warming increases the viability of

Arctic tundra species, especially *Dryas* and *Bistorta* (Wookey *et al* 1995, Arft *et al* 1999, Müller *et al* 2011). Our other study species, *Alopecurus*, *Luzula* and *Salix* seem to have well developed mechanisms to cope with varying growing-season starts by keeping seed viability constant or even high despite a late start.

Intra-annual variability and methodological limitations

Our snow regime gradient shows that in a climate with shifting snowmelt timing, an earlier or later start of phenoperiods caused by changes in snow melt date could lead to a corresponding earlier or later ending, respectively. This is represented within our intra-annual comparison, where earlier melting years show earlier occurrences of most phenophases. However, if TDD thresholds triggered phenophase occurrence (as it seems to do across snow regimes), then this threshold should be the same each year independent of snowmelt date or absolute temperature. This is not the case here, and we suggest three potential explanations of both mechanistic and methodological nature.

First, the lack of coherence between year and TDD threshold suggests that phenophase occurrence is a combination of both temperature and season length. If in one year the TDD demand is low even though the timing is late, this suggests that more time to reach that phenophase can offset colder periods. Conversely, if in another year TDD demand is high while timing is early, this suggests that development can be accelerated during warmer periods. Therefore, the suggested periodicity may not be rigid enough to lead to exact phenoperiod durations or TDD demands each year, given the other constraints of this study as outlined below.

Second, other factors than those considered in this study, such as soil moisture or nutrient status, or other weather related parameters which may vary across years, such as amounts of photosynthetically active radiation (PAR), may control the timing of phenophases, leading to the observed intra-annual variability of TDD thresholds. For example, if the studied species react to soil moisture thresholds (Jonas *et al* 2008), a generally drier year might lead to advanced phenology. This is complicated by the fact that rain events could modulate soil moisture (and PAR by cloud formation) during different parts of the year and affect different phenophases. In this study, the deeper snow regimes are slightly moister (Semenchuk *et al* 2015) and the potential soil moisture threshold to trigger late-season phenophases might be reached later in the season. Further, if soil moisture is a co-factor for late-season phenophase timing, then other factors might control phenology in sites wetter than our mesic and heath tundra (Marchand *et al* 2004). Winter warming events followed by icing can expose and freeze preformed buds and reduce

flowering (Semenchuk *et al* 2013). Deeper snow protects sensitive buds and plant parts from damage. This may also affect flower formation and subsequent seed viability. Further research on these potential mechanisms is recommended.

Finally, the between-year variability observed could be a methodological artefact in the form of systematic observer error (Gottfried *et al* 2012, Morrison 2016). Each year, data has been acquired by different field personnel (usually two to three people) with a different field leader every other year. While a calibration at the beginning of each field day was a central part of data acquisition, it has been shown that cover estimates by eye in particular can be biased and individually different (Morrison 2016). This could lead to a bias between years where, for example, the team or individual team members of one year systematically over-estimate cover and hence note the occurrence of a phenophase (50% cover per plot) earlier than teams of other years would have.

Snow regime effects are consistent in all years and most species, making our conclusions on phenophase timing and period durations robust and valid. However, our absolute phenophase timing estimates may be late-biased because we assumed the phenophase occurred the day it was recorded, while in reality it occurred at an unknown point in time between the last observation date and the date of recording (Bjorkman *et al* 2015). Since this constraint is consistently applied throughout the study, it does not interfere with our results on snow regime effects, but warrants caution when interpreting phenophase occurrences and comparing them with other studies.

The results derived from the methodology used in this study complement findings from landscape scale remote sensing studies and highlight the need for scaling plot level responses to landscape scale responses (Karlsen *et al* 2014, Anderson *et al* 2016, Boike *et al* 2016). This has already been shown to have a potential value as the onset of the growing season based on field observations has been successfully quantified based on NDVI threshold methods (Karlsen *et al* 2014, Anderson *et al* 2016). In fact, large-scale remote sensing studies from other biomes are also starting to report that the timing of autumn senescence is affected by the timing of spring phenology (Keenen and Richardson 2015), and our study verifies these findings on plot-scale level.

Conclusions

The presence of periodicity in our study species might render the plant community vulnerable to future changes in snowmelt patterns. First, period durations of periodic species might not be able to adapt to changing growing-season durations, while those of aperiodic species are more likely to. Second, while changing snowmelt patterns might change phenology

timing, its effects may be modulated by increasing growing-season temperatures accelerating and, hence, shortening some periods (Bjorkman *et al* 2015). This may apply specifically for periodic species and give them a further disadvantage compared to aperiodic species. A recent study suggests that late-season warming trends are stronger than those of early-season (Boike *et al* 2016). This could lead to a proportionally higher post-senescence respiratory loss of periodic species compared to aperiodic ones.

We conclude that periodic species are likely to be limited in their ability to adapt to changing snowmelt dates and may be disadvantaged compared to some of the invading species on Svalbard such as *Rumex longifolius*, *Ranunculus acris*, *Ranunculus repens*, *Epilobium montanum*, and the grass species *Deschampsia cespitosa* and *Poa pratensis* (Roalsø *et al* 2012). If such species demonstrate aperiodic characteristics, they can fully exploit changing or variable snow regime patterns (Wookey *et al* 2009). We suggest that besides factors such as temperature or nutrient limitations, periodicity might be a key plant trait predicting competitiveness of a species in response to climate change in tundra ecosystems.

Acknowledgments

We want to thank all our field assistants for help with collecting the field data. The funding for this study came from: The University Centre on Svalbard (UNIS), UiT-The Arctic University of Norway, and grants from the Norwegian Research Council: Project 230970 (The effect of snow depth and snowmelt timing on arctic terrestrial ecosystems) to EJC, Arctic Field Grants 2010, 2011, 2012 to PRS, and from the Svalbard Environmental Fund to EJC.

References

- Anderson H B, Nilsen L, Tømmervik H, Karlsen S-R, Nagai S and Cooper E J 2016 Using ordinary digital cameras in place of near-infrared sensors to derive vegetation indices for phenology studies of High Arctic vegetation *Remote Sens.* **8** 847
- Arft A M *et al* 1999 Responses of tundra plants to experimental warming: meta-analysis of the international tundra experiment *Ecological Monogr.* **69** 491
- Bates D, Maechler M, Bolker B and Walker S 2015 Fitting linear mixed-effects models using 'lme4' *J. Stat. Softw.* **67** 1–48
- Bhatt U *et al* 2013 Recent declines in warming and vegetation greening trends over pan-Arctic tundra *Remote Sens.* **5** 4229–54
- Bieniek P A *et al* 2015 Climate drivers linked to changing seasonality of alaska coastal tundra vegetation productivity *Earth Interactions* **19** 1–29
- Bjorkman A D, Elmendorf S C, Beamish A L, Vellend M and Henry G H R 2015 Contrasting effects of warming and increased snowfall on Arctic tundra plant phenology over the past two decades *Global Change Biol.* **21** 4651–61
- Boike J *et al* 2016 Satellite-derived changes in the permafrost landscape of central Yakutia, 2000–2011: wetting, drying, and fires *Glob. Planet. Change* **139** 116–27
- Brown R, Derksen C and Wang L 2010 A multi-data set analysis of variability and change in Arctic spring snow cover extent, 1967–2008 *J. Geophys. Res.* **115** D16111
- Bulygina O N, Razuvaev V N and Korshunova N N 2009 Changes in snow cover over Northern Eurasia in the last few decades *Environ. Res. Lett.* **4** 45026
- Cooper E J 2014 Warmer shorter winters disrupt Arctic terrestrial ecosystems *Ann. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **45** 271–95
- Cooper E J, Dullinger S and Semenchuk P 2011 Late snowmelt delays plant development and results in lower reproductive success in the High Arctic *Plant Sci.* **180** 157–67
- Fracheboud Y, Luquez V, Bjorken L, Sjodin A, Tuominen H and Jansson S 2009 The control of autumn senescence in European Aspen *Plant Physiol.* **149** 1982–91
- Gillespie M A K, Baggesen N and Cooper E J 2016 High Arctic flowering phenology and plant-pollinator interactions in response to delayed snow melt and simulated warming *Environ. Res. Lett.* **11** 115006
- Gottfried M *et al* 2012 Continent-wide response of mountain vegetation to climate change *Nat. Clim. Change* **2** 111–5
- Hervé M 2016 RVAideMemoire: diverse basic statistical and graphical functions *R package version 0.9-38* (<http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=RVAideMemoire>)
- Hothorn T, Bretz F and Westfall P 2008 Simultaneous inference in general parametric models *Biometrical J.* **50** 346–63
- Høye T T and Forchhammer M C 2008 Phenology of High-Arctic arthropods: effects of climate on spatial, seasonal, and inter-annual variation *Advances in Ecological Research* vol 40 (Amsterdam: Elsevier) pp 299–324
- Høye T T, Mølgaard Ellebjerg S and Philipp M 2007 The impact of climate on flowering in the High Arctic—the case of *Dryas* in a hybrid zone *Arctic Antarct. Alpine Res.* **39** 412–21
- Høye T T, Post E, Schmidt N M, Trøjelsgaard K and Forchhammer M C 2013 Shorter flowering seasons and declining abundance of flower visitors in a warmer Arctic *Nat. Clim. Change* **3** 759–63
- Iler A M, Inouye D W, Høye T T, Miller-Rushing A J, Burkle L A and Johnston E B 2013 Maintenance of temporal synchrony between syrphid flies and floral resources despite differential phenological responses to climate *Global Change Biol.* **19** 2348–59
- Inouye D, Morales M and Dodge G 2002 Variation in timing and abundance of flowering by *Delphinium barbeyi* Huth (Ranunculaceae): the roles of snowpack, frost, and La Niña, in the context of climate change *Oecologia* **130** 543–50
- IPCC 2013 *Climate change 2013: The Physical Science Basis: Working Group I Contribution to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (New York: Cambridge University Press) 1535 pp
- Jonas T, Rixen C, Sturm M and Stoeckli V 2008 How alpine plant growth is linked to snow cover and climate variability *J. Geophys. Res.* **113** G03013
- Karlsen S R, Elvebakk A, Høgda K A and Grydeland T 2014 Spatial and temporal variability in the onset of the growing season on Svalbard, Arctic Norway — measured by MODIS-NDVI satellite data *Remote Sens.* **6** 8088–106
- Keenen T and Richardson A D 2015 The timing of autumn senescence is affected by the timing of spring phenology: implications for predictive models *Global Change Biol.* **21** 2634–41
- Lenth R V 2016 Least-squares means: the {R} package {lsmeans} *J. Stat. Softw.* **69** 1–33
- Livensperger C, Steltzer H, Darrouzet-Nardi A, Sullivan P F, Wallenstein M and Weintraub M N 2016 Earlier snowmelt and warming lead to earlier but not necessarily more plant growth *AoB Plants* **8** plw021
- Mallik A U, Wdowiak J V and Cooper E J 2011 Growth and reproductive responses of *Cassiope tetragona*, a circumpolar evergreen shrub, to experimentally delayed snowmelt *Arctic Antarct. Alpine Res.* **43** 404–9
- Marchand F L *et al* 2004 Climate warming postpones senescence in High Arctic tundra *Arctic Antarct. Alpine Res.* **36** 390–4

- McGraw J B, Chester A L and Stuart L 1983 A note on July senescence in tundra plants at Eagle Creek, Alaska, USA *Arctic Alpine Res.* **15** 267
- Menzel A *et al* 2006 European phenological response to climate change matches the warming pattern *Global Change Biol.* **12** 1969–76
- Morgner E, Elberling B, Strebel D and Cooper E J 2010 The importance of winter in annual ecosystem respiration in the High Arctic: effects of snow depth in two vegetation types *Polar Res.* **29** 58–74
- Morrison L W 2016 Observer error in vegetation surveys: a review *J. Plant Ecol.* **9** 367–79
- Müller E, Cooper E J and Alsos I G 2011 Germinability of arctic plants is high in perceived optimal conditions but low in the field *Botany* **89** 337–48
- Myneni R B, Keeling C D, Tucker C J, Asrar G and Nemani R R 1997 Increased plant growth in the northern high latitudes from 1981 to 1991 *Nature* **386** 698–702
- Oberbauer S F, Starr G and Pop E W 1998 Effects of extended growing season and soil warming on carbon dioxide and methane exchange of tussock tundra in Alaska *J. Geophys. Res.* **103** 29075–82
- Oberbauer S F *et al* 2013 Phenological response of tundra plants to background climate variation tested using the International Tundra Experiment *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **368** 20120481
- Park T, Ganguly S, Tømmervik H, Euskirchen E S, Høgda K A, Karlsen K R, Brovkin V, Neman R R and Myneni R B 2016 Changes in growing season duration and productivity of northern vegetation inferred from long-term remote sensing data *Environ. Res. Lett.* **11** 084001
- Parmesan C and Yohe G 2003 A globally coherent fingerprint of climate change impacts across natural systems *Nature* **421** 37–42
- R Core Team 2016 *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing* (Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing)
- Roalsø E R 2012 Alien plant species in Svalbard *Masters Thesis* Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim 20 pp
- Rosa R K, Oberbauer S F, Starr G, Puma I P L, Pop E, Ahlquist L and Baldwin T 2015 Plant phenological responses to a long-term experimental extension of growing season and soil warming in the tussock tundra of Alaska *Global Change Biol.* **21** 4520–32
- Rumpf S B, Semenchuk P R, Dullinger S and Cooper E J 2014 Idiosyncratic responses of High Arctic plants to changing snow regimes (ed Rixen C) *PLoS One* **9** e86281
- Saavedra F, Inouye D W, Price M V and Harte J 2003 Changes in flowering and abundance of *Delphinium nuttallianum* (Ranunculaceae) in response to a subalpine climate warming experiment *Global Change Biol.* **9** 885–94
- Semenchuk P R, Elberling B, Amtorp C, Winkler J, Rumpf S, Michelsen A and Cooper E J 2015 Deeper snow alters soil nutrient availability and leaf nutrient status in High Arctic tundra *Biogeochemistry* **124** 81–94
- Semenchuk P R, Elberling B and Cooper E J 2013 Snow cover and extreme winter warming events control flower abundance of some, but not all species in High Arctic Svalbard *Ecol. Evol.* **3** 2586–99
- Sørensen T J and Glerup E 1941 *Temperature Relations and Phenology of the Northeast Greenland Flowering Plants* vol 125 (Copenhagen: C.A. Reitzel)
- Starr G, Oberbauer S F and Pop E 2000 Effects of lengthened growing season and soil warming on the phenology and physiology of *Polygonum bistorta* *Global Change Biol.* **6** 357–69
- Tsegay B A, Lund L, Nilsen J, Olsen J E, Molmann J M, Ernsten A and Junntilla O 2005 Growth responses of *Betula pendula* ecotypes to red and far-red light *Electron. J. Biotechnol.* **8** 17–23
- Wang J, Rich P M, Price K P and Kettle W D 2004 Relations between NDVI and tree productivity in the central Great Plains *Int. J. Remote Sens.* **25** 3127–38
- Wang X, Piao S, Xu X, Ciais P, MacBean N, Myneni R B and Li L 2015 Has the advancing onset of spring vegetation green-up slowed down or changed abruptly over the last three decades?: 30-year change of spring vegetation phenology *Global Ecol. Biogeogr.* **24** 621–31
- Wipf S 2010 Phenology, growth, and fecundity of eight subarctic tundra species in response to snowmelt manipulations *Plant Ecol.* **207** 53–66
- Wipf S and Rixen C 2010 A review of snow manipulation experiments in Arctic and alpine tundra ecosystems *Polar Res.* **29** 95–109
- Wookey P A, Robinson C H, Parsons A N, Welker J M, Press M C, Callaghan T V and Lee J A 1995 Environmental constraints on the growth, photosynthesis and reproductive development of *Dryas octopetala* at a High Arctic polar semi-desert, Svalbard *Oecologia* **102** 478–89
- Wookey P A *et al* 2009 Ecosystem feedbacks and cascade processes: understanding their role in the responses of Arctic and alpine ecosystems to environmental change *Global Change Biol.* **15** 1153–72