The thermal tolerance of photosynthetic tissues: a global systematic review and agenda for future research

Sonya R. Geange[1,2,‡,*], Pieter A. Arnold[1,‡,*], Alexandra A. Catling[1,3], Onoriode Coast[1,4], Alicia M. Cook[5], Kelli M. Gowland[1], Andrea Leigh[5], Rocco F. Notarnicola[1], Bradley C. Posch[1], Susanna E. Venn[6], Lingling Zhu[1], Adrienne B. Nicotra[1]

[1] Research School of Biology, The Australian National University, Canberra, ACT, Australia

[2] Department of Biological Sciences, University of Bergen, Thormøhlensgt, Bergen, Norway

[3] School of Biological Sciences, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD, Australia

[4] Natural Resources Institute, University of Greenwich, Central Avenue, Chatham Maritime, Kent ME4 4TB, United Kingdom

[5] School of Life Sciences, University of Technology Sydney, Broadway, NSW, Australia

[6] School of Life and Environmental Sciences, Deakin University, Melbourne, VIC, Australia

[‡] Sonya R. Geange and Pieter A. Arnold should be considered joint first author

[*] Corresponding authors:

Sonya R. Geange (phone: +447432057249, email: sonya.geange@uib.no)

Pieter A. Arnold (phone: +61261252543, email: pieter.arnold@anu.edu.au)

Word counts:

Summary: 200

Main text: 8121

No. of figures: 5 (all in colour)

No. of tables: 2

Supporting information: Figs S1-S8, Notes S1

Summary

Understanding plant thermal tolerance is fundamental to predicting impacts of extreme temperature events that are increasing in frequency and intensity across the globe. Extremes, not averages, drive species evolution, determine survival, and increased crop performance. To better prioritise agricultural and natural system research, it is crucial to evaluate how researchers are assessing the capacity of plants to tolerate extreme events. We conducted a systematic review to determine how plant thermal tolerance research is distributed across wild and domesticated plants, growth forms and biomes, and identify crucial knowledge gaps. Our review shows that most thermal tolerance research examines cold tolerance of cultivated species; ~5% of articles consider both heat and cold tolerance. Plants of extreme environments are understudied, and techniques widely applied in cultivated systems are largely unused in natural systems. Lastly, we find that lack of standardised methods and metrics compromises the potential for mechanistic insight. Our review provides an entry point for those new to the methods used in plant thermal tolerance research and bridges often disparate ecological and agricultural perspectives for the more experienced. We present a considered agenda of thermal tolerance research priorities to stimulate efficient, reliable, and repeatable research across the spectrum of plant thermal tolerance.

Keywords: agriculture, climate change, extreme, temperature, thermal breadth, thermotolerance, warming.

Introduction

As the Earth's climate changes, our dependence on healthy vegetation systems is coming into sharp focus. Temperature is arguably the most important determinant of plant species adaptation and distribution across the planet (Nievola *et al.*, 2017). Researchers seek to understand plant species responses to temperature to breed crops for a growing population, gain fundamental insight into physiological, ecological, and evolutionary processes, and predict responses of wild species to the changing climate. There has been an ever-increasing number of publications over the last century in various specialist fields of plant thermal tolerance research, but the work is scattered across different fields and geographic regions. Thus, as a research community we cannot easily and objectively prioritise research effort or effectively summarise what the thousands of published studies tell us about plant thermal tolerance.

Many biological processes are fundamentally dependent on temperature: including growth, reproduction and, in plants, photosynthesis. Classic studies have established that thermal limits are key to establishing the distribution limits of land plants, constraining the survival of plant tissue between -60°C and +60°C, where species growing in the most extreme biomes exhibit a range of adaptations to function and persist (Osmond *et al.*, 1987). Importantly, it is extreme low and high temperatures that can impair physiological functions, growth, and determine survival by profoundly changing the structure and fluidity of cell membranes, altering enzyme function, and destroying proteins (Osmond *et al.*, 1987; Sung *et al.*, 2003; Hatfield & Prueger, 2015). Extreme temperature events that are increasing in frequency and severity (IPCC, 2018) can affect organisms profoundly and are a major driving force for selection, adaptation, and species persistence (Gutschick & BassiriRad, 2003; Buckley & Huey, 2016; Lancaster & Humphreys, 2020).

Studies have shown that plant cold tolerance varies depending on factors such as elevation, ontogeny (Marcante *et al.*, 2012; Sierra-Almeida & Cavieres, 2012), microsites (i.e. sheltered *vs* exposed) (Bannister *et al.*, 2005; Briceño *et al.*, 2014; Venn & Green, 2018), and water availability (Sierra-Almeida *et al.*, 2009; Venn *et al.*, 2013). For example, alpine plants can withstand very low temperatures and tolerate extracellular ice formation and the resulting dehydration (Sakai & Larcher, 1987; Larcher, 2003). Higher heat tolerance is found at lower absolute latitudes and is positively correlated with mean annual temperature (Lancaster & Humphreys, 2020). For a given latitude, desert species have higher tolerance to heat relative to coastal congeneric species *in situ*, but these differences can diminish under common garden conditions (Knight & Ackerly, 2002; 2003). Recent studies of Australian desert species have found that within a single desert biome, species vary widely in their physiological response to high temperature (with critical temperatures ranging from 48-54°C). Further, critical damage thresholds are driven less by macro-scale climate or latitude, than by microhabitat variation, especially soil moisture variation (Curtis *et al.*, 2016).

Crops are susceptible to temperature extremes and exposure to sub- and supra-optimal temperatures can cause significant yield losses. The degree of susceptibility to temperature stress varies with species, duration, intensity, and developmental stage. Extreme heat after seedling establishment can scorch leaves, impair biochemical processes, and accelerate premature senescence. Cold or heat stress coinciding with reproductive development in major cereal crops (the most temperature-sensitive stage; Yoshida *et al.*, 1981) negatively affects reproductive processes and structures, which consequently reduces yield quantity and quality (Jagadish *et al.*, 2007; Coast *et al.*, 2016). If, and to what extent, crops acclimate to thermal stress is still being tested. However, research is increasingly showing that crop varieties can acclimate their physiology to both low (Yamori *et al.*, 2010) and high temperatures (Li *et al.*, 1991; Wang *et al.*, 2011) to varying extents, similar to that observed in wild species.

Our rapidly changing climate means that extreme events are having major impacts on wild and agricultural systems worldwide (Gitz *et al.*, 2016; Harris *et al.*, 2018); plant thermal tolerance research must be well directed, or risk floundering at such a critical time. At one extreme – high temperature – the frequency, intensity, and a-seasonality of heatwaves are breaking records annually (Hewitson *et al.*, 2014; Harris *et al.*, 2018). Although some species exhibit a high capacity to withstand higher temperatures and heatwaves than are currently experienced (Drake *et al.*, 2018; Aspinwall *et al.*, 2019), heatwaves are predicted to exceed the thermal tolerance limits of many species across a wide latitudinal range (O'Sullivan *et al.*, 2017). Shortened growing seasons, yield reductions, and crop losses have been occurring and are predicted to worsen (>40% by 2100 in some regions), primarily due to increasing heat stress (Jha *et al.*, 2014). Similarly, at the other extreme – low temperature – the frequency of cold snaps is increasing in some regions, both directly (e.g. through disruption of the polar vortex driving cold cells towards temperate regions; Kretschmer *et al.*, 2018) and indirectly (e.g. where warmer averages reduce snow cover and increase exposure to frost; Woldendorp *et al.*, 2008). If frosts occur during warmer conditions or if there is a substantial late-season frost event, such as the 2007 spring freeze in the USA, then this temperature backlash can cause substantial frost damage and widespread devastation to crops and natural species alike (Jönsson *et al.*, 2004; Gu *et al.*, 2008). Understanding cold tolerance limits may elucidate which species may be released from temperature limitation in future, for instance the expansion of subtropical and tropical plants into temperate zones due to reduced frequency or severity of cold snaps (Cavanaugh *et al.*, 2014).

Thermal tolerance in practice reflects a range of interacting elements. In many regions, plants may experience both hot and cold extremes, with events in each direction causing a shift in overall resource allocation from growth and reproduction to protection from physiological stress (Lortie *et al.*, 2004; Mitra & Bhatia, 2008). For example, heating events are common in alpine environments, where small stature plants track soil rather than air temperatures and thus heat to potentially damaging levels (Squeo *et al.*, 1991). The few studies examining heat tolerance for alpine species indicate that it can be surprisingly high (~48-50°C), with species living in warmer microhabitats having higher heat tolerance than species living in sheltered habitats (Buchner & Neuner, 2003; Larcher *et al.*, 2010).

Focusing on responses of a given species to only one of these extremes is therefore unlikely to provide a comprehensive understanding of thermal tolerance or to increase our predictive power in the face of climate change. Moreover, the potential for an extreme temperature event to become critically stressful to a plant may depend on a range of accompanying circumstances, such as water status, light conditions, or ambient temperatures prior to or following the event. Plants in cold climates may shift their thermal tolerance or alter their phenology in response to average warming conditions, but this may be at the cost of frost hardiness (Jönsson *et al.*, 2004). In addition, what constitutes an ‘extreme’ event for a given species or biome may be relatively benign in a different context. Thus, it is essential to consider abiotic factors and the dynamics of plant thermal tolerance.

Here, we present the results and synthesis of a large-scale systematic review focused on the tolerance of photosynthetic tissues of land plants to extreme heat and/or cold stress for both cultivated and wild species across life forms, biomes, and the world. We explore the many techniques that are used to measure thermal tolerance, the metrics derived from them, and the widely diverging experimental conditions under which thermal tolerance is assessed. We note that the concept of what constitutes ‘thermal tolerance’ is debatable. Some studies focus on reduced productivity under simulated future climates, others assess repairable damage after moderate chilling or heat stress, and others focus on the onset of irreparable damage following extreme freezing or heatwave events. For the purposes of this review we define thermal tolerance as the temperature (high or low) beyond which the plant exhibits substantial or lasting damage; we note that this temperature is often estimated from (and assumed to be correlated with) the temperature at which the plant invokes protective mechanisms.

Our objective was to review the geographic and temporal distribution of research efforts, assess methodological approaches, and highlight the commonalities, ambiguities, and deficiencies in global plant thermal tolerance research. Our review provides a timely synthesis of research to date and bridges often disparate ecological and agricultural perspectives. We also present recommendations and an agenda to highlight thermal tolerance research priorities and provide a go-to reference to inform efficient and reliable research across the spectrum of plant thermal tolerance.

Our approach to the systematic review

A systematic review relies on synthesis of a comprehensive and repeatable literature search (Lowry *et al.*, 2013; Lortie, 2014; Gurevitch *et al.*, 2018). We employed the Preferred Reporting Items in Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) framework (Moher *et al.*, 2009) to compile a database of articles that measured plant thermal tolerance (Fig. S1). Briefly, our literature search (December 2017) of the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) Web of Knowledge used an extensive list of search terms (Supporting Information Notes S1) and yielded more than 21,000 articles. We first screened the titles and then the abstracts and at each step excluded articles that did not include investigations into tolerance of leaves or leaf-buds of angiosperms and gymnosperms exposed to potentially damaging high or low temperature events as distinct from growth conditions.

Each article was evaluated based on 15 criteria (Notes S1) relating to each thermal tolerance assay technique being reported, important elements of experimental design, focal species, and characteristics thereof. Experimental conditions for assessing thermal tolerance diverge widely and methods for imposing experimental thermal stress can include mild to severe temperatures that are either applied gradually (ramped), suddenly (shocked), as a sustained growth temperature, or as a combination of any of these three. There is good biological justification for considering different rates of exposure to change. Thus, our survey focused on characterising specific design elements of the studies we included. We documented the conditions with which thermal stress was imposed to determine how consistent and comparable they were.

Many articles reported multiple techniques to evaluate thermal tolerance. Henceforth we refer to scientific publications as ‘articles’ and uses of individual techniques within an article as ‘studies’. After quality checks, the dataset contained data from 1,691 unique articles comprising 3,743 studies of thermal tolerance assays (Fig. S1). The dataset is publicly available through the figshare repository (10.6084/m9.figshare.13083662).

A brief history and description of plant thermal tolerance techniques

A broad array of techniques is used to assay thermal stress. Thermal tolerance research on both cultivated and wild species became more common in the 1990s, but the rate of increase was more dramatic in cultivated species, which has culminated in four-fold more thermal tolerance articles on cultivated (n = 1,358) than wild species (n = 339). The technologies used to measure thermal tolerance have evolved through time (Fig. 1a,b). Early studies assessed thermal tolerance simply by quantifying visual damage. Moving forward, researchers of cultivated species were consistently earlier adopters of emerging techniques, such as (epi)genetics and ‘omics (e.g. metabolomics, proteomics, genomics), often 10-20 years in advance of use in wild species research (Fig. 1, Notes S1). Overall, the most widely used techniques for assaying plant thermal tolerance in the past 20 years have been chlorophyll fluorescence (487 studies), electrolyte leakage (468 studies), and a broad array of other biochemical assays (446 studies in total). In recent years, studies using (epi)genetics and ‘omics, biochemical assays, and reactive oxygen species (ROS) and antioxidant techniques have been rapidly increasing. These specific techniques are expanded upon below and Notes S1 summarises these and the remaining thermal tolerance techniques and includes relevant indicators and references.

Fluorescence techniques measure changes in fluorescence re-emitted from chlorophyll in the photosystems in response to high or low (potentially stressful) temperature. A variety of measures have been applied in this context, including minimum fluorescence (F_0); maximum fluorescence (F_M); photosynthetic quantum efficiency (φPSII); maximum photosynthetic quantum efficiency (F_V/F_M); non-photochemical quenching (NPQ); and chlorophyll *a* fluorescence transients (Maxwell & Johnson, 2000). Exemplary articles have used these methods to define thermal metrics such as LT_{50} (also T_{50}), the temperature at which F_V/F_M declines to 50% of the maximum F_V/F_M of unstressed photosystems (Curtis *et al.*, 2014) or T_{crit}, the inflection point between slow and fast rise phases of the temperature-dependent increase in F_0; (Knight & Ackerly, 2002). Others have measured R_{fd}: chlorophyll fluorescence decrease ratio or vitality index, calculated on the decline of F_M to the fluorescence steady-state level (F_S) (Perera-Castro *et al.*, 2018). Their popularity has increased in recent years as fluorescence techniques can be high throughput, but there has been little explicit comparison of how the various measures differ in their interpretation.

Measures of electrolyte leakage are another widely applied technique; these assess change in ion concentrations in response to thermal damage using electrical conductivity. These methods are highly conducive to determination of thermal metrics such as critical temperatures at which 50% (or other standard) change in tissue ionic conductance (gTi) or electrical conductivity (EC) is reached. From these, researchers have calculated LT_{50}, which is well correlated with frost damage (Kreyling *et al.*, 2015), and other damage indices (I_d) (Whitlow *et al.*, 1992). Tolerance metrics derived from electrolyte leakage are strongly related to the climate of origin of both native and non-native species (Kreyling *et al.*, 2015) and species that are cold-sensitive release electrolytes more rapidly than cold-resistant species (Patterson *et al.*, 1976). Electrolyte leakage measures the site of physiological injury at extreme temperatures and can be high-throughput, but it is potentially less sensitive than chlorophyll fluorescence or gas exchange, and is limited to laboratory assays (Xu *et al.*, 2014).

There is a wide array of biochemical measures employed in thermal tolerance research including heat shock proteins (HSPs) and studies of ROS. Heat shock proteins and factors are produced rapidly in response to abiotic stresses to alleviate cellular damage (Wang *et al.*, 2004). HSPs function as molecular chaperones, assist in protein folding, maintain signal transduction, and prevent protein aggregation (Chen *et al.*, 2018). Their relative abundance can be detected using western blotting or slot/dot blotting. In general, more tolerant individuals or species will induce a larger abundance of HSPs, or changes in gene expression associated with their production (Feder & Hofmann, 1999); however, this pattern is not universal or clear-cut (Barua & Heckathorn, 2004). An array of techniques including chromatography, quantitative real-time PCR, and *in vitro* chaperone-like activity assays are used to assess heat shock responses (Chen *et al.*, 2018). Although their name suggests a specificity for heat stress, HSPs can be upregulated in response to a wide range of other stresses that induce protein unfolding including cold, drought, salinity, and oxidative stress (Feder & Hofmann, 1999; Barua & Heckathorn, 2004; Wang *et al.*, 2004). However, patterns of protein synthesis during cold acclimation can differ substantially to those expressed during heat shock responses (Guy, 1999). Therefore, while HSP determination may aid mechanistic understanding of the stress response for a given species, we are far from using such techniques widely, especially for wild species.

ROS and antioxidants play important roles in maintaining the redox state in plant cells. ROS are natural by-products of metabolic processes that can affect gene expression and contribute to plant growth, signalling, development, cell cycles, programmed cell death, abiotic stress responses, pathogen defence, and adaptation (Gill & Tuteja, 2010; Mittler *et al.*, 2011). Like HSPs, ROS concentrations can increase rapidly in response to diverse stimuli, including temperature extremes. Increased ROS concentration following thermal stress leads to unfavourable modification of lipids, proteins, and nucleic acids, resulting in cell damage and metabolic dysfunction. These impairments inhibit growth, reduce fertility, and promote premature senescence. Plants produce antioxidants to scavenge or detoxify ROS or their precursors and prevent free radical formation to mitigate cellular damage caused by uncontrolled ROS accumulation. However, under extreme temperature stress, antioxidant production can lag ROS production, making ROS a major factor in crop yield loss. A wide variety of ROS and antioxidants can be assayed with various methods to assess concentration or expression patterns with thermal stress (Gill & Tuteja, 2010; Mittler *et al.*, 2011).

More recently, epigenetics, genomics, and other ‘omics (e.g. transcriptomics, metabolomics, phenomics) have been applied in thermal tolerance research. These approaches have revealed regulatory mechanisms, new gene variants and their expression and function, and have been instrumental in adaptive plant breeding for resistance to abiotic stressors (Jha *et al.*, 2014; 2017;

Shah *et al.*, 2018). For example, identifying molecular mechanisms underlying heat stress responses *in silico* has led to the refinement of transgenic techniques to engineer the overexpression of HSPs and genes related to ROS activity and membrane stability to confer increased heat tolerance in various crop species (Grover *et al.*, 2013). However, assessing the success of these efforts is confounded by various research groups applying non-standardised methods, and limited field-scale phenomic capabilities (Grover *et al.*, 2013).

Often what determines the adoption of an approach to assessing thermal tolerance is a combination of context of the research question, conventional wisdom, and local practice. However, when bodies of work are produced in isolation, in a limited number of research laboratories, or focused on one biome or study organism, the potential for siloing and lack of comparability among research programs arises. Thus, our review considers when and where these various techniques have been applied.

What comprises the plant thermal tolerance literature?

Geographic spread

An examination of the geography of thermal tolerance research based on both the country of affiliation of the first author and the location where the experiments were conducted (when available), shows that plant thermal tolerance is researched all over the world but, unsurprisingly, the distribution of this research is not uniform. The volume of articles by authors based in the USA, China, and Europe, vastly outweighs contributions by other individual countries (Fig. 2; see Figs S2-S5 for more detailed global and regional distributions). The patchy network of research likely reflects institutional bias and availability of research funding, where most articles, even for ecological research in the tropics, for example, are led by authors from developed countries (Stocks *et al.*, 2008). Many of the thermal tolerance articles on cultivated species pre-date the more recent focus on climate change and trace back to developing domesticated species suited to a range of growing environments.

Overall, articles published on wild species represent a narrower portion of global distribution than do those on cultivated species (Fig. 2a,b). Wild species are understudied in many of the more thermally extreme regions on Earth (e.g. north-west Asia, Middle East, Africa, South and Central America, and India, Fig. 2a,c,e,g). These gaps in global coverage, particularly for heat tolerance (Fig. 2g,h), mean that thermal tolerance is understudied in exactly those developing countries where there is rising demand for increased crop yield and where some of the greatest climate change-induced yield losses are predicted to occur (Parry *et al.*, 2004; Tester & Langridge, 2010).

Comparative thermal tolerance studies

Delving deeper shows that our understanding of thermal tolerance is informed by an eclectic spread of research across growth forms, and that there is relatively little broad-scale comparative work. We have a far greater understanding of the thermal tolerance of species that we have bred and depend on for food, timber, and fibre (n = 1,358), than those that comprise the rest of Earth's terrestrial biosphere that perform essential ecosystem services (n = 339; Fig. 3). Within the literature, and for both cultivated and wild species, a greater proportion of articles investigate cold (59%) than heat tolerance (35%) and there are strikingly few articles that examine both heat and cold tolerance together (5%, Table 1).

In terms of taxonomic selection, research on cultivated species tended to focus on a single species (42%) or on differences among intraspecific varieties (41%), but less often across multiple species (17%; Fig. 4a). In contrast, studies on wild species were split evenly between focusing on single or multiple species (44%) but investigated intraspecific diversity far less often (12%; Fig. 4b). The representation of different life forms also varied between cultivated and wild systems. Studies on cultivated species contained a greater proportion of graminoids (e.g. Poaceae), forbs/herbs (e.g. vegetable species) and vines (e.g. viticulture), with fewer shrubs or trees (Fig. 4c). In contrast, studies on wild species were more evenly spread with relatively more focus on woody species (Fig. 4d).

The recent work of Lancaster and Humphreys (2020) demonstrates the potential for meta-analytic comparison of thermal tolerance, and there remains ample opportunity to build on the relatively few studies that apply a standard method of assessing thermal tolerance and take an explicitly broad comparative approach. In particular, extension of excellent comparative works such as O'Sullivan *et al.* (2017), Zhu *et al.* (2018), Sentinella *et al.* (2020), and Lancaster and Humphreys (2020) into extreme biomes, across a wider range of growth forms, and considering other experimental nuances is still warranted. Such efforts will lead to a better understanding of general rules in thermal tolerance and have potential to explore the underlying mechanistic differences in the various measures of tolerance.

Cold *vs* heat tolerance research

Studies on cultivated species covered both cold and heat tolerance across the different types of cultivation, but with more studies on cold tolerance overall (Table 1, Fig. 3a). Cold tolerance was more often assessed within viticulture, plantation forestry, horticultural and vegetable crops, *Arabidopsis*, and multiple or other types of cultivation (e.g. tobacco, plants for oil). In contrast, heat tolerance made up more than half of the studies within cereals, fibre crops, and pasture and turf grasses. Cereals and fibre crops had the lowest proportion of articles that considered both heat and cold tolerance simultaneously.

For wild species, the proportion of studies focusing on heat, cold, and both heat and cold tolerance varied across biomes, but cold tolerance research made up the majority for all biomes except for arid ones (Table 1; Fig. 3b). Plant responses to both cold and hot extremes may be linked at localised scales via processes such as early snowmelt (Körner, 2003) or microhabitat variability (Suggitt *et al.*, 2018), or across a species' distribution by large scale changes in global circulation patterns influence extreme events (Kretschmer *et al.*, 2018). In tropical/subtropical biomes, the proportion of studies on cold and heat tolerance was more equal and these had the highest number of articles that examined both heat and cold tolerance. Studies in temperate biomes made up 34% of the wild dataset and these were dominated by cold tolerance studies. Articles on boreal forests were focused entirely on cold tolerance, as were most articles on arctic/alpine/subalpine biomes. Remarkably, heat tolerance was assessed far less often than cold tolerance in wild species; the greatest proportion of heat tolerance research was conducted in the warmer biomes: arid/semi-arid/savannah and tropical/subtropical, but even here, cold tolerance research was as or more prevalent. Given consistent predictions of increasing frequency and intensity of heatwaves across the world together with average warming (Perkins-Kirkpatrick & Gibson, 2017; Harris *et al.*, 2018; IPCC, 2018), the relatively low coverage of studies on plant heat tolerance is concerning.

Considerations when designing thermal tolerance experiments

Application of techniques

Our assessment of the history of thermal tolerance research indicates that there were not gaping holes in coverage by cultivation type, biome, or life form in the application of techniques for evaluating thermal tolerance. However, there is clearly opportunity for expanding the application of many techniques into new areas and non-model systems. For example, it is perhaps not surprising that HSPs have not been examined in species from the world's coldest biomes.

Plant thermal tolerance arises from complex phenomena involving perception of thermal stress, transmission of the information (cascade signalling), genomic regulatory processes, and then physiological and biochemical changes (Urano *et al.*, 2010; Hasanuzzaman *et al.*, 2013). By integrating approaches across scales we can shed light on the molecular mechanisms and cellular pathways that lead to physiological changes and confer tolerance (comprehensively reviewed by Nievola *et al.*, 2017). Applying multidisciplinary and holistic approaches to diverse species will reveal new gene variants, products, and traits for crop-breeders to target for engineering or breeding programs to obtain new stress-tolerant varieties (Fragkostefanakis *et al.*, 2015; Jha *et al.*, 2017; Shah *et al.*, 2018). Our review found a range of techniques under the umbrella of biochemistry (including ROS, HSPs, and other biochemistry) and ‘omics (metabolomics, transcriptomics) that are commonplace in cultivated studies but rare in wild studies. We see great potential to gain better mechanistic understanding in wild species by applying more of these biochemical techniques and aiming to scale to the whole phenotype (e.g. Aspinwall *et al.*, 2019).

The emergence of high-throughput techniques for proteomics and metabolomics (Zivy *et al.*, 2015) along with phenomics (Furbank *et al.*, 2019) allows thermal tolerance to be assessed in both controlled environments and field studies for cultivated and wild species alike. This presents the opportunity to scale from mechanism to emergent phenotype (Deshmukh *et al.*, 2014; Campbell *et al.*, 2018). Greater crosstalk among researchers studying thermal tolerance on cultivated and wild species and application of these approaches to high-throughput scales would be mutually beneficial.

Ours is an era of evidence synthesis and meta-analyses (Gurevitch *et al.*, 2018), in which new analytical tools are released frequently. The rise of open trait databases such as TRY (Kattge *et al.*, 2020) and GlobTherm (Bennett *et al.*, 2018) underpins efforts to consolidate knowledge and extend the application and utility of individual studies to a global context. Databases hold great promise to generate comparative analyses; for example, contrasting thermal metrics across species or biomes, or assessing different measurement techniques for given species (e.g. Lancaster & Humphreys, 2020). We caution that there remain many considerations and caveats to consider in such syntheses; for example, the differences in measurement conditions and the specific methods of application of thermal stress, techniques to measure tolerance, and other aspects of experimental design. Armed with new insights and databases, researchers can contribute improvements to the accuracy and dynamic capabilities of model predictions and decision-making tools for regional-scale suitability, growth, and yield of crop species as extreme events become more frequent and intense (Caubel *et al.*, 2015; Zampieri *et al.*, 2019).

Experimental design considerations

It is abundantly clear that experimental designs and techniques vary widely among studies, and most notably between wild and cultivated systems (Figs 5a, S6). We found that it was common for research on cultivated species to compare relative performance of many varieties under a set of controlled conditions, but rare to provide an explicit explanation for temperature treatment choices (see Zub *et al.*, 2012 for an exemplary exception). On the other hand, these studies also generally conducted several complementary assays to achieve broader mechanistic insights. In contrast, studies on wild species focused on identifying tolerance limits under natural conditions more than understanding tolerance mechanisms; however, they generally provided explanations for their chosen rates of temperature change and treatment temperatures (e.g. Sierra-Almeida & Cavieres, 2012). Our review demonstrated three areas that warrant careful consideration and explanation when designing thermal tolerance research: how temperature stress is applied, the importance of recognising thermal legacy, and accounting for interactions with other factors. These are presented in detail below and summarised in Table 2A.

Application of temperature stress

Field, common-garden, glasshouse, and growth chambers each present different limitations, and the specific context of growth conditions can greatly influence plant responses (Passioura, 2006; Poorter *et al.*, 2016). Overall, we found that most articles (94%) imposed stress in an experimentally controlled manner, such as with a temperature-controlled growth chamber or water bath, as opposed to focusing on natural extreme events such as frosts or heatwaves (6%). In some experimentally controlled studies, thermal stress was imposed as a controlled ramp and in others as a sudden shock (Fig. 5b), each of which can induce different response mechanisms and pathways. In contrast to shocks, ramping temperature allows time for hardening processes to provide some thermal protection before reaching critically damaging temperatures. The application of ramp *vs* shock approaches differed between studies of cultivated and wild species. Research on cultivated species applied thermal stress as shocks more often than on wild species (Fig. S7). Within wild species, most studies on cold tolerance ramped stress, whereas those researching heat tolerance applied a shock more often than ramping (Fig. S7). Biochemical assays and (epi)genetics and ’omics were most often conducted on plant tissue that was exposed to a temperature shock, whereas studies using electrolyte leakage, assays of visual damage, and thermometry were more often conducted on plant tissue that was exposed to a temperature ramp (Fig. 5b).

Cultivated species were assayed most often for periods of hours (1,322 studies) or longer (days = 785 studies and weeks = 431 studies), whereas for wild species, shorter timeframes were generally used: hours or less (415 studies). The exception was for HSPs, where stresses lasting <24h were common for both cultivated and wild species. Research on wild species that did apply stress over longer periods of days (89 studies) and weeks (72 studies) tended to focus on water potential, ROS/antioxidants, other biochemical factors, and gas exchange (Fig. 5a). In wild species, short stress intervals of 60 minutes or less were often used in association with gas exchange or chlorophyll fluorescence assays (Fig. 5a). A greater proportion of studies on cultivated species failed to clearly specify the maximum stress duration compared to those on wild species (Fig. 5a). In some cases, these differences reflect that the type of assay dictates the stress duration and cannot be consistent, but nonetheless such variation among studies hampers our ability to identify common responses.

In nature, the rate and frequency of exposure to extreme temperatures varies between cold and hot extremes. Leaf temperature can vary rapidly and repeatedly on a hot, calm day (Vogel, 2009), such that the frequency, duration, and magnitude of the heat stress are likely to affect the impact of and response to the stress. In contrast, exposure to extreme low temperatures tends to be more gradual and sustained over hours or even days (Sierra-Almeida & Cavieres, 2012). Thus, there is biological justification for using different rates to apply thermal stress when studying heat *vs* cold tolerance. However, we found that in many cases, studies elected to deliver their heat or cold treatments as a shock (e.g. moving a plant directly from a benign to a high or low temperature-controlled growth room) without providing the rationale behind that approach. The insect thermal tolerance literature is actively debating how moving to a dynamic delivery of extreme temperature (i.e. ramping temperature at biologically-relevant speeds, as opposed to a quick shock) would increase the relevance and impact of their research (Rezende *et al.*, 2014), and plant researchers could stand to benefit from considering a similar approach.

One limitation to adopting techniques used in animal thermal tolerance is the growth form of plants, which determine how we measure them. In the animal literature, it is standard to measure critical temperatures on small arthropods on which whole-organism tolerance can be assessed (e.g. Slatyer *et al.*, 2013; Hoffmann & Sgrò, 2018; MacLean *et al.*, 2019). Fundamentally, whole-organism measures on plants are more challenging due to their modularity, below-ground biomass, and growth form variation that contribute to a complex array of alternative mechanisms to escape or cope with thermal stress (Huey *et al.*, 2002). Modular organs such as leaves are therefore targeted for most thermal tolerance measurements in plants. However, this only determines limits to photosynthetic performance or organ survival, rather than higher-level or probabilistic measurements of whole-organism performance and survival that are more common in the animal thermal tolerance literature (Rezende & Bozinovic, 2019). Seedlings will be essential to exploring whether tolerance of leaves can be reasonable approximations for thermal tolerance measurements for whole plants or how these approaches could be developed.

Adopting more realistic regimes and justifying these with data from relevant natural settings, as well as providing better descriptions of the temperature ranges around set points would enable a more nuanced investigation of the differences between acute *vs* chronic stress responses, and between facultative protective responses *vs* signs of irreparable damage (Lai & He, 2016; Trapero-Mozos *et al.*, 2018). At present, the definition and use of ‘stress’ and ‘stressful events’ is somewhat *ad hoc* and impedes our ability to compare results or derive generalisations (Jansen &

Potters, 2017). Differentiating damaging conditions from those that are suboptimal or induce protective mechanisms is essential contextual information; researchers need to attempt to explain how and why selected treatments and assays were conducted. By placing treatments in context with historical, realised, or projected climatic conditions, researchers provide an opportunity for others to assess the extremity of the treatments imposed relative to the biology of that species. For example, what may be an extremely high temperature for vegetative growth in broccoli (*Brassica oleracea* var. italica Plenck) is sub-optimal for maize (*Zea mays* L.), and sensitivity to thermal stress will also vary across life-stages and with environmental history (Hatfield & Prueger, 2015).

Understanding thermal legacy

Although warmer origin species often exhibit higher heat tolerances than cooler origin species under common conditions (Zhu *et al.*, 2018; Lancaster & Humphreys, 2020), it is important to note that the acclimation state of plants or tissue can substantially affect thermal tolerance and understanding the potential to acclimate will be important for predicting impacts of our changing climate. For example, geographic trends in thermal tolerance appear to be much stronger in acclimated (hardened) plants (Lancaster & Humphreys, 2020). While we did not directly assess acclimation, the term acclimation certainly frequents the literature we reviewed (Fig. S8). Thermal tolerance can shift in response to changes in both continuous growth temperature and exposure to extreme temperature events (Downton *et al.*, 1984; Hamilton *et al.*, 2008; Drake *et al.*, 2018) and changes can occur across the scale of minutes (e.g. heat shock) to months (e.g. seasonal change) (Havaux, 1993; Bannister *et al.*, 2005). Acclimation of thermal tolerance can be influenced by temperature alone (Strimbeck *et al.*, 2008), as well as other environmental conditions such as photoperiod (Bannister *et al.*, 2005) and water availability (Lu & Zhang, 1998). Thus, in addition to considering interactive effects on thermal tolerance, it is crucial for studies on thermal tolerance to be explicit about the thermal legacy of their study organisms.

Variability in background thermal regimes may have significant effects on plant responses to extreme conditions (Gutschick & BassiriRad, 2003; Bita & Gerats, 2013). Furthermore, plant thermal tolerance research seldom reports variability of ambient environmental factors in controlled growth environments (including temperature, light, and humidity) or differences between air and leaf temperatures, which can differ among species by up to 10°C in hot conditions (Wise *et al.*, 2004; Vogel, 2009). Comparisons among studies that differ in experimental designs, biomes, and species may be complicated by ambiguity at best and, more concerningly by legacy, if prior thermal exposure is not reported explicitly and terms to describe changes in thermal tolerance are not defined carefully.

Interactions with other environmental factors

Average temperatures are increasing alongside more intense and frequent extreme events, often with a backdrop of resource limitation. These factors will likely exacerbate the effect of thermal stress with potentially long-lasting or irreversible community-level effects (Harris *et al.*, 2018). Variation in other abiotic factors may include ordinary elements such as seasonal variation in temperature, light, or water availability. In many situations thermal stress from high temperatures will occur with or following onset of water limitation. Nonetheless, most studies in the literature focused on thermal tolerance in the absence of additional experimental variables (57%). Among the studies that included additional environmental factors, the most common was the effect of a controlled growth temperature prior to applying thermal stress (13%), e.g. to determine whether hardening alters the effect of extreme events. Given that heat stress events often co-occur with belowground resource limitations, it is concerning that an extremely small percentage of studies considered how availability of water (6%) or soil nutrients (2%) affected thermal responses. Likewise, we found few studies that considered the effects of light (3%), CO_2 (1%), or other non-climate factors (8%) on thermal stress responses. Indeed, such two- and three-way treatment interactions were investigated by just 10% of all studies. Given that our changing climate will bring shifts in both thermal and precipitation regimes and that drought and thermal acclimation have been shown to interact (Sierra-Almeida *et al.*, 2009; Hoover *et al.*, 2014), it seems pertinent to consider their combined impact on tissue damage, yield loss, or mortality. For studies of thermal tolerance to have real-world meaning, a greater understanding of how other factors limit responses to temperature is crucial.

Towards development of standard approaches and comparable thermal metrics

The more we can apply a set of standardised approaches across species, crop types or biomes, and different thermal regimes, the greater our potential to identify general patterns in the physiology, ecology, and evolution of thermal tolerance. Of course, the reality is that methods are regularly fine-tuned and refined for specific study organisms and contexts. Plant thermal tolerance research is most informative if the underlying premises regarding experimental conditions are well justified and experimental procedures are explained unambiguously.

Thermal tolerance metrics are a valuable tool to support comparative research to identify general patterns across species or biomes. For example, T_{crit} and T_{50} of $F_{\mathrm{V}}/F_{\mathrm{M}}$, often generated via measuring chlorophyll fluorescence, have been measured for hundreds of species (Notes S1; e.g. Knight & Ackerly, 2002; Zhu *et al.*, 2018; Lancaster & Humphreys, 2020). However, we found that only 23% of studies across both cultivated (49%) and wild (17%) species either reported a metric or provided information from which such a metric might be obtainable. Thus, where possible, we advocate adoption of techniques that generate a thermal tolerance metric that can be used for global comparative analyses.

The many different and nuanced approaches to researching plant thermal tolerance have propagated various metrics and terms. For example, plant thermal tolerance metrics frequently do not specify whether they reflect a heat or cold response (e.g. T_{crit} could refer to either hot or cold critical temperature). Further, measures of the same name, but derived from different thermal tolerance assays will vary in their functional significance depending on the underlying physiological processes that are being quantified. While measures and metrics from different tolerance assays (e.g. LT_{50} from $F_{\mathrm{V}}/F_{\mathrm{M}}$ and LT_{50} from visual damage) yield interesting intra-assay comparisons, they do not always provide equivalent information, correlate well with each other, or represent biologically sensible comparisons (e.g. Neuner & Pramsohler, 2006; Curtis *et al.*, 2016). Ideally, streamlining metrics and terms would allow for greater comparability across experimental approaches and techniques, as is currently more commonplace in animal ecophysiology (Rezende *et al.*, 2014; Rezende & Bozinovic, 2019; Sunday *et al.*, 2019). Exploring how different assays correlate is a further vital step toward standardising approaches to evaluate thermal tolerance but also for understanding the mechanistic links among patterns of response in different measures.

We advocate a multidisciplinary approach to assessing plant thermal tolerance. For example, measure the thermal tolerance of photosynthesis directly using a method that produces a tolerance metric, such as chlorophyll fluorescence or electrolyte leakage. Biochemical responses to thermal extremes, particularly ROS and HSP, could then be measured to probe underlying mechanisms. To better understand the impact of thermal tolerance, a holistic view to growth and seed production is always useful, though we appreciate often logistically intractable. However, we note that until there are more studies that investigate the thermal tolerance responses of plants to extreme events using multiple approaches, we cannot infer which method generates the most reliable information or metric for predictive models.

An agenda for future thermal tolerance research

The primary objective of this synthesis was to determine the state of knowledge in the field of plant thermal tolerance research and to identify commonalities, ambiguities, and deficiencies in the global literature of plant thermal tolerance measurement. By mapping topics by article titles and author keywords, we can visualise the general siloing with respect to thermal tolerance assays, species selection, and geography (Fig. S8). After decades of research, there are still remarkable holes in our knowledge base, punctuated by large divides among specific sub-fields of thermal tolerance research. Our systematic review found little equivalency among techniques and study designs, let alone thermal metrics, indicating that cross-species comparisons remain far from straightforward. Addressing these issues will be crucial as trait databases become key sources for understanding plant responses to increased temperature means and extremes as the climate changes.

Our review has demonstrated the need to explicitly revisit not only how we study thermal tolerance, but also what our priorities are while studying it. The 'how' has been covered above. Below, we outline four broad areas that we see as priorities for empirical thermal tolerance research, for which our recommendations are summarised in Table 2B. This agenda seeks to provoke discussion and improve efficiency, repeatability, and comparative power in our research to catalyse fundamental advances and applied outcomes.

1. The comparative ecology of thermal tolerance in the ecological and evolutionary strategy spaces

Plant ecologists have made great advances in understanding how traits are related to distribution of species across the globe (O'Sullivan *et al.*, 2017; Lancaster & Humphreys, 2020; Sentinella *et al.*, 2020), but we have less understanding of how thermal ecology links to other elements of plant strategy space (Vasseur *et al.*, 2018). If we are to assess which ecosystems are most at risk under climate change accurately, a greater understanding of how thermal tolerance of species scales to the community level is essential. Multi-species comparative projects were under-represented within our dataset and these were not comparisons of within or between community variation in most cases. In the stand-out exemplary studies, there remains relatively low representation of non-woody growth forms. Undoubtedly, factors such as competition, facilitation, differential resource utilisation, and population demographics all modify the thermal response profiles of individual species and have flow-on effects to the functioning of communities and ecosystems. For example, the variation in thermal tolerance of species, growth forms, or functional types has the potential to change relative survival and dominance within communities, thereby leading to shifts in the distribution of species and communities (Ackerly, 2003). Such changes may then alter ecosystem function at small catchment and large landscape scales. Thus, improved understanding of how such variation affects community thermal tolerance in natural systems is warranted.

2. Understanding the geography and drivers of thermal tolerance breadth

Published research on wild plants in alpine biomes around the world has primarily focused on cold tolerance (e.g. Bannister, 2007; Briceño *et al.*, 2014) while in desert plants, research on heat tolerance dominates (e.g. Knight & Ackerly, 2002; Curtis *et al.*, 2014; 2016). Yet mountain plants can reach extreme high temperatures in summer (Larcher *et al.*, 2010) and desert plants are exposed to extreme cold (Lazarus *et al.*, 2019). Little is known about thermal tolerance breadth, including whether specialising for one extreme is antagonistic to the other. While responses to heat and cold shock may differ or have different kinetics, some share signalling and metabolic pathways (Kaplan *et al.*, 2004) and so fundamental insight about the mechanistic determinants of thermal tolerance could be revealed by comparing heat and cold tolerance. Further, thermal tolerance breadth may vary with climatic affiliation; for example, being broader in widespread species or species from variable or more extreme climates (Sheth & Angert, 2014).

Biodiversity models often assume that realised distributions reflect species' fundamental climatic tolerances, however, by underestimating thermal tolerances these models may underestimate the breadth of a species' niche (Bush *et al.*, 2018). Thus, we propose that the thermal tolerance breadth could be a better indicator of species' fundamental climatic tolerance, and thus adaptive capacity: important considerations to better predict species distributions or extinction risk under climate change. Thermal tolerance breadth could also be indicative of a crop's suitability for particular agro-ecological zones and potentially a desirable trait to target in crop breeding in growing regions that have both cold and hot extremes (Varshney *et al.*, 2011). Cultivars or species with narrow thermal tolerance breadth may be particularly vulnerable to changing climatic conditions, especially if that narrow tolerance is associated with low genetic diversity and narrow range sizes (Slatyer *et al.*, 2013). Conversely, cultivars selected for their tolerance to temperature extremes or natural species that have evolved with frequent extremes in temperature may have high thermal tolerance breadth and be buffered against crop failure and extinction (Buckley & Huey, 2016). Thus, thermal tolerance breadth has potential to yield insight with relevance to both wild and cultivated species. Such hypotheses have been tested in animals, but rarely in plants (Sheth & Angert, 2014).

3. Influences of other factors on thermal tolerance and the potential for shared mechanistic and evolutionary underpinnings

Few studies examine how thermal tolerance interacts with other abiotic factors that could enhance or reduce susceptibility to thermal extremes. Although research that has focused on thermal tolerances has yielded important information we cannot infer from these studies how plants would respond to combinations of temperature and one or more other stresses (Mittler, 2006; Suzuki *et al.*, 2014). In agricultural fields and natural habitats, plants are often exposed to multiple simultaneous environmental stresses. For example, heat stress frequently occurs in combination with drought.

Interactions between water limitation and thermal response are ripe for investigation (Jagadish *et al.*, 2011; Fahad *et al.*, 2017), given that both temperature and precipitation regimes are changing across much of the globe. There is growing evidence that plant thermal tolerances are underpinned by molecular and metabolic processes that are both distinct to temperature stress (Rizhsky *et al.*, 2004) and common to other stresses (e.g. tricarboxylic acid-cycle intermediates increase in response to temperature and drought stress; Kaplan *et al.*, 2004). For combinations of thermal tolerance with tolerance to one or more other stresses, plants require unique metabolic and signalling responses (Zandalinas *et al.*, 2018). There remains much to be learnt about the drivers of these unique processes. Addressing this gap is essential for improving model parameterisation for the prediction of plant responses to climate change, identification of key traits for climate-resilient crop breeding programs, and the development of better adaptation strategies for managed agricultural settings and natural habitats.

4. Understanding the sensing of and response to thermal stress along the continuum from protective mechanisms to acquired damage

There is a complex continuum between temperatures that induce protective mechanisms and those that cause irreparable damage and impact survival (Nievola *et al.*, 2017). The relative impact of a single large *vs* repeated small exposures outside optimal temperatures remains poorly understood, and the mechanisms underlying priming or memory responses and recovery from thermal stress are complex and still an active area of investigation (Bruce *et al.*, 2007; Lämke & Bäurle, 2017; Hüve *et al.*, 2019). The extent of and mechanisms underlying the plasticity of thermal tolerance are thus another area needing attention and improved analysis (Arnold *et al.*, 2019).

Timeframes over which thermal tolerance acclimates in response to realistic temperature fluctuations on diurnal and seasonal bases are yet to be explored in depth. Such studies will provide more comprehensive insight into capacity for stress priming, recovery, and memory (Crisp *et al.*, 2016; Hilker & Schmülling, 2019). Thermal tolerance is highly responsive to changes in climate, growing environment, and interactive abiotic factors and stressors, but not all observed responses will be equally important. On macroscales, general trends in plant thermal tolerance can be observed at a coarse resolution across a range of techniques (Lancaster & Humphreys, 2020), and there is evidence that thermal tolerance plasticity is consistent across different growing environments (Zhu *et al.*, 2018). Much like determining that extreme events have greater impact on selection pressure and population persistence than average warming (Buckley & Huey, 2016), it will be critical to determine the relative importance of the sensitivity and variability of thermal tolerance responses in dynamic environments.

Conclusions

A comprehensive understanding of the thermal tolerance of land plants is crucial. Our rapidly changing climate demands that we pay increased attention to the importance of thermal tolerance for agricultural production and efficiency, ecosystem services, and persistence of wild species. Our systematic review documents geographic and temporal distributions of research efforts and methodological approaches in plant thermal tolerance to date. It shows that there are substantial gaps in our knowledge, and we argue that these are hindering new insights into plant thermal tolerance. The lack of standardised research methods, limited transdisciplinary communication, ambiguous use of terminology and metrics, and unrepresentative global coverage are methodological issues that can be addressed. Conceptual advances will arise from a focus on understanding how thermal tolerance varies in ecological and evolutionary strategy space, studying the importance of thermal breadth, and delimiting mechanisms that underlie acclimation potential and thus the ability to induce protection *vs* accumulate damage. Finally, we crucially need more insight into how thermal tolerance interacts with and its relative importance in comparison to other abiotic factors such as drought. To these ends, we have identified key design elements for effective thermal tolerance research and outlined an agenda to instigate both fundamental advances and applied outcomes.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Verónica Briceño, Jack Egerton, and Rachel Slatyer for insightful discussions during the early phases of this research. We also thank Owen Atkin, Belinda Medlyn, David Ackerly, and two other anonymous reviewers for feedback on earlier drafts of the manuscript.

Author contributions

SRG, PAA, and ABN led the systematic review, data curation and analyses, and led manuscript writing with substantial input on drafts from all authors. All authors contributed significantly to the immense effort that was screening and evaluating articles in the systematic review.

ORCIDs

Sonya R. Geange: 0000-0001-5344-7234

Pieter A. Arnold: 0000-0002-6158-7752

Alexandra A. Catling: 0000-0002-7537-183X

Onoriode Coast: 0000-0002-5013-4715

Alicia M. Cook: 0000-0003-3594-3220

Kelli M. Gowland: 0000-0001-6066-3103

Andrea Leigh: 0000-0003-3568-2606

Rocco F. Notarnicola: 0000-0001-9860-6497

Bradley C. Posch: 0000-0003-0924-6608

Susanna E. Venn: 0000-0002-7433-0120

Lingling Zhu: 0000-0003-0489-0680

Adrienne B. Nicotra: 0000-0001-6578-369X

References

Ackerly D. 2003. Community assembly, niche conservatism, and adaptive evolution in changing environments. *International Journal of Plant Sciences* **164**: S165-S184.

Arnold PA, Kruuk LEB, Nicotra AB. 2019. How to analyse plant phenotypic plasticity in response to a changing climate. *New Phytologist* **222**: 1235-1241.

Aspinwall MJ, Pfautsch S, Tjoelker MG, Vårhammar A, Possell M, Drake JE, Reich PB, Tissue DT, Atkin OK, Rymer PD, et al. 2019. Range size and growth temperature influence Eucalyptus species responses to an experimental heatwave. *Global Change Biology* **25**: 1665-1684.

Bannister P. 2007. Godley review: a touch of frost? Cold hardiness of plants in the southern hemisphere. *New Zealand Journal of Botany* **45**: 1-33.

Bannister P, Maegli T, Dickinson KJM, Halloy SRP, Knight A, Lord JM, Mark AF, Spencer KL. 2005. Will loss of snow cover during climatic warming expose New Zealand alpine plants to increased frost damage? *Oecologia* **144**: 245-256.

Barua D, Heckathorn SA. 2004. Acclimation of the temperature set-points of the heat-shock response. *Journal of Thermal Biology* **29**: 185-193.

Bennett JM, Calosi P, Clusella-Trullas S, Martínez B, Sunday J, Algar AC, Araújo MB, Hawkins BA, Keith S, Kühn I, et al. 2018. GlobTherm, a global database on thermal tolerances for aquatic and terrestrial organisms. *Scientific Data* **5**: 180022.

Bita C, Gerats T. 2013. Plant tolerance to high temperature in a changing environment: scientific fundamentals and production of heat stress-tolerant crops. *Frontiers in Plant Science* **4**: 273.

Briceño VF, Harris-Pascal D, Nicotra AB, Williams E, Ball MC. 2014. Variation in snow cover drives differences in frost resistance in seedlings of the alpine herb *Aciphylla glacialis*. *Environmental and Experimental Botany* **106**: 174-181.

Bruce TJA, Matthes MC, Napier JA, Pickett JA. 2007. Stressful “memories” of plants: evidence and possible mechanisms. *Plant Science* **173**: 603-608.

Buchner O, Neuner G. 2003. Variability of heat tolerance in alpine plant species measured at different altitudes. *Arctic, Antarctic, and Alpine Research* **35**: 411-420.

Buckley LB, Huey RB. 2016. How extreme temperatures impact organisms and the evolution of their thermal tolerance. *Integrative and Comparative Biology* **56**: 98-109.

Bush A, Catullo RA, Mokany K, Thornhill AH, Miller JT, Ferrier S. 2018. Truncation of thermal tolerance niches among Australian plants. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* **27**: 22-31.

Campbell ZC, Acosta-Gamboa LM, Nepal N, Lorence A. 2018. Engineering plants for tomorrow: how high-throughput phenotyping is contributing to the development of better crops. *Phytochemistry Reviews* **17**: 1329-1343.

Caubel J, García de Cortázar-Atauri I, Launay M, de Noblet-Ducoudré N, Huard F, Bertuzzi P, Graux A-I. 2015. Broadening the scope for ecoclimatic indicators to assess crop climate suitability according to ecophysiological, technical and quality criteria. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **207**: 94-106.

Cavanaugh KC, Kellner JR, Forde AJ, Gruner DS, Parker JD, Rodriguez W, Feller IC. 2014. Poleward expansion of mangroves is a threshold response to decreased frequency of extreme cold events. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **111**: 723-727.

Chen B, Feder ME, Kang L. 2018. Evolution of heat-shock protein expression underlying adaptive responses to environmental stress. *Molecular Ecology* **27**: 3040-3054.

Coast O, Murdoch AJ, Ellis RH, Hay FR, Jagadish KSV. 2016. Resilience of rice (*Oryza* spp.) pollen germination and tube growth to temperature stress. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **39**: 26-37.

Crisp PA, Ganguly D, Eichten SR, Borevitz JO, Pogson BJ. 2016. Reconsidering plant memory: intersections between stress recovery, RNA turnover, and epigenetics. *Science Advances* **2**: e1501340.

Curtis EM, Gollan J, Murray BR, Leigh A. 2016. Native microhabitats better predict tolerance to warming than latitudinal macro-climatic variables in arid-zone plants. *Journal of Biogeography* **43**: 1156-1165.

Curtis EM, Knight CA, Petrou K, Leigh A. 2014. A comparative analysis of photosynthetic recovery from thermal stress: a desert plant case study. *Oecologia* **175**: 1051-1061.

Deshmukh R, Sonah H, Patil G, Chen W, Prince S, Mutava R, Vuong T, Valliyodan B, Nguyen HT. 2014. Integrating omic approaches for abiotic stress tolerance in soybean. *Frontiers in Plant Science* **5**: 244.

Downton WJS, Berry JA, Seemann JR. 1984. Tolerance of photosynthesis to high temperature in desert plants. *Plant Physiology* **74**: 786-790.

Drake JE, Tjoelker MG, Vårhammar A, Medlyn BE, Reich PB, Leigh A, Pfautsch S, Blackman CJ, López R, Aspinwall MJ, et al. 2018. Trees tolerate an extreme heatwave via sustained transpirational cooling and increased leaf thermal tolerance. *Global Change Biology* **24**: 2390-2402.

Fahad S, Bajwa AA, Nazir U, Anjum SA, Farooq A, Zohaib A, Sadia S, Nasim W, Adkins S, Saud S, et al. 2017. Crop production under drought and heat stress: plant responses and management options. *Frontiers in Plant Science* **8**: 1147.

Feder ME, Hofmann GE. 1999. Heat-shock proteins, molecular chaperones, and the stress response: evolutionary and ecological physiology. *Annual Review of Physiology* **61**: 243-282.

Fragkostefanakis S, Röth S, Schleiff E, Scharf K-D. 2015. Prospects of engineering thermotolerance in crops through modulation of heat stress transcription factor and heat shock protein networks. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **38**: 1881-1895.

Furbank RT, Jimenez-Berni JA, George-Jaeggli B, Potgieter AB, Deery DM. 2019. Field crop phenomics: enabling breeding for radiation use efficiency and biomass in cereal crops. *New Phytologist* **223**: 1714-1727.

Gill SS, Tuteja N. 2010. Reactive oxygen species and antioxidant machinery in abiotic stress tolerance in crop plants. *Plant Physiology and Biochemistry* **48**: 909-930.

Gitz V, Meybeck A, Lipper L, Young CD, Braatz S. 2016. Climate change and food security: risks and responses. *Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) Report*.

Grover A, Mittal D, Negi M, Lavania D. 2013. Generating high temperature tolerant transgenic plants: achievements and challenges. *Plant Science* **205-206**: 38-47.

Gu L, Hanson PJ, Post WM, Kaiser DP, Yang B, Nemani R, Pallardy SG, Meyers T. 2008. The 2007 eastern US spring freeze: increased cold damage in a warming world? *BioScience* **58**: 253-262.

Gurevitch J, Koricheva J, Nakagawa S, Stewart G. 2018. Meta-analysis and the science of research synthesis. *Nature* **555**: 175-182.

Gutschick VP, BassiriRad H. 2003. Extreme events as shaping physiology, ecology, and evolution of plants: toward a unified definition and evaluation of their consequences. *New Phytologist* **160**: 21-42.

Guy C. 1999. Molecular responses of plants to cold shock and cold acclimation. *Journal of Molecular Microbiology and Biotechnology* **1**: 231-242.

Hamilton EW, Heckathorn SA, Joshi P, Wang D, Barua D. 2008. Interactive effects of elevated CO_2 and growth temperature on the tolerance of photosynthesis to acute heat stress in C_3 and C_4 species. *Journal of Integrative Plant Biology* **50**: 1375-1387.

Harris RMB, Beaumont LJ, Vance TR, Tozer CR, Remenyi TA, Perkins-Kirkpatrick SE, Mitchell PJ, Nicotra AB, McGregor S, Andrew NR, et al. 2018. Biological responses to the press and pulse of climate trends and extreme events. *Nature Climate Change* **8**: 579-587.

Hasanuzzaman M, Nahar K, Alam M, Roychowdhury R, Fujita M. 2013. Physiological, biochemical, and molecular mechanisms of heat stress tolerance in plants. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* **14**: 9643-9684.

Hatfield JL, Prueger JH. 2015. Temperature extremes: effect on plant growth and development. *Weather and Climate Extremes* **10**: 4-10.

Havaux M. 1993. Rapid photosynthetic adaptation to heat stress triggered in potato leaves by moderately elevated temperatures. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **16**: 461-467.

Hewitson B, Janetos AC, Carter TR, Giorgi F, Jones RG, Kwon WT, Mearns LO, Schipper ELF, van Aalst M 2014. Regional context. In: Barros VR, *et al.* eds. *Climate*

Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part B: Regional Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1133-1197.

Hilker M, Schmülling T. 2019. Stress priming, memory, and signalling in plants. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **42**: 753-761.

Hoffmann AA, Sgrò CM. 2018. Comparative studies of critical physiological limits and vulnerability to environmental extremes in small ectotherms: how much environmental control is needed? *Integrative Zoology* **13**: 355-371.

Hoover DL, Knapp AK, Smith MD. 2014. Resistance and resilience of a grassland ecosystem to climate extremes. *Ecology* **95**: 2646-2656.

Huey RB, Carlson M, Crozier L, Frazier M, Hamilton H, Harley C, Hoang A, Kingsolver JG. 2002. Plants *versus* animals: do they deal with stress in different ways? *Integrative and Comparative Biology* **42**: 415-423.

Hüve K, Bichele I, Kaldmäe H, Rasulov B, Valladares F, Niinemets Ü. 2019. Responses of aspen leaves to heatflecks: both damaging and non-damaging rapid temperature excursions reduce photosynthesis. *Plants* **8**: 145.

IPCC. 2018. Global Warming of 1.5° C: An IPCC Special Report on the Impacts of Global Warming of 1.5° C Above Pre-industrial Levels and Related Global Greenhouse Gas Emission Pathways, in the Context of Strengthening the Global Response to the Threat of Climate Change, Sustainable Development, and Efforts to Eradicate Poverty. Geneva, Switzerland.

Jagadish KSV, Cairns JE, Kumar A, Somayanda IM, Craufurd PQ. 2011. Does susceptibility to heat stress confound screening for drought tolerance in rice? *Functional Plant Biology* **38**: 261-269.

Jagadish SV, Craufurd PQ, Wheeler TR. 2007. High temperature stress and spikelet fertility in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *Journal of Experimental Botany* **58**: 1627-1635.

Jansen MAK, Potters G 2017. Stress: the way of life In Shabala S. *Plant stress physiology*. Boston, MA, USA: CABI. ix-xiv.

Jha UC, Bohra A, Parida SK, Jha R. 2017. Integrated "omics" approaches to sustain global productivity of major grain legumes under heat stress. *Plant Breeding* **136**: 437-459.

Jha UC, Bohra A, Singh NP. 2014. Heat stress in crop plants: its nature, impacts and integrated breeding strategies to improve heat tolerance. *Plant Breeding* **133**: 679-701.

Jönsson AM, Linderson M-L, Stjernquist I, Schlyter P, Bärring L. 2004. Climate change and the effect of temperature backlashes causing frost damage in *Picea abies*. *Global and Planetary Change* **44**: 195-207.

Kaplan F, Kopka J, Haskell DW, Zhao W, Schiller KC, Gatzke N, Sung DY, Guy CL. 2004. Exploring the temperature-stress metabolome of *Arabidopsis*. *Plant Physiology* **136**: 4159-4168.

Kattge J, Bönisch G, Díaz S, Lavorel S, Prentice IC, Leadley P, Tautenhahn S, Werner GDA, Aakala T, Abedi M, et al. 2020. TRY plant trait database – enhanced coverage and open access. *Global Change Biology* **26**: 119-188.

Knight CA, Ackerly DD. 2002. An ecological and evolutionary analysis of photosynthetic thermotolerance using the temperature-dependent increase in fluorescence. *Oecologia* **130**: 505-514.

Knight CA, Ackerly DD. 2003. Evolution and plasticity of photosynthetic thermal tolerance, specific leaf area and leaf size: congeneric species from desert and coastal environments. *The New Phytologist* **160**: 337-347.

Körner C. 2003. *Alpine plant life*. New York, USA: Springer.

Kretschmer M, Coumou D, Agel L, Barlow M, Tziperman E, Cohen J. 2018. More-persistent weak stratospheric polar vortex states linked to cold extremes. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* **99**: 49-60.

Kreyling J, Schmid S, Aas G. 2015. Cold tolerance of tree species is related to the climate of their native ranges. *Journal of Biogeography* **42**: 156-166.

Lai C-H, He J. 2016. Physiological performances of temperate vegetables with response to chronic and acute heat stress. *American Journal of Plant Sciences* **7**: 2055-2071.

Lämke J, Bäurle I. 2017. Epigenetic and chromatin-based mechanisms in environmental stress adaptation and stress memory in plants. *Genome Biology* **18**: 124.

Lancaster LT, Humphreys AM. 2020. Global variation in the thermal tolerances of plants. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **117**: 13580.

Larcher W. 2003. *Physiological Plant Ecology: Ecophysiology and stress physiology of Functional Group*: Springer-Verlag

Larcher W, Kainmüller C, Wagner J. 2010. Survival types of high mountain plants under extreme temperatures. *Flora* **205**: 3-18.

Lazarus BE, Germino MJ, Richardson BA. 2019. Freezing resistance, safety margins, and survival vary among big sagebrush populations across the western United States. *American Journal of Botany* **106**: 922-934.

Li PH, Davis DW, Shen ZY. 1991. High-temperature-acclimation potential of the common bean: can it be used as a selection criterion for improving crop performance in high-temperature environments? *Field Crop Research* **27**: 241-256.

Lortie CJ. 2014. Formalized synthesis opportunities for ecology: systematic reviews and meta-analyses. *Oikos* **123**: 897-902.

Lortie CJ, Brooker RW, Kikvidze Z, Callaway RM. 2004. The value of stress and limitation in an imperfect world: a reply to Körner. *Journal of Vegetation Science* **15**: 577-580.

Lowry E, Rollinson EJ, Laybourn AJ, Scott TE, Aiello-Lammens ME, Gray SM, Mickley J, Gurevitch J. 2013. Biological invasions: a field synopsis, systematic review, and database of the literature. *Ecology and Evolution* **3**: 182-196.

Lu C, Zhang J. 1998. Effects of water stress on photosynthesis, chlorophyll fluorescence and photoinhibition in wheat plants. *Australian Journal of Plant Physiology* **25**: 883-892.

MacLean HJ, Sørensen JG, Kristensen TN, Loeschcke V, Beedholm K, Kellermann V, Overgaard J. 2019. Evolution and plasticity of thermal performance: an analysis of variation in thermal tolerance and fitness in 22 *Drosophila* species. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **374**: 20180548.

Marcante S, Sierra-Almeida A, Spindelböck JP, Erschbamer B, Neuner G. 2012. Frost as a limiting factor for recruitment and establishment of early development stages in an alpine glacier foreland? *Journal of Vegetation Science* **23**: 858-868.

Maxwell K, Johnson GN. 2000. Chlorophyll fluorescence—a practical guide. *Journal of Experimental Botany* **51**: 659-668.

Mitra R, Bhatia CR. 2008. Bioenergetic cost of heat tolerance in wheat crop. *Current Science* **94**: 1049-1053.

Mittler R. 2006. Abiotic stress, the field environment and stress combination. *Trends in Plant Science* **11**: 15-19.

Mittler R, Vanderauwera S, Suzuki N, Miller G, Tognetti VB, Vandepoele K, Gollery M, Shulaev V, Van Breusegem F. 2011. ROS signaling: the new wave? *Trends in Plant Science* **16**: 300-309.

Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group. 2009. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Annals of Internal Medicine* **151**: 264-269.

Neuner G, Pramsohler M. 2006. Freezing and high temperature thresholds of photosystem 2 compared to ice nucleation, frost and heat damage in evergreen subalpine plants. *Physiologia Plantarum* **126**: 196–204.

Nievola CC, Carvalho CP, Carvalho V, Rodrigues E. 2017. Rapid responses of plants to temperature changes. *Temperature* **4**: 371-405.

O'Sullivan OS, Heskel MA, Reich PB, Tjoelker MG, Weerasinghe LK, Penillard A, Zhu L, Egerton JJG, Bloomfield KJ, Creek D, et al. 2017. Thermal limits of leaf metabolism across biomes. *Global Change Biology* **23**: 209-223.

Osmond CB, Austin MP, Berry JA, Billings WD, Boyer JS, Dacey JWH, Nobel PS, Smith SD, Winner WE. 1987. Stress physiology and the distribution of plants. *BioScience* **37**: 38-48.

Parry ML, Rosenzweig C, Iglesias A, Livermore M, Fischer G. 2004. Effects of climate change on global food production under SRES emissions and socio-economic scenarios. *Global Environmental Change* **14**: 53-67.

Passioura JB. 2006. The perils of pot experiments. *Functional Plant Biology* **33**: 1075-1079.

Patterson BD, Murata T, Graham D. 1976. Electrolyte leakage induced by chilling in *Passiflora* species tolerant to different climates. *Functional Plant Biology* **3**: 435-442.

Perera-Castro AV, Brito P, González-Rodríguez AM. 2018. Changes in thermic limits and acclimation assessment for an alpine plant by chlorophyll fluorescence analysis: F_v/F_m vs. R_{fd}. *Photosynthetica* **56**: 527-536.

Perkins-Kirkpatrick SE, Gibson PB. 2017. Changes in regional heatwave characteristics as a function of increasing global temperature. *Scientific Reports* **7**: 12256.

Poorter H, Fiorani F, Pieruschka R, Wojciechowski T, van der Putten WH, Kleyer M, Schurr U, Postma J. 2016. Pampered inside, pestered outside? Differences and similarities between plants growing in controlled conditions and in the field. *New Phytologist* **212**: 838-855.

Rezende EL, Bozinovic F. 2019. Thermal performance across levels of biological organization. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **374**: 20180549.

Rezende EL, Castañeda LE, Santos M. 2014. Tolerance landscapes in thermal ecology. *Functional Ecology* **28**: 799-809.

Rizhsky L, Liang H, Shuman J, Shulaev V, Davletova S, Mittler R. 2004. When defense pathways collide. The response of *Arabidopsis* to a combination of drought and heat stress. *Plant Physiology* **134**: 1683-1696.

Sakai A, Larcher W. 1987. *Frost surival of Plants: Responses and adaptation to freezing stress*: Springer-Verlag Berlin.

Sentinella AT, Warton DI, Sherwin WB, Offord CA, Moles AT. 2020. Tropical plants do not have narrower temperature tolerances, but are more at risk from warming because they are close to their upper thermal limits. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* **29**: 1387-1398.

Shah T, Xu J, Zou X, Cheng Y, Nasir M, Zhang X. 2018. Omics approaches for engineering wheat production under abiotic stresses. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* **19**: 2390.

Sheth SN, Angert AL. 2014. The evolution of environmental tolerance and range size: a comparison of geographically restricted and widespread *Mimulus*. *Evolution* **68**: 2917-2931.

Sierra-Almeida A, Cavieres LA. 2012. Summer freezing resistance of high-elevation plant species changes with ontogeny. *Environmental and Experimental Botany* **80**: 10-15.

Sierra-Almeida A, Cavieres LA, Bravo LA. 2009. Freezing resistance varies within the growing season and with elevation in high-Andean species of central Chile. *New Phytologist* **182**: 461-469.

Slatyer RA, Hirst M, Sexton JP. 2013. Niche breadth predicts geographical range size: a general ecological pattern. *Ecology Letters* **16**: 1104-1114.

Squeo FA, Rada F, Azocar A, Goldstein G. 1991. Freezing tolerance and avoidance in high tropical Andean plants: Is it equally represented in species with different plant height? *Oecologia* **86**: 378-382.

Stocks G, Seales L, Paniagua F, Maehr E, Bruna EM. 2008. The geographical and institutional distribution of ecological research in the tropics. *Biotropica* **40**: 397-404.

Strimbeck GR, Kjellsen TD, Schaberg PG, Murakami PF. 2008. Dynamics of low-temperature acclimation in temperate and boreal conifer foliage in a mild winter climate. *Tree Physiology* **28**: 1365-1374.

Suggitt AJ, Wilson RJ, Isaac NJB, Beale CM, Auffret AG, August T, Bennie JJ, Crick HQP, Duffield S, Fox R, et al. 2018. Extinction risk from climate change is reduced by microclimatic buffering. *Nature Climate Change* **8**: 713-717.

Sunday J, Bennett JM, Calosi P, Clusella-Trullas S, Gravel S, Hargreaves AL, Leiva FP, Verberk WCEP, Olalla-Tárraga MÁ, Morales-Castilla I. 2019. Thermal tolerance patterns across latitude and elevation. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **374**: 20190036.

Sung D-Y, Kaplan F, Lee K-J, Guy CL. 2003. Acquired tolerance to temperature extremes. *Trends in Plant Science* **8**: 179-187.

Suzuki N, Rivero RM, Shulaev V, Blumwald E, Mittler R. 2014. Abiotic and biotic stress combinations. *New Phytologist* **203**: 32-43.

Tester M, Langridge P. 2010. Breeding technologies to increase crop production in a changing world. *Science* **327**: 818-822.

Trapero-Mozos A, Ducreux LJM, Bita CE, Morris W, Wiese C, Morris JA, Paterson C, Hedley PE, Hancock RD, Taylor M. 2018. A reversible light- and genotype-dependent acquired thermotolerance response protects the potato plant from damage due to excessive temperature. *Planta* **247**: 1377-1392.

Urano K, Kurihara Y, Seki M, Shinozaki K. 2010. ‘Omics’ analyses of regulatory networks in plant abiotic stress responses. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology* **13**: 132-138.

Varshney RK, Bansal KC, Aggarwal PK, Datta SK, Craufurd PQ. 2011. Agricultural biotechnology for crop improvement in a variable climate: hope or hype? *Trends in Plant Science* **16**: 363-371.

Vasseur F, Sartori K, Baron E, Fort F, Kazakou E, Segrestin J, Garnier E, Vile D, Violle C. 2018. Climate as a driver of adaptive variations in ecological strategies in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Annals of Botany* **122**: 935-945.

Venn SE, Green K. 2018. Evergreen alpine shrubs have high freezing resistance in spring, irrespective of snowmelt timing and exposure to frost: an investigation from the Snowy Mountains, Australia. *Plant Ecology* **219**: 209-216.

Venn SE, Morgan JW, Lord JM. 2013. Foliar freezing resistance of Australian alpine plants over the growing season. *Austral Ecology* **38**: 152-161.

Vogel S. 2009. Leaves in the lowest and highest winds: temperature, force and shape. *New Phytologist* **183**: 13-26.

Wang W, Vinocur B, Shoseyov O, Altman A. 2004. Role of plant heat-shock proteins and molecular chaperones in the abiotic stress response. *Trends in Plant Science* **9**: 244-252.

Wang X, Cai J, Jiang D, Liu F, Dai T, Cao W. 2011. Pre-anthesis high-temperature acclimation alleviates damage to the flag leaf caused by post-anthesis heat stress in wheat. *Journal of Plant Physiology* **168**: 585-593.

Whitlow TH, Bassuk NL, Ranney TG, Reichert DL. 1992. An improved method for using electrolyte leakage to assess membrane competence in plant tissues. *Plant Physiology* **98**: 198-205.

Wise RR, Olson AJ, Schrader SM, Sharkey TD. 2004. Electron transport is the functional limitation of photosynthesis in field-grown Pima cotton plants at high temperature. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **27**: 717-724.

Woldendorp G, Hill MJ, Doran R, Ball MC. 2008. Frost in a future climate: modelling interactive effects of warmer temperatures and rising atmospheric CO_2 on the incidence and severity of frost damage in a temperate evergreen (*Eucalyptus pauciflora*). *Global Change Biology* **14**: 294-308.

Xu H, Liu G, Liu G, Yan B, Duan W, Wang L, Li S. 2014. Comparison of investigation methods of heat injury in grapevine (*Vitis*) and assessment to heat tolerance in different cultivars and species. *BMC Plant Biology* **14**: 156.

Yamori W, Noguchi K, Hikosaka K, Terashima I. 2010. Phenotypic plasticity in photosynthetic temperature acclimation among crop species with different cold tolerances. *Plant Physiology* **152**: 388–399.

Yoshida S, Satake T, Mackill DS. 1981. High temperature stress in rice. *IRRI Research Paper Series* **67**: 1-15.

Zampieri M, Ceglar A, Dentener F, Dosio A, Naumann G, van den Berg M, Toreti A. 2019. When will current climate extremes affecting maize production become the norm? *Earth's Future* **7**: 113-122.

Zandalinas SI, Mittler R, Balfagón D, Arbona V, Gómez-Cadenas A. 2018. Plant adaptations to the combination of drought and high temperatures. *Physiologia Plantarum* **162**: 2-12.

Zhu L, Bloomfield KJ, Hocart CH, Egerton JJG, O'Sullivan OS, Penillard A, Weerasinghe LK, Atkin OK. 2018. Plasticity of photosynthetic heat tolerance in plants adapted to thermally contrasting biomes. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **41**: 1251-1262.

Zivy M, Wienkoop S, Renaut J, Pinheiro C, Goulas E, Carpentier S. 2015. The quest for tolerant varieties: the importance of integrating “omics” techniques to phenotyping. *Frontiers in Plant Science* **6**: 448.

Zub HW, Arnoult S, Younous J, Lejeune-Hénaut I, Brancourt-Hulmel M. 2012. The frost tolerance of *Miscanthus* at the juvenile stage: differences between clones are influenced by leaf-stage and acclimation. *European Journal of Agronomy* **36**: 32-40.

Figure Legends

Fig. 1. (a) Thermal tolerance techniques are presented in order of appearance within the literature for cultivated (left) and wild systems (right). (b) The uptake of techniques since the 1960s; a given article may use multiple techniques (studies) represented exceeds the total articles identified in the systematic review. Numbers to the right of each plotted line refer to the numbered techniques described in (c). (c) Definitions for each of the 10 techniques within the scope of this review. Techniques displayed with an adjacent circle indicate the capacity for a thermal metric to be generated. Additional information on the techniques and references are provided in Supplementary Notes S1.

Fig. 2. Global distribution of plant thermal tolerance research. The choropleth map is coloured by the number of articles in the country of the first author's affiliation. Total articles on (a) cultivated and (b) wild species; cold tolerance studies on (c) cultivated and (d) wild species; studies on cold and heat tolerance together (termed both) on (e) cultivated and (f) wild species; heat tolerance studies on (g) cultivated and (h) wild species. The number of studies varies considerably, hence each panel has a different scale for the colour gradient scale bars. The colour gradients are log-transformed. Regional maps of articles from USA, China, Europe, and wild studies by experiment location instead of author location are presented in Figs S2–S5.

Fig. 3. The number of studies of thermal tolerance measures on (a) cultivated species across types of cultivation and (b) wild species across different biomes that focus on either cold tolerance, heat tolerance, or both heat and cold tolerance. Inset figures highlight the relative uptake of heat, cold, or both heat and cold tolerance approaches through time for articles on (c) cultivated and (d) wild species.

Fig. 4. The proportion (and numbers) of intraspecific, single species or multiple species studies on (a) cultivated and (b) wild species. The variation in life form of the focal study organisms (forb/herb, graminoid, shrub, tree, vine, or multiple forms (for studies on multiple species)) for studies on (c) cultivated and (d) wild species.

Fig. 5. (a) The maximum duration of the thermal stress imposed and (b) the type of stress (ramp, shock, not specified), expressed proportionally within each assay technique for cultivated and wild systems. Maximum durations listed in order from the longest duration on the left to shortest on the right: months, weeks, days, hours, minutes, or unspecified. For (b) we defined ramp as a rate of change in temperature less than 1^{o}C per minute and shock as a rate of change exceeding 1^{o}C per minute. Numbers of studies are shown to the right of the proportion bars.

Tables

Table 1. Summary of the number of studies (and percentage of articles in parentheses) for thermal tolerance research on cultivated species of each type of cultivation and for wild species of each biome category investigating cold, heat, or both heat and cold tolerance.

Cultivated – type of cultivation	**Cold**		**Heat**		**Heat and cold**		**Total**
Arabidopsis	201	(61.5)	106	(30.8)	21	(7.7)	328
Cereals	339	(49.6)	388	(47.3)	22	(3.4)	749
Fibre	36	(39.4)	43	(54.5)	2	(6.1)	81
Horticulture and vegetables	523	(60.4)	334	(32.4)	61	(7.1)	918
Legumes	117	(51.3)	117	(38.3)	24	(10.4)	258
Pasture and turf grasses	71	(46.1)	111	(48.3)	9	(5.6)	191
Plantation forestry	71	(66.2)	44	(25.0)	14	(8.8)	129
Viticulture	45	(63.8)	38	(27.7)	5	(8.5)	88
Other crops	146	(64.3)	70	(29.7)	16	(4.0)	232
Multiple	33	(61.3)	19	(29.0)	7	(9.7)	59
Not specified	0	(0.0)	3	(100.0)	0	(0.0)	3
Cultivated – subtotal	**1,582**	**(56.7)**	**1,273**	**(37.7)**	**181**	**(5.6)**	**3,036**
Wild – biome							
Alpine/Arctic tundra/Subalpine	79	(74.5)	29	(21.3)	4	(4.2)	112
Arid/Semi-arid/Savannah	27	(45.0)	20	(55.0)	0	(0.0)	47
Boreal forest	45	(100.0)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)	45
Mediterranean	29	(52.0)	17	(40.0)	5	(8.0)	51
Temperate	179	(76.2)	54	(21.3)	5	(2.5)	238
Tropical/Subtropical	32	(61.8)	26	(23.5)	16	(14.7)	74
Multiple	65	(64.7)	39	(29.4)	9	(7.9)	113
Not specified	12	(42.9)	15	(57.1)	0	(0.0)	27
Wild – subtotal	**468**	**(69.7)**	**200**	**(25.9)**	**39**	**(4.4)**	**707**
All species total	**2,050**	**(59.3)**	**1,473**	**(35.3)**	**220**	**(5.4)**	**3,743**

Note that multiple individual uses of thermal tolerance techniques (studies) can occur in a single article; therefore, we reported both the number of studies along with percentages of articles in parentheses for each subcategory (row).

Table 2. Key considerations and recommendations for future research.

A. ***Methodological and design considerations:***
   1. **Application of techniques:** Greater crosstalk among researchers studying thermal tolerance of cultivated and wild species would be mutually beneficial to compare and apply different techniques and develop high-throughput approaches.
   2. **Experimental design considerations:** Careful consideration when designing thermal tolerance research, particularly on how temperature stress is applied, thermal legacy effects, and interactions with other environmental factors.
   3. **Development of standard approaches and comparable metrics:** Test comparability of methods and metrics and use multidisciplinary approaches to generate stronger insights into both mechanisms and patterns of thermal tolerance.

B. ***Research priority agenda:***
   1. **The comparative ecology of thermal tolerance in the ecological and evolutionary strategy spaces:** Trait-based approaches in plant ecology should be linked to thermal tolerance to scale-up to higher-level ecosystem processes. Broad-scale comparative studies across a wider range of growth forms, biomes, and that can account for methodological differences will generate greater understanding of biogeographic patterns of tolerance.
   2. **Understanding the geography and drivers of thermal tolerance breadth:** Prioritise measuring thermal tolerance breadth, both heat and cold tolerance, particularly in wild species in thermally extreme regions or regions where snowmelt dynamics are changing, and crop species in regions where climate vulnerability is high.
   3. **Influences of other factors on thermal tolerance and the potential for shared mechanistic and evolutionary underpinnings:** Multi-factorial experiments are key to identifying molecular and metabolic responses and for determining which are distinct to temperature stress or common to other sources of stress.
   4. **Understanding the sensing of and response to thermal stress along the continuum from protective mechanisms to acquired damage:** Conduct detailed investigations into the time-sensitive aspects of recovery and damage dynamics, the role of plasticity, and effects of various thermal stresses, including means, extremes, variability, and microhabitats, on plant thermal tolerance.

Supporting Information

Fig. S1 PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items in Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) diagram illustrating the number of articles identified through database searching, title and abstract screening, and full-text searching.

Fig. S2 Choropleth map of the distribution of plant thermal tolerance research within the People's Republic of China.

Fig. S3 Choropleth map of the distribution of plant thermal tolerance research within the United States of America.

Fig. S4 Choropleth map of the distribution of plant thermal tolerance research within Europe.

Fig. S5 Choropleth map of the global distribution of plant thermal tolerance research on wild plants coloured by where the experiment was conducted, rather than the country of origin of the first author's affiliation.

Fig. S6 Number of times a thermal tolerance technique was used within types of cultivation within cultivated systems and biomes within wild systems.

Fig. S7 Proportion (and number) of studies for cultivated and wild systems that employed a ramp or shock approach to initiating thermal stress, when considering cold tolerance, heat tolerance or both cold and heat tolerance.

Fig. S8 Topic mapping of thermal tolerance articles using title and author keywords.

Notes S1. Systematic review methods, options and justifications for reviewer screening of articles, and extended version of Fig. 1 glossary of common tools and techniques for measuring thermal tolerance in land plants.

New Phytologist Supporting Information

Article title: The thermal tolerance of photosynthetic tissues: a global systematic review and roadmap for future research
Authors: Sonya R. Geange, Pieter A. Arnold, Alexandra A. Catling, Onoriode Coast, Alicia M. Cook, Kelli M. Gowland, Andrea Leigh, Rocco F. Notarnicola, Bradley C. Posch, Susanna E. Venn, Lingling Zhu, Adrienne B. Nicotra
Article acceptance date: 14 September 2020

The following Supporting Information is available for this article:

Fig. S1 PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items in Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) diagram illustrating the number of articles identified through database searching, title and abstract screening, and full-text searching.

Fig. S2 Choropleth map of the distribution of plant thermal tolerance research within the People's Republic of China.

Fig. S3 Choropleth map of the distribution of plant thermal tolerance research within the United States of America.

Fig. S4 Choropleth map of the distribution of plant thermal tolerance research within Europe.

Fig. S5 Choropleth map of the global distribution of plant thermal tolerance research on wild plants coloured by where the experiment was conducted, rather than the country of origin of the first author's affiliation.

Fig. S6 Number of times a thermal tolerance technique was used within types of cultivation within cultivated systems and biomes within wild systems.

Fig. S7 Proportion (and number) of studies for cultivated and wild systems that employed a ramp or shock approach to initiating thermal stress, when considering cold tolerance, heat tolerance or both cold and heat tolerance.

Fig. S8 Topic mapping of thermal tolerance articles using title and author keywords.

Notes S1 Systematic review methods, options and justifications for reviewer screening of articles, and extended version of Fig. 1 glossary of common tools and techniques for measuring thermal tolerance in land plants.

Fig. S1



Fig. S1. PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items in Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) diagram illustrating the number of articles identified through database searching, title and abstract screening, and full-text searching. Indicated at the bottom of the diagram are the number of articles identified as belonging to either cultivated or wild systems.

Fig. S2


(a) China cultivated: total

(b) China wild: total


(c) China cultivated: cold

(d) China wild: cold


(e) China cultivated: both

(f) China wild: both


(g) China cultivated: heat

(h) China wild: heat

Fig. S2. Distribution of plant thermal tolerance research within the People's Republic of China. The choropleth map is coloured by the number of articles in the province of the first author's affiliation. Total number of articles on (a) cultivated species and on (b) wild species; focussing on cold tolerance in (c) cultivated species and on (d) wild species; cold and heat tolerance together (termed both) on (e) cultivated species and on (f) wild species; and focussing on heat tolerance in (g) cultivated species and on (h) wild species. Note that each panel has a different scale for the colour gradient scale bars, and that the gradients are log-transformed for easier differentiation between the colours among provenances because the number of articles varies significantly. China had 334 articles on cultivated species, but only 36 on wild species. Most articles on cultivated species within China were in the central and eastern provinces, whereas the few wild articles included north-western and eastern provinces. Province abbreviations: AH = Anhui, BJ = Beijing, CQ = Chongqing, FJ = Fujian, GS = Gansu, GD = Guangdong, GX = Guangxi, GZ = Guizhou, HI = Hainan, HE = Hebei, HL = Heilongjiang, HA = Henan, HK = Hong Kong, HB = Hubei, HN = Hunan, NM = Inner Mongolia, JS = Jiangsu, JX = Jiangxi, JL = Jilin, LN = Liaoning, NX = Ningxia, QH = Qinghai, SN = Shaanxi, SX = Shanxi, SD = Shandong, SH = Shanghai, SX = Sichuan, TW = Taiwan, TJ = Tianjin City, XZ = Tibet, XJ = Xinjiang, YN = Yunnan, ZJ = Zhejiang.

Fig. S3



(a) USA cultivated: total

(b) USA wild: total



(c) USA cultivated: cold

(d) USA wild: cold



(e) USA cultivated: both

(f) USA wild: both



(g) USA cultivated: heat

(h) USA wild: heat

Fig. S3. Distribution of plant thermal tolerance research within the United States of America (USA). The choropleth map is coloured by the number of articles in the state of the first author's affiliation. Total number of articles on (a) cultivated species and on (b) wild species; focussing on cold tolerance in (c) cultivated species and on (d) wild species; cold and heat tolerance together (termed both) on (e) cultivated species and on (f) wild species; and focussing on heat tolerance in (g) cultivated species and on (h) wild species. Note that each panel has a different scale for the colour gradient scale bars, and that the gradients are log-transformed for easier differentiation between the colours among countries because the number of articles varies significantly. The USA had 241 articles on cultivated species, but only 80 articles on wild species. Research on cultivated species was conducted throughout the USA, but only in four states (Hawai'i, Massachusetts, Wyoming, and West Virginia) were cold and heat tolerance investigated together. State abbreviations: AL = Alabama, AK = Alaska, AR = Arkansas, AZ = Arizona, CA = California, CO = Colorado, CT = Connecticut, DE = Delaware, DC = District of Columbia, FL = Florida, GA = Georgia, HI = Hawai'i, ID = Idaho, IL = Illinois, IN = Indiana, IA = Iowa, KS = Kansas, KY = Kentucky, LA = Louisiana, ME = Maine, MD = Maryland, MA = Massachusetts, MI = Michigan, MN = Minnesota, MS = Mississippi, MO = Missouri, MT = Montana, NE = Nebraska, NV = Nevada, NH = New Hampshire, NJ = New Jersey, NM = New Mexico, NY = New York, NC = North Carolina, ND = North Dakota, OH = Ohio, OK = Oklahoma, OR = Oregon, PA = Pennsylvania, RI = Rhode Island, SC = South Carolina, SD = South Dakota, TN = Tennessee, TX = Texas, UT = Utah, VT = Vermont, VA = Virginia, WA = Washington, WV = West Virginia, WI = Wisconsin, WY = Wyoming.

Fig. S4


(a) Europe cultivated: total

(b) Europe wild: total


(c) Europe cultivated: cold

(d) Europe wild: cold


(e) Europe cultivated: both

(f) Europe wild: both


(g) Europe cultivated: heat

(h) Europe wild: heat

Fig. S4. Distribution of plant thermal tolerance research within Europe. The choropleth map is coloured by the number of articles in the country of the first author's affiliation. Total number of articles on (a) cultivated species and on (b) wild species; focussing on cold tolerance in (c) cultivated species and on (d) wild species; cold and heat tolerance together (termed both) on (e) cultivated species and on (f) wild species; and focussing on heat tolerance in (g) cultivated species and on (h) wild species. Note that each panel has a different scale for the colour gradient scale bars, and that the gradients are log-transformed for easier differentiation between the colours among countries because the number of articles varies significantly. Europe had reasonable coverage for wild species, with 133 articles, in addition to 433 on cultivated species. Notably, Eastern European countries were well represented in articles of cultivated species, but less so for wild species. Country abbreviations are provided for a subset of countries for orientation purposes: AT = Austria, BY = Belarus, BG = Bulgaria, CZ = Czech Republic, EE = Estonia, FI = Finland, FR = France, DE = Germany, GR = Greece, HU = Hungary, IT = Italy, LV = Latvia, LT = Lithuania, NO = Norway, PL = Poland, PT = Portugal, RO = Romania, RU = Russia, RS = Serbia, ES = Spain, SE = Sweden, TR = Turkey, UA = Ukraine, UK = United Kingdom.

Fig. S5



Fig. S5. Global distribution of plant thermal tolerance research on wild plants. In contrast to Figs S2-S4, the choropleth map here is coloured by the number of articles in the country where the experiment was conducted, rather than the country of origin of the first author's affiliation, to better represent the distribution of the experimental locations of articles on wild species. For wild species (a) the total number articles, then those focusing on (b) cold tolerance, (c) cold and heat tolerance together (termed both), and (d) heat tolerance. Note that each panel has a different scale for the colour gradient scale bars. Because the number of articles varies significantly, the gradients are log-transformed for easier differentiation of the colours among countries. Comparing study location and affiliation identifies a handful of articles from otherwise unrepresented countries, though there were relatively few discrepancies between the first author's affiliation and the location that the wild experiments were conducted. Notably, Peru, Ecuador, Antarctica, Greenland, Iceland, Papua New Guinea, and French Guiana were locations for wild experiments on cold tolerance that were not reflected in the first author's affiliation, and 40 articles did not state any clear location information.

Fig. S6

(a) Cultivated



(b) Wild



Fig. S6. The number of times a thermal tolerance technique was used within (a) types of cultivation within cultivated systems and (b) biomes within wild systems. Note that the scale bars for number of records differ between cultivated and wild panels.

Fig. S7



Fig. S7. The proportion (and number) of studies for cultivated and wild systems that employed a ramp or shock approach to initiating thermal stress, when considering cold tolerance, heat tolerance or both cold and heat tolerance. Ramp approaches are defined as ≤1°C/min temperature change and shock defined as >1°C/min temperature change.

Fig. S8


(a)
Topic 3
Topic 5
Topic 1
Topic 4
Topic 2
(b)
Topic
5
tolerance, cold, gene, arabidopsis, acclimation
4
temperature, high, fluorescence, chlorophyll, photosynthesis
3
stress, heat, response, protein, wheat
2
freezing, frost, resistance, hardiness, winter
1
chilling, plants, acid, leaves, antioxidant
0
100
200
300
400
Count of Publications
(c)
Topic 1
chilling
plants
acid
leaves
antioxidant
induced
activity
oxidative
tomato
membrane
damage
maize
enzymes
sensitivity
abscisic
content
seedlings
lipid
increased
chloroplast
metabolism
genotypes
cell
injury
mays
peroxidation
zea
system
development
accumulation
0
0.02
0.04
0.06
0.08
Topic 2
freezing
frost
resistance
hardiness
winter
water
related
changes
acclimation
seedlings
leakage
hardening
injury
electrolyte
ice
thermal
bud
climate
carbohydrates
different
tolerance
seasonal
potential
sugar
brassica
spruce
spring
grapevine
nucleation
test
0
0.02
0.04
0.06
0.08
0.1
0.12
Topic 3
stress
heat
response
protein
wheat
shock
drought
thermotolerance
triticum
cultivars
aestivum
physiological
proline
proteomic
combined
lines
involved
differential
mutant
rubisco
seed
stage
modulation
grain
protection
dependent
hsp
characterization
recover
molecular
0
0.05
0.1
0.15
0.2
0.25
Topic 4
temperature
high
fluorescence
chlorophyll
photosynthesis
effects
low
leaf
photosynthetic
species
photosystem
growth
photoinhibition
light
elevated
electron
transport
rate
conductance
tree
different
efficiency
photochemical
respiration
carbon
exchange
extreme
psii
recovery
tropical
0
0.05
0.1
0.15
Topic 5
tolerance
cold
gene
arabidopsis
acclimation
expression
rice
transgenic
enhances
analysis
factor
transcription
thaliana
regulation
tobacco
adaptation
variation
abiotic
improves
sativa
overexpression
barley
genetic
function
aba
oryza
profiling
cbf
using
levels
0
0.05
0.1
0.15

Fig. S8. Topic mapping of thermal tolerance articles using title and author keywords. (a) 2D ordination of title and author keywords. Each point represents one article, and articles are coloured according to the highest weighted topic for that article. (b) Bar chart showing the number of articles within each of the five topic groups. Terms above each bar indicate the five most common terms for that group. (c) The top 25 key terms for each topic group from five topic clusters (determined by 2D ordination for similarity) are presented in decreasing frequency of occurrence. Descriptive summary of the five major groupings within the thermal tolerance literature: Topic 1 was mostly focused on chilling and was strongly associated with articles on horticulture and vegetables and viticulture research. Assays that featured prominently within this grouping were membrane damage, antioxidants, and other biochemistry. Topic 2 focused heavily on freezing (as distinct from chilling) resistance, particularly within wild species. Here, electrolyte leakage and membrane damage again featured prominently, but assays of ice nucleation and carbohydrate analysis were also common. Within this group of articles, there was also a strong seasonal element, with research encompassing winter and spring freezing activity. Topic 3 was represented by articles on the heat tolerance of cultivated systems, where there was an emphasis on biochemical and molecular techniques. Articles on heat tolerance of wild species were not distinct from this group. Topic 4 primarily encompassed gas exchange articles across both cultivated and wild systems, regardless of whether they were heat or cold focused. Topic 5 focused on cold tolerance and gene expression, often on model organisms or cultivated species. These results collectively suggest that there is some siloing with respect to thermal tolerance assays, species selection, and geography.

Notes S1

1. Systematic review methods

We conducted a search of the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) Web of Knowledge across all subscribed Web of Science databases using an extensive list of search terms. The following words/terms were used within the title and topics tabs: **Title**: (*cold* OR *freez** OR *chill** OR *frost** OR "*low temperature**" OR *froze** OR *heat** OR "*high temperature**" OR "*extreme temperature**" OR "*thermal extreme**" OR *ice* OR *therm** OR "*cool** *temp**" OR "*hot temp**" OR "*rising temp**" OR *temp** OR "*warm temp**" OR "*increas** *temp**" OR *cool** OR *warm** OR *hot)* AND **Topic**: *(tolera** OR *stress** OR *respon** OR *avoid** OR *resistan** OR *acclimat** OR *harden** OR *adapt** OR *injur*)* AND **Topic**: *(plant** OR *shrub** OR *tree** OR *leaf** OR *bud** OR *herb** OR *grass** OR *graminoid** OR *thallus** OR *moss** OR *fern** OR *forb** OR *leaves)* AND **Topic**: *(cold* OR *freez** OR *chill** OR *frost** OR "*low temperature**" OR *froze** OR *heat** OR "*high temperature**" OR "*extreme temperature**" OR "*thermal extreme**" OR *ice* OR *therm** OR "*cool** *temp**" OR "*hot temp**" OR "*rising temp**" OR *temp** OR "*warm** *temp**" OR "*increas** *temp**" OR *cool** OR *warm** OR *hot*). Asterisks denote Boolean operators that included all words and terms that began with the specified root. Using the "refine" function in Web of Science, we limited outputs to articles published in English and within the Web of Science categories of Plant Sciences, Ecology, Agronomy, Horticulture, Forestry, Agriculture Multi-disciplinary, Biodiversity Conservation, or Biology. We included articles published across all years and across all indexes. Our original literature search was conducted on 14 December 2017, using world-leading database access from The Australian National University. Despite focusing only on Web of Science outputs, which may have missed or excluded some relevant articles, it yielded 21,763 articles.

We used the *metagear* package (Lajeunesse, 2016) in the R environment for statistical computing v3.5.1 (R Core Team, 2018) to download full-text articles and to randomly allocate the 21,763 articles to be screened by 12 co-authors. In an initial screen, titles of these articles were assessed and tagged as "yes", "no", or "maybe" for inclusion to the next screening step. This was based on whether the titles indicated investigations into tolerance of leaves or leaf-buds of angiosperms and gymnosperms exposed to potentially damaging high or low temperature events as distinct from growth conditions. The co-authors then re-assessed articles grouped as "maybe" and a consensus "yes" or "no" grouping was achieved, yielding 6,508 articles kept at the title level. The procedure was repeated for abstracts, which resulted in 2,877 articles retained for evaluation as full-text articles (Fig. S1).

Article evaluation criteria

The criteria were:

1) Whether the article dealt with cultivated (e.g. crop plants, horticultural plants, forestry trees, and including the model species *Arabidopsis*) or wild species.
2) Whether the assay investigated heat, cold, or both heat and cold effects.
3) The diversity of the species measured in the study.
4) For articles on cultivated species – the type of cultivation.
5) For wild species – the biome of origin for the studied plants.
6) The life forms of species.
7) The thermal tolerance technique(s) used.
8) Whether the thermal tolerance assay was applied to leaves, leaf-buds, or both.
9) The nature of the thermal stress applied in the experiment (manipulated or natural).
10) Whether other experimental factors (water, light, etc.) were considered.
11) Whether a thermal metric was reported for the technique(s).
12) Whether stress temperature was gradually ramped or applied as a shock during thermal assay(s).
13) The maximum duration of the thermal assay.
14) Whether the thermal assay was repeated.
15) Whether to include the article or not and, if not, the reason(s) for exclusion.

The criteria for exclusion of an article were: the full-text was not easily accessible; the article was a review, not an empirical article; the methodological details were insufficient to evaluate how the study was conducted; the plants were not stressed at a non-growth temperature (e.g. slightly elevated growth temperatures but not outside average ranges); the study did not address thermal tolerance of leaves or leaf-buds; or the response variable was not relevant for evaluating thermal tolerance of leaf tissue (e.g. growth or whole-plant survival). For clarity, and to aid co-authors in their evaluation of each criterion, expanded justification reference material was drawn up (section 2 below). In addition, a glossary of common tools and techniques for measuring thermal tolerance in land plants was produced (Fig. 1c and section 3 below).

Once all co-authors had finalised screening, the data were aggregated and rigorously checked for duplicated articles, missing values, clerical errors, and inconsistencies. Where it was necessary to add in or change missing values, the article was re-evaluated to verify that any changes to the data were appropriate. After checking the dataset, the final version contained data from 1,691 unique articles comprising 3,743 studies of thermal tolerance assays (Fig. S1).

The global distribution and concentration of articles on plant thermal tolerance were evaluated using the country of the affiliation of the first author of the article for both cultivated and wild studies. Additionally, we recorded where the experiments were conducted and whether the sample collection location information was stated for wild studies. For the most dominant regions in our database (China, USA, and Europe), we also generated province, state and country-level maps, respectively. Spatial data for generating world, China, USA and European maps were obtained from the R packages *ggmap* (Kahle & Wickham, 2013), *ggplot2* (Wickham, 2016), *maptools* (Bivand & Lewin-Koh, 2019), and *usmap* (Di Lorenzo, 2018).

We used topic mapping with the article title and author keywords to explore topical aggregations and/or divisions within the field of thermal tolerance research. Terms were created through constructing a document term matrix, which converted all text to lower case, removed punctuation and numbers, stemmed all words, and removed words with fewer than three letters or those contributing to less than 1% of documents. Final terms reported represent the most common 'full' version of a stemmed term. We mapped five topic groups, which provided a balance between providing a broad overview of the field and avoided creating artificial subfields. Topic mapping was conducted using the R package *revtools* (Westgate, 2019) and ISI Web of Knowledge bibliography files. The model was run over 20,000 iterations to optimise fit using the Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) approach. The generated ordination plot clustered together articles that the algorithm defined as belonging to a similar topic group.

2. Options and justifications for reviewer screening of articles

Each article that was identified for screening at the full-text level was evaluated by the reviewers based on the 15 criteria listed in the main text. Below is an outline for the training for multiple authors to assess articles against the 15 criteria, then the criteria and extended justifications for them, along with a list of available options that the reviewers had for each criterion.

Training dataset

Full-text articles of 30 of the 2,877 articles were chosen as a training dataset for the 12 co-authors to review and evaluate based on pre-defined screening criteria (see below). The training dataset included a representative sample of articles that spanned multiple years, thermal tolerance techniques, and publication fields. The training process identified ambiguities in the screening criteria and reduced discrepancies among the individual reviewers, such that the remaining full-text articles could be randomly allocated across the reviewers for consistent screening. To ensure that reviewer decisions were similar, 20 duplicate articles were surreptitiously included in these allocations, to reveal any inconsistencies in the review process. If a reviewer was unsure about their decisions on a given article, they could request a secondary review by another reviewer with more specific expertise.

Criteria and justifications

(1) If the article dealt with cultivated or wild species

Based on the contextual information provided in the article, was the study conducted on cultivated plants (e.g. crop plants, horticultural plants, forestry trees, *Arabidopsis*) or on wild plant species. Wild plants could include native or invasive species, or wild plant species that were brought into or grown in laboratory or glasshouse conditions, as long as the context for the study was assessing a wild ecosystem and not of plants for direct anthropogenic use. Checked at abstract and full-text levels.

Reviewer options: *Cultivated, Wild*

(2) Whether the assay investigated heat, cold, or both heat and cold effects

The type of thermal tolerance assessed in the article. Heat tolerance, cold tolerance, or both heat and cold tolerance within the same article. Mild temperature differences, such as chilling stress on cold-adapted species or mild warming treatments were considered to be non-stressful or not different to growth temperatures, and were excluded as such. If reviewer was unsure about the relevant severity of the temperature stress imposition (i.e. whether the study measured tolerance *per se*), they requested a secondary review. Checked at abstract and full-text levels.

Reviewer options: *Cold, Heat, Both heat and cold*

(3) The diversity of the species measured in the study

The level of intra- or inter-specific variation that the study investigated. Single species studies were those that reported tolerance from only a single type of a single species. Intraspecific studies reported more than one type of a single species (e.g. different cultivars, lines, varietals of the same species). Multiple species studies reported tolerance on more than one distinct species. Transgenic or genetically modified plants were typically reported in intraspecific studies, but consensus was not reached among reviewers regarding how these plants were classified into the three categories (e.g. whether intraspecific or multiple species); such studies might represent up to 10% of the dataset based on article abstracts that contained the term "transgenic".

Reviewer options: *Single species, Intraspecific, Multiple species*

(4) For studies on cultivated taxa – the type of cultivation

The category of cultivation for the species that were measured for thermal tolerance. Arabidopsis includes all studies using *Arabidopsis thaliana* as a model laboratory species, noting that studies on wild *Arabidopsis* plants were not included under this category. Cereals included all Poaceae species. Fibre included cotton and textile crops. Forestry includes species grown specifically for forestry-use (e.g. the same species used for forestry in one study may be a wild species in a different country or study context). Horticulture and vegetables included all cultured ornamental plants, fruits, tree nuts, and vegetables. Legumes included all Fabaceae species. Pasture and turf grasses included all grasses cultivated for use in grazing pastures or for lawn use. Viticulture included all grapes. Other crop included oil crops, tobacco plants, and other medicinal crops. Multiple was for when more than one type of cultivation was used within a single study. Any plant species that was not a managed, bred species was considered to be wild. Not specified was for when all other categorising options were exhausted.

Reviewer options: *Arabidopsis, Cereals, Fibre, Horticulture and vegetables, Legumes, Pasture and turf grasses, Plantation forestry, Viticulture, Other crop, Multiple, Not specified, Wild*

(5) For wild species – the biome of the studied plants

The biome from which the experimental samples of wild species originate. Any non-wild species (i.e. cultivated species, see criterion 4 above) were assigned an arbitrary biome label of cultivated. In many cases, the article specified the biome from which the samples originated or at least provided some geographic information or context to assist the reviewer in determining biome by searching various online resources such localised information or maps based on species and location information, and global biome maps (e.g. Olson *et al.*, 2001; Friedl *et al.*, 2010; Higgins *et al.*, 2016). The categories were very broad-scale assessments of climate conditions to identify major differences among biomes. Multiple was used when the article compared across more than one biome. Not specified was used when the biome remained unclear after searching for the species/cultivar and geographic region.

Reviewer options: *Alpine/Arctic tundra/Subalpine, Arid/Semi-arid/Savannah, Boreal forest, Mediterranean, Temperate, Tropical/Subtropical, Crop, Multiple, Not specified*

(6) The life-forms of species

The life-form of the plant species. Tall plants with a woody stem were classified as trees. Small-medium height woody plants were classified as shrubs. Any plant with a trailing or climbing growth habit were classified as vines. Grass-like plants were classified as graminoids. All other herbaceous plants that were angiosperms or gymnosperms were classified as forbs/herbs. If the species does not fit in any life-form category (i.e. is not an angiosperm or gymnosperm), then the article was excluded due to not measuring a relevant plant species. Articles that used the same thermal tolerance technique or conditions across multiple plant life-forms were classified as multiple.

Reviewer options: *Tree, Shrub, Vine, Graminoid, Herb/forb, Multiple*

(7) The thermal tolerance technique(s) used

The type of scientific technique that the study used to assess the thermal tolerance of leaves or buds. If the article used more than one technique, an additional row of information was entered for each relevant technique and experimental condition (see criteria 8-14 below). Further details on each technique are provided in section 3 below. Chlorophyll fluorescence measured changes in fluorescence re-emitted from chlorophyll in the photosystems. Gas exchange included the rate of CO_2 uptake or O_2 evolution to evaluate the ability of a leaf to recover photosynthetic capacity/respiration rate. Electrolyte leakage/membrane stability included measures of structural damage to cell membranes and electrical conductivity. Quantified visual damage estimation (or death) included calculations of the percentage of damaged leaves on a whole-plant, or proportion

of cell death or damaged area on an individual leaf or bud. Note that articles that recorded only whole-plant survival and did not explore mechanistic drivers at leaf or bud level were excluded. Thermometry/spectrometry included spectral or infrared imaging (including SPAD measurements of chlorophyll content), reflectance, and measurements of exothermic reactions such as ice nucleation. Reactive oxygen species (ROS) and antioxidants included oxygen radicals, oxidizing agents, and antioxidants that can affect gene expression or impact on plant responses to stress. Heat shock proteins/factors (HSPs/HSFs) included molecular chaperones and their transcriptional activators, respectively, which are induced to alleviate damage caused by high temperatures. (Epi)genetics and 'omics included any of the 'omics (e.g. metabolomics, proteomics), protein expression, gene expression, genomics, and epigenetics. Articles on whole genomes were not considered because the genome itself does not respond to stress in the time of a stress event, where such an article would be excluded. Other biochemistry included any wet chemistry that did not fall into other category (e.g. ions, osmotic potential, chlorophyll content or sugars when measured by wet chemistry). Water potential included measures of the potential for water to move between areas of a plant, for example via osmosis or mechanical pressures.
Reviewer options: *Chlorophyll fluorescence, Gas exchange, Electrolyte leakage and membrane stability, Quantified visual damage, Thermometry and spectrometry, Reactive oxygen species and antioxidants, Heat shock proteins and factors, (Epi)genetics and 'omics, Other biochemistry, Water potential*

(8) If the thermal tolerance technique was used on leaves, buds, or both

The relevant plant tissue that was measured in the thermal tolerance assay. Included articles could have measured whole or parts of leaves, leaf buds, or both leaves and leaf buds. Articles that used non-specified tissues from seedlings were included under the classification of leaves and leaf buds, because seedlings have a leaf bud and will often have leaves. If the study measured any other plant part instead (e.g. seeds, pollen, flower buds, flowers) then it was excluded.
Reviewer options: *Leaf, leaf buds, leaves and leaf buds*

(9) The conditions under which the experiment was conducted

The experimental nature of the temperature stress applied to the plants in the study. Temperature-controlled experimentally imposed stress included controlled environment facilities or growth chambers where temperatures were controlled within set ranges. Not temperature-controlled experimentally imposed stress included semi-natural or variable settings with an imposed manipulation but not tight temperature control (e.g. ITEX, open-top chambers, or shade-cloth to protect from frost). Entirely naturally imposed stress was where the study took advantage of a natural event such as a heatwave or frost.

Reviewer options: *Experimentally imposed stress that was temperature controlled, Experimentally imposed stress that was not temperature controlled, Entirely naturally imposed stress*

(10) If other experimental factors were considered

Aspects of the study experimental design in addition to thermal tolerance. These were growth or treatment conditions that were intentionally manipulated, and options were specified for potential factorial combinations of climate change relevant conditions. None refers to any study that measured thermal tolerance without applying any additional treatment. Climate change relevant conditions were considered to be temperature (growth temperature treatments, not stress conditions), light, CO_2, water availability, or soil nutrients and options were provided for every factorial combination of these factors. Non-climate change relevant factors were considered to be any other factor not listed as climate change relevant (e.g. hormones or antioxidant applications, herbivory). Other combination included any other factorial combination of factors that did not fall into the possible combinations of climate change relevant factors (e.g. hormone × salt treatment). Genotypic differences were not specified here.

Reviewer options: *None, Temperature, Water, Light, Nutrients/soil,* CO_2*, Temperature × water, Temperature × light, Temperature × nutrients/soil, Temperature ×* CO_2*, Water × light, Water × nutrients/soil, Water ×* CO_2*, Light × nutrients/soil, Light ×* CO_2*, Nutrients/soil ×* CO_2*, Temperature × water × light, Temperature × water ×* CO_2*, Temperature × water × nutrients/soil, Temperature × light ×* CO_2*, Temperature × light × nutrients/soil, Water × light ×* CO_2*, Water × light × nutrients/soil, Water ×* CO_2 *× nutrients/soil, Light × nutrients/soil ×* CO_2*, Non-climate change relevant, Other combination*

(11) Whether a thermal metric was reported for the technique(s)

Any relevant metric for the temperature at which a given quantifiable thermal event occurs (e.g. intracellular freezing that is reported with a nucleation temperature measurement). Thermal metric reported included articles that explicitly stated the thermal metric value in text or a table. Thermal metric can be calculated included articles that contained information from which a thermal metric could be extracted or calculated (e.g. data presented in a Figure). No thermal metric reported included all other articles that did not measure or report a thermal metric. Example thermal metrics are T_{crit}, T_{20}, NT, LT_{50} of tissues but not whole-plant survival.

Reviewer options: *Thermal metric reported, Thermal metric can be calculated, No thermal metric reported*

(12) If temperature was gradually ramped or changed as a step function during thermal assay(s)

Type of application of temperature stress from which thermal tolerance was determined. Shock was if the rate of change in temperature was greater than or equal to 1°C per minute. Ramp was used if the rate of change was slower than 1°C per minute. Not specified was used when the nature of the treatment and test temperatures were unclear or unspecified in the article.

Reviewer options: *Shock, Ramp, Not specified*

(13) The maximum duration of the thermal tolerance assay

The cumulative duration of the thermal tolerance assay. Minutes included all assays lasting from seconds to up to 59 minutes. Hours included all assays lasting from 60 minutes up to and including 24 hours. Days included all assays lasting from greater than 24 hours up to seven days. Weeks included all assays lasting from greater than seven days up to 28 days. Months included any assays lasting more than 29 days. Not specified was used when the duration of the assay was not stated and could not otherwise be determined from the article text or figures.

Reviewer options: *Minutes, Hours, Days, Weeks, Months, Not specified*

(14) If the thermal assay was repeated

Whether the thermal tolerance assays were repeated during the course of the experimental duration. Repeated was when the same assay was applied for plants at different developmental or growth stages. Not repeated was if the thermal tolerance assay was measured once only on the individual experimental plants.

Reviewer options: *Repeated, Not repeated*

(15) Whether to include the article or not and, if not, the reason(s) for exclusion

Reviewers chose to include the article or provide the main reason for excluding it. Include was used for all articles that contained appropriate data on plant thermal tolerance according to all criteria listed above. Article not accessible was used where the article full-text pdf could not be accessed from The Australian National University library access through the ISI Web of Science, Google Scholar, or ResearchGate and similar academic platforms. Insufficient method details was used where the article did not provide enough detail or explicit information for a reviewer to confidently assess how the study was carried out and subsequently fill out one or more attribute columns where not specified was not otherwise an option. Not stressed at non-growth temperature was used for articles that did not apply what could be deemed a thermal *stress* (e.g. mild chilling treatments or growth under 1°C warming), which was sometimes context- or species-specific. The thermal stress should have lasted less time than a growing season and should have been at a temperature that the authors of the paper considered to be outside of normal growth temperatures (e.g. plants grown at 18°C in a laboratory or glasshouse then exposed to 30°C was considered stressful by the authors because even if that temperature was regularly encountered in the field, the temperature was much higher than the laboratory-grown plants have grown in). Review article was used for any article that was a literature review or commentary type of article that did not contain primary data from a scientific investigation. Not relevant plant species was used for any article that studied thermal tolerance of plants that were not angiosperms or gymnosperms (e.g. bryophytes). Not relevant plant part was used for any article that studied thermal tolerance of plant material other than leaves and/or leaf buds, or for studies that only measured thermal tolerance as whole-plant survival. Not relevant measure was used for articles that did not measure thermal tolerance (e.g. only measured change in growth parameters under increased temperatures). Other reason was used for other relevant reasons for excluding articles (e.g. conference proceedings, written in non-English language, methodology articles, or not about plants).

Reviewer options: *Include, Article not accessible, Insufficient method details, Not stressed at non-growth temperature, Review article, Not relevant plant species, Not relevant plant part, Not relevant measure, Other*

3. Extended version of Fig. 1 glossary of common tools and techniques for measuring thermal tolerance in land plants

Techniques used to measure thermal tolerance in plant leaves and leaf buds. For each article in our systematic review, we assessed what type of thermal tolerance technique was used and whether the results could provide a specific temperature at which some physiological threshold is reached; we termed this a thermal tolerance metric (TTM). To qualify as a TTM, the metric would have to be based on the response of an organ assayed across multiple temperatures. Specific metrics vary but are generally critical values for thresholds, e.g. LT_{50} (lethal temperature at which 50% damage ensues). Below, we describe the categories of techniques that we included in our systematic review and provide examples of the specific measurements and potential TTMs for each technique. We cite a small number of references here that we found to be good examples of application of the techniques.

Technique and summary **(Earliest record of technique in our review)**	**Measures or indicators of the technique** **Thermal tolerance metric, TTM**
Quantified visual damage estimation or death (1961) A calculation of the percentage of damaged (discoloured or brown) leaves on the whole-plant or cellular level (e.g. leaf dry mass; leaf area (damaged *vs* healthy); proportion of cell death; etc.)	**Measures:** Microscopy for visual assessment of cells; Photography of whole or section of leaves; visual score of damage to leaf buds (Zub *et al.*, 2012) **TTM:** LT_{50}, the temperature of 50% necrosis of cells, buds, or leaves
Chlorophyll fluorescence (1979) Measured changes in fluorescence re-emitted from chlorophyll in the photosystems in response to high or low (potentially stressful) temperature	**Measures:** Minimum fluorescence (F_0); Maximum fluorescence (F_M); Photosynthetic quantum efficiency (φPSII); Maximum photosynthetic quantum efficiency (F_V/F_M); Photochemical quenching (qP); Non-photochemical quenching (NPQ); Chlorophyll a fluorescence transients (O-J-I-P) measures (Berry & Bjorkman, 1980; Strasserf &

Technique and summary (Earliest record of technique in our review)	Measures or indicators of the technique Thermal tolerance metric, TTM
	Srivastava, 1995; Maxwell & Johnson, 2000) **TTM:** LT_{50} or T_{50} threshold: temperature at which F_V/F_M declines to 50% of the maximum F_V/F_M of unstressed photosystems (Curtis *et al.*, 2014); T_{crit}: temperature at calculated inflection point between slow and fast rise phases of the temperature-dependent increase in F_0) (Knight & Ackerly, 2002); TS_{20} and LT_{50} or T_{50}: temperature when F_0 reaches 20 or 50%, respectively, of the F_0 maximum (T_{max}) (Knight & Ackerly, 2002); R_{fd}: chlorophyll fluorescence decrease ratio or vitality index, calculated on the decline of F_M to the fluorescence steady state level (F_S) (Lichtenthaler *et al.*, 1986; Perera-Castro *et al.*, 2018)
Thermometry and spectrometry (1964) Thermometry: plant tissue temperatures can indicate functional parameters (e.g. point of ice nucleation on a leaf and its progression through the plant); can differentiate between the roles of extrinsic and intrinsic ice nucleating agents in the freezing process; and the effect of the freezing process on the plant form. Spectrometric approaches are primarily used to assess pigment distributions, contents and to derive indices of photochemical health	**Thermometry measures:** analyses of the critical temperatures for ice formation in cells (e.g. high-resolution infrared thermography) (Wisniewski *et al.*, 2008); thermal imaging can also be used to assess plant water status (water stressed plants with reduced stomatal conductance are generally warmer) **Spectrometry measures:** reflectance at various wavelengths (visual to near infrared) - can be spatially resolved (imaging) or point based (e.g. pigments) (Lefsrud *et al.*, 2005) **TTM:** *NT* – Ice nucleation temperature
Electrolyte leakage and membrane stability (1972) Damaged cell membranes leak ions and other contents and damage can be measured using electrical conductivity	**Measures:** tissue ionic conductance (*gTi*), electrical conductivity (EC); damage index (*Id*) (Whitlow *et al.*, 1992) **TTM:** LT_{50} - Temperature at which 50% electrolyte leakage occurs
Gas exchange (1968) Examines changes in the rates of leaf CO_2 uptake or O_2 evolution as indicators of photosynthetic capacity and respiration. Measures frequently include rate of water loss	**Measures:** Net CO_2 assimilation rate (A_{net}); dark respiration (R_{dark}) stomatal conductance (g_s); intercellular CO_2 concentration (c_i); and transpiration rate (E) of intact leaves (von Caemmerer & Farquhar, 1981) **TTM:** T_{max} upper thermal limit of leaf respiratory CO_2 release in darkness (O'Sullivan *et al.*, 2013; 2017)

Technique and summary **(Earliest record of technique in our review)**	**Measures or indicators of the technique** **Thermal tolerance metric, TTM**
Water Potential (1974) Quantifies the potential for water to move between one area of a plant to another through osmosis, gravity, mechanical pressure, or matrix effects such as capillary action	**Measures:** Recorded as negative potential ψ, relative to pure water reference. Measured using psychrometers, or pressure chambers. A unit of pressure, as a form of energy (ψ, psi, MPa) (West & Gaff, 1976) **TTM:** π_{tlp} – leaf turgor loss point or bulk turgor loss point, taken as the point at which leaf cells become flaccid – fails to maintain cell turgor pressure
(Epi)genetics and 'omics (1971) Molecular mechanisms that alter gene expression and function without changes in the DNA sequence (chemical modification of DNA (methylation) and histones, incorporation of histone variants and long or small non-coding RNAs) **Gene expression:** techniques to evaluate amounts and types of mRNA molecules in a cell (e.g. via transcriptomics), reflecting the function and enzymatic activities of the sample. **'Omics more broadly: encompasses all the other 'omics** e.g. whole-genome detection of genes (genomics), proteins (proteomics), and metabolites (metabolomics)	**Indicators:** SMP (Single Methylation Polymorphism); DMR (Differentially Methylated Regions); GBS (Genome Bisulfite Sequencing): techniques aimed to evaluate the methylation status of the cytocines in the whole genome (WGBS) or in a reduced representation of it (RRBS), taking advantage of a bisulfite treatment that converts non-methylated cytocines in uracils (van Gurp *et al.*, 2016; Paun *et al.*, 2019) **'Omics techniques:** Mass spectrometry (MS); SNP genotyping (genomics); RNAseq and gene expression, microarrays, gene chips (transcriptomics); gel electrophoreses, enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays (ELISAs), protein microarrays and chromatography (proteomics); nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR), and chromatography (metabolomics) (Gemperline *et al.*, 2016)
Heat shock proteins and factors (HSPs and HSFs) (1991) Rapidly induced proteins and factors in response to abiotic stresses and alleviate damage. HSPs function as molecular chaperones, assist in protein folding, maintain signal transduction and prevent protein aggregation (Chen *et al.*, 2018)	**Measures:** Relative abundance detected using western blotting, slot/dot blotting (more tolerant individuals would induce a larger abundance of HSPs), gene expression (chromatography, quantitative real time PCR), *in vitro* chaperone-like activity assay, electron microscopy (Zhang *et al.*, 2015; Chen *et al.*, 2018) **Common** HSPs **measured:** Hsp100, Hsp90, Hsp70, Hsp60, and small HSPs
Reactive Oxygen Species (ROS) and antioxidants (1981)	**Indicators**: Many aspects of the roles of ROS in plants are covered in a ROS special issue of Plant Physiology (2006)

Technique and summary **(Earliest record of technique in our review)**	**Measures or indicators of the technique** **Thermal tolerance metric, TTM**
ROS are oxygen radicals and non-radical oxidizing agents that can be converted into radicals. ROS are natural by-products of a plants metabolic processes and can affect gene expression and impact upon a plants growth, signalling, development, cell cycle, programmed cell death (PCD), abiotic stress responses, pathogen defence and adaptation (Gill & Tuteja, 2010; Mittler *et al.*, 2011). ROS concentrations can increase rapidly in response to a multitude of stimuli including temperature extremes. Antioxidants mitigate cellular damages caused by the accumulation of ROS	and in (Gill & Tuteja, 2010; Mittler *et al.*, 2011) **Common ROS:** Free radicals: superoxide radicals, hydroxyl radicals (OH^*), perhydroxy radicals (O_2H^*), alkoxy radicals; non-radicals: hydrogen peroxide (H_2O_2), singlet oxygen (O_{2i}); others that may not be in plants: molecular oxygen (triplet ground state, $O_2{}^3\Sigma$), superoxide anion ($O_2{}^{\cdot -}$), ozone (O_3) **Common antioxidants:** Thiobarbituric acid (TBA), Malondialdehyde (MDA), Ascorbate or ascorbic acid or Vitamin C (ASH), Glutathione (GSH), Ascorbate peroxidase (APX), Superoxide dismutase (SOD), Catalase (CAT), Glutathione reductase (GR); as well as less common radicals such as: a-tocopherols, phenolic compounds, alkaloids and non-protein amino acids
Other Biochemistry (1968) Temperature tolerance can also be measured by the presence (or absence) and change in quantity of certain biochemicals	**Measures:** Other chemical compounds that can be used to infer thermal tolerance include: • Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs), e.g. isoprene • Biogenic Volatile Organic Compounds (BVOCs), e.g. terpenes • Organic acids (ascorbic acid, pyruvic acid, etc.) and amino acids (proline, asparagine, etc.) • Sugars (sucrose, glucose, etc.) or sugar alcohols (xyilitol, myo-inositol, etc.), raffinose family oligosaccharides (RFOs) • Plant hormones (abscisic acid (ABA), salicylic acid (SA), jasmonic acid (JA) • Phenol and flavonoid contents • Nutrient/element content (e.g. N, Ca, Mg, K, Na) • Chlorophyll content (unless measured using spectrometry)

References

Berry J, Bjorkman O. 1980. Photosynthetic response and adaptation to temperature in higher plants. *Annual Review of Plant Physiology* **31**: 491-543.

Bivand R, Lewin-Koh E 2019. 'maptools': tools for handling spatial objects. v0.9-5.

Chen B, Feder ME, Kang L. 2018. Evolution of heat-shock protein expression underlying adaptive responses to environmental stress. *Molecular Ecology* **27**: 3040-3054.

Curtis EM, Knight CA, Petrou K, Leigh A. 2014. A comparative analysis of photosynthetic recovery from thermal stress: a desert plant case study. *Oecologia* **175**: 1051-1061.

Di Lorenzo P 2018. 'usmap': US Maps Including Alaska and Hawaii. v0.4.0.

Friedl MA, Sulla-Menashe D, Tan B, Schneider A, Ramankutty N, Sibley A, Huang X. 2010. MODIS Collection 5 global land cover: algorithm refinements and characterization of new datasets. *Remote Sensing of Environment* **114**: 168-182.

Gemperline E, Keller C, Li L. 2016. Mass spectrometry in plant-omics. *Analytical Chemistry* **88**: 3422-3434.

Gill SS, Tuteja N. 2010. Reactive oxygen species and antioxidant machinery in abiotic stress tolerance in crop plants. *Plant Physiology and Biochemistry* **48**: 909-930.

Higgins SI, Buitenwerf R, Moncrieff GR. 2016. Defining functional biomes and monitoring their change globally. *Global Change Biology* **22**: 3583-3593.

Kahle D, Wickham H. 2013. ggmap: Spatial Visualization with ggplot2. *The R Journal* **5**: 144-161.

Knight CA, Ackerly DD. 2002. An ecological and evolutionary analysis of photosynthetic thermotolerance using the temperature-dependent increase in fluorescence. *Oecologia* **130**: 505-514.

Lajeunesse MJ. 2016. Facilitating systematic reviews, data extraction and meta-analysis with the metagear package for R. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* **7**: 323-330.

Lefsrud MG, Kopsell DA, Kopsell DE, Curran-Celentano J. 2005. Air temperature affects biomass and carotenoid pigment accumulation in kale and spinach grown in a controlled environment. *HortScience* **40**: 2026-2030.

Lichtenthaler HK, Buschmann C, Rinderle U, Schmuck G. 1986. Application of chlorophyll fluorescence in ecophysiology. *Radiation and Environmental Biophysics* **25**: 297-308.

Maxwell K, Johnson GN. 2000. Chlorophyll fluorescence—a practical guide. *Journal of Experimental Botany* **51**: 659-668.

Mittler R, Vanderauwera S, Suzuki N, Miller G, Tognetti VB, Vandepoele K, Gollery M, Shulaev V, Van Breusegem F. 2011. ROS signaling: the new wave? *Trends in Plant Science* **16**: 300-309.

O'Sullivan OS, Heskel MA, Reich PB, Tjoelker MG, Weerasinghe LK, Penillard A, Zhu L, Egerton JJG, Bloomfield KJ, Creek D, et al. 2017. Thermal limits of leaf metabolism across biomes. *Global Change Biology* **23**: 209-223.

O'Sullivan OS, Weerasinghe KWLK, Evans JR, Egerton JJG, Tjoelker MG, Atkin OK. 2013. High-resolution temperature responses of leaf respiration in snow gum (*Eucalyptus pauciflora*) reveal high-temperature limits to respiratory function. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **36**: 1268-1284.

Olson DM, Dinerstein E, Wikramanayake ED, Burgess ND, Powell GVN, Underwood EC, D'Amico JA, Itoua I, Strand HE, Morrison JC, et al. 2001. Terrestrial ecoregions of the world: a new map of life on earth. *BioScience* **51**: 933-938.

Paun O, Verhoeven KJF, Richards CL. 2019. Opportunities and limitations of reduced representation bisulfite sequencing in plant ecological epigenomics. *New Phytologist* **221**: 738-742.

Perera-Castro AV, Brito P, González-Rodríguez AM. 2018. Changes in thermic limits and acclimation assessment for an alpine plant by chlorophyll fluorescence analysis: F_v/F_m vs. R_{fd}. *Photosynthetica* **56**: 527-536.

R Core Team 2018. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.

Strasserf RJ, Srivastava A. 1995. Polyphasic chlorophyll *a* fluorescence transient in plants and cyanobacteria. *Photochemistry and Photobiology* **61**: 32-42.

van Gurp TP, Wagemaker NCAM, Wouters B, Vergeer P, Ouborg JNJ, Verhoeven KJF. 2016. epiGBS: reference-free reduced representation bisulfite sequencing. *Nature Methods* **13**: 322-324.

von Caemmerer S, Farquhar GD. 1981. Some relationships between the biochemistry of photosynthesis and the gas exchange of leaves. *Planta* **153**: 376-387.

West DW, Gaff DF. 1976. The effect of leaf water potential, leaf temperature and light intensity on leaf diffusion resistance and the transpiration of leaves of *Malus sylvestris*. *Physiologia Plantarum* **38**: 98-104.

Westgate MJ. 2019. revtools: bibliographic data visualization for evidence synthesis in R. *Research Synthesis Methods* **10**: 606-614.

Whitlow TH, Bassuk NL, Ranney TG, Reichert DL. 1992. An improved method for using electrolyte leakage to assess membrane competence in plant tissues. *Plant Physiology* **98**: 198-205.

Wickham H 2016. ggplot2: elegant graphics for data analysis. New York, USA: Springer-Verlag.

Wisniewski M, Glenn DM, Gusta L, Fuller MP. 2008. Using infrared thermography to study freezing in plants. *HortScience* **43**: 1648-1651.

Zhang J, Liu B, Li J, Zhang L, Wang Y, Zheng H, Lu M, Chen J. 2015. *Hsf* and *Hsp* gene families in *Populus*: genome-wide identification, organization and correlated expression during development and in stress responses. *BMC Genomics* **16**: 181.

Zub HW, Arnoult S, Younous J, Lejeune-Hénaut I, Brancourt-Hulmel M. 2012. The frost tolerance of *Miscanthus* at the juvenile stage: differences between clones are influenced by leaf-stage and acclimation. *European Journal of Agronomy* **36**: 32-40.



(a) Cultivated

Quantified visual damage
Thermometry & Spectrometry
Gas exchange
(Epi)genetics and ‘omics
Electrolyte leakage / Membrane stability
Water potential
Chlorophyll fluorescence
Reactive Oxygen Species (ROS)/ Antioxidants
Heat Shock Proteins (HSPs)

1960
1970
1980
1990
2000
2010
2020

Wild

Quantified visual damage
Electrolyte leakage / Membrane stability
Thermometry & Spectrometry
Chlorophyll fluorescence
Gas exchange
Water potential
(Epi)genetics and ‘omics
Reactive Oxygen Species (ROS)/ Antioxidants
Heat Shock Proteins (HSPs)

(b)

(c) Techniques

1. Quantified visual damage ○

Measures the percentage of damaged (discolored/brown) leaves or leaf area (e.g. proportion of cell death; leaf area).

2. Thermometry & Spectrometry ○

Used to identify temperature-induced changes in plant tissue and can indicate functional parameters (e.g. leaf ice nucleation point and its progression through the plant and indices of photochemical health).

3. Gas exchange ○

Determines the ability of a leaf to recover photosynthethic capacity, or change its rate of respiration, after exposure to stressful temperature through examination of the time stability of rate of CO_2 uptake or O_2 evolution.

4. Electrolyte leakage / Membrane stability ○

Measures electrical conductivity to determine cell membrane damage/ leakiness in response to stress.

5. Chlorophyll fluorescence ○

Refers to light re-emitted from chlorophyll and provides a sensitive indicator of temperature stress.

6. Water potential ○

Quantifies the potential for water to move between one area of a plant to another through osmosis, gravity, mechanical pressure or matrix effects such as capillary action.

7. (Epi)genetics and ‘omics

Broadly, ‘omics refers to the fields of molecular biology that are specifically associated with whole-genome detection of: genes (genomics), gene expression (transcriptomics), proteins (proteomics), and metabolites (metabolomics). Epigenomics specifically refers to the molecular mechanisms that alter gene expression and function without changes in DNA sequence (e.g. through chemical modification of DNA (methylation) and histones, incorporation of histone variants and long or small non-coding RNAs).

8. Heat Shock Proteins (HSPs)

Rapidly induced in response to abiotic stresses and alleviates damage. HSPs function as molecular chaperones, assist in protein folding, maintain signal transduction and prevent protein aggregation.

9. Reactive Oxygen Species (ROS)/ Antioxidants

ROS are oxygen radicals and non-radical oxidizing agents that can be converted into radicals. They are by-products of a plant’s metabolic processes which can impact upon a plant’s growth, signalling, development, cell cycle, programmed cell death, abiotic stress responses and pathogen defence and can increase rapidly in response to temperature stress. Antioxidants mitigate the cellular damage that ROS cause.

10. Other biochemistry

Techniques can be used to assess thermal tolerance by the presence or absence of certain biochemicals.


(a) Cultivated: total
N Articles
1
10
100
300
(b) Wild: total
N Articles
1
5
30
80
(c) Cultivated: cold
N Articles
1
10
50
150
(d) Wild: cold
N Articles
1
5
20
45
(e) Cultivated: both
N Articles
1
5
10
15
(f) Wild: both
N Articles
1
2
3
4
(g) Cultivated: heat
N Articles
1
10
60
130
(h) Wild: heat
N Articles
1
5
15
30


(a) Cultivated: Type of cultivation
Not specified
Multiple
Fibre
Viticulture
Plantation forestry
Pasture grasses
Other crop
Legumes
Arabidopsis
Cereals
Horticulture / Vegetables
0
250
500
750
1000
Number of Studies
(c)
800
400
0
Number of Articles
1960
1980
2000
2020
Year of Publication
(b) Wild: Biome
Not specified
Boreal forest
Mediterranean
Arid / Semi-arid / Savannah
Tropical / Subtropical
Alpine / Arctic Tundra / Subalpine
Multiple
Temperate
0
100
200
300
Number of Studies
(d)
800
400
0
Number of Articles
1960
1980
2000
2020
Year of Publication
Heat
Heat and Cold
Cold


Cultivated
Wild
(a)
1243
1278
515
(b)
87
308
312
Species Diversity
Intraspecific
Multiple Species
Single Species
(c)
308
267
237
92
967
1165
(d)
7
160
294
65
59
112
Life Form
Forb / Herb
Graminoid
Multiple
Shrub
Tree
Vine

(a)


Cultivated
Wild
Thermal Tolerance Technique
Water potential
Thermometry / Spectrometry
ROS and Antioxidants
Quantified visual damage
Other biochemistry
Heat Shock Proteins / Factors
Gas exchange
(Epi)genetics and 'omics
Electrolyte leakage/ Membrane stability
Chlorophyll fluorescence
63
190
278
265
524
69
294
398
497
458
18
69
27
150
65
12
75
21
119
151
0.00
0.25
0.50
0.75
1.00
Proportion of Studies
Maximum Duration
Months
Weeks
Days
Hours
Minutes
Not Specified

(b)


Cultivated
Wild
Thermal Tolerance Technique
Water potential
Thermometry / Spectrometry
ROS and Antioxidants
Quantified visual damage
Other biochemistry
Heat Shock Proteins/ Factors
Gas exchange
(Epi)genetics and 'omics
Electrolyte leakage/ Membrane stability
Chlorophyll fluorescence
63
190
278
265
524
69
294
398
497
458
18
69
27
150
65
12
75
21
119
151
0.00
0.25
0.50
0.75
1.00
Proportion of Studies
Ramp / Shock
Shock
Ramp
Not Specified