

## Article (refereed) - postprint

---

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

Caron, Maria Mercedes; Zellweger, Florian; Verheyen, Kris; Baeten, Lander; Hédli, Radim; Bernhardt-Römermann, Markus; Berki, Imre; Brunet, Jörg; Decocq, Guillaume; Díaz, Sandra; Dirnböck, Thomas; Durak, Tomasz; Heinken, Thilo; Jaroszewicz, Bogdan; Kopecký, Martin; Lenoir, Jonathan; Macek, Martin; Malicki, Marek; Máliš, František; Nagel, Thomas A.; Perring, Michael P; Petřík, Petr; Reczyńska, Kamila; Pielech, Remigiusz; Schmidt, Wolfgang; Świerkosz, Krzysztof; Teleki, Balázs; Wulf, Monika; De Frenne, Pieter. 2021. **Thermal differences between juveniles and adults increased over time in European forest trees.** *Journal of Ecology*, 109 (11). 3944-3957, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.13773>

This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.

© 2020 John Wiley & Sons Ltd

This version is available at <http://nora.nerc.ac.uk/id/eprint/531574>

Copyright and other rights for material on this site are retained by the rights owners. Users should read the terms and conditions of use of this material at <https://nora.nerc.ac.uk/policies.html#access>.

**This document is the authors' final manuscript version of the journal article, incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer review process. There may be differences between this and the publisher's version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from this article.**

The definitive version is available at <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/>

Contact UKCEH NORA team at  
[noraceh@ceh.ac.uk](mailto:noraceh@ceh.ac.uk)

1 **Title: Thermal differences between juveniles and adults increased over time in European forest**  
2 **trees**

3  
4  
5 Caron, Maria Mercedes<sup>1</sup>, Zellweger, Florian<sup>2</sup>, Verheyen, Kris<sup>3</sup>, Baeten, Lander<sup>3</sup>, Hédli, Radim<sup>4,5</sup>,  
6 Bernhardt-Römermann, Markus<sup>6</sup>, Berki, Imre<sup>7</sup>, Brunet, Jörg<sup>8</sup>, Decocq, Guillaume<sup>9</sup>, Díaz, Sandra<sup>1,10</sup>,  
7 Dirnböck, Thomas<sup>11</sup>, Durak, Tomasz<sup>12</sup>, Heinken, Thilo<sup>13</sup>, Jaroszewicz, Bogdan<sup>14</sup>, Kopecký, Martin<sup>15,16</sup>,  
8 Lenoir, Jonathan<sup>9</sup>, Macek, Martin<sup>15</sup>, Malicki, Marek<sup>17,18</sup>, Máliš, František<sup>19,20</sup>, Nagel, Thomas A.<sup>21</sup>,  
9 Perring, Michael P.<sup>3,22,29</sup>, Petřík, Petr<sup>15</sup>, Reczyńska, Kamila<sup>23</sup>, Pielech, Remigiusz<sup>24</sup>, Schmidt,  
10 Wolfgang<sup>25</sup>, Świerkosz, Krzysztof<sup>26</sup>, Teleki, Balázs<sup>27</sup>, Wulf, Monika<sup>28</sup>, De Frenne, Pieter<sup>3</sup>

11  
12  
13 1: Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas, Instituto Multidisciplinario de Biología  
14 Vegetal (IMBIV), CONICET, Casilla de Correo 495, 5000 Córdoba, Argentina

15 2: Swiss Federal Institute for Forest, Snow and Landscape Research WSL, 8903 Birmensdorf,  
16 Switzerland.

17 3: Ghent University - Forest & Nature Lab. Geraardsbergsesteenweg 267. 9090 Melle-Gontrode  
18 Belgium

19 4: Institute of Botany, Czech Academy of Sciences, Lidická 25/27, 60200 Brno, Czech Republic

20 5: Department of Botany, Faculty of Science, Palacký University in Olomouc, Šlechtitelů 27, 78371  
21 Olomouc, Czech Republic

22 6: Friedrich-Schiller-University Jena. Institute of Ecology and Evolution. Dornburger Str. 159. 07743  
23 Jena, Germany

24 7: University of Sopron, Faculty of Forestry, H-9400 Sopron, Hungary

25 8: Southern Swedish Forest Research Centre, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Box 49,  
26 23053 Alnarp, Sweden

27 9: Unité « Ecologie et Dynamique des Systèmes Anthropisés » (UMR CNRS 7058 EDYSAN),  
28 Université de Picardie Jules Verne, 1 rue des Louvels, 80037 Amiens Cedex 1, France

29 10: Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas, Físicas y Naturales,  
30 Departamento de Diversidad Biológica y Ecología, Córdoba, Argentina.

31 11: Environment Agency Austria, Vienna, Spittelauer Lände 5, 1090

32 12: Laboratory of Plant Physiology and Ecology, University of Rzeszów, Rejtana 16c, PL-35-959  
33 Rzeszów, Poland

34 13: Institute of Biochemistry and Biology, General Botany, University of Potsdam, Maulbeerallee 3,  
35 14469 Potsdam, Germany

36 14: University of Warsaw, Faculty of Biology, Białowieża Geobotanical Station, Sportowa 19, 17-230  
37 Białowieża, Poland

38 15: Institute of Botany of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Zámek 1, CZ-252 43, Průhonice, Czech  
39 Republic

40 16: Faculty of Forestry and Wood Sciences, Czech University of Life Sciences Prague, Kamýcká  
41 129, CZ-165 21, Prague 6 – Suchbátka, Czech Republic

42 17: Department of Pharmaceutical Biology and Biotechnology, Wrocław Medical University, Borowska  
43 211, 50-556 Wrocław, Poland

44 18: Department of Botany, Faculty of Biological Sciences, University of Wrocław, Kanonia 6/8, 50-328  
45 Wrocław, Poland

46 19: Technical University in Zvolen, Faculty of Forestry, T.G. Masaryka 24, 960 53 Zvolen, Slovakia

47 20: National Forest Centre, T.G. Masaryka 22, 960 92 Zvolen, Slovakia

48 21: Department of Forestry and Renewable Forest Resources, Biotechnical Faculty, University of  
49 Ljubljana, Večna pot 83, Ljubljana 1000, Slovenia

50 22: Ecosystem Restoration and Intervention Ecology Research Group, School of Biological Sciences,  
51 The University of Western Australia, 35 Stirling Highway, Crawley WA6008 Australia

52 23: Department of Botany, Institute of Environmental Biology, University of Wrocław, PL-50-328  
53 Wrocław, Poland

54 24: Department of Forest Biodiversity, University of Agriculture in Kraków, al. 29 Listopada 46, 31-425  
55 Kraków, Poland

56 25: Department of Silviculture and Forest Ecology of the Temperate Zones, University of Göttingen,  
57 Büsgenweg 1, 37077 Göttingen, Germany

58 26: Museum of Natural History, University of Wrocław, Sienkiewicza 21, PL-50-335 Wrocław, Poland

59 27: MTA-DE Lendület Functional and Restoration Ecology Research Group, 4032 Debrecen  
60 Egyetem sqr. 1, Hungary

61 28: Research Area 2, Leibniz-ZALF e.V. Müncheberg, Eberswalder Straße 84, D-15374 Müncheberg,  
62 Germany  
63 29: Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, Environment Centre Wales, Deiniol Road, Bangor, LL57 2UW.  
64 United Kingdom  
65  
66 **Contact Information:** Maria Mercedes Caron. Phone : +54 9 387 5988014. Email :  
67 [mechicaron@gmail.com](mailto:mechicaron@gmail.com)  
68

69

70 **Abstract**

- 71 1. Woody species' requirements and environmental sensitivity change from seedlings to adults,  
72 a process referred to as ontogenetic shift. Such shifts can be increased by climate change. To  
73 assess the changes in the difference of temperature experienced by seedlings and adults in  
74 the context of climate change, it is essential to have reliable climatic data over long periods  
75 that capture the thermal conditions experienced by the individuals throughout their life cycle.
- 76 2. Here we used a unique cross-European database of 2195 pairs of resurveyed forest plots  
77 with a mean intercensus time interval of 37 years. We inferred macroclimatic temperature  
78 (free-air conditions above tree canopies – representative of the conditions experienced by  
79 adult trees) and microclimatic temperature (representative of the juvenile stage at the forest  
80 floor, inferred from the relationship between canopy cover, distance to the coast, and below-  
81 canopy temperature) at both surveys. We then address the long-term, large-scale, and  
82 multitaxa dynamics of the difference between the temperatures experienced by adults and  
83 juveniles of 25 temperate tree species.
- 84 3. We found significant, but species-specific, variations in the perceived temperature (calculated  
85 from presence/absence data) between life stages during both surveys. Additionally, the  
86 difference of the temperature experienced by the adult *versus* juveniles significantly increased  
87 between surveys for eight of 25 species. We found evidence of a relationship between the  
88 difference of temperature experienced by juveniles and adults over time and one key  
89 functional trait (i.e. leaf area). Together, these results suggest that the temperatures  
90 experienced by adults vs juveniles became more decoupled over time for a subset of species,  
91 probably due to the combination of climate change and a recorded increase of canopy cover  
92 between the surveys resulting in higher rates of macroclimate than microclimate warming.
- 93 4. *Synthesis.* We document warming and canopy-cover induced changes in the difference of the  
94 temperature experienced by juveniles and adults. These findings have implications for forest  
95 management adaptation to climate change such as the promotion of tree regeneration by  
96 creating suitable species-specific microclimatic conditions. Such adaptive management will  
97 help to mitigate the macroclimate change in the understory layer.

98 **Key words:** climate change, forestREplot, microclimate, plant functional traits, resurvey, temperate  
99 tree species, ontogenetic shift  
100

101 **1. Introduction**

102 Accelerated climate change (Smith, Edmonds, Hartin, Mundra, & Calvin, 2015) is impacting global  
103 biodiversity (Díaz et al., 2019; Petr, Boerboom, Van der Veen, & Ray, 2014; Segan, Murray, &  
104 Watson, 2016; Shepherd et al., 2016; Urban, 2015). Documented impacts of climate change on plants  
105 include changes in community composition, species richness, population dynamics, physiology,  
106 phenology, and species distribution (e.g. Lenoir et al. 2008; Steinbauer et al. 2018; Dusenge et al.  
107 2019; Kuhn & Gegout 2019; Piao et al. 2019). Macro-scale redistributions of organisms, including  
108 trees, in response to climate change depend on dispersal and establishment in previously  
109 uncolonized areas (Monleon & Lintz, 2015). However, the species' environmental requirements and  
110 tolerances (in terms of e.g. temperature, humidity and light requirements) can change from seedlings  
111 to adult life stages (Grubb, 1977; Parrish & Bazzaz, 1985a), a process referred to as ontogenetic shift  
112 (Bertrand, Gegout, & Bontemps, 2011; Eriksson, 2002; Miriti, 2006; Parrish & Bazzaz, 1985b; Werner  
113 & Gilliam, 1984). Therefore, sites with environmental conditions suitable for adults might be less  
114 suitable for their offspring, and vice versa.

115 In general, early stages of plant's life cycle (i.e. seedlings and juveniles) are considered more  
116 sensitive than adults of the same species to environmental factors such as heat, frost and drought  
117 (Bennett, Mcdowell, Allen, & Anderson-Teixeira, 2015; Lloret, Peñuelas, Prieto, Llorens, & Estiarte,  
118 2009; Mérian & Lebourgeois, 2011). Hence, it is likely that climate change will differently impact adults  
119 and juveniles of the same species. Therefore, it is essential to further our understanding of how  
120 environmental change affects plants along their entire life cycle. The capacity to disperse, colonize  
121 and successfully persist in new suitable areas and therefore the species' capacity to change their  
122 distribution tracking novel climatic conditions is influenced by (i) the speed at which an individual can  
123 produce offspring and regenerate, (ii) morphological (e.g. leaf-height-seed) and physiological traits  
124 (e.g. maximum photosynthesis capacity, leaf nitrogen content) and (iii) species properties (e.g. shade  
125 tolerance, grazing tolerance) (Burke & Grime, 1996; Bussotti, Pollastrini, Holland, & Brüggemann,  
126 2015; Díaz et al., 2016; Dobrowski et al., 2015; Sádlo, Chytrý, Pergl, & Pyšek, 2018). It is expected  
127 that species resistance and resilience to climatic variability is affected by the presence of certain  
128 functional traits (e.g. leaf mass per area is linked to the responses of plants to drought, high light and  
129 scarcity of nutrients; Bussotti et al., 2015; Lohbeck et al., 2015). The environment, including  
130 temperature, can strongly affect all the phases of plant species' regeneration from dormancy break

131 until seedling establishment and survival (Carón et al., 2014, 2015; De Frenne et al., 2011; Fay &  
132 Schultz, 2009; González-Rodríguez, Villar, & Navarro-Cerrillo, 2011; Shevtosova et al., 2009; Walck,  
133 Hidayati, Dixon, Thompson, & Poschlod, 2011). Therefore, regeneration responses to climate change  
134 vary among species with contrasting functional traits.

135 Differences in the distribution range along elevational and latitudinal gradients between life stages  
136 (i.e. adults and juveniles of the same species) are frequently linked to the associated environmental  
137 conditions and climate change (e.g. Lenoir et al. 2009; Woodall et al. 2009; Rabasa et al. 2013; Zhu  
138 et al. 2014; Monleon & Lintz 2015). However, despite that many studies link these differences to  
139 climate change there is a disparity in the direction of the reported shifts. For example, Monleon &  
140 Lintz (2015) showed that, across 46 temperate forest tree species in the United States of America, the  
141 mean annual temperature of the range of seedlings was 0.120°C colder than that of the range of  
142 adults. This difference was attributed to climate change because most species' seedlings'  
143 distributional ranges showed a consistent shift towards colder environments than mature trees.  
144 Conversely, Zhu et al. (2014) showed that most (77%) of the juveniles of 65 tree species in the  
145 eastern United States have higher optimal temperature (in relation to the species abundance), than  
146 the adults. Across species, they detected relatively more abundant juveniles than adults of the same  
147 species in warmer climates, again relating this pattern to climate change. However, other studies  
148 attributed the differences between seedling and adult distributions to ontogenetic shifts. For instance,  
149 seedlings were growing in warmer and drier conditions than adults of the same species, in 12 tree  
150 species in Slovakia (Central Europe) (Máliš et al., 2016). Hence, there is evidence suggesting that the  
151 differences in the environmental conditions experienced by seedlings vs adults from a given species  
152 can be due to ontogenetic shifts, climate change or both acting together (ontogenetic shifts enhanced  
153 by climate change).

154 To accurately study thermal ontogenetic shifts in the context of climate change, and to better  
155 understand the relative importance of ontogenetic shifts and climate change on the contrasting  
156 thermal conditions experienced by adults and juveniles, it is essential to have precise and accurate  
157 data on the actual temperatures experienced by the individuals throughout their different life stages:  
158 from tree seedlings to adult trees and over long time periods. Temperature conditions in forest  
159 systems can vary substantially near the ground surface (understory conditions where juveniles grow)  
160 compared to the conditions at the canopy to which the leaves of adult trees are exposed (De Frenne,

161 Zellweger, Rodríguez-Sánchez, Scheffers, Hylander, Luoto, Vellend, Verheyen, & Lenoir, 2019;  
162 Zellweger et al., 2020).

163 Forest canopy cover, structure and composition strongly influence the microclimatic conditions at the  
164 forest floor including light, humidity and temperature, thereby impacting seedling regeneration, early  
165 survival and growth (George & Bazzaz, 1999) with long-term effects in forest composition, structure  
166 and functioning (Royo & Carson, 2006). Across biomes, the temperature difference between free-air  
167 conditions (macroclimate) and the understory (microclimate) can vary between 1 – 4 °C resulting in  
168 less extreme and less variable conditions below the canopy (De Frenne, Zellweger, Rodríguez-  
169 Sánchez, Scheffers, Hylander, Luoto, Vellend, Verheyen, & Lenoir, 2019). Therefore, the combined  
170 influence of climate change and forest management on forest canopy cover can strongly alter the  
171 microclimatic temperature as perceived by seedlings and juveniles on the forest floor. In some  
172 temperate European forests, an increase in tree growth and forest densities has been reported as a  
173 consequence of decreasing sulphur pollution at the end of the 1980s, an increase in soil nitrogen  
174 availability since the 1950s and changes in forest management practices over the past decades  
175 including a decrease in management intensity. As a matter of fact, many forest sites in Europe have  
176 become either unmanaged or experienced lower management intensities (Baeten et al., 2014;  
177 Depauw et al., 2020; Gold, Korotkov, & Sasse, 2006; Luysaert et al., 2010; McGrath et al., 2015;  
178 Norby et al., 2005; Pretzsch, Biber, Schu, Uhl, & Ro, 2014; Rautiainen, Wernick, Waggoner, Ausubel,  
179 & Kauppi, 2011). In many parts of Europe, logging and natural losses of tree biomass have been  
180 significantly lower than annual increments, resulting in approximately doubled standing stocks of trees  
181 per hectare in 2000 compared to the stocks recorded in 1950 (Gold et al., 2006). This increase in  
182 canopy density produced cooler and darker conditions in the understory. These changes have the  
183 potential to mitigate or even reverse the effects of recent warming in the understory (De Frenne et al.  
184 2013; De Frenne et al. 2019; Zellweger et al. 2020). Therefore, it is likely that adults and juveniles of  
185 tree species have experienced different levels of climate warming: macroclimate warming vs.  
186 microclimate warming (*sensu* Zellweger et al. 2020).

187 Despite the importance of considering the differences between overstory and understory  
188 temperatures, many ecological studies focusing on forest systems still rely on gridded macroclimate  
189 data (Worldclim: Fick & Hijmans 2017; CHELSA; Karger et al. 2017; and TerraClimate; Abatzoglou et  
190 al. 2018) based on weather stations located outside forests above short grass. Such weather stations

191 only reflect macroclimatic conditions misrepresenting the sub-canopy climatic conditions (i.e.  
192 microclimatic conditions). However, a correct representation of the temperature at the understory is  
193 key, especially for forest regeneration studies. Indeed, the mismatch between the environmental  
194 requirements of tall adults vs. juveniles on the forest floor is extremely important in that respect  
195 (Geiger, Aron, & Todhunter, 2003; Lenoir, Hattab, & Pierre, 2017; Uvarov, 1931; Zellweger et al.,  
196 2020). Fortunately, recent advances have made it possible to use local forest microclimatic data  
197 obtained from a network of microclimate sensors located in forest understories across Europe. Based  
198 on that information, a relationship between macroclimate, forest cover and microclimate was  
199 established (see Zellweger et al. 2019). To correctly evaluate the impacts of climate change on the  
200 adult and juvenile life stages (i.e. ontogenetic shifts in the context of climate change), it is necessary  
201 to have repeated records (resurveys) of both layers (canopy and understory) in undisturbed forest and  
202 with sufficient time between records (several decades) in order to capture the effects of climate  
203 warming on species occurrences. Moreover, if resurveys with long intervals between surveys are  
204 combined, with accurate records of temperature over multiple regions, it is possible to increase the  
205 representativeness, and thus generality, of the results (Verheyen et al., 2017).

206 Here we specifically address the long-term, large-scale, multitaxa dynamics of the difference between  
207 the temperatures perceived by adults and juveniles, for 25 of the most common European temperate  
208 forest tree species. To this end, we took advantage of a unique database containing 2195 pairs of  
209 resurveyed plots in 48 regions (12 countries) across Europe. Our database contains species  
210 presence and cover data (visual estimates of percentage ground cover by each species) of adults and  
211 juveniles <1.3 m) with a mean time interval between the baseline survey and the resurvey of 37 years.  
212 For both surveys, we extracted macroclimatic temperatures from global climate grids and calculated  
213 microclimate temperatures in the forest understory (representative of the juvenile layer) across the  
214 continent using, for the first time at such scale, the established relationship between macroclimatic  
215 temperature, tree canopy cover and the temperature offset inside the forest (see Zellweger *et al.*  
216 2019). This relationship was fitted by calculating the difference of temperature outside and inside the  
217 forest by combining microclimate data obtained from a sensor network with weather station records  
218 across Europe. We determined: (i) the degree of warming as perceived by the canopy of the adult  
219 (macroclimate temperature) and juvenile (microclimate temperature) layers between the baseline and  
220 resurvey period (thermal shift over time for each life stage); (ii) the difference in the perceived

221 temperature between the adult and juvenile layers during each survey (ontogenetic shift); (iii) whether  
222 the difference in temperature as experienced by adults and juveniles changed over time (ontogenetic  
223 shift over time) and (iv) whether any difference in ontogenetic shift over time was correlated with  
224 species properties and key morphological and physiological traits important for dispersal and  
225 establishment and for coping with environmental conditions (i.e. LHS - leaf-height-seed traits and  
226 species' shade tolerance).

227 Our overarching hypothesis is that both life stages (adults and juveniles) experienced warming  
228 between surveys due to climate change. However, we expect lower sub-canopy than above-canopy  
229 warming, caused by a canopy-induced offset of maximum daytime temperatures. Therefore, we  
230 expect that a climate change-induced increase in canopy cover increased the thermal decoupling  
231 between both layers. Additionally, we expect that if there are changes over time in the differences  
232 between the perceived temperature of the adults and juveniles such changes will be species-specific  
233 and linked to key functional traits and to species' shade tolerance. Traits are known to influence  
234 species' migration rates and therefore the species' capacity to track suitable environmental conditions  
235 but also the species' capacity to successfully establish and develop under changing environmental  
236 conditions such as warming, drought and shading (Burke & Grime, 1996; Bussotti et al., 2015;  
237 Dobrowski et al., 2015). Hence, traits affect the range of environmental conditions that both phases  
238 (adults and juveniles) are able to tolerate. We expect that species with small seeds, large leaves and  
239 high shade tolerances will exhibit higher thermal differences between adults and juveniles. We expect  
240 this to be linked to (i) changes in distribution of the juveniles due to the higher dispersal capacity and  
241 (ii) to higher tolerances to shadier and cooler environments at the forest floor caused by denser  
242 canopies.

## 243 **2. Materials and methods**

### 244 *Database characterization and plots selection*

245 We used data from the forestREplot database (Verheyen et al., 2017). This database contains  
246 species presence and cover data (percentage of ground cover by the canopy of each species  
247 estimated consistently, in both surveys, in the same plots) from forest resurveys in permanent or  
248 quasi-permanent plots (no pseudoreplicates) with variable plot sizes (between 1 m<sup>2</sup> and 1000 m<sup>2</sup> but  
249 in most cases the plots were either a 10×10 m or a 9m radius plot) located in natural or semi-natural  
250 forests in temperate deciduous forests across Europe (see details of the database at

251 [www.forestreplot.ugent.be](http://www.forestreplot.ugent.be)). The vast majority of the plots in this database are in ancient and mainly  
252 undisturbed or very low-managed forests (between surveys).

253 We selected 2195 pairs of non-overlapping (in space) plots contained in 48 resurveyed datasets  
254 (hereafter regions). These plots have a broad spatial distribution across Europe (Fig. 1a) and were  
255 selected because they have accurate records of the adult layer (>7 m height) and the juvenile layer  
256 (seedlings and saplings < 1m or <1.3 m height depending on the region considered) during either the  
257 baseline survey or resurvey (see Perring et al. 2018) (Fig. 1b, Fig.1c and Table S1).

258 The first surveys (hereafter referred to as “baseline survey”) were carried out between 1933 and 1994  
259 while the resurveys of the same plots (hereafter referred to as “resurvey”) were carried out between  
260 1987 and 2017. The time intervals between the two surveys ranged between 12 and 66 years (with a  
261 mean of 37 years; Fig. 1b and Table S1).

262 For this study, we selected the 25 most common forest tree species spread across this plot network.  
263 All the selected species were present in at least 2.5 % of the plots available in the forestREplot  
264 database.

#### 265 *Temperature data*

266 Recorded and estimated macroclimate and microclimate temperatures, respectively, during both  
267 surveys (baseline and resurvey) were used for the analysis. The macroclimate above-canopy  
268 temperature used was the mean daily maximum summer temperature (June, July and August)  
269 extracted for each plot mainly from TERRACLIMATE (<http://www.climatologylab.org/terraclimate.html>)  
270 while the Climate Research Unit - CRU (<https://crudata.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/hrg/>) was used for 224  
271 plots of the baseline survey plots for which TERRACLIMATE information was not available. The  
272 TERRACLIMATE database was complemented when needed with the CRU database because they  
273 correlated strongly (in the baseline survey  $R=0.69$ ,  $p<0.001$  and in the resurvey  $R=0.81$ ,  $p<0.001$  for  
274 overlapping data points). The extracted maximum summer temperatures were averaged per plot for  
275 the five years preceding each survey (baseline surveys and resurveys) (Fig. 1c).

276 The microclimate temperature within the understory layer (where juveniles grow) at the baseline  
277 survey and resurvey were calculated at the plot level for plots where each species was present in  
278 either the baseline or the resurvey. To compute microclimate temperatures near the forest floor at  
279 both time periods, we used the information of canopy cover at each plot (visual estimates of  
280 percentage ground cover by each species) recorded *in situ* when each survey (baseline and resurvey)

281 took place (reflecting all the conditions that influenced the canopy cover e.g. management, soil  
282 nutrient, rainfall variability, CO<sub>2</sub> and Nitrogen deposition) and the empirical relationship established by  
283 Zellweger et al. (2019) between macroclimate temperature, canopy cover, distance to the coast and  
284 sub-canopy temperature. The microclimatic information used by Zellweger et al. (2019) was obtained  
285 from a network of sensors installed in ten plots representing a regional gradient of canopy cover  
286 distributed in ten regions across Europe (all included in this study). The air temperature at 1m above  
287 the ground was recorded hourly from February 2017 to February 2018, then, aggregated to minimum  
288 (T<sub>min</sub>), mean (T<sub>mean</sub>) and maximum (T<sub>max</sub>) daily temperature. Next, the temperature offset values  
289 were calculated as the difference between the daily temperature statistics (T<sub>min</sub>, T<sub>mean</sub>, T<sub>max</sub>)  
290 recorded inside the forest and the respective temperature statistic recorded by the closest weather  
291 station (macroclimate above-canopy temperature). Finally, the daily temperature offsets were  
292 aggregated to calculate monthly means (Zellweger et al. 2019).

293 The data obtained was used to build a set of models that analysed the temperature offset as function  
294 of two groups of explanatory variables i) local canopy structure and composition and ii) landscape  
295 structure and topography. Next, the best performing model ( $R^2=0.33$ , RMSE gamm 0.92) with local  
296 canopy cover and distance to the coast as predictors was selected after evaluation using the cross-  
297 validation approach such that a model was calibrated based on data from nine out of 10 regions and  
298 validated based on the remaining one ('leave one out' approach). This model developed by Zellweger  
299 et al., (2019) was used to calculate the below-canopy (juvenile layer) maximum temperature during  
300 summer of the five years precedent to the year of each survey (to iron out any extremes that happen  
301 during the year of the survey) as it was proven to correctly predict the temperature offset in summer.  
302 Additionally, this model reflects principal physical mechanisms for driving the radiation regime below  
303 the canopy, which is a key determinant of the below canopy temperature offsets. During warm and  
304 clear days, a large part of the incoming short- wave radiation is absorbed and reflected by the canopy,  
305 while increasing evapotranspirative cooling, resulting in a cooling of the understory maximum  
306 temperature (De Frenne et al., 2021; De Frenne, Zellweger, Rodríguez-Sánchez, Scheffers,  
307 Hylander, Luoto, Vellend, Verheyen, Lenoir, et al., 2019). Moreover, as the variables used to fit the  
308 model are the plot-specific distance to the coast (invariable), the canopy cover (*in situ* recorded at the  
309 moment of each survey, in 100 plots included in this study) and the macro maximum summer  
310 temperatures extracted from TERRACLIMATE or CRU (extracted for each survey), and the model

311 relies on the physics of radiative transfers through vegetation canopies, the model despite its  
312 limitations, can be used to estimate the temperature at the juvenile layer during both surveys.

313 These analyses resulted in a database that contained mean daily maximum above-canopy  
314 temperatures during the summer extracted from weather stations close to the forests and mean daily  
315 maximum sub-canopy temperatures during the summer for each plot and averaged for the five years  
316 preceding each survey (baseline surveys and resurveys) (Fig. 1c).

317 The maximum summer macroclimate and microclimate temperatures were selected for the analysis  
318 because (i) canopy structure and composition play a key role in regulating the offset of maximum  
319 summer temperatures (Zellweger et al., 2019) and (ii) local maximum temperatures are of paramount  
320 importance for the response of organisms to climate warming due to its relationship with species-  
321 specific heat tolerances and fitness (Macek, Kopecký, & Wild, 2019). We do not interpret our results  
322 in terms of optimal niche locations since the distribution of our plots is not indicative of the species full  
323 distribution range or species performance.

#### 324 *Data analyses*

325 Plots where juveniles and adults of the selected species were recorded (presence/absence data) in  
326 either the baseline survey or the resurvey were used to extract the estimated maximum temperature  
327 data for juveniles (maximum microclimate temperature) and maximum temperature data for adults  
328 (maximum macroclimate temperature). These data were used to calculate: (i) temperature changes  
329 between surveys (thermal shifts over time for each life stage); (ii) temperature variations between life  
330 stages (thermal ontogenetic shifts during both the baseline survey and the resurvey); and (iii) the  
331 change between surveys of the difference in the temperature as perceived by adults and juveniles  
332 (temperature at the adult layer minus the temperature at the juvenile layer; thermal ontogenetic shift  
333 over time) (Fig 1d).

334 We analysed:

335 i) changes in temperature between surveys for the adult and juvenile layers separately using  
336 the temperature at each layer (adult temperature and juvenile temperature) as a response variable  
337 and the survey (baseline vs. resurvey) as explanatory fixed variable.

338 ii) variations of temperature between layers for each survey separately (baseline and  
339 resurvey) using the temperature at both layers (adult and juvenile temperatures) as a response  
340 variable and the layer as explanatory fixed variable (adult vs. juveniles).

341           iii) changes between surveys of the difference between the temperature experienced by the  
342 adult layer and the juvenile layer using the difference between the temperature experienced by the  
343 adults minus the temperature experienced by the juveniles as response variable while the survey was  
344 used as explanatory variable.

345 Generalized mixed-effect models for all the species together included species nested in region as  
346 random intercept, and models for each species separately (species-specific models) included only the  
347 region as random intercept to account for the nested nature and spread of the data within regions  
348 (Table 1). Additionally, to test that there was not pseudo-replication linked to the plot where the  
349 species were recorded i.e. more than one species could be recorded in the same plot, the same  
350 analysis was done with species nested in region and plot (see results in Table S6). Finally, to test that  
351 the results were not biased due to the presence of an adult individual adjoining but not inside the plot  
352 and therefore that plot was recorded as only containing juveniles, the same analyses were repeated  
353 assuming that all the plots where seedlings were present also had an adult individual (see results in  
354 Table S7). All the models were fitted using the lme4 package in R version 3.5.2 (R Core Team, 2018)  
355 and in all cases the significance of the explanatory variable was assessed based on likelihood ratio  
356 tests (Zuur, Ieno, Walker, Saveliev, & Smith, 2009).

357 Next, to be able to understand and link the temperature responses to changes in forest canopy,  
358 changes in cover and frequency (number of times a plant species occurs) over time were analysed for  
359 all the species together and for each species separately using cover and frequency as a response  
360 variable, respectively, and survey as explanatory variable (see results in Tables S3 and S4). The  
361 models for all the species together included species nested in region as random intercept and the  
362 species-specific models included only the region as random intercept. The contribution of the  
363 explanatory variable was assessed based on the likelihood ratio tests (Zuur, Ieno, Walker, Saveliev, &  
364 Smith, 2009).

365 Finally, for all 25 species and then also for the 8 species that showed significant changes in thermal  
366 ontogenetic shifts between surveys (i.e. analysis iii), we correlated this difference (one value per  
367 species) with a shade tolerance index, and the mean and the standard deviation of key functional  
368 traits (leaf mass area, leaf area, plant height and seed mass, Table S2) (Westoby 1998, Díaz et al.  
369 2016). Pearson correlation was used for height while Spearman correlations were used for leaf mass  
370 area, leaf area and seed mass due to the non-normality of those data. The values of the key

371 functional traits were extracted from Díaz et al. (2016). The functional trait values provided by Díaz et  
372 al. (2016) are the geometric mean extracted from the Plant Trait Database TRY ([https:// www.try-  
374 db.org](https://www.try-<br/>373 db.org)) supplemented by published data not included in TRY and a small number of original  
375 unpublished data (Díaz et al., 2016). All data were standardized and subjected to error detection and  
376 quality control (see details in Díaz et al. 2016). The standard deviation values were calculated from  
377 the individual records of traits values available in the TRY database. The number of observations per  
378 trait and species range from a single one (in the case of rare, geographically restricted species) to  
379 hundreds (in the case of common species with broad ranges; Díaz et al. 2016). The shade tolerance  
index for each species was extracted from Niinemets & Valladares (2006).

### 380 **3. Results**

381 Across all species, the adult layer temperature increased by  $1.56\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C} \pm \text{SD } 0.53$  ( $0.38\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}/\text{decade}$ )  
382 between the baseline and the resurvey while the juvenile layer temperature increased by  $1.34\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C} \pm \text{SD}$   
383  $0.42$  ( $0.35\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}/\text{decade}$ ) between surveys (Table S3 and Table S12). However, the rate of temperature  
384 change in both layers was species-specific (Table S3, Fig. 2 and Table S12). In the adult layer,  
385 *Quercus rubra* experienced the highest degree of warming ( $3.59\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ , i.e.  $0.78\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}/\text{decade}$ ) while *Tilia*  
386 *cordata* exhibited the strongest warming in the juvenile layer ( $2.19\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ , i.e.  $0.67\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}/\text{decade}$ ) (Table S3,  
387 Fig. 2 and Table S12).

388 The adult layer experienced significantly higher temperatures than the juvenile layer in both the  
389 baseline survey ( $+2.19\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C} \pm \text{SD } 0.74$ ) and the resurvey ( $+2.41\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C} \pm \text{SD } 0.73$ ) across species (Table  
390 S3). However, the difference between the temperature experienced by the adults and juveniles was  
391 again species-specific (Table S3, Fig. 2 and Table S12). In the baseline survey, the highest difference  
392 between the temperature experienced by the adults and the juveniles was recorded in *Populus*  
393 *tremula* ( $+3.84\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) and in the resurvey in *Tilia platyphyllos* ( $+3.92\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) (Table S3, Fig. 2 and Table  
394 S12).

395 Temperature differences between adults and juveniles changed significantly between surveys when  
396 all the species are considered together (Table S3). We found that the temperature difference  
397 experienced by adults vs juveniles increased over time for 17 (68%) of the 25 analysed European tree  
398 species. However, this difference was significant for eight out of 25 species only (Table S3 and Fig.  
399 3). These eight species exhibited an average increase of  $0.18\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$  in the temperature difference  
400 between adult and juvenile layers when comparing the baseline survey to the resurvey (Fig. 3). In

401 other words, the thermal ontogenetic shift between putative “mothers” and “daughters” significantly  
402 increased over time for eight tree species. The only species in which this temperature difference  
403 significantly decreased, by 0.14 °C, was *Acer campestre* (Fig. 3).

404 Finally, we tested for relationships between thermal ontogenetic shifts and tree species traits. The  
405 evidence for the relationship between thermal ontogenetic shifts over time and traits was weak; when  
406 all 25 species were analysed together, there were no significant correlations between any analysed  
407 trait or their standard deviation and temporal temperature differences between adult and juvenile  
408 layers (correlation ranged from -0.38 to 0.36; Table S11). The difference between the temperature  
409 experienced by adult and juvenile layers over time slightly increased (non-significantly) with the shade  
410 tolerance index (correlation= 0.24, p-value= 0.239; Table S11). A significant positive correlation  
411 (correlation= 0.83, p-value=0.015) was detected between the leaf area, and the difference between  
412 surveys of the variation in the temperature experienced by adults and juveniles, but only for those  
413 eight species exhibiting a significant positive thermal ontogenetic shift over time (Fig. 4 and Table  
414 S10). However, significant positive thermal ontogenetic shifts were not related to leaf mass area, seed  
415 mass, shade tolerance, nor height or their standard deviation (correlations ranged from -0.64 to 0.41;  
416 Table S10).

#### 417 **4. Discussion**

418 The temperature experienced by the studied tree species of temperate European forests, in both the  
419 adult and juvenile layers, changed significantly between surveys. In other words, we detect a shift in  
420 the thermal conditions experienced by both life stages over time. The observed unequal warming of  
421 both layers over time is in line with our expectations of lower sub-canopy than above-canopy  
422 warming, due to a canopy-induced offset of maximum daytime temperatures (Davis, Dobrowski,  
423 Holden, Higuera, & Abatzoglou, 2019; De Frenne, Zellweger, Rodríguez-Sánchez, Scheffers,  
424 Hylander, Luoto, Vellend, Verheyen, & Lenoir, 2019; Zellweger et al., 2019). Considering that the  
425 juvenile layer might express current conditions while the distribution of adults rather expresses past  
426 conditions (Lenoir et al., 2009; Urbieto, Zavala, & Marañón, 2011; Woodall et al., 2009), the  
427 divergence in temperatures might also be influenced by the colonization of new areas (this in turn, is  
428 affected by species’ dispersal capacity). However, due to the warming recorded in the juvenile layer,  
429 our results suggest that species did not manage to shift their distributions to maintain the same  
430 thermal conditions in the resurvey as recorded in the baseline, and likely adapted to the new warmer

431 conditions. The higher difference in thermal conditions between surveys in adults than juveniles  
432 suggest that adult trees are lagging more behind macroclimate change than their conspecific  
433 juveniles.

434 We trust that our estimates of the juvenile layer temperatures are reliable because the model  
435 incorporates canopy cover (*in situ* recorded by experienced forest ecologists at the moment of each  
436 survey) and macroclimate which are the major drivers of below-canopy temperature offsets (De  
437 Frenne et al., 2021; De Frenne, Zellweger, Rodríguez-Sánchez, Scheffers, Hylander, Luoto, Vellend,  
438 Verheyen, Lenoir, et al., 2019) and relies on the physics of radiative transfers through vegetation  
439 canopies. Nonetheless, there are no old forest microclimate measurements in our plots so our  
440 estimates of the baseline temperature at the juvenile layer remain uncertain but are, to the best of our  
441 knowledge, the only ones available. Additionally, although this is carefully avoided in resurvey studies  
442 (Verheyen et al., 2018), possible differences in the way canopy cover was recorded in the baseline  
443 and the resurvey and the methods used by Zellweger et al. (2019) could affect the estimated  
444 temperatures at the juvenile layer. Moreover, there is a part of variability that remains unexplained by  
445 the model used here and it is possible that the variability of the estimated below canopy temperatures  
446 might be lower than the variation of the real observed data.

447 The warming recorded here in both layers is in line, but slightly higher than, the global mean land  
448 surface air temperature increase of 1.29 °C measured between 1940 and 2016 (the time period  
449 considered in this study) (IPCC, 2019). The higher degree of warming recorded in this work is likely  
450 due to the fact that we analysed maximum summer temperatures. The detected temperature increase  
451 was species-specific and, considering the close relationship between latitude and observed and  
452 projected temperatures (De Frenne, Graae, et al., 2013; Monleon & Lintz, 2015), it is likely that  
453 recorded species-specific warming is also linked to the spatial distribution of a species and its  
454 dispersal and establishment capacity (Table S8) despite the fact that our database did not cover the  
455 complete distribution of the species. This species-specific response, might also be linked to the  
456 species-specific crown architecture (e.g. *Betula* species transmit more light to the forest floor than for  
457 example *Abies alba*). However, the influence of crown architecture on the change in the temperature  
458 over time is beyond the scope of this work but should be considered in future studies. The observed  
459 species-specific pattern of temperature increase between surveys should be considered with caution  
460 because the estimates are based on temperature datasets that have a relatively coarse resolution

461 (~4x4 km for TERRACLIMATE). In our study focused on thermal shifts, we only consider one of the  
462 multiple factors that influence the presence of an individual, i.e. temperature, while other factors and  
463 processes could also influence the establishment of new individuals including masting, herbivory, the  
464 past legacy of human interventions and forest management (Lombaerde et al., 2020).

465 Among both surveys, thermal ontogenetic shifts were detected: in the baseline survey the adult layer  
466 experienced 2.19 °C warmer temperatures than the juveniles and in the resurvey this difference  
467 increased by 0.22 °C, reaching 2.41 °C. Differences in the temperatures experienced by adults and  
468 the juveniles were recorded in other forest types and regions including in the USA (Monleon & Lintz,  
469 2015; Zhu et al., 2014) and the Mediterranean (Urbieta et al., 2011). In some cases, these thermal  
470 differences between life stages have been linked to shifts in distribution as a response to climate  
471 change, namely younger life stages shifting towards currently cooler conditions compared to adults'  
472 distribution mirroring past climatic conditions (e.g. Lenoir et al. 2009; Woodall et al. 2009; Monleon &  
473 Lintz 2015). Others found that the range shifts among tree life stages were more consistent with  
474 ontogenetic differences in environmental requirements than with responses to climate change (Máliš  
475 et al., 2016). The latter conclusion was supported by the fact that the authors used recent and  
476 historical data reflecting conditions before current warmer period and identified similar differences  
477 between adults and juveniles in both time periods, driven by warmer growing conditions of seedlings  
478 than adults. Máliš et al. (2016) analysed changes in distribution and linked these distributional  
479 changes with mean macroclimatic conditions calculated for each plot using a network of local  
480 meteorological stations while we used maximum summer macro- and microclimatic temperatures  
481 estimated for each plot using global databases and the relationship between the canopy cover and  
482 the understory temperature. The model used here despite its limitations (see above) correctly predict  
483 the temperature offset in summer (Zellweger et al., 2019). Additionally, the use of the average of the  
484 five years presiding each survey avoids the bias linked to possible abnormal warm or cold summers.  
485 Other authors (e.g. Lenoir et al. 2009; Woodall et al. 2009; Monleon & Lintz 2015) reported results in  
486 the same direction as our findings (i.e. seedlings growing in colder conditions than adults) but linked  
487 these observations to climate warming-induced distributional shifts with seedlings or juveniles  
488 colonizing cooler locations and not to ontogenetic shifts. Using the macroclimatic (adult layer) and  
489 microclimatic (juvenile layer) temperatures, we detected thermal ontogenetic shifts in the studied tree  
490 species independently of the origin of the species and the time period considered (baseline survey

491 and resurvey). Indeed, non-native species such as *Prunus serotina* and *Quercus rubra* (introduced  
492 from the North America) had similar thermal ontogenetic shifts as native European species of the  
493 same genera.

494 The thermal difference experienced by the adults and juveniles (i.e. ontogenetic shift) increased over  
495 time for 17 (68%) of the 25 analysed European tree species. However, this shift was only significant  
496 for eight out of 25 species. Thus, the temperature experienced by the individuals at the two layers  
497 became increasingly decoupled over time for a subset of the studied species. This increased  
498 decoupling is likely caused by the higher warming rates at the canopy layer compared to the forest  
499 floor due to canopy-induced temperature offset. Indeed, the mean canopy cover increased between  
500 surveys in six out of the eight species where we observed increased decoupling between the  
501 temperature experienced by the adults and the juveniles (Table S4, Table S5 and Table S13). The  
502 significant decrease in the difference of the temperature experienced by adults and juveniles over  
503 time reported for one species (*Acer campestre*) might be linked to a decrease in cover in certain plots  
504 caused by mortality of adults of this species, potentially due to an exceedance of physiological  
505 tolerances due to macroclimate warming. Nevertheless, it is possible that the decoupling might also  
506 be linked to species making small local shifts in their ranges and differences in the ability of the  
507 juvenile stages to keep up with the velocity of climate change. It is even likely that these mechanisms  
508 are occurring simultaneously. The increased difference of temperature between the adult and juvenile  
509 layers between surveys partially compensated (0.18°C) macroclimate warming (De Frenne,  
510 Zellweger, Rodríguez-Sánchez, Scheffers, Hylander, Luoto, Vellend, Verheyen, & Lenoir, 2019). This  
511 means that for species that experienced an increase of the difference of temperature between the  
512 adult and juvenile layer between the baseline and recent surveys, the warming was less strong than  
513 for the other species.

514 Our trait-based analyses shed light on the causes of the divergent responses in the difference of the  
515 temperature experienced by adults vs. juveniles between surveys. Large-leafed species exhibited an  
516 increase of the difference between the temperature experienced by adults vs. juveniles over time,  
517 likely because large leaves provide competitive advantages in dealing with the darker conditions of  
518 the understory (Bequet et al., 2011; Li, Liu, & Berninger, 2004). Seedlings with larger leaves can  
519 overtop neighbouring vegetation and get better access to light at the forest floor (Leishman, Wright,  
520 Moles, & Westoby, 2000; Poorter & Rose, 2005). Additionally, larger leaves have usually a thicker

521 boundary layer that slows sensible heat exchange with the surrounding air, developing larger leaf-to-  
522 air temperature differences than smaller leaves. The wider leaf-to-air temperature differences of larger  
523 leaves may allow them to more quickly heat up during cool mornings to favourable temperatures for  
524 photosynthesis, what might allow for higher photosynthetic returns (Wright et al., 2017). The  
525 intraspecific variability of leaf area, included in our analysis as the traits' standard deviation,  
526 apparently, does not affect the difference between the temperature experienced by adults vs.  
527 juveniles over time (no significant correlation). Leaf traits as well as other species traits and properties  
528 (e.g., shade tolerance) can vary not only intraspecifically but also along the species life cycle (i.e.,  
529 ontogenetic shift in traits values). This variation of traits along the species life cycle is somehow  
530 present in our standard deviation analysis as the traits' database used here combines adult and  
531 juveniles' traits values as well as data collected in controlled experiments and in nature. However, a  
532 detail analysis of how ontogenetic changes in functional traits affect the difference between the  
533 temperature experienced by juveniles vs. adults is beyond the scope of this work. Finally, we did not  
534 find a significant relationship between the shade tolerance of the species and the changes in the  
535 adults vs. juveniles thermal differences among surveys. We had, however, a relatively small species  
536 sample size ( $n= 25$  or  $n= 8$ ) (Wasserstein & Lazar, 2016) and further analysis should be done with  
537 larger sample size to confirm these results.

### 538 **Conclusions**

539 In sum, the significant differences between the temperature experienced by adults vs. juveniles  
540 indicate that the different phases of the life cycle can differ in their thermal requirements and/or  
541 tolerances, in line with the ontogenetic shift theory (Bertrand et al., 2011; Eriksson, 2002; Máliš et al.,  
542 2016; Miriti, 2006; Parrish & Bazzaz, 1985b). These findings highlight the importance of studying the  
543 impacts of climate change on different phases of the plant life cycle using reliable climatic information  
544 for each phase and layer. Moreover, our findings suggest that the capacity to deal with climate  
545 change varies with the trees' life stages and with species identity. Adults are more likely to cope with  
546 warming by persisting locally for a long time while juveniles are less likely to do so and thus more  
547 likely to track the shifting isotherms thereby increasing the thermal ontogenetic shifts.

548 By disentangling the impacts of climate change on different phases of plants' life cycle, our work  
549 sheds light onto the ontogenetic changes across large geographical and temporal scales in the  
550 context of climate change. This information is key to advance our understanding of the ecology and

551 dynamics of temperate forests in the face of climate warming. Our findings could also assist forest  
552 managers in predicting future species composition based on climatic projections, and in promoting  
553 tree regeneration by creating suitable tree species-specific microclimatic conditions, helping to  
554 mitigate, at least partially, the change at the understory level driven by changes in macroclimate.

#### 555 **Acknowledgements**

556 Mercedes Caron was supported by FONCyT PICT-2017-2245 and by CESAM Visiting Staff Platform  
557 (2019) - Ghent University

558 Florian Zellweger received funding from the Swiss National Science Foundation (project 172198 and  
559 193645)

560 Kris Verheyen and Michael Perring were supported by the European Research Council (ERC)  
561 UnderSCORE grant #861957

562 Sandra Díaz was supported by FONCyT PICT-2017-1084

563 Radim Hédli, Martin Macek, Petr Petřík, and Martin Kopecký were supported by the long-term  
564 research development project No. RVO 67985939 of the Czech Academy of Sciences.

565 František Máliš was funded by Slovak Research and Development Agency grant No. APVV-19-0319.

566 Pieter De Frenne received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European  
567 Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (ERC Starting Grant FORMICA 757833).

568 **Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare that they don't have any conflict of interest.

569 **Author Contributions statement:** MMC and PDF designed the study. MMC performed the analysis.  
570 FZ provided the climatic database. KV, LB, RH, MB-R, IB, JB, GD, TD, TH, BJ, MK, JL, MM, MM,  
571 MF, NTA, PP, KR, RP, WS, KS, BT, MW and PDF collected the vegetation information available in  
572 the ForestREplot database. FZ, LB, SD, JL, MPP and PDF contributed to the initial discussion of the  
573 paper design. All the authors provided comments.

574 **Data Availability statement:** All vegetation data used in this paper is available in the forestREplot  
575 database ([www.forestreplot.ugent.be](http://www.forestreplot.ugent.be)). Macro and micro temperature data available from the Dryad  
576 Digital Repository <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.rfj6q57bh> (Caron, M. M., et al., 2021). The rest of the  
577 data is available in the cited references or presented in the tables or figures.

#### 578 **References**

579 Abatzoglou, J. T., Dobrowski, S. Z., Parks, S. A., & Hegewisch, K. C. (2018). Terraclimate, a high-  
580 resolution global dataset of monthly climate and climatic water balance from 1958-2015.

581 *Scientific Data*, 5:170191.

582 Baeten, L., Warton, D. I., Van Calster, H., De Frenne, P., Verstraeten, G., Cornelis, J., ... Verheyen,  
583 K. (2014). A model-based approach to studying changes in compositional heterogeneity, 156–  
584 164. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12137>

585 Bennett, A. C., Mcdowell, N. G., Allen, C. D., & Anderson-Teixeira, K. J. (2015). Larger trees suffer  
586 most during drought in forests worldwide. *Nature Plants*, 1 (October), 1–5.  
587 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nplants.2015.139>

588 Bequet, R., Campioli, M., Kint, V., Vansteenkiste, D., Muys, B., & Ceulemans, R. (2011). Leaf area  
589 index development in temperate oak and beech forests is driven by stand characteristics and  
590 weather conditions. *Trees - Structure and Function*, 25, 935–946.  
591 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00468-011-0568-4>

592 Bertrand, R., Gegout, J.-C., & Bontemps, J.-D. (2011). Niches of temperate tree species converge  
593 towards nutrient-richer conditions over ontogeny. *Oikos*, 120, 1479–1488.  
594 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2011.19582.x>

595 Burke, M. J. W., & Grime, J. P. (1996). An experimental study of plant community invasibility. *Ecology*,  
596 77(3), 776–790.

597 Bussotti, F., Pollastrini, M., Holland, V., & Brüggemann, W. (2015). Functional traits and adaptive  
598 capacity of European forests to climate change. *Environmental and Experimental Botany*, 111,  
599 91–113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envexpbot.2014.11.006>

600 Carón, M. M., De Frenne, P., Brunet, J., Chabrierie, O., Cousins, S. A. O., De Backer, L., ...  
601 Verheyen, K. (2014). Latitudinal variation in seeds characteristics of *Acer platanoides* and *A.*  
602 *pseudoplatanus*. *Plant Ecology*, 215(8), 911–925. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11258-014-0343-x>

603 Carón, M. M., De Frenne, P., Brunet, J., Chabrierie, O., Cousins, S. A. O., Decocq, G., ... Verheyen,  
604 K. (2015). Divergent regeneration responses of two closely related tree species to direct abiotic  
605 and indirect biotic effects of climate change. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 342, 21–29.  
606 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2015.01.003>

607 Caron, M. M., Zellweger, F., Verheyen, K., Baeten, L., Hédli, R., Bernhardt-Römermann, M., ... De  
608 Frenne (2021) Data From: Thermal differences between juveniles and adults increased over  
609 time in European forest trees Dryad Digital Repository <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.rfj6q57bh>

610 Davis, K. T., Dobrowski, S. Z., Holden, Z. A., Higuera, P. E., & Abatzoglou, J. T. (2019). Microclimatic

611 buffering in forests of the future: the role of local water balance. *Ecography*, 42, 1–11.  
612 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.03836>

613 De Frenne, P., Brunet, J., Shevtsova, A., Kolb, A., Graae, B. J., Chabrierie, O., ... Verheyen, K.  
614 (2011). Temperature effects on forest herbs assessed by warming and transplant experiments  
615 along a latitudinal gradient. *Global Change Biology*, 17(10), 3240–3253.  
616 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2011.02449.x>

617 De Frenne, P., Graae, B. J., Rodríguez-Sánchez, F., Kolb, A., Chabrierie, O., Decocq, G., ...  
618 Verheyen, K. (2013). Latitudinal gradients as natural laboratories to infer species' responses to  
619 temperature. *Journal of Ecology*, n/a-n/a. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.12074>

620 De Frenne, P., Lenoir, J., Luoto, M., Scheffers, B. R., Zellweger, F., Aalto, J., ... Hylander, K. (2021).  
621 Forest microclimates and climate change: Importance, drivers and future research agenda.  
622 *Global Change Biology*, (February), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15569>

623 De Frenne, P., Rodríguez-Sánchez, F., Coomes, D. A., Baeten, L., Verstraeten, G., Vellend, M., ...  
624 Verheyen, K. (2013). Microclimate moderates plant responses to macroclimate warming. *PNAS*,  
625 110(46), 18561–18565. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1311190110>

626 De Frenne, P., Zellweger, F., Rodríguez-Sánchez, F., Scheffers, B. R., Hylander, K., Luoto, M., ...  
627 Lenoir, J. (2019). Global buffering of temperatures under forest canopies. *Nature Ecology &*  
628 *Evolution*, 3, 744–749. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-019-0842-1>

629 De Lombaerde, E., Baeten, L., Verheyen, K., Perring, M. P., Ma, S., & Landuyt, D. (2020). Understory  
630 removal effects on tree regeneration in temperate forest: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied*  
631 *Ecology*, 58(1), 9–20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13792>

632 Depauw, L., Perring, M. P., Landuyt, D., Maes, S. L., Blondeel, H., De Lombaerde, E., ... Verheyen,  
633 K. (2020). Light availability and land-use history drive biodiversity and functional changes in  
634 forest herb layer communities. *Journal of Ecology*, (108), 1411–1425.  
635 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.13339>

636 Díaz, S., Settele, J., Brondízio, E., Ngo, H., Guèze, M., Agard, J., ... Zayas, C. (2019). *Summary for*  
637 *policymakers of the global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services of the*  
638 *Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. Report of*  
639 *the Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem*  
640 *Services on the work of its seventh session*. Paris.

641 Díaz, Sandra, Kattge, J., Cornelissen, J. H. C., Wright, I. J., Lavorel, S., Dray, S., ... Gorné, L. D.  
642 (2016). The global spectrum of plant form and function. *Nature*, 529(7585), 167–171.  
643 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature16489>

644 Dobrowski, S. Z., Swanson, A. K., Abatzoglou, J. T., Holden, Z. A., Safford, H. D., Schwartz, M. K., &  
645 Gavin, D. G. (2015). Forest structure and species traits mediate projected recruitment declines  
646 in western US tree species. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 24(8), 917–927.  
647 <https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12302>

648 Dusenge, M. E., Duarte, A. G., & Way, D. A. (2019). Tansley review Plant carbon metabolism and  
649 climate change : elevated CO 2 and temperature impacts on photosynthesis , photorespiration  
650 and respiration. *New Phytologist*, 2, 32–49. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.15283>

651 Eriksson, O. (2002). Ontogenetic niche shifts and their implications for recruitment in three clonal  
652 Vaccinium shrubs: *Vaccinium myrtillus* , *Vaccinium vitis-idaea* , and *Vaccinium oxycoccos*.  
653 *Canadian Journal of Botany*, 80, 635–641. <https://doi.org/10.1139/B02-044>

654 Fay, P. A., & Schultz, M. J. (2009). Germination, survival, and growth of grass and forb seedlings:  
655 Effects of soil moisture variability. *Acta Oecologica*, 35(5), 679–684.  
656 <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.actao.2009.06.007>

657 Fick, S. E., & Hijmans, R. J. (2017). WorldClim 2: new 1-km spatial resolution climate surfaces for  
658 global land areas. *International Journal of Climatology*, 37(12), 4302–4315.  
659 <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.5086>

660 Geiger, R., Aron, R. H., & Todhunter, P. (2003). *The climate near the ground*. Rowman and Littlefield,  
661 Oxford.

662 George, L. O., & Bazzaz, F. A. (1999). The Fern Understory as an Ecological Filter : Emergence and  
663 Establishment of Canopy-Tree Seedlings. *Ecology*, 80(3), 833–845.

664 Gold, S., Korotkov, A., & Sasse, V. (2006). The development of European forest resources, 1950 to  
665 2000. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 8(2), 183–192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2004.07.002>

666 González-Rodríguez, V., Villar, R., & Navarro-Cerrillo, R. M. (2011). Maternal influences on seed  
667 mass effect and initial seedling growth in four *Quercus* species. *Acta Oecologica*, 37(1), 1–9.  
668 <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.actao.2010.10.006>

669 Grubb, P. J. (1977). The maintenance of species-richness in plant communities: the importance of the  
670 regeneration niche. *Biological Reviews*, 52, 107–145.

671 IPCC. (2019). *Climate Change and Land*.

672 Karger, D. N., Conrad, O., Böhner, J., Kawohl, T., Kreft, H., Soria-Auza, R. W., ... Kessler, M. (2017).  
673 Climatologies at high resolution for the earth's land surface areas. *Scientific Data*, 4, 170122.  
674 <https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2017.122>

675 Kuhn, E., & Gegout, J.-C. (2019). Highlighting declines of cold-demanding plant species in lowlands  
676 under climate warming. *Ecography*, 42, 36–44. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.03469>

677 Leishman, M. R., Wright, I. J., Moles, A. T., & Westoby, M. (2000). The Evolutionary Ecology of Seed  
678 Size. In M. Fenner (Ed.), *Seeds: The Ecology of Regeneration in Plant Communities* (pp. 31–  
679 58).

680 Lenoir, J., Gégout, J. C., Marquet, P. a, de Ruffray, P., Brisse, H., J. Lenoir, ... Brisse, H. (2008). A  
681 Significant Upward Shift in Plant Species Optimum Elevation During the 20th Century. *Science*,  
682 320(June), 1768–1771. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1156831>

683 Lenoir, J., Gegout, J.-C., Pierrat, J.-C., Bontemps, J.-D., & Dhote, J.-F. (2009). Differences between  
684 tree species seedling and adult altitudinal distribution in mountain forests during the recent warm  
685 period (1986 - 2006). *Ecography*, 32(January), 765–777. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.2009.05791.x>

686

687 Lenoir, J., Hattab, T., & Pierre, G. (2017). Climatic microrefugia under anthropogenic climate change:  
688 implications for species redistribution. *Ecography*, 40(2), 253–266.  
689 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.02788>

690 Li, C., Liu, S., & Berninger, F. (2004). Picea seedlings show apparent acclimation to drought with  
691 increasing altitude in the eastern Himalaya. *Trees*, 18, 277–283. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00468-003-0304-9>

692

693 Lloret, F., Peñuelas, J., Prieto, P., Llorens, L., & Estiarte, M. (2009). Plant community changes  
694 induced by experimental climate change : Seedling and adult species composition. *Perspectives*  
695 *in Plant Ecology, Evolution and Systematics*, 11, 53–63.  
696 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ppees.2008.09.001>

697 Lohbeck, M., Lebrija-Trejos, E., Martínez-Ramos, M., Meave, J. A., Poorter, L., & Bongers, F. (2015).  
698 Functional trait strategies of trees in dry and wet tropical forests are similar but differ in their  
699 consequences for succession. *PLoS ONE*, 10(4), 1–15.  
700 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0123741>

701 Luysaert, S., Ciais, P., Piao, S. L., Schulze, E.-D., Jung, M., Zaehle, S., ... members of the  
702 Carboeurope-IP synthesis Team. (2010). The European carbon balance . Part 3 : forests. *Global*  
703 *Change Biology*, 16, 1429–1450. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2009.02056.x>

704 Macek, M., Kopecký, M., & Wild, J. (2019). Maximum air temperature controlled by landscape  
705 topography affects plant species composition in temperate forests. *Landscape Ecology*,  
706 0123456789(34), 2541–2556. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-019-00903-x>

707 Máliš, F., Kopecky, M., Petrik, P., Vladovic, J., Merganic, J., & Vida, T. (2016). Life stage, not climate  
708 change, explains observed tree range shifts. *Global Change Biology*, 22, 1904–1914.  
709 <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13210>

710 McGrath, M. J., Luysaert, S., Meyfroidt, P., Kaplan, J. O., Bürgi, M., Chen, Y., ... Valade, A. (2015).  
711 Reconstructing European forest management from 1600 to 2010. *Biogeosciences*, 12, 4291–  
712 4316. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-12-4291-2015>

713 Mérian, P., & Lebourgeois, F. (2011). Size-mediated climate – growth relationships in temperate  
714 forests : A multi-species analysis. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 261, 1382–1391.  
715 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2011.01.019>

716 Miriti, M. N. (2006). Ontogenetic shift from facilitation to competition in a desert shrub. *Journal of*  
717 *Ecology*, 94, 973–979. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2745.2006.01138.x>

718 Monleon, V. J., & Lintz, H. E. (2015). Evidence of Tree Species' Range Shifts in a Complex  
719 Landscape. *PLoS ONE*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0118069>

720 Niinemets, Ü., & Valladares, F. (2006). Tolerance to shade, drought, and waterlogging of temperate  
721 Northern Hemisphere trees and shrubs. *Ecological Monographs*, 76, 521–547.

722 Norby, R. J., Delucia, E. H., Gielen, B., Calfapietra, C., Giardina, C. P., King, J. S., ... Oren, R. (2005).  
723 Forest response to elevated CO<sub>2</sub> is conserved across a broad range of productivity. *PNAS*, 102,  
724 18052–18056.

725 Parrish, J. A. D., & Bazzaz, F. A. (1985a). Nutrient content of *Abutilon theophrasti* seeds and the  
726 competitive ability of the resulting plants. *Oecologia*, 65(2), 247–251.  
727 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00379224>

728 Parrish, J. A. D., & Bazzaz, F. A. (1985b). Ontogenetic niche shifts in old-field annuals. *Ecology*,  
729 66(4), 1296–1302.

730 Perring, M. P., Bernhardt-Römermann, M., Baeten, L., Midolo, G., Blondeel, H., Depauw, L., ...

731 Verheyen, K. (2018). Global environmental change effects on plant community composition  
732 trajectories depend upon management legacies. *Global Change Biology*, (June 2017).  
733 <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14030>

734 Petr, M., Boerboom, L. G. J., Van der Veen, A., & Ray, D. (2014). A spatial and temporal drought risk  
735 assessment of three major tree species in Britain using probabilistic climate change projections.  
736 *Climatic Change*, 124(4), 791–803. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-014-1122-3>

737 Piao, S., Fu, Y., Liu, Q., Chen, A., Janssens, I. A., Dai, J., ... Zhu, X. (2019). Plant phenology and  
738 global climate change: Current progresses and challenges. *Global Change Biology*,  
739 25(February), 1922–1940. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14619>

740 Poorter, L., & Rose, S. A. (2005). Light-dependent changes in the relationship between seed mass  
741 and seedling traits: A meta-analysis for rain forest tree species. *Oecologia*, 142(3), 378–387.  
742 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-004-1732-y>

743 Pretzsch, H., Biber, P., Schu, G., Uhl, E., & Ro, T. (2014). Forest stand growth dynamics in Central  
744 Europe have accelerated since 1870, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms5967>

745 R Core Team. (2018). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R  
746 Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from <https://www.r-project.org/>.

747 Rabasa, S. G., Granda, E., Benavides, R., Kunstler, G., Espelta, J. M., Ogaya, R., ... Valladares, F.  
748 (2013). Disparity in elevational shifts of European trees in response to recent climate warming.  
749 *Global Change Biology*, 19, 2490–2499. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12220>

750 Rautiainen, A., Wernick, I., Waggoner, P. E., Ausubel, J. H., & Kauppi, P. E. (2011). A National and  
751 International Analysis of Changing Forest Density. *PLoS ONE*, 6(5), 1–7.  
752 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0019577>

753 Royo, A. A., & Carson, W. P. (2006). On the formation of dense understory layers in forests  
754 worldwide: consequences and implications for forest dynamics, biodiversity, and succession.  
755 *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*, 36(36), 1345–1362. <https://doi.org/10.1139/X06-025>

756 Sádlo, J., Chytrý, M., Pergl, J., & Pyšek, P. (2018). Plant dispersal strategies: a new classification  
757 based on the multiple dispersal modes of individual species. *Preslia*, 90, 1–22.  
758 <https://doi.org/10.23855/preslia.2018.001>

759 Segan, D. B., Murray, K. A., & Watson, J. E. M. (2016). A global assessment of current and future  
760 biodiversity vulnerability to habitat loss – climate change interactions. *Global Ecology and*

761 *Conservation*, 5, 12–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2015.11.002>

762 Shepherd, E., Knight, A. T., Ling, M. A., Darrah, S., Van Soesbergen, A., & Burgess, N. D. (2016).  
763 Status and Trends in Global Ecosystem Services and Natural Capital: Assessing Progress  
764 Toward Aichi Biodiversity Target 14. *Conservation Biology*, 9(December), 429–437.  
765 <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12320>

766 Shevtosova, A., Graae, B. J., Jochum, T., Milbau, A., Kockelbergh, F., Beyens, L., ... Nijs, I. (2009).  
767 Critical periods for impact of climate warming on early seedling establishment in subarctic  
768 tundra. *Global Change Biology*, 15(11), 2662–2680. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2009.01947.x)  
769 [2486.2009.01947.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2009.01947.x)

770 Smith, S. J., Edmonds, J., Hartin, C. A., Mundra, A., & Calvin, K. (2015). Near-term acceleration in the  
771 rate of temperature change. *Nature Climate Change*, 5(April 2015), 333–336.  
772 <https://doi.org/10.1038/NCLIMATE2552>

773 Steinbauer, M. J., Grytnes, J.-A., Jurasinski, G., Kulonen, A., Lenoir, J., Pauli, H., ... Bardy-  
774 Durchhalter, M. (2018). Accelerated increase in plant species richness on mountain summits is  
775 linked to warming. *Nature*, 556, 231–234.

776 Urban, M. C. (2015). Accelerating extinction risk from climate change. *Science*, 348(6234), 571–573.

777 Urbieto, I. R., Zavala, M. A., & Marañón, T. (2011). Mediterranean pine and oak distribution in  
778 southern Spain: Is there a mismatch between regeneration and adult distribution? *Journal of*  
779 *Vegetation Science*, 22, 18–31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1654-1103.2010.01222.x>

780 Uvarov, B. P. (1931). Insects and climate. *Transactions of the Royal Entomological Society of*  
781 *London*, 79(1), 1–232. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2311.1931.tb00696.x>

782 Verheyen, K., Bažány, M., Chečko, E., Chudomelová, M., Patryk, D. C., Guillaume, C., ... Baeten, L.  
783 (2018). Journal of Vegetation Science Observer and relocation errors matter in resurveys of  
784 historical vegetation plots. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, (May), 812–823.  
785 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jvs.12673>

786 Verheyen, K., De Frenne, P., Baeten, L., Waller, D. M., Hédli, R., Perring, M. P., ... Bernhardt-  
787 Römermann, M. (2017). Combining Biodiversity Resurveys across Regions to Advance Global  
788 Change Research. *BioScience*, 67(1), 73–83. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biw150>

789 Walck, J. L., Hidayati, S., Dixon, K. W., Thompson, K., & Poschlod, P. (2011). Climate change and  
790 plant regeneration from seed. *Global Change Biology*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365->

791 2486.2010.02368.x

792 Wasserstein, R. L., & Lazar, N. A. (2016). The ASA's Statement on  $p$ -Values: Context, Process, and  
793 Purpose. *The American Statistician*, 70(2), 129–133.

794 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00031305.2016.1154108>

795 Werner, E. E., & Gilliam, J. F. (1984). The ontogenetic niche and species interactions in size-  
796 structured populations. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 15, 393–425.

797 Westoby, M. (1998). A leaf-height-seed (LHS) plant ecology strategy scheme. *Plant and Soil*, 199,  
798 213–227.

799 Woodall, C. W., Oswalt, C. M., Westfall, J. A., Perry, C. H., Nelson, M. D., & Finley, A. O. (2009). An  
800 indicator of tree migration in forests of the eastern United States. *Forest Ecology and*  
801 *Management*, 257, 1434–1444. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2008.12.013>

802 Wright, I. J., Dong, N., Maire, V., Prentice, I. C., Westoby, M., Díaz, S., ... Reich, P. B. (2017). Global  
803 climatic drivers of leaf size. *Science*, 12(September), 917–921.

804 Zellweger, F., Commes, D., Lenoir, J., Depauw, L., Maes, S. L., Wulf, M., ... De Frenne, P. (2019).  
805 Seasonal drivers of understorey temperature buffering in temperate deciduous forests across  
806 Europe. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, (July), 1774–1786.  
807 <https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12991>

808 Zellweger, F., De Frenne, P., Lenoir, J., Vangansbeke, P., Verheyen, K., Bernhardt-Römermann, M.,  
809 ... Coomes, D. (2020). Forest microclimate dynamics drive plant responses to warming.  
810 *Science*, 368(May), 772–775. [https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1126/science.aba6880](https://doi.org/DOI:10.1126/science.aba6880)

811 Zhu, K., Woodall, C. W., Ghosh, S., Gelfand, A. E., & Clark, J. S. (2014). Dual impacts of climate  
812 change : forest migration and turnover through life history. *Global Change Biology*, 20, 251–264.  
813 <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12382>

814 Zuur, A. F., Ieno, E. N., Walker, N., Saveliev, A. A., & Smith, G. M. (2009). *Mixed effects models and*  
815 *extensions in ecology with R*. New York, NY: Springer New York. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-87458-6)  
816 [387-87458-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-87458-6)

Table 1: Mixed-effect models used for the analysis of thermal shift between surveys and layers and the change in the difference between the temperature experienced by adults (macroclimate) and juveniles (microclimate) over time across and within species

<b>Models across species</b>			
	<b>Response variable</b>	<b>Fixed effects</b>	<b>Random effects</b>
For the adult layer	Macroclimate temperature	Survey	Region x sp + sp
For the juvenile layer	Microclimate temperature	Survey	Region x sp + sp
For the baseline survey	Temperature (macroclimate temperature & microclimate temperature)	Layer	Region x sp + sp
For the resurvey	Temperature (macroclimate temperature & microclimate temperature)	Layer	Region x sp + sp
For the complete database (baseline and resurvey including adults and juveniles)	$\Delta$ Temperature (macroclimate temperature – microclimate temperature)	Survey	Region x sp + sp
<b>Species-specific models</b>			
	<b>Response variable</b>	<b>Fixed effects</b>	<b>Random effects</b>
For the adult layer	Macroclimate temperature	Survey	Region
For the juvenile layer	Microclimate temperature	Survey	Region
For the baseline survey	Temperature (macroclimate temperature & microclimate temperature)	Layer	Region
For the resurvey	Temperature (macroclimate temperature & microclimate temperature)	Layer	Region
For the complete database (baseline and resurvey including adults and juveniles)	$\Delta$ Temperature (macroclimate temperature – microclimate temperature)	Survey	Region




Fig. 1: a) Locations of the datasets used for the analysis, b) Histogram of number of plots with years of the baseline survey and resurvey and c) Histogram showing number of plots with given maximum summer temperature in the adult (i.e. macroclimate) and juvenile (i.e. microclimate) layer at the time of the baseline (top) and resurvey (bottom), vertical lines represent the means of each layer d) Scheme of the study design: we first calculate the thermal shift over time for each life stage as the difference in temperatures between resurvey and baseline survey. Second, we calculated ontogenetic thermal shift as the temperature of the canopy (adult layer) vs forest floor (juvenile layer). Finally, we merged both approaches and calculated the ontogenetic thermal shift difference over time integrating the first and second calculation.




Fig. 2: Juvenile layer temperature (subcanopy microclimate temperature) and adult layer temperature (above-canopy macroclimate temperature) for the 25 most common tree species in the baseline survey and resurvey. Vertical lines represent the species means of each layer and survey.




Fig. 3: a) Difference between the adult layer temperature and the juvenile layer temperature (calculated as adult layer minus juvenile layer such that positive values reflect warmer temperatures for the overstory trees) in the baseline survey (red) and the resurvey (yellow); error bars denote standard errors. b) Model estimates of the difference between the adult and juvenile layers temperatures over time. Full circles indicate significant differences and open circles insignificant differences, error bars denote two standard errors.





Fig. 4: Positive relationship between the temperature difference of adults minus juvenile trees over time (resurvey minus baseline survey) and leaf area (mm<sup>2</sup>). Shown here only for the eight species with a significant change in the ontogenetic thermal niche over time (n = 8).



Our study shows that the difference between the temperature experienced by the adult and juvenile stages (ontogenetic niche shift) significantly increased between two temporally distant surveys for eight of 25 European forest tree species. This result suggest that the temperatures experienced by adults vs juveniles became more decoupled over time due to climate warming and changes in canopy cover.

Table S1: Datasets from the forestREplot database ([www.forestreplot.ugent.be](http://www.forestreplot.ugent.be)) used in this work. All plots have records of adult trees (adult layer) and seedlings and juveniles in the understory (juvenile layers) (Perring et al., 2018).

Dataset ID	Country	Region name	Latitude (°N)	Longitude (°E)	Baseline survey	Resurvey
EU_001	Belgium	Gaume	49.6	5.6	1953 - 1963	2008
EU_002	Belgium	Binnen-Vlaanderen	51.1	3.5	1980	2009
EU_003	Belgium	Zoerselbos	51.3	4.7	1982	2008
EU_006	Belgium	Meerdaalwoud	50.8	4.7	1954	2000
EU_009a	Sweden	Dalby	55.7	13.3	1935	2013
EU_009b	Sweden	Dalby	55.7	13.3	1976	2013
EU_011	Germany	Elbe-Weser	53.6	9.0	1986 - 1987	2008
EU_012	Czech Republic	Děvín Wood	48.9	16.6	1953 - 1964	2002 - 2003
EU_014	Czech Republic	Rychlebské hory Mts.	50.3	17.1	1942	1998 - 1999
EU_016	Germany	Göttingen, SFB	51.5	10.0	1980	2001
EU_017	Czech Republic	Milíčovský les	50.0	14.5	1986	2008
EU_018	Switzerland	Switzerland	47.3	7.8	1940 - 1965	1998
EU_019	France	Hirson	49.9	4.1	1956 - 1965	1996 - 1999
EU_020	France	Andigny	50.0	3.6	1957 - 1963	1995 - 1996
EU_021	Netherlands	Speulderbos	52.3	5.7	1957 - 1959	1987 - 1988
EU_023a	Germany	Echinger Lohe	48.3	11.6	1986	2003
EU_025	Germany	Göttingen, Carici-Fagetum	51.3	9.8	1960	2011 - 2012
EU_026	Germany	Göttingen, Hordelymo-Fagetum	51.6	10.0	1960 - 1966	2009
EU_027	Austria	Zöbelboden	46.8	14.4	1993	2005 - 2017
EU_028	Hungary	Nyírség	47.8	22.3	1933	1990
EU_030	Germany	Brandenburg	52.1	13.9	1962 - 1965	2012
EU_031	Slovakia	Slovakia, South-West	48.4	17.3	1966 - 1972	2007
EU_032	Slovakia	Slovakia, Central	48.3	19.4	1964 - 1973	2005 - 2007
EU_033	Slovakia	Slovakia, North-East	49.2	21.9	1965 - 1974	2006
EU_034	Czech Republic	České Středohoří	50.6	14.1	1965	2012
EU_038	Poland	Białowieża	52.7	23.9	1966	2012
EU_039	France	Jura	46.8	6.4	1989	2007
EU_042	Germany	Sonneberg	50.4	11.1	1961 - 1962	2016
EU_044	Germany	Göttingen, Hünstollen	51.6	10.0	1992	2012
EU_046	Poland	Sanocko-Turczańskie Mountains	49.5	22.4	1972 - 1973	2005 - 2007
EU_047	Poland	Bazaltowa Mt	51.0	16.1	1992 - 1994	2010 - 2014
EU_048	Poland	Buki Sudeckie beech forest	50.9	16.0	1990	2014
EU_049	Poland	Trzebnickie Hills	51.3	16.8	1962	2011 - 2012
EU_051	Sweden	Öland	56.7	16.5	1988	2014
EU_052	Germany	Brandenburg Nord	53.1	13.5	1963 - 1964	2014
EU_053	Germany	Brandenburg Süd	51.8	13.8	1960 - 1966	2014
EU_054	Germany	Unteres Spreewald-Randgebiet	52.1	13.9	1965	2010
EU_055	Slovenia	Strmec	45.6	14.8	1983	2015
EU_056	Slovenia	Rajhenavski Rog	45.7	15.0	1983	2015
EU_057	Slovenia	Pecka	45.8	15.0	1983	2015
EU_058	France	Compiègne forest	49.4	2.9	1970 - 1971	2014 - 2015
EU_059	Hungary	Bakony és Gerecse	47.2	18.1	1955 - 1966	2015 - 2016
EU_060	Hungary	Bükkalja és Dél-Cserehát	47.9	20.4	1956 - 1963	2014 - 2015
EU_061	Hungary	Gödöllői-dombság	47.6	19.4	1955 - 1961	2014 - 2016
EU_062	Hungary	Mátra-Bükk-Zemplén	48.2	20.9	1955 - 1966	2015 - 2016
EU_063	Hungary	Órség	46.9	16.6	1954	2014 - 2015
EU_064	Hungary	Visegrádi-hegység	47.7	19.0	1953 - 1957	2015 - 2016
EU_065	Poland	Olszyny Niezgodzkie	51.5	17.0	1993	2013
EU_066	Germany	Großer Staufenberg	51.6	10.6	1988	2016

Table S2: Functional traits and shade tolerance index used for the analysis

Species name	Leaf mass area (g/m <sup>2</sup> )	Leaf area (leaf or leaflet) (mm <sup>2</sup> )	Plant Height (m)	Seed Mass (mg)	Shade tolerance*
<i>Abies alba</i>	106.05	32.42	42.07	62.01	4.6
<i>Acer campestre</i>	72.15	3146.41	12.22	122.00	3.18
<i>Acer platanoides</i>	51.66	7085.13	21.93	121.60	4.2
<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	72.12	8456.57	24.46	64.61	3.73
<i>Alnus glutinosa</i>	68.11	3070.29	17.80	1.60	2.71
<i>Betula pendula</i>	69.71	1135.68	12.03	0.69	2.03
<i>Betula pubescens</i>	71.45	1327.98	12.59	0.20	1.85
<i>Carpinus betulus</i>	51.02	2191.45	16.72	36.46	3.97
<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	65.37	2061.6	31.48	186.99	4.56
<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	75.24	1683.18	23.12	56.71	2.66
<i>Larix decidua</i>	104.33	19.65	34.90	6.49	1.5
<i>Picea abies</i>	225.18	31.72	40.69	6.44	4.45
<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>	209.68	71.55	25.87	7.43	1.67
<i>Populus tremula</i>	70.53	2265.01	18.25	0.11	2.22
<i>Prunus avium</i>	56.70	2141.06	16.56	185.49	3.33
<i>Prunus serotina</i>	58.11	2115.27	13.31	98.52	2.46
<i>Quercus cerris</i>	101.53	2766.85	33.03	3453.84	2.55
<i>Quercus petraea</i>	72.34	2985.81	31.44	579.50	2.73
<i>Quercus robur</i>	72.50	2991.55	27s.08	3048.02	2.45
<i>Quercus rubra</i>	67.44	6217.05	18.29	2696.92	2.75
<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>	69.50	616.09	13.48	3.47	2.73
<i>Sorbus torminalis</i>	40.99	6209.69	10.20	34.73	3.38
<i>Tilia cordata</i>	42.17	2818.29	18.78	34.54	4.18
<i>Tilia platyphyllos</i>	40.68	6034.07	29.83	91.26	4
<i>Ulmus glabra</i>	58.84	3823.83	31.75	12.38	3.53

\*shade tolerance extracted from Niinemets and Valladares (2006) (0=no tolerance to 5=max. tolerance)

Table S3: Mixed effect models' results of temperature variation between surveys for each layer, temperature variation between layers in both surveys and change of the difference between the temperature experienced by the adult and juvenile layers over time (adult layer temperature minus juvenile layer temperature over time). Here we only present statistical results (likelihood ratio tests, LRT, and p-values of those tests); effect sizes and distributions of data are available in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3. Significance codes level: n.s.:  $P > 0.05$ ; \* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\* $P < 0.01$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.001$ .

Species	Temperature variation between surveys				Temperature variation between the adult and the juvenile layers				Change of the difference between the temperature at the adult and juvenile layer over time	
	Juvenile layer		Adult layer		Baseline survey		Resurvey		LRT	P-value
	LRT	P-value	LRT	P-value	LRT	P-value	LRT	P-value		
All species together	5895.4	< 2.2e-16 ***	9790.8	<2.2e-16 ***	3144	<2.2e-16 ***	15535	<2.2e-16 ***	55.194	1.092e-13 ***
<i>Abies alba</i>	259.56	< 2.2e-16 ***	586.12	< 2.2e-16 ***	471.76	< 2.2e-16 ***	566.97	< 2.2e-16 ***	3.7207	0.0500*
<i>Acer campestre</i>	330.26	< 2.2e-16 ***	154.57	< 2.2e-16 ***	480.76	< 2.2e-16 ***	385.14	< 2.2e-16 ***	13.585	0.000228 ***
<i>Acer platanoides</i>	549.81	< 2.2e-16 ***	412.79	< 2.2e-16 ***	1009.9	< 2.2e-16 ***	1130	<2.2e-16 ***	91.027	< 2.2e-16 ***
<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	900.96	< 2.2e-16 ***	819.99	< 2.2e-16 ***	1712.2	< 2.2e-16 ***	1849.1	< 2.2e-16 ***	0.068143	n.s.
<i>Alnus glutinosa</i>	40.849	1.645e-10 ***	440.23	< 2.2e-16 ***	208.46	< 2.2e-16 ***	234.72	< 2.2e-16 ***	0.27609	n.s.
<i>Betula pendula</i>	26.043	3.339e-07 ***	526.9	<2.2e-16 ***	95.93	<2.2e-16 ***	245.58	< 2.2e-16 ***	1.8704	n.s.
<i>Betula pubescens</i>	5.5367	0.01862 *	98.446	< 2.2e-16 ***	10.426	0.001243 **	45.461	1.557e-11 ***	0.20274	n.s.
<i>Carpinus betulus</i>	391.34	< 2.2e-16 ***	1085.2	< 2.2e-16 ***	1082.5	< 2.2e-16 ***	1307.9	< 2.2e-16 ***	0.14288	n.s.
<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	777.62	< 2.2e-16 ***	1811.8	< 2.2e-16 ***	2084.7	< 2.2e-16 ***	2900.1	< 2.2e-16 ***	90.974	< 2.2e-16 ***
<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	825.62	< 2.2e-16 ***	1478.4	< 2.2e-16 ***	1935	<2.2e-16 ***	2203.9	< 2.2e-16 ***	0.08687	n.s.
<i>Larix decidua</i>	3.5907	0.0581	59.556	1.189e-14 ***	21.329	3.869e-06 ***	31.096	2.456e-08 ***	0.09084	n.s.
<i>Picea abies</i>	52.06	5.382e-13 ***	284.46	< 2.2e-16 ***	198.15	< 2.2e-16 ***	419	<2.2e-16 ***	0.84209	n.s.
<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>	147.07	< 2.2e-16 ***	597.04	< 2.2e-16 ***	211.88	< 2.2e-16 ***	4 246.48	< 2.2e-16 ***	3.1012	n.s.
<i>Populus tremula</i>	26.648	2.442e-07 ***	17.681	2.612e-05 ***	107.04	< 2.2e-16 ***	67.854	< 2.2e-16 ***	0.68252	n.s.
<i>Prunus avium</i>	96.921	< 2.2e-16 ***	57.25	3.837e-14 ***	25.59	<2.2e-16 ***	7 285.87	< 2.2e-16 ***	6.5259	0.01063 *
<i>Prunus serotina</i>	9.439	0.002124 **	64.52	9.554e-16 ***	19.803	8.583e-06 ***	264.17	< 2.2e-16 ***	0.5595	n.s.
<i>Quercus cerris</i>	16.351	5.263e-05 ***	101.26	< 2.2e-16 ***	63.703	1.446e-15 ***	62.767	2.326e-15 ***	5.837	0.01569 *
<i>Quercus petraea</i>	145.56	< 2.2e-16 ***	521.01	< 2.2e-16 ***	660.6	<2.2e-16 ***	612.43	< 2.2e-16 ***	11.198	0.0008189 ***
<i>Quercus robur</i>	383.9	< 2.2e-16 ***	767.04	< 2.2e-16 ***	1121.5	< 2.2e-16 ***	1160.7	< 2.2e-16 ***	0.27127	n.s.
<i>Quercus rubra</i>	20.083	7.417e-06 ***	7.0821	0.007786 **	16.013	6.289e-05 ***	73.953	< 2.2e-16 ***	2.0572	n.s.

<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>	274.37	< 2.2e-16 ***	94.258	< 2.2e-16 ***	200.08	< 2.2e-16 ***	160.34	< 2.2e-16 ***	2.1523	n.s.
<i>Sorbus torminalis</i>	89.543	< 2.2e-16 ***	134.56	< 2.2e-16 ***	129.54	< 2.2e-16 ***	181.75	< 2.2e-16 ***	16.695	4.389e-05 ***
<i>Tilia cordata</i>	113.87	< 2.2e-16 ***	277.85	< 2.2e-16 ***	249.29	< 2.2e-16 ***	287.36	< 2.2e-16 ***	0.0090372	n.s.
<i>Tilia platyphyllos</i>	48.793	2.844e-12 ***	67.759	< 2.2e-16 ***	98.87	< 2.2e-16 ***	175.64	< 2.2e-16 ***	33.043	9.015e-09 ***
<i>Ulmus glabra</i>	437.52	< 2.2e-16 ***	434.64	< 2.2e-16 ***	956.75	< 2.2e-16 ***	758.32	< 2.2e-16 ***	0.15073	n.s.

Table S4: Likelihood ratio tests (LRT) of the cover change between the baseline survey and the resurvey for the juvenile and adult layers. Significance codes level: n.s.: P > 0.05; \*P < 0.05; \*\*P < 0.01; \*\*\*P < 0.001

	Juvenile layer		Adult layer	
	LRT	P-value	LRT	P-value
All species	34.591	4.068e-09 ***	71.982	<2.2e-16 ***
<i>Abies alba</i>	48.880	2.721e-12 ***	0.001	0.9732
<i>Acer campestre</i>	0.993	n.s.	30.335	3.635e-08 ***
<i>Acer platanoides</i>	41.993	9.158e-11 ***	23.422	1.301e-06 ***
<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	16.643	4.511e-05 ***	18.594	1.618e-05 ***
<i>Alnus glutinosa</i>	0.049	n.s.	0.585	n.s.
<i>Betula pendula</i>	0.005	n.s.	0.003	n.s.
<i>Betula pubescens</i>	0.450	n.s.	0.032	n.s.
<i>Carpinus betulus</i>	0.295	n.s.	10.441	0.001232 **
<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	1.729	n.s.	13.136	0.0002897 ***
<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	40.690	1.784e-10 ***	4.169	0.04115 *
<i>Larix decidua</i>	3.837	0.05015	4.128	0.04217 *
<i>Picea abies</i>	4.585	0.03226 *	0.301	n.s.
<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>	15.500	8.252e-05 ***	7.361	0.006666 **
<i>Populus tremula</i>	0.956	n.s.	0.339	n.s.
<i>Prunus avium</i>	1.765	n.s.	11.430	0.0007227 ***
<i>Prunus serotina</i>	0.068	n.s.	0.169	n.s.
<i>Quercus cerris</i>	7.539	0.006035 **	6.703	0.009627 **
<i>Quercus petraea</i>	0.274	n.s.	16.007	6.31e-05 ***
<i>Quercus robur</i>	1.744	n.s.	4.872	0.02729 *
<i>Quercus rubra</i>	0.149	n.s.	0.024	0.8781
<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>	1.427	n.s.	1.0907	n.s.
<i>Sorbus torminalis</i>	0.077	n.s.	4.310	0.03789 *
<i>Tilia cordata</i>	2.714	n.s.	9.149	0.002489 **
<i>Tilia platyphyllos</i>	2.217	n.s.	11.906	0.0005595 ***
<i>Ulmus glabra</i>	1.147	n.s.	0.431	n.s.

Table S5: Likelihood ratio tests (LRT) of the species-specific frequency change for the adult and the juvenile layers between surveys. Significance codes level: n.s.:  $P > 0.05$ ; \* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\* $P < 0.01$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.001$

	Juvenile layer		Adult layer	
	LRT	P-value	LRT	P-value
All species	2845.500	< 2.2e-16 ***	1.877	n.s.
<i>Abies alba</i>	34.875	3.516e-09 ***	49.780	1.72e-12 ***
<i>Acer campestre</i>	20.546	5.822e-06 ***	8.493	0.003566 **
<i>Acer platanoides</i>	181.530	< 2.2e-16 ***	0.478	n.s.
<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	360.660	< 2.2e-16 ***	18.715	1.518e-05 ***
<i>Alnus glutinosa</i>	68.643	< 2.2e-16 ***	4.179	0.04091 *
<i>Betula pendula</i>	41.414	1.231e-10 ***	15.008	0.0001071 ***
<i>Betula pubescens</i>	47.948	4.377e-12 ***	4.557	0.03278 *
<i>Carpinus betulus</i>	168.500	< 2.2e-16 ***	8.519	0.003514 **
<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	485.730	< 2.2e-16 ***	17.575	2.762e-05 ***
<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	700.890	< 2.2e-16 ***	17.898	2.33e-05 ***
<i>Larix decidua</i>	0	1	0.448	n.s.
<i>Picea abies</i>	157.760	< 2.2e-16 ***	7.068	0.007846 **
<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>	74.552	< 2.2e-16 ***	15.804	7.027e-05 ***
<i>Populus tremula</i>	3.361	n.s.	14.406	0.0001474 ***
<i>Prunus avium</i>	134.210	< 2.2e-16 ***	5.837	0.0157 *
<i>Prunus serotina</i>	426.670	< 2.2e-16 ***	88.936	< 2.2e-16 ***
<i>Quercus cerris</i>	2.604	n.s.	5.738	0.01661 *
<i>Quercus petraea</i>	42.513	7.021e-11 ***	1.072	n.s.
<i>Quercus robur</i>	54.309	1.713e-13 ***	1.232	n.s.
<i>Quercus rubra</i>	44.521	2.517e-11 ***	17.741	2.531e-05 ***
<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>	157.860	< 2.2e-16 ***	2.805	n.s.
<i>Sorbus torminalis</i>	1.643	n.s.	11.872	0.0005699 ***
<i>Tilia cordata</i>	55.572	9.011e-14 ***	0.326	n.s.
<i>Tilia platyphyllos</i>	63.475	1.624e-15 ***	2.095	n.s.
<i>Ulmus glabra</i>	121.190	< 2.2e-16 ***	81.178	< 2.2e-16 ***

Table S6: Mixed effect models' results of (i) temperature difference between the adult and the juvenile layers in the baseline survey and the resurvey (ii) temperature difference between the baseline survey and the resurvey for the juvenile and adult layers, and (iii) change of the difference between the adult and juvenile layer over time (adult layer minus juvenile layer over time) using species *nested* in *plot* nested in *region* as random structures

	Temperature differences between the adult and the juvenile layers				Temperature difference between surveys				Change of the difference between the adult and juvenile layer over time	
	Baseline survey		Resurvey		Adult layer		Juvenile layer		LRT	P-value
	LRT	P-value	LRT	P-value	LRT	P-value	LRT	P-value		
All the species with random structure (1 plot/region/species)	10764	< 2.2e-16 ***	15803	< 2.2e-16 ***	18668	< 2.2e-16 ***	25592	< 2.2e-16 ***	150.39	< 2.2e-16 ***

¥LRT: likelihood ratio test

§Significance codes level: n.s.: P > 0.05; \*P < 0.05; \*\*P < 0.01; \*\*\*P < 0.001

Table S7: Mixed effect models' results of (i) temperature difference between the adult and the juvenile layers in the baseline survey and the resurvey (ii) temperature difference between the baseline survey and the resurvey for the juvenile and adult layers, and (iii) change of the difference between the adult and juvenile layer over time (adult layer minus juvenile layer over time)

Species	Temperature differences between the adult and the juvenile layers				Temperature difference between surveys				Change of the difference between the adult and juvenile layer over time	
	Baseline survey		Resurvey		Adult layer		Juvenile layer		LRT	P-value
	LRT	P-value	LRT	P-value	LRT	P-value	LRT	P-value		
All species together	15152	< 2.2e-16 ***	19582	< 2.2e-16 ***	14047	< 2.2e-16 ***	5895.4	< 2.2e-16 ***	55.194	1.092e-13 ***
Abies alba	499.38	< 2.2e-16 ***	582.18	< 2.2e-16 ***	612.52	< 2.2e-16 ***	259.56	< 2.2e-16 ***	3.7207	n.s.
Acer campestre	702.11	< 2.2e-16 ***	625.73	< 2.2e-16 ***	467.33	< 2.2e-16 ***	330.26	< 2.2e-16 ***	13.585	0.000228 ***
Acer platanoides	1530.9	< 2.2e-16 ***	1977	< 2.2e-16 ***	1228.3	< 2.2e-16 ***	549.81	< 2.2e-16 ***	91.027	< 2.2e-16 ***
Acer pseudoplatanus	2082.6	< 2.2e-16 ***	2512.6	< 2.2e-16 ***	1566	< 2.2e-16 ***	900.96	< 2.2e-16 ***	0.068	n.s.
Alnus glutinosa	204.06	< 2.2e-16 ***	238.96	< 2.2e-16 ***	445.86	< 2.2e-16 ***	40.849	1.645e-10 ***	0.27609	n.s.
Betula pendula	101.41	< 2.2e-16 ***	257.85	< 2.2e-16 ***	581.82	< 2.2e-16 ***	26.043	3.339e-07 ***	1.8704	n.s.
Betula pubescens	26.998	2.036e-07 ***	64.59	655e-16 ***	125.32	< 2.2e-16 ***	5.5367	0.01862 *	0.203	n.s.
Carpinus betulus	1048.2	< 2.2e-16 ***	1442.2	< 2.2e-16 ***	1180.9	< 2.2e-16 ***	391.34	< 2.2e-16 ***	0.143	n.s.
Fagus sylvatica	2102.9	< 2.2e-16 ***	2958.6	< 2.2e-16 ***	1894.4	< 2.2e-16 ***	777.62	< 2.2e-16 ***	90.974	< 2.2e-16 ***
Fraxinus excelsior	2238.2	< 2.2e-16 ***	2820.8	< 2.2e-16 ***	1861.7	< 2.2e-16 ***	825.62	< 2.2e-16 ***	0.087	n.s.
Larix decidua	19.447	1.034e-05 ***	23.999	.683e-07 ***	68.637	< 2.2e-16 ***	3.5907	n.s.	0.091	n.s.
Picea abies	199.43	< 2.2e-16 ***	411.07	< 2.2e-16 ***	304.95	< 2.2e-16 ***	952.06	5.382e-13 ***	0.84209	n.s.
Pinus sylvestris	223.59	< 2.2e-16 ***	8261.49	< 2.2e-16 ***	632.85	< 2.2e-16 ***	147.07	< 2.2e-16 ***	3.1012	n.s.
Populus tremula	122.99	< 2.2e-16 ***	105.06	< 2.2e-16 ***	30.078	4.149e-08 ***	26.648	2.442e-07 ***	0.68252	n.s.
Prunus avium	189.76	< 2.2e-16 ***	2568.46	< 2.2e-16 ***	211.59	< 2.2e-16 ***	96.921	< 2.2e-16 ***	6.5259	0.01063 *
Prunus serotina	32.746	1.05e-08 ***	528.9	< 2.2e-16 ***	39.377	3.494e-10 ***	9.439	0.002124 **	0.5595	n.s.
Quercus cerris	63.876	1.325e-15 ***	66.156	4.166e-16 ***	104.01	< 2.2e-16 ***	16.351	5.263e-05 ***	5.837	0.01569 *
Quercus petraea	679.99	< 2.2e-16 ***	674.53	< 2.2e-16 ***	541.74	< 2.2e-16 ***	145.56	< 2.2e-16 ***	11.198	0.0008189 ***
Quercus robur	1130.2	< 2.2e-16 ***	1229	< 2.2e-16 ***	970.47	< 2.2e-16 ***	383.9	< 2.2e-16 ***	0.271	n.s.
Quercus rubra	49.35	2.145e-12 ***	136.84	< 2.2e-16 ***	33.817	6.054e-09 ***	20.083	7.417e-06 ***	2.0572	n.s.
Sorbus aucuparia	759.84	< 2.2e-16 ***	1039.6	< 2.2e-16 ***	505.59	< 2.2e-16 ***	274.37	< 2.2e-16 ***	2.1523	n.s.
Sorbus torminalis	140.54	< 2.2e-16 ***	181.69	< 2.2e-16 ***	182.88	< 2.2e-16 ***	89.543	< 2.2e-16 ***	16.695	4.389e-05 ***
Tilia cordata	247.89	< 2.2e-16 ***	329.31	< 2.2e-16 ***	295.07	< 2.2e-16 ***	113.87	< 2.2e-16 ***	0.0090372	n.s.

Tilia platyphyllos	137.07	< 2.2e-16 ***	249.47	< 2.2e-16 ***	148.18	< 2.2e-16 ***	48.793	2.844e-12 ***	33.043	9.015e-09 ***
Ulmus glabra	1137.2	< 2.2e-16 ***	1229.5	< 2.2e-16 ***	889.52	< 2.2e-16 ***	437.52	< 2.2e-16 ***	0.15073	n.s.

¥LRT: likelihood ratio test

§Significance codes level: n.s.:  $P > 0.05$ ; \* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\* $P < 0.01$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.001$

Table S8: Mixed effect models' results of (i) temperature difference between the years of the baseline survey and the resurvey for the juvenile and adult layers, (ii) difference between the temperature at the adult and juvenile layers divided for the timespan as a function of the year of the surveys (adult layer minus juvenile layer over time) and (iii) change of temperature between surveys as a function of the latitude of the plots.

	Temperature difference between the years of the baseline survey and the resurvey				Temperature (macroclimate temperature – microclimate temperature)/timespan as a function of the survey		Temperature difference between surveys as a function of the latitude of the plots			
	Juvenile		Adult		LRT	Pr(Chi)	Juveniles		Adults	
	LRT	Pr(Chi)	LRT	Pr(Chi)			LRT	Pr(Chi)	LRT	Pr(Chi)
All species together	5048.7	< 2.2e-16 ***	7614.5	< 2.2e-16 ***	17.951 2	2.267e-05 ***	0.98236	n.s.	1.0287	n.s.
<i>Abies alba</i>	238.66	< 2.2e-16 ***	482.52	< 2.2e-16 ***	8.2339	0.004111 **	5.8022	0.01601 *	1.9991	n.s.
<i>Acer campestre</i>	251.37	< 2.2e-16 ***	128.31	< 2.2e-16 ***	28.627	8.776e-08 ***	0.9581	n.s.	0.13211	n.s.
<i>Acer platanoides</i>	560.37	< 2.2e-16 ***	394.28	< 2.2e-16 ***	96.981	< 2.2e-16 ***	0.17598	n.s.	0.055253	n.s.
<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	759.48	< 2.2e-16 ***	601.22	< 2.2e-16 ***	0.013473	0.9076	6.1803	0.01292 *	0.60601	n.s.
<i>Alnus glutinosa</i>	30.255	3.788e-08 ***	424.62	< 2.2e-16 ***	0.57231	0.4493	5.1022	0.02389 *	49.8	1.702e-12 ***
<i>Betula pendula</i>	26.548	2.57e-07 ***	455.72	< 2.2e-16 ***	0.048191	0.8262	2.1237	n.s.	0.62082	n.s.
<i>Betula pubescens</i>	4.4019	0.0359 *	102.51	< 2.2e-16 ***	0.021766	0.8827	1.1982	n.s.	2.1611	n.s.
<i>Carpinus betulus</i>	268.34	< 2.2e-16 ***	851.09	< 2.2e-16 ***	7.4088	0.00649 **	0.22645	n.s.	3.1853	n.s.
<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	698.4	< 2.2e-16 ***	1420.5	< 2.2e-16 ***	74.932 <	< 2.2e-16 ***	0.63462	n.s.	16.033	6.225e-05 ***
<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	752.81	< 2.2e-16 ***	1233.1	< 2.2e-16 ***	1.4823	0.2234	1.59	n.s.	2.4553	n.s.
<i>Larix decidua</i>	2.415	n.s.	50.536	1.17e-12 ***	0.005021	0.9435	0.3031	n.s.	0.17868	n.s.
<i>Picea abies</i>	41.647	1.093e-10 ***	182.01	< 2.2e-16 ***	0.061099	0.8048	3.3467	n.s.	3.2886	n.s.
<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>	134.64	< 2.2e-16 ***	552.8	< 2.2e-16 ***	2.9653	0.08507 .	4.7847	0.02871 *	3.554	0.0594 .
<i>Populus tremula</i>	16.453	4.986e-05 ***	6.7285	0.009488 **	0.48345	0.4869	1.8399	n.s.	4.7498	0.0293 *
<i>Prunus avium</i>	90.886	< 2.2e-16 ***	50.68	1.087e-12 ***	1.9341	0.1643	0.79042	n.s.	0.0093667	n.s.
<i>Prunus serotina</i>	15.813	6.993e-05 ***	65.294	6.452e-16 ***	0.85505	0.3551	0.071246	n.s.	50.234	1.364e-12 ***
<i>Quercus cerris</i>	18.423	1.769e-05 ***	100.59	< 2.2e-16 ***	5.9563	0.01466 *	5.7064	0.0169 *	10.979	0.0009215 ***
<i>Quercus petraea</i>	115.36	< 2.2e-16 ***	427.37	< 2.2e-16 ***	4.5384	0.03314 *	0.24558	n.s.	7.0997	0.00771 **
<i>Quercus robur</i>	268.82	< 2.2e-16 ***	566.57	< 2.2e-16 ***	4.227 0	0.03979 *	6.1691	0.013 *	7.6084	0.00581 **
<i>Quercus rubra</i>	22.791	1.806e-06 ***	4.9427	0.0262 *	0.8173	0.366	0.52961	n.s.	1.593	n.s.

<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>	244.05	<2.2e-16 ***	70.733	< 2.2e-16 ***	0.063578	0.8009	0.17589	n.s.	0.34575	n.s.
<i>Sorbus torminalis</i>	83.779	< 2.2e-16 ***	122.49	< 2.2e-16 ***	16.166	5.804e-05 ***	10.061	0.001515 **	2.4983	n.s.
<i>Tilia cordata</i>	85.318	< 2.2e-16 ***	200.83	< 2.2e-16 ***	3.0475	0.08086 .	0.55434	n.s.	0.0087326	n.s.
<i>Tilia platyphyllos</i>	52.137	5.176e-13 ***	46.354	9.871e-12 ***	23.614	1.177e-06 ***	0.04691	n.s.	0.0099724	n.s.
<i>Ulmus glabra</i>	372.66	< 2.2e-16 ***	353.52	< 2.2e-16 ***	0.41734	0.5183	2.027	n.s.	0.0081974	n.s.

\*LRT: likelihood ratio test

§Significance codes level: n.s.:  $P > 0.05$ ; \* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\* $P < 0.01$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.001$

Table S9: Correlation between the timespan between surveys and the difference of temperature between the adult and juvenile layers between surveys. A positive correlation indicates that the longer the timespan between surveys the difference between the temperature experienced by the adults and the juvenile's layers is higher.

Species	t	df	p-value	R
All species together	-15.356	17200	< 2.2e-16	-0.1162921
<i>Abies alba</i>	-9.9305	859	< 2.2e-16	-0.3209031
<i>Acer campestre</i>	1.7128	522	0.08734	0.07475904
<i>Acer platanoides</i>	0.48283	1074	0.6293	0.01473139
<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	-2.4151	1910	0.01583	-0.05517622
<i>Alnus glutinosa</i>	4.47	df= 314	1.094e-05	0.2445955
<i>Betula pendula</i>	-1.8382	418	0.06675	-0.08954576
<i>Betula pubescens</i>	-4.1669	179	4.80E-05	-0.2973637
<i>Carpinus betulus</i>	3.254	1122	0.001172	0.09668885
<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	-8.3059	2471	< 2.2e-16	-0.1648047
<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	-1.7609	2071	0.0784	-0.03866499
<i>Larix decidua</i>	-0.97308	74	0.3337	-0.1124019
<i>Picea abies</i>	-13.511	690	< 2.2e-16	-0.4574085
<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>	3.566	552	0.0003939	0.1500622
<i>Populus tremula</i>	1.5373	107	0.1272	0.1469997
<i>Prunus avium</i>	2.8067	303	0.005329	0.1591854
<i>Prunus serotina</i>	2.5595	152	0.01146	0.2032662
<i>Quercus cerris</i>	-0.89683	119	0.3716	-0.08193611
<i>Quercus petraea</i>	-0.29387	798	0.7689	-0.01040235
<i>Quercus robur</i>	2.7468	1070	0.006119	0.08367797
<i>Quercus rubra</i>	3.1188	73	0.002599	0.342893
<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>	-7.2794	874	7.47E-13	-0.2390891
<i>Sorbus torminalis</i>	1.7021	138	0.09099	0.1433939
<i>Tilia cordata</i>	2.7255	234	0.006905	0.17541
<i>Tilia platyphyllos</i>	-0.85662	189	0.3927	-0.06218922
<i>Ulmus glabra</i>	-1.1999	839	0.2305	-0.04138811

Table S10: Correlation values between functional traits, shade tolerance and the difference of temperature between adult and juvenile layers over time for the n = 8 species that exhibit a significant increase of the difference of the temperature between adult and juvenile layers over time.

Variables	df	Correlation	p-value
Plant height (m)	6	0.023	0.9571
Leaf area (mm <sup>2</sup> )	6	0.833	0.01538
Leaf mass area	6	-0.643	0.09618
Seed mass (mg)	6	-0.214	0.6191
Shade tolerance index	6	0.117	0.7823
Plant height (m) (SD)	6	-0.309	0.4618
Leaf area (mm <sup>2</sup> ) (SD)	6	0.411	0.3113
Leaf mass area (SD)	6	-0.453	0.2598
Seed mass (mg)(SD)	6	-0.179	0.6707

Table S11: Correlation values between functional traits, shade tolerance and the difference of temperature between adult and juvenile layers over time for the all the species (n = 25)

Variables	df	Correlation	p-value
Plant height (m)	23	-0.029	0.8915
Leaf area (mm <sup>2</sup> )	23	0.258	0.2128
Leaf mass area	23	-0.380	0.0618
Seed mass (mg)	23	0.362	0.0758
Shade tolerance index	23	0.244	0.2398
Standard deviation Plant height (m)	23	-0.101	0.6306
Standard deviation Leaf area (mm <sup>2</sup> )	23	0.232	0.2645
Standard deviation Leaf mass area	23	-0.248	0.2313
Standard deviation Seed mass (mg)	23	0.119	0.5722

Table S2: Maximum temperatures (°C) of the adults (macroclimate temperature) and the juveniles (microclimate temperature) at the baseline and the resurvey

Species	Baseline (B)			Resurvey (R)			Adults R-B	Juveniles R-B
	Adults (A)	Juveniles (J)	A-J	Adults (A)	Juveniles (J)	A-J		
<i>Abies alba</i>	20.537	19.020	1.516	22.466	20.053	2.413	1.930	1.033
<i>Acer campestre</i>	23.284	20.012	3.273	25.218	21.618	3.600	1.933	1.606
<i>Acer platanoides</i>	21.034	18.872	2.161	22.395	20.267	2.128	1.362	1.395
<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	21.361	19.108	2.253	22.914	20.473	2.440	1.552	1.365
<i>Alnus glutinosa</i>	22.368	20.310	2.058	23.614	22.324	1.290	1.246	2.014
<i>Betula pendula</i>	22.162	20.906	1.256	23.652	21.673	1.980	1.490	0.767
<i>Betula pubescens</i>	22.013	20.785	1.228	23.177	22.352	0.825	1.163	1.567
<i>Carpinus betulus</i>	22.369	20.102	2.267	23.822	21.420	2.403	1.453	1.318
<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	20.955	19.067	1.888	22.422	20.198	2.225	1.467	1.131
<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	21.581	18.940	2.641	22.922	20.396	2.526	1.341	1.456
<i>Larix decidua</i>	20.638	19.487	1.151	22.239	20.685	1.554	1.601	1.198
<i>Picea abies</i>	20.908	19.795	1.113	22.431	19.999	2.432	1.523	0.203
<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>	22.492	21.106	1.385	23.977	22.558	1.419	1.485	1.452
<i>Populus tremula</i>	22.578	18.736	3.842	23.074	20.565	2.508	0.496	1.829
<i>Prunus avium</i>	22.531	19.869	2.662	24.069	21.093	2.976	1.538	1.224
<i>Prunus serotina</i>	21.822	19.518	2.304	23.515	21.244	2.270	1.692	1.726
<i>Quercus cerris</i>	25.057	21.923	3.134	26.794	23.294	3.500	1.737	1.371
<i>Quercus petraea</i>	22.998	20.592	2.407	24.071	21.261	2.809	1.072	0.669
<i>Quercus robur</i>	21.934	19.892	2.042	23.139	21.132	2.007	1.205	1.240
<i>Quercus rubra</i>	21.539	20.178	1.361	25.131	21.820	3.311	3.592	1.642
<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>	21.171	19.286	1.885	22.900	20.386	2.513	1.729	1.100
<i>Sorbus torminalis</i>	22.176	19.498	2.678	23.959	20.954	3.006	1.783	1.456
<i>Tilia cordata</i>	21.945	18.929	3.016	23.545	21.116	2.430	1.601	2.186
<i>Tilia platyphyllos</i>	21.743	18.604	3.139	23.672	19.756	3.916	1.929	1.152
<i>Ulmus glabra</i>	21.266	19.125	2.141	22.388	20.607	1.781	1.122	1.482

Table S13: Percentage ground cover (%) for the adults and the juveniles at the baseline and the resurvey

Species	Baseline (B)			Recent (R)			Adults R-B	Juveniles R-B
	Adults (A)	Juveniles (J)	A-J	Adults (A)	Juveniles (J)	A-J		
<i>Abies alba</i>	42.700	1.481	41.219	39.404	2.085	37.319	-3.296	0.604
<i>Acer campestre</i>	6.359	1.314	5.045	11.353	1.671	9.681	4.993	0.357
<i>Acer platanoides</i>	11.205	1.624	9.581	17.936	2.261	15.675	6.731	0.637
<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	13.126	3.368	9.758	16.481	4.704	11.777	3.356	1.336
<i>Alnus glutinosa</i>	40.961	0.647	40.314	35.685	1.878	33.806	-5.276	1.231
<i>Betula pendula</i>	10.185	0.795	9.390	9.716	0.726	8.990	-0.468	-0.069
<i>Betula pubescens</i>	23.396	2.412	20.985	18.407	1.765	16.642	-4.990	-0.646
<i>Carpinus betulus</i>	25.636	2.235	23.401	26.295	2.857	23.438	0.659	0.622
<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	49.970	4.925	45.045	51.334	5.541	45.793	1.364	0.616
<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	28.837	4.548	24.289	21.911	5.311	16.600	-6.926	0.763
<i>Larix decidua</i>	10.819	1.000	9.819	11.047	0.360	10.687	0.228	-0.640
<i>Picea abies</i>	17.328	1.143	16.185	18.711	4.651	14.060	1.383	3.509
<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>	27.377	0.671	26.705	25.031	1.329	23.702	-2.345	0.658
<i>Populus tremula</i>	6.565	0.981	5.584	7.986	1.914	6.072	1.421	0.932
<i>Prunus avium</i>	1.961	1.250	0.711	6.516	1.522	4.994	4.555	0.272
<i>Prunus serotina</i>	6.250	1.500	4.750	15.603	3.104	12.499	9.353	1.604
<i>Quercus cerris</i>	21.148	12.250	8.898	24.915	5.059	19.857	3.767	-7.191
<i>Quercus petraea</i>	29.491	4.118	25.373	31.880	3.870	28.010	2.389	-0.248
<i>Quercus robur</i>	26.445	1.324	25.121	26.123	1.145	24.978	-0.322	-0.179
<i>Quercus rubra</i>	18.833	1.533	17.300	11.208	0.808	10.399	-7.626	-0.725
<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>	2.360	0.841	1.519	4.451	2.002	2.449	2.091	1.161
<i>Sorbus torminalis</i>	6.048	1.059	4.989	6.105	0.658	5.448	0.058	-0.402
<i>Tilia cordata</i>	17.590	2.787	14.803	23.170	1.794	21.376	5.579	-0.993
<i>Tilia platyphyllos</i>	11.355	0.511	10.844	17.597	1.689	15.908	6.242	1.178
<i>Ulmus glabra</i>	23.509	2.223	21.286	15.626	2.339	13.287	-7.883	0.116