

# Warmer growing seasons improve cereal yields in Northern Europe only with increasing precipitation

Faranak Tootoonchi<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Göran Bergkvist<sup>1</sup>, Giulia Vico<sup>3</sup>

1 Department of crop production ecology, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU), Uppsala, Sweden

5 2 Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA

3 Department of ecology, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU), Uppsala, Sweden

\* *Correspondence to:* Faranak Tootoonchi (faranak.tootoonchi@slu.se)

**Abstract.** Crop yields depend on climatic conditions such as precipitation and temperature and their timing before and during the growing season. At high latitudes, climate change could lengthen the growing season and ~~provide~~ ~~lead to more suitable temperatures, but~~ ~~temperatures more suitable for crops but~~ also expose crops to more frequent damaging conditions. We quantified the response of regionally-averaged ~~1965–2020~~ winter and spring cereal yields in Sweden ~~for 1965–2020~~ to a wide set of ~~ecophysiologicaly-meaningful descriptors~~ ~~climatic descriptors~~ ~~selected based on physiological understanding to maintain model interpretability of climatic conditions.~~ ~~With.~~ ~~With~~ statistical models, we explored the role of both short-term and average conditions over ~~different physiologically~~ ~~relevant-crop~~ developmental stages, as well as of a proxy of water availability during the period prior to the main growing season. Temperature and precipitation or dry spell lengths for the entire growing season explained 75–85% of yield variability, performing better than shorter-term potentially damaging conditions ~~such as number of~~ ~~days with precipitation above 20 mm or temperatures above 25 °C~~. Low precipitation or extended dry spells combined with high temperatures and, conversely, high precipitation sums with cool temperatures ~~decreased-were~~ ~~associated with reduced~~ yields for all crops. Our findings suggest that under climate change crop yields will be reduced in Sweden, unless warming is accompanied by increase in precipitation during the main growing season. With unaltered or reduced growing season precipitation, benefiting from warmer temperatures caused by climate change will require adaptation measures.

**Keywords.** Climate change, precipitation and temperature, climatic indicators, crop yield, cereals, high  
25 latitudes

# 1 Introduction

Crop yields depend on climatic conditions such as precipitation, temperature, and their interactions (Porter and Semenov, 2005; Ray et al., 2015; Riha et al., 1996). These climatic conditions define the water and energy available for crop establishment, growth, and yield formation (Barron-Gafford et al., 2012; Song et al., 2016). Crop responses to climatic conditions are complex and nonlinear. Both excessive and insufficient precipitation, as well as excessively high or low temperatures, can damage the crop and reduce marketable yields (Hatfield and Prueger, 2015; Luan et al., 2021; Miedema, 1982; Mittra and Stickler, 1961). Excessively dry and warm conditions can cause water and heat stress, hasten development, reduce net photosynthesis, kernel numbers and size, and ultimately decrease ~~crop yields~~ (Hatfield and Prueger, 2015; Praba et al., 2009; Siebert et al., 2017). At the other extreme, excessive precipitation is often associated with reduced solar radiation (Díaz-Torres et al., 2017), causes nutrient losses and oxygen deficiency (Becker, 2014; Schreiber, 1999), and enhances fungal growth (Barnes et al., 2018). Intense precipitation can also damage crops mechanically. ~~To assess expected climate change effects on crop yields and improve crop yield modeling, we need to identify the most damaging conditions for crop yields and determine the extent of their impacts are necessary steps to assess expected climate change effects on crop yields and for improving crop yield modeling.~~

At high latitudes, such as in Northern Europe, current temperatures ~~lead result into short limited~~ periods ~~suitable~~ for soil cultivation and crop growth. Global warming ~~can might~~ create new opportunities, ~~by contributing to longer by lengthening the~~ growing season and ~~more suitable improving~~ growing conditions, ~~potentially increasing yields~~ (Bindi and Olesen, 2011; Juhola et al., 2017; Olesen et al., 2011; Wiréhn et al., 2017), ~~or widening expanding~~ the range of cultivable crops (Heikonen et al., 2025; Wiréhn, 2018), ~~and enhancing photosynthesis and water-use efficiency due to rising CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations~~ (Rezaei et al., 2023). ~~At the same time,~~ warmer conditions enhance evapotranspiration thus reducing soil water availability and increasing the risk of plant water stress unless precipitation increases. Moreover, frequency and magnitude of extreme conditions such as dry, hot or wet spells, are expected to increase globally, ~~including also~~ in northern Europe (Song et al., 2016; Toreti et al., 2019; Wiréhn et al., 2017). Indeed, reduced yields due to excessively dry periods during the growing season or ~~due to soil water saturation that limits field that limits~~ access to machinery, ~~are have~~ already ~~been~~ observed in Northern Europe (De Toro et al., 2015; Trnka et al., 2011). Nonetheless, the net effect of positive and negative changes ~~in of~~ climatic conditions in Northern Europe is still unclear.

Different aspects of climatic conditions and their co-occurrence affect crop yields. Even detrimental conditions of short duration can have large adverse effects (Hakala et al., 2020; Zhu and Troy, 2018). Averaging the climatic conditions over the growing season can mask the role of these short-term, but potentially severely damaging conditions (Lesk et al., 2022; Luan et al., 2021; Troy et al., 2015; Vogel et al., 2019). Considering short-term conditions is particularly important in the face of climate change because of the projected changes in timing and magnitude of short-term extreme events (Thiery et al., 2021; Tootoonchi et al., 2023; Wiréhn et al., 2017). Furthermore, combinations of damaging climatic conditions can have ~~impacts on crops that are~~ disproportionately large ~~impacts~~ compared with the sum of their individual ~~effects impacts~~ (Alizadeh et al., 2020; Luan et al., 2021; Suzuki et al., 2014; Teutschbein et al., 2023a). To effectively evaluate the effects of climatic conditions on crop yields, we need to consider both seasonal averages and shorter-term conditions, as well as their combinations. Yet

65 we lack quantification of the role of short-term conditions and combination of conditions on crop yields at high latitudes.

Crops respon~~sed differently~~ to growing conditions ~~at different~~depend on their developmental stages, ~~with via~~ often complex mechanisms and non-linear ~~mechanisms-effects~~ (Lüttger and Feike, 2018; Mäkinen et al., 2018; Suliman et al., 2024; Trnka et al., 2014). For example, spring cereals tend to be more sensitive to water stress around flowering (Martyniak, 2008) compared with other developmental stages, and ~~even~~ more so when co-occurring with heat stress (Barnabás et al., 2008; Dolferus et al., 2011; Senapati et al., 2021). Late-season precipitation can reduce crop yield and quality by enhancing fungal growth or delaying harvests due to wet soils (Olesen et al., 2011). Moreover, ~~t~~The conditions before the beginning of the growing season can ~~also~~ have legacy impacts, ~~by affecting soil water accumulation~~ (Trnka et al., 2016). Accumulated soil water before the beginning of the growing season helps buffering the negative effects of limited precipitation after sowing of spring crops or after the end of winter dormancy for winter crops (Li et al., 2019). ~~However,~~ ~~E~~xcessive soil water, ~~however,~~ delays sowing of spring crops (Trnka et al., 2011). Despite the importance of the timing of conditions in relation to crop physiological development, the response to climatic conditions at different developmental stages, and the ~~role of~~ legacy effects of conditions ~~of climatic conditions~~ before the main growing season, remain largely uncharacterized, in particular at high latitudes.

Climatic conditions during a period can be summarized via a variety of climatic indicators (McMillan, 2021; Schmidt and Felsche, 2024; Wiréhn, 2021; Zhu and Troy, 2018). These are ‘simple diagnostic quantities that are used to characterize an aspect of a geophysical system’ (Schneider et al., 2013), such as states, variability, or frequencies of climatic conditions (Wiréhn, 2021). Selecting the most suitable indicators is challenging and depends on the purpose, regional climate, and most critical climatic conditions (Adger, 2006; Wiréhn, 2021). A systematic exploration of a wide range of relevant climatic indicators is essential to identify the most relevant indicators to explain crop yields.

Using county-level yield data of staple cereals and meteorological data for 1965-2020 across Sweden, we systematically explore the role of various climatic indicators on crop yields under Northern European conditions. Specifically, we answer the following questions:

1. Which climatic conditions and relative to which period (i.e., pre- (main) growing season, pre- or post-flowering, or whole growing season) explain crop yields best?
2. Which climatic conditions, and their combinations, are the most beneficial for yields? Which are the most detrimental?

The results can help predict crop yield through statistical models. They also provide insights into the climate change impacts on agriculture for Northern Europe and whether specific cereals are better adapted to the conditions likely to become more frequent in the future.

## 2 Data and Methods

We aimed to identify which climatic conditions, their combinations and timing during the year were most important in defining each crop yield in Sweden (Section 2.1, Fig. 1). The climatic indicators (section 2.2) were chosen based on our ecophysiological understanding of plant response to climatic conditions (as detailed in Section


2.2.1). We considered four periods of physiological relevance, defined for each crop and year based on a minimalist phenological model (Section 2.2.2). We then compared the performance of several statistical models, with yield of each crop as dependent variable and different climatic indicators and their interactions as explanatory variables (Section 2.3).

105

## 2.1 Crop yield and climatic data

Crop yield data for the period 1965-2020 over the 21 Swedish counties (län in Swedish) was obtained from Statistics Sweden (Statistikdatabasen), for the most commonly grown cereals in the country, i.e. winter wheat, spring wheat, spring barley and oats (Fig. 1). The percentage of unavailable data was 18%, 33%, 1% and 13%, respectively, and can be ascribed to either uncertainty in yearly yield cultivation (i.e., yield not meeting reporting criteria) or confidentiality reasons (i.e., crop sown only in few fields, Statistikdatabasen). The fraction of cultivated area per county was higher in the south where conditions are more favorable, permitting cultivation of all four crops, whereas only oats and spring barley were reported for the north (Fig. 1).

110



115

Figure 1: Overview of the study area including (a) the location of cropped areas in green and (b-e) the average yields of each of the four crops for each county in Sweden during the period 1965-2020. Only the counties The limited county boundaries for winter and spring wheat corresponding to the regions where these crops are cultivated are reported, i.e., only to ,extending only to mid-latitudes of approximately 60°N for winter and spring wheat. Note that winter wheat and spring wheat are cultivated only in the southern-most counties.

120

For meteorological data, we used gridded observed daily precipitation as well as average, minimum and maximum daily temperature values from E-Obs gridded data (Cornes et al., 2018) version 26.0e at 0.1\_°resolution.

Counties extend over 2.9-98.2 km<sup>2</sup> and include large areas that are not cropped due to unsuitable climatic and soil conditions. Hence, we considered as representative of each county the gridded meteorological data averaged over cropped areas of the county. The cropped area was assumed to match the ~~the~~ Non-irrigated arable fields in the CORINE land cover map (European Environment Agency, 2020). The 2006 map (CLC2006) was used as representative of the entire period.

## 2.2 Modeling components Climatic indicators

### 2.2.1 Selection procedure of climatic indicators

We selected candidate climatic indicators based on previous local and global analyses, to include those that had shown promise to explain crop yield variability across a wide geographic ranges (Kaseva et al., 2023; Luan et al., 2021; Mäkinen et al., 2018; Wiréhn et al., 2017; Zhu and Troy, 2018). We also considered some complementary indicators that had not been previously used to explain yield variability, but we deemed relevant in particular under Northern European conditions, based on the climatic conditions under which most commonly grown crops thrive or are damaged.

The selection process resulted in 20 candidate indicators (Table 1). These either reflected separate attributes of precipitation and temperature (averages over specific periods or frequency of exceedance of specific thresholds of either precipitation or temperature), or were composite in nature (i.e., included the role of both temperature and precipitation). Examples of composite indicators are the dryness index (DI) and total precipitation occurring in days with freezing temperature (P\_T0).

Selected ~~indicators captured~~ Different Complementary attributes of the climatic conditions ~~were captured~~, such as variability (e.g., standard deviation of precipitation and temperature, Pvar and Tvar), duration of specific conditions (e.g., maximum number of consecutive dry days, CDD), occurrence of peaks over thresholds (e.g., number of days with precipitation above 10 mm, NDP10) and magnitude (intensity) of a variable (e.g., maximum precipitation amount in a single day, MaxP\_1D, or total precipitation over the period, Psum). The candidate indicators also reflected conditions over different time spans, such as averages over longer periods, up to the whole main growing season (e.g., mean temperature, Tmean; see Section 2.2.2 for the definition of the growing season), or short-term but potentially severely detrimental conditions lasting only one or few days (e.g., CDD). While even shorter-term extremes, such as intense rainfall over 15 minutes can impact crops, we cannot explore their effects as such data are not available at the spatiotemporal scale of this study.

We checked the candidate indicators for similarity, based on Spearman correlation coefficients (Spearman, 1904, Fig. 2). To focus on complementary indicators and reduce redundancy and collinearity, we eliminated one climatic indicator within each pair of highly correlated ( $>|0.5|$ ) indicators (as in e.g. Addor et al., 2018 or Sjulgård et al., 2023). The pairwise correlations between precipitation and temperature indicators were generally lower (between -0.3 and 0.3) compared with correlation between indicators based on precipitation or temperature only. A general positive correlation prevailed among precipitation indicators, except for indicators of dryness (Ndry5 and CDD), which were negatively correlated with the rest of the precipitation indicators. Temperature indicators were negatively correlated for those representing low temperatures Frost and Icing days, as well as for daily temperature variance, but were ~~positively~~ positively correlated for the rest of the indicators.

160 Among pairs of highly correlated indicators linked to precipitation, we chose CDD over NDDry\_5d because  
the former represents dry periods of various lengths. Between CWD and NDP1, we chose NDP1 as it may  
indirectly capture also the reduction in solar radiation (Díaz-Torres et al., 2017). We also kept the number of days  
with precipitation exceeding 20 mm (NDP20), instead of the indicator relative to 10 mm (NDP10), due to the  
damaging and extreme nature of the former. We also eliminated the maximum amount of precipitation over 1 and  
165 5 days (MaxP\_1D and MaxP\_5D) because both were highly correlated with NDP20. For highly correlated  
temperature indicators, we selected the number of days above 25 °C (NDT25) instead of 30 °C (NDT30) because  
temperatures higher than 25 °C likely are at the high end of optimal temperatures of typical local varieties;  
moreover, the historically low frequency of days above 30 °C could reduce the robustness of the constructed  
statistical models. Between number of frost and icing days we retained frost days, because freezing nights can be  
170 sufficient to cause permanent damage in non-acclimated crops (François and Vrac, 2023). Regarding average  
temperatures, we focused on Tmean, i.e., the average mean daily temperature, because it was well correlated with  
both minimum and maximum daily temperatures, averaged over the same period. Moreover, Tmean is readily  
available in climatic data.


175 The two composite indicators, DI (Dryness Index, a proxy for water availability) and P\_T0 (a proxy for snow  
amount), were highly correlated when calculated before the beginning of the main growing season (see Section  
2.2.2), likely because of the low temperatures during that period. ~~and w~~Between the two, we selected DI because  
of its direct influence on crops (Jackson et al., 2023). While sufficient snow cover is important for insulating winter  
crops (Zhu et al., 2022), directly assessing snow effects requires multiple additional indicators and reliable snow  
data, which are limited and uncertain at the 0.1° resolution at a high spatial resolution over 1965–2020 (Wood et  
180 al., 2025).

After the selection, we retained five precipitation indicators (Psum, Pvar, NDP1, NDP20 and CDD), four  
temperature indicators (Tmean, Tvar, frost and NDT25), and one composite indicator (DI; in bold in Table 1).

185 **Table 1: List of 20 indicators that were identified from the literature or were deemed relevant to assess the impact  
of climatic conditions on crop yields at high latitudes. Indicators were categorized into 3 categories, representing (a)  
precipitation (b) temperature and (c) combined influence of precipitation and temperature. The indicators in bold are**

those selected after a second round of screening, eliminating those showing high Spearman correlation with the selected ones, and after selecting those with complementary nature.

Variable	climatic indicators [Unit]	Description	Examples of application in crop response
(a) Precipitation	<b>Psum [cm]</b>	Total of daily precipitation	(Luan et al., 2022; Lüttger and Feike, 2018; Vogel et al., 2019)
	<b>NDP1 [days]</b>	Number of days, also non-consecutive, with daily precipitation above 1 mm	(Copernicus Climate Change Service, 2019)
	<b>NDP10 [days]</b>	Number of days, also non-consecutive, with daily precipitation above 10 mm	(Copernicus Climate Change Service, 2019)
	<b>NDP20 [days]</b>	Number of days, also non-consecutive, with daily precipitation above 20 mm	(Copernicus Climate Change Service, 2019)
	<b>MaxP_1D [mm·day<sup>-1</sup>]</b>	Maximum precipitation amount in one day	(Lesk et al., 2020)
	<b>MaxP_5D [mm·day<sup>-1</sup>]</b>	Maximum precipitation amount in five consecutive days	(Vogel et al., 2019; Zhu and Troy, 2018)
	<b>NDDry_5d [-]</b>	Number of dry spells longer than 5 consecutive days	(Manning et al., 2023; Masupha et al., 2016)
	<b>Pvar [mm<sup>2</sup>·day<sup>-2</sup>]</b>	Variance of daily precipitation	(Tootoonchi et al., 2022; Zhu and Troy, 2018)
	<b>CDD [days]</b>	Maximum number of <i>consecutive</i> dry (< 1mm/day) days	(Luan et al., 2022)
	<b>CWD [days]</b>	Maximum number of consecutive wet (> 1mm/day) days	(Copernicus Climate Change Service, 2019)
(b) Temperature	<b>Tmean [°C]</b>	Mean of daily mean temperature	(Carter et al., 2018; Luan et al., 2022; Vogel et al., 2019)
	<b>Tmin [°C]</b>	Mean of daily minimum temperature	(Copernicus Climate Change Service, 2019)
	<b>Tmax [°C]</b>	Mean of daily maximum temperature	(Copernicus Climate Change Service, 2019)
	<b>NDT25 [days]</b>	Number of days, also non-consecutive, with maximum temperature above 25°C	(Lüttger and Feike, 2018; Zhu and Troy, 2018)
	<b>NDT30 [days]</b>	Number of days, also non-consecutive, with maximum temperature above 30°C	(Lüttger and Feike, 2018; Zhu and Troy, 2018)
	<b>Frost [days]</b>	Number of days, also non-consecutive, with daily minimum temperature below 0°C	(Copernicus Climate Change Service, 2019)
	<b>Icing [days]</b>	Number of days, also non-consecutive, with daily maximum temperature below 0°C	(Zhu and Troy, 2018)
	<b>Tvar [°C<sup>2</sup>·day<sup>-2</sup>]</b>	Variance of daily mean temperature	(Tootoonchi et al., 2022; Zhu and Troy, 2018)
(c) Combined P and T	<b>DI [mm·mm<sup>-1</sup>]</b>	Dryness index, i.e., the ratio of total potential evapotranspiration (PET) calculated via Hamon (Hamon, 1961) to total precipitation. <a href="#">DI &gt; 1 indicate water-limited conditions, whereas DI &lt; -1 indicate water availability exceeding crop demand.</a>	(Luan et al., 2022; Todorovic et al., 2022)
	<b>P_T0 [mm·day<sup>-1</sup>]</b>	Sum of precipitation occurring when mean daily temperature is below 0°C	(Climate indicator - Snow   SMHI, 2023; Fontrodona-Bach et al., 2023)



190

**Figure 2: Spearman correlation between pairwise indicators representing magnitude, variation and duration of precipitation and temperature, as well as two composite indicators over the entire growing season (see Table 1 for indicator definitions and section 2.2.2 for the definition of periods). The significant correlations ( $p < 0.05$ ) are marked with a grey circle. The figure refers to the main growing season of winter wheat for all indicators except the composite indicators DI and P-T0, which refer to the pre-growing period. Similar patterns were observed when considering spring crops and sub-periods.**

195

### 2.2.2 Periods of interest

For each crop and cropped land in each county, we defined the (main) growing season, pre-flowering and post-flowering based on estimated sowing, flowering and maturity dates, averaged over the 56 years spanned by yield data. Lacking phenological observations, we estimated these dates via, we used a phenological model based on growing degree days (GDD) –and day length, with crop-specific thresholds previously tested–employed a parameterized and already tested for crops across Europe (Marini et al., 2020; Olesen et al., 2012). This approach complements the crop growing calendar (Caparros-Santiago et al., 2021; Minoli et al., 2022) by accounting for year-to-year variations in flowering and maturity due to temperature variability and is especially useful when field-level phenology data are unavailable. We also tested the effects of different GDD thresholds and of using year-to-year variations instead of averages and found that neither affected the results.

200

205

We defined the growing season as the period between sowing and maturity dates for spring cereals, and between beginning of the main growing season and maturity for winter wheat, which in the region is sown in the autumn and harvested the following summer. Similarly, the pre-flowering period ran between sowing (for spring crops) and beginning of the main growing season (for winter wheat) and flowering, whereas the post-flowering period extends between flowering and maturity. For winter wheat we focused on the main growing season, i.e., when most of the plant activity occurs, for winter wheat as this is the most important period for yield formation, although damages to the plant can occur also during the winter. The beginning of the main growing season, i.e. the timing of the release of winter dormancy, was estimated as the first yearly occurrence of an increase in GDD corresponding steeper than  $\geq 4 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}\cdot\text{d}^{-1}$  (Costa et al., 2024). The date did not considerably change when other

210

215

220 thresholds beyond  $4\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}\cdot\text{d}^{-1}$  were considered. ~~We defined the growing season as the period between sowing and maturity dates for spring cereals, and between beginning of the main growing season and maturity for winter wheat. Similarly, the pre-flowering period ran between sowing (for spring crops) and beginning of the main growing season (for winter wheat) and flowering, whereas the post-flowering period extends between flowering and maturity. We also tested the effects of different GDD thresholds and of using year-to-year variations instead of averages, and found that neither affected the results.~~

225 We calculated the retained indicators (Table 1, in **bold**) for each year and cropped land in each county, relative to the three crop-specific periods: entire growing season, pre- and post-flowering. Dryness index was calculated in the above-mentioned periods and also during pre-growing season periods as this variable is most likely to capture effects extending beyond the main growing season for winter crops and the actual growing season for spring crops, while simultaneously reflecting the combined influence of temperature and precipitation. Lacking clear evidence on the duration of any legacy effects prior to sowing or beginning of the growing season, we ~~considered~~ examined the dryness index averaged over or 30, 60, 90 day-long periods before the sowing date for spring crops, or the beginning of the main growing period for winter wheat and selected the period resulting in highest model performance for each crop.

### 230 ~~2.2.3.2.3~~ Linear mixed effect models ~~Statistical analyses~~

235 We used linear mixed effect models (Bürger et al., 2012; Smith et al., 2005) to explore crop yield responses to climatic indicators during the identified periods. We fitted separate models for each crop, with yield  $Y$  as the dependent variable, and a set of explanatory climatic indicators as fixed effects. Neither yields nor climatic indicators were de-trended, and log-transformation of yields was unnecessary because the yields were not skewed. This also had the advantage that fitted parameters could be directly interpreted as changes in yield per unit change in the climatic conditions. ~~Instead, w~~ We included time elapsed from year 1965 ( $t$ ) as a continuous variable in all models, thus accounting for the combined impacts of climate change and increasing  $\text{CO}_2$  emissions, as well as technological improvements, including variety and management changes. Furthermore, year and county were included as categorical random effects in all models to consider spatiotemporal heterogeneity and variations over the study area.

240 We considered three types of models for each crop. The first type had the composite precipitation-temperature indicator, dryness index, as explanatory variable to capture the role of precipitation and temperatures at the same time. Dryness index can summarize key aspects of soil water availability essential for crop growth through interplay between precipitation and temperature, thus ~~being~~ used as an indicator to capture balance between water supply and energy-driven demand. As such, dryness index provides a more ~~process-oriented~~ process-oriented view at the relationship between precipitation, temperature, and their interactions. We included also quadratic dependence of yield on dryness index to account for excessive dryness (Luan et al., 2022). The fixed part of the model was

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_t t + \beta_{DI}(DI) + \beta_{DI^2}(DI)^2 \quad \text{eq. 1}$$

250 Where  $Y$  is the yield of the crop of interest,  $\beta_0$  is the global intercept,  $\beta_t$ ,  $\beta_{DI}$  and  $\beta_{DI^2}$  represent dependences of yield on  $t$ ,  $DI$  and  $DI^2$ , respectively.

The second type of model aimed at quantifying the role of conditions that either extend over the whole period considered (e.g., averages), or for a potentially substantial part of that (e.g., dry spells). We focused on pairs of interacting indicators representing precipitation ( $x_P$ ) and temperature ( $x_T$ ) characteristics, separately. We considered three pairs of  $x_P$  and  $x_T$  indicators, each reflecting different aspects: i) Precipitation sums (Psum) and temperature averages (Tmean), characterizing average conditions, ii) precipitation and temperature variance (Pvar and Tvar), characterizing the variability of the conditions, or iii) maximum length of the dry spells (CDD) and temperature averages (Tmean), characterizing the occurrence of dry spells, the effect of which is expected to be more marked at higher temperature. As fixed effects, in its most complex form, the model included a quadratic dependence on  $x_P$  and  $x_T$  as well as all the possible two-way interactions, because the damaging effects of low precipitations are stronger with high temperatures and vice versa. The fixed part of the model was

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_t t + \beta_P(x_P) + \beta_T(x_T) + \beta_{P2}(x_P)^2 + \beta_{T2}(x_T)^2 + \beta_{PT}(x_P)(x_T) + \beta_{P2T}(x_P)^2(x_T) + \beta_{PT2}(x_P)(x_T)^2 + \beta_{P2T2}(x_P)^2(x_T)^2 \quad \text{eq. 2}$$

where  $\beta_0$  is the global intercept,  $\beta_t$ ,  $\beta_P$  and  $\beta_T$  are the slopes of the linear dependencies of crop yield on time, precipitation and temperature indicators, respectively, and  $\beta_{P2}$  and  $\beta_{T2}$  are quadratic dependencies of crops to the same indicators. Including a quadratic dependence on  $x_P$  and  $x_T$  allows for intermediate yield-maximizing conditions. The interactions between precipitation and temperature indicators are represented by  $\beta_{PT}$ ,  $\beta_{P2T}$  and  $\beta_{PT2}$ . We compared the performance of the most complex model (eq. 2) with nine model variants of decreasing complexity, for a total of 10 model variants for each of pair of  $x_P$  and  $x_T$  indicator, period of the year, and crop. For each period of the year, crop and pair of climatic indicators, among the variants of eq. 2, we first selected the model with lowest Akaike Information criterion (AIC). AIC is a statistical performance measure that accounts for the model complexity, thus allowing a fair comparison of models differing in number of coefficients. For each crop and for each set of explanatory indicators, among the models with lowest AIC relative to the different periods, we picked the one with highest complexity as the final model. With this strategy, we had models of comparable complexity for separate crops and separate indicators.

The third type of model focused on short-duration, but potentially damaging, conditions. We considered four short-term indicators as explanatory variables. These indicators were selected from the pool of reviewed indicators (2.2.1), due to their damaging nature and reflected complementary behaviors, two reflecting precipitation characteristics (NDP1, NDP20), and two temperature characteristics (NDT25 and Frost). The fixed part of the model was

$$\text{Yield} = \beta_0 + \beta_t t + \beta_{NDP1}(NDP1) + \beta_{NDT25}(NDT25) + \beta_{NDP20}(NDP20) + \beta_{Frost}(Frost) + \beta_{NDP1-2}(NDP1)^2 + \beta_{NDT25-2}(NDT25)^2 + \beta_{NDP20-2}(NDP20)^2 + \beta_{Frost-2}(Frost)^2 \quad \text{eq. 3}$$

where  $\beta_{NDP1}$  and  $\beta_{NDP20}$  represent the linear dependencies of yield to two precipitation indicators NDP1 and NDP20 and  $\beta_{NDT25}$  and  $\beta_{Frost}$  to two temperature indicators NDT25 and Frost, respectively.  $\beta_{NDP1-2}$ ,  $\beta_{NDP20-2}$ ,  $\beta_{NDT25-2}$  and  $\beta_{Frost-2}$  represent the quadratic dependencies of the crops to the same indicators. We introduced quadratic dependences to allow for yield-maximizing intermediate conditions and high levels of damaging conditions. We did not include any interaction terms, because these conditions do not likely compound. We did not perform any model selection and simplification for this model.

285 We applied the first type of model, that based on DI, to all four periods, including pre- growing season, while the second and third types of models were applied on three periods, i.e., the entire growing season, pre-flowering and after flowering.

290 We selected indicator combinations and models to balance data availability, simplicity, and interpretability, guided by our eco-physiological understanding (Luan et al., 2022; Ortiz-Bobea et al., 2021; Ray et al., 2015). This approach allowed us to avoid physiologically unsupported or overly complex combinations. We fitted each model via the restricted maximum likelihood method using fitlme function in MatLab R2023a. Based on AIC, we determined which climatic indicators, model structures and periods had the highest performance (Fig. 3). The same approach was used to compare the different lengths of the pre- (main) growing periods (30, 60, 90 days). Beyond AIC, we considered the fraction of explained variance by fixed effects only (r2marg) or by both fixed effects and random effects (r2cond) as additional metric of model performance (Nakagawa & Schielzeth 2013). We considered effects significant when  $p < 0.05$ . We then plotted crop yield as a function of best performing set of climatic indicators and pre- (main) growing dryness index, relative to the intermediate year 1992 (Fig. 4-5). The MatLab statement for each of the three types of models can be found in Supplementary Information (SI), showing yield dependence to both random and fixed effects.


### 300 3 Results

The best performing model had precipitation sum and temperature averages as explanatory variables for winter wheat (Fig. 3a) and spring barley (Fig. 3b), and maximum length of the dry spell (CDD) and temperature average for spring wheat (Fig. 3c) and oats (Fig. 3d). The fraction of explained variance by fixed effects ranged from 0.15 to 0.50 (Fig. 3), and from 0.76 to 0.85 when considering also the random effects (Table 2; Supplementary information-SI, Table S1-S4). The fraction of explained variance was lowest for oats and highest for winter wheat.

305 Conditions relative to the entire (main) growing season had the highest performance for all crops, i.e., the according to the lowest AIC. Models based on post-flowering conditions for winter wheat (Fig. 3a) and oats (Fig. 3d), pre-flowering conditions for spring barley (Fig. 3b), and pre-growing dryness index for spring wheat (Fig. 3c) had the second best performance. However, despite a higher AIC, these models had comparable fraction of explained a fraction of the variance to comparable with the models of the entire growing season, for a given set of indicators. The difference in marginal r2 was 2 to-10% depending on the crop (Fig. 3).

310 Models based on the dryness index had intermediate performance (Fig. 3) for all periods and crops except spring wheat. The effects of dryness index, as a proxy of the legacy effects of the period before the beginning of the (main) growing season, were best captured when considering the conditions during 60 days prior to the sowing for spring wheat, and 90 days for the other crops (not shown).

315 Models based on either short-term indicators or the variability of precipitation and temperature had the lowest performances (Fig. 3).



320 **Figure 3:** Performance of statistical models for yields differing in explanatory variables and period, for four crops (a) winter wheat (b) spring barley (c) spring wheat and (d) oats. Performance is assessed based on the AIC. The darker the color the lower the AIC and hence the higher the performance. Values in each cell indicate the corresponding

$r^2_{marg}$  for each model, representing the fraction of variance explained by climatic conditions and time. Duration of the pre- (main) growing season is 2 months for spring wheat and 3 months for other crops. [Short-term conditions](#) ~~includerefer to the model combining addictively two precipitation indicators (NDP1, NDP20) and two temperature indicators (NDT25, Frost). For a full list of abbreviations, see Table 1.~~

325

~~Yields increased between 0.2 ton·ha<sup>-1</sup> per decade for spring crops and 0.5 ton·ha<sup>-1</sup> per decade for winter wheat (Table 2), i.e., 7% to 10% of the long-term average.~~


Table 2 Best performing combination of model, climatic indicators and period for each crop (a-d) and associated estimated coefficients, standard error (SE) and p. For each model we report also the fraction of explained variance when using only the fixed effects ( $r^2_{marg}$ ) and when using both fixed effects and random effects ( $r^2_{rand}$ ). Cases for  $p < 0.05$  are highlighted in bold.

330

		Winter wheat and spring barley					
		Period		Entire growing season			
		Indicators		Psum (denoted as $x_P$ ) and Tmean (denoted as $x_T$ )			
		Model structure		$\beta_0 + \beta_t t + \beta_P x_P + \beta_T x_T + \beta_{P^2} x_P^2 + \beta_{PT}(x_P)(x_T)$			
		a) Winter wheat			b) Spring barley		
Predictor	Coefficient	Estimate	SE	p	Estimate	SE	p
-	$\beta_0$ [ton·ha <sup>-1</sup> ]	10.432	1.253	<b>&lt;0.05</b>	9.138	0.765	<b>&lt;0.05</b>
Time t	$\beta_t$ [ton·ha <sup>-1</sup> ·yr <sup>-1</sup> ]	0.054	0.004	<b>&lt;0.05</b>	0.028	0.002	<b>&lt;0.05</b>
Precipitation indicator P	$\beta_P$ [ton·ha <sup>-1</sup> ·cm <sup>-1</sup> ]	-0.330	0.074	<b>&lt;0.05</b>	-0.259	0.034	<b>&lt;0.05</b>
Temperature indicator T	$\beta_T$ [ton·ha <sup>-1</sup> ·°C <sup>-1</sup> ]	-0.568	0.088	<b>&lt;0.05</b>	-0.530	0.050	<b>&lt;0.05</b>
P x T	$\beta_{PT}$ [ton·ha <sup>-1</sup> ·cm <sup>-1</sup> ·°C <sup>-1</sup> ]	0.032	0.005	<b>&lt;0.05</b>	0.022	0.002	<b>&lt;0.05</b>
P <sup>2</sup>	$\beta_{P^2}$ [ton·ha <sup>-1</sup> ·cm <sup>-2</sup> ]	-0.003	0.001	<b>&lt;0.05</b>	-0.001	0.000	<b>&lt;0.05</b>
	$r^2_{marg}$		0.50			0.24	
	$r^2_{cond}$		0.87			0.82	
		Spring wheat and oats					
		Period		Entire growing season			
		Indicators		CDD (denoted as $x_P$ ) and Tmean (denoted as $x_T$ )			
		Model structure		$\beta_0 + \beta_t t + \beta_P x_P + \beta_T x_T + \beta_{T^2} x_T^2 + \beta_{PT}(x_P)(x_T)$			
		c) Spring wheat			d) Oats		

	Name	Estimate	SE	p	Estimate	SE	p
-	$\beta_0$ [ton·ha <sup>-1</sup> ]	-12.394	4.354	<0.05	-9.544	2.905	<0.05
Time t	$\beta_t$ [ton·ha <sup>-1</sup> ·yr <sup>-1</sup> ]	0.033	0.003	<0.05	0.023	0.002	<0.05
Precipitation indicator P	$\beta_p$ [ton·ha <sup>-1</sup> ·day <sup>-1</sup> ]	0.130	0.054	<0.05	0.134	0.036	<0.05
Temperature indicator T	$\beta_T$ [ton·ha <sup>-1</sup> ·°C <sup>-1</sup> ]	2.116	0.612	<0.05	1.741	0.419	<0.05
P x T	$\beta_{PT}$ [ton·ha <sup>-1</sup> ·day <sup>-1</sup> ·°C <sup>-1</sup> ]	-0.009	0.003	<0.05	-0.011	0.002	<0.05
T <sup>2</sup>	$\beta_{T^2}$ [ton·ha <sup>-1</sup> ·°C <sup>-2</sup> ]	-0.071	0.021	<0.05	-0.060	0.015	<0.05
	<i>r2marg</i>		0.38			0.26	
	<i>r2cond</i>		0.85			0.77	

335 In all crops, precipitation and temperature indicators interacted in defining yields (Table 2). [Yields increased between 0.2 ton·ha<sup>-1</sup> per decade for spring crops and 0.5 ton·ha<sup>-1</sup> per decade for winter wheat \(Table 2\), i.e., 7% to 10% of the long-term average.](#) Winter wheat and spring barley yields were maximum or near maximum for combinations of jointly increasing precipitation sums and average temperatures during the (main) growing season (Fig. 4a-b). Yields of spring wheat and oats were maximum at approximately average temperature 14 °C and ~~one~~ [one week long 7 day](#) CDD (Fig. 4c-d). The yield maximizing temperatures decreased with increasing CDDs.



340

**Figure 4: Crop yield as a function of best performing set of climatic indicators. (a) winter wheat, (b) spring barley, (c) spring wheat, (d) oats. Winter wheat and spring barley were best explained through precipitation sum (Psum) and temperature averages (Tmean) of the entire growing season, while spring wheat and oats were best explained through CDD and Tmean of the entire growing season. The contour plots are based on the fixed parts of the statistical models estimated for each crop separately. Time is set to the year 1992 which is an intermediate year within the study period (1965-2020). The ranges of the climatic indicators correspond to the 5th and 95th percentiles of each indicator.**

345

Yields of all crops except oats depended non-linearly on the pre-(main) growing dryness index (DI, Table 3). The yield maximizing DI was  $1.2 \text{ mm} \cdot \text{mm}^{-1}$  for winter wheat and  $-2.7 \text{ mm} \cdot \text{mm}^{-1}$  for spring wheat (Fig. 5a,c) – corresponding to the 60<sup>th</sup> and 90<sup>th</sup> percentiles of the observed range respectively. Also spring barley yield also depended non-linearly on DI, but the yield maximizing DI was above the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile of the observed range of DI (Fig. 5b). For oats pre-growing proxy of water availability did not affect yield (Table 3d).

350

**Table 3 Model representing the legacy effects of water availability during pre-main growing period for winter wheat and pre-growing period for spring cereal. The table has the identified length of the period prior to (main) growing, model structure, estimated parameters and their units. Each model also included the fraction of explained variance when using only the field effects (r2marg) and when using both fixed effects and random effects (r2rand).**

355

Crop	a) Winter wheat	b) Spring barley	c) Spring wheat	d) Oats
------	-----------------	------------------	-----------------	---------

Identified length of the period prior to (main) growing	90 days			90 days			60 days			90 days		
Model Structure	$\beta_0 + \beta_t t + \beta_{DI} DI_1 + \beta_{DI2} DI^2$											
Name	Estimate	SE	p	Estimate	SE	p	Estimate	SE	p	Estimate	SE	p
$\beta_0$ [ton·ha <sup>-1</sup> ]	3.147	0.285	<0.05	2.149	0.214	<0.05	2.747	0.228	<0.05	2.764	0.184	<0.05
$\beta_t$ [ton·ha <sup>-1</sup> ·yr <sup>-1</sup> ]	0.050	0.005	<0.05	0.025	0.003	<0.05	0.028	0.004	<0.05	0.021	0.004	<0.05
$\beta_{DI}$ [ton·ha <sup>-1</sup> ]	0.884	0.298	<0.05	0.195	0.055	<0.05	0.414	0.145	<0.05	-0.053	0.065	0.41
$\beta_{DI2}$ [ton·ha <sup>-1</sup> ]	-0.351	0.109	<0.05	-0.014	0.004	<0.05	-0.075	0.032	<0.05	0.001	0.005	0.77
$r^2_{marg}$	0.44			0.18			0.32			0.15		
$r^2_{cond}$	0.85			0.80			0.80			0.75		




Figure 5: Crop yield as a function of pre-growing dryness index (DI) based on the estimated length of legacy impacts for (a) winter wheat (3 months), (b) spring barley (3 months) and (c) spring wheat (2 months). The estimated yield is based on the fixed parts of the statistical models estimated for each crops separately. Time is set to 1992, the intermediate year in the study period 1965-2020. The ranges of the DIs correspond to the 5<sup>th</sup> and 95<sup>th</sup> percentiles of each indicator.

## 4 Discussion

### 4.1 Average conditions explained crop yields better than short-term conditions

Our models explained up to 85% of yield variability, in line with results of previous analyses relative to other climates (e.g., Luan et al., 2021; Ray et al., 2015; Zampieri et al., 2017). The models based on indicators representing including average conditions performed better than those representing based on short-term, but potentially damaging, conditions (Fig. 3). Although This is in contrast with observed negative effects of heatwaves (i.e., temperatures exceeding 28 or 30 °C) at flowering have been observed in spring barley in Finland and winter barley in Minnesota (Hakala et al., 2020; Sadok et al., 2022), models based on such short-term damaging conditions performed less well in our analysis. We surmise that this the lower performance of models based on short-term damaging conditions is in part due to their infrequent occurrence of short-term potentially damaging conditions in our records (e.g., few occurrences of days with average temperatures above 25 °C, or frost during sensitive developmental stages). Moreover, the effects of these short-term conditions are easily might be averaged out across the cropped land in each county, either because crops in different fields are not simultaneously

375 ~~at the most sensitive stage or~~ because of extreme-cancelling averaging of climatic conditions ~~or because crops in~~  
~~different fields might not be simultaneously at the most sensitive stage.~~

380 ~~Based on the AIC, models considering indicators relative to the entire (main) growing season had higher~~  
~~performance than those relative to sub-periods. Thus, crop yields were better explained by growing season~~  
~~conditions compared with those during a specific developmental stage, in line with. In accordance with our results,~~  
~~conditions during the entire growing season explained yield of spring cereals better than those of sub-periods~~  
~~results from analyses of data from~~ in long-term experiments in Sweden and Poland (Marini et al., 2020). This  
385 could be due to crops ~~managing to compensate~~ any unfavorable conditions during one period with ~~increased~~  
~~growth during other periods (Foulkes et al., 2011). Nevertheless, In contrast to our results, over larger climatic~~  
~~gradients, the period conditions~~ around and after flowering explained yields better than ~~those of these~~ entire  
390 growing season ~~over larger climatic gradients~~ (Hamed et al., 2022; Hoffman et al., 2020; Suliman et al., 2024).  
~~However, these large scale analyses, likely because these results refer to generally extended over~~ warmer  
~~conditions compared to in our study area, with temperatures at flowering likely exceeding the crop optimum.~~  
~~Moreover, crop development during the main growing season increases the relative importance of soil water~~  
~~evaporation and transpiration, and the dependence of the crop on water in the shallower layers, so that the same~~  
395 ~~precipitation amount has different effects on crop growth. There are also~~ We also acknowledge the ~~uncertainties~~  
~~inherent~~ in estimating ~~the~~ developmental stages through ~~a model models, such as that based on growing degree~~  
~~days used as done~~ here, instead of observations, and ~~by in considering assuming that~~ the model-estimated maturity  
400 date ~~to coincide~~ with the harvest date. ~~Despite performing worse according to the AIC, conditions relative to sub-~~  
~~periods of the (main) growing season, as well as pre- (main) growing dryness index explained a fraction of yield~~  
~~variance comparable to that of the conditions during the entire (main) growing season for all crops. As such,~~  
~~conditions during sub-periods add complementary information to what can be deduced from the entire (main)~~  
~~growing season.~~

405 The explanatory power of climatic conditions were lower for oats and spring barley yields compared with  
spring and winter wheat (Fig. 4). A possible explanation is that wheat yield data refer to southern Sweden only,  
410 whereas spring barley and oats are grown under a wider range of latitudes and hence ~~climatic conditions and other~~  
~~factors, such as including~~ soil ~~conditions characteristics~~ and day length. Moreover, the need to adapt to such a wide  
variety of conditions likely resulted in cultivation of different varieties, e.g. six- vs. two-row barley (Skoglund,  
2022), which was not explicitly considered in our ~~models analyses~~.

405 ~~Despite performing worse according to the AIC, conditions relative to sub-periods of the (main) growing~~  
~~season, as well as pre- (main) growing dryness index explained a fraction of yield variance comparable to that of~~  
~~the conditions during the entire (main) growing season for all crops. As such, conditions during sub-periods add~~  
~~complementary information to what can be deduced from the entire (main) growing season. Conditions~~  
~~before the main growing season can have practical relevance in terms of predicting water storage when~~  
~~precipitation is insufficient, and sowing date when the soil is water is saturated, as well as an early prediction of~~  
410 ~~low yields (Anand et al., 2024).~~

#### 4.34.2 Coordinated temperature and precipitation conditions maximized crop

##### yields

In the best performing models, temperature averages interacted with precipitation sum when explaining winter wheat and spring barley yields, and with the length of the longest dry spells for spring wheat and oats yields. We surmise there is no physiological reason behind the different precipitation indicators, due to negligible differences between the fractions of explained variance and high ranking of both options in all crops. Rather, the response patterns to both precipitation sum and CDD point to the importance of sufficient water availability.

The temperature at which yields neared approached their maxima increased with precipitation sums and decreased with dry spell length of the dry spells (Fig. 4), highlighting the strong interacting effects between of temperature and precipitation water availability. These pattern temperature by precipitation interactions are line consistent with analyses of survey analysis data across a of wider climatic gradients (e.g., Carter et al., 2018; Luan et al., 2021; Matiu et al., 2017) and ecophysiological evidence that crop response to temperature depends on water availability (e.g., Suzuki et al., 2014). In particular, increasing precipitation benefits yields only up to a point, beyond which excessive water can cause waterlogging and reduce the effect of absorbed solar (Díaz-Torres et al., 2017; Ewel, 1999), as also observed in Sweden and hence precipitation and temperature (Sjulgård et al., 2023).

Conversely, high temperatures combined with prolonged dry periods reduce yields through water and heat stress, lowering net photosynthesis and shortening the grain filling period (Fischer, 1985; Porter and Semenov, 2005; Slafer et al., 2023), ultimately producing smaller kernels and lower yields (Hatfield & Prueger, 2015). Yield losses from high temperatures can be partly offset by higher precipitation, which enhances evaporative cooling via transpiration, particularly in oats and wheat (Martin et al., 2012; Peltonen-Sainio et al., 2018; Schaubberger et al., 2017; Tack et al., 2015) (Martin et al., 2012; Schaubberger et al., 2017). At the opposite extreme, wet and cool conditions can also reduce yields (Sjulgård et al., 2023), (Fig. 3), as excessive soil moisture via waterlogging, which limits root functioning and growth. Both low precipitation and extended dry spells combined with high temperatures and, conversely, high precipitation sums under cool temperatures decreased yields, during the entire (main) growing season and pre-flowering period, in line w. In accordance with our results, yield declined with both excessive wetter water and dryer than normal conditions decreasing yields in across Sweden (Sjulgård et al., 2023). Indeed, co-occurring high temperature and reduced water availability, but also cold and wet conditions, undermine crop growth (Ewel, 1999). High temperatures combined with long dry periods reduced yields through water and heat stress, by decreasing lowering net photosynthesis and shortening the growth period (Fischer, 1985; Porter and Semenov, 2005; Slafer et al., 2023). However, yield losses due to high temperature averages were reduced by increasing precipitation (Peltonen Sainio et al., 2018; Schaubberger et al., 2017; Tack et al., 2015), facilitating evaporative cooling associated with transpiration, particularly for oats and wheat (Martin et al., 2012; Schaubberger et al., 2017). At the other extreme, wet and cool conditions was ere also damaging (Fig. 3) because such combination increases too high soil water content, can result in water logging, which in turn causinge oxygen deficiency and reduced growth (Tian et al., 2021) and/or reduced solar radiation (Díaz-Torres et al., 2017; Ewel, 1999).

The dryness index (DI) explained a fraction of yield variability that was lower than that of the best-performing model including precipitation and temperature indicators, but of comparable magnitude, consistent with findings from studies conducted across broader climatic gradients and under warmer conditions. (Luan et al., 2022). Its relatively high performance is the result of DI inherently capturing the interactive effects of temperature and precipitation, by combining precipitation with the potential evapotranspiration, which increases with temperature.

(Luan et al., 2022). Dryness index prior to the (main) growing season explained yields of all crops except oats, showing the importance of legacy effect and supporting its use as an early indicator of the final yield (Anand et al., 2024), possibly to guide management decision and planning, for example by informing the timing and location of sowing or the choice of crops. The period with the highest performance was 60-day period before the growing season for spring wheat yields, and 90 days for the other crops. The shorter period emerging for spring wheat might be due to this crop being grown exclusively in southern Sweden (Fig. 1), where snowpack is shallower than in the north, and hence the memory in the form of accumulated snow more limited. An increase in DI, i.e. an increase in temperature or a decrease in precipitation, was beneficial for winter wheat up to  $DI=1.2 \text{ mm}\cdot\text{mm}^{-1}$  and over most of the observed range for spring crops, although absolute changes in yields were small. High DI generally reduces soil saturation, which can advance sowing and benefit yields by improving field access (Trnka et al., 2011). Excessive soil moisture can increase nitrogen losses through denitrification and leaching (Guo et al., 2014). Further, a higher temperature can contribute to earlier snowmelt (Pan et al., 2022), reduced soil water and quicker warming in spring, that can hamper crop establishment due to rapid drying of superficial soil layers.

For the typical current pre-growing season DI (x-axis in Fig. 5) an increase in DI, i.e. an increase in temperature or a decrease in precipitation, was beneficial for spring crops, although absolute changes in yields were small. For winter wheat, increasing pre-main growing dryness up to intermediate DI of up to  $1.2 \text{ mm}\cdot\text{mm}^{-1}$  increased yield. Increasing DIs could be associated with reduced excessively wet soils that delay sowing and decrease yields. High DI generally reduces soil saturation, which can advance sowing and benefit yields by improving field access (Trnka et al., 2011). However, in northern regions where winter precipitation falls mainly as snow, soils remain wet longer due to late snowmelt, limiting this effect. For winter wheat, excessive soil moisture can increase nitrogen losses through denitrification and leaching (Guo et al., 2014). More generally, removal of excessive moisture enhances soil warming, facilitating early crop growth and development (Porter and Semenov, 2005).

Sowing time is determined by soil moisture content in shallow soil layers and field access to machinery (Trnka et al., 2011). For spring wheat, which that is grown in southern Sweden with little or no limited snow cover, a high DI is associated could reduce soil saturation and advance with early sowing, benefitting and consequent high yields. Conversely, in Northern Sweden, high winter precipitation is associated with deep is mostly in the form of snow and spring snowcover that takes longer time to melt occurs in the spring late, thus so that soils dry up slowly and sowing happens later. For winter wheat, excessive moist increases the risk of nitrogen losses through denitrification and leaching (Guo et al., 2014). For all crops, removal of excessive moist enhances increasing soil temperatures that facilitates early crop growth and development (Porter and Semenov, 2005).

During pre-flowering, the range of required precipitation for winter wheat was lower than for spring wheat (SI, Fig. S1-S2). This is likely a consequence of winter wheat being already established prior to the start of the main growing season, i.e. with deeper roots that can benefit from the soil water that does not immediately dry up access

larger water stores and help the crop during early season dry periods (He et al., 2020; Thorup-Kristensen et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2017).

### ~~Hot or wet days were the only short term conditions explaining yields~~

490 Among the considered short term conditions (Table 1), only wet days and hot days (i.e., days with temperature above 25 °C) substantially explained yields (SI, Table S1-S4). An intermediate number of wet days was associated to the maximum yields in all crops and periods, except for the pre-flowering period for spring wheat (SI, Table S2). This is in line with physiological evidence and statistical analyses showing that increasing precipitation is beneficial only to a point, beyond which the disadvantages caused by water logging and reduced solar radiation dominate (Díaz Torres et al., 2017). Hot days reduced yields in oats and spring barley (SI, Table S3-S4), in agreement with results from field experiments in Finland (Hakala et al., 2020). High temperatures during grain filling interfere with starch synthesis and shorten the grain filling period (Sofield et al., 1977), resulting in smaller. While grain filling is quicker at high temperatures, the final kernels become smaller and therefore lower high temperatures reduce yields (Hatfield & Prueger, 2015).

### 500 4.54.3 Implications under climate change

Climate indicators and timeOur models, explaining a large fraction of yield variability, can explained up to 85% of crop yield variability, in line with results from other climates or extending globally (e.g., Luan et al., 2021; Ray et al., 2015; Zampieri et al., 2017). As such, t These indicators provide insights into the effects of specific climatic conditions on cereals in Northern Europe, including future climates, due to the region's similar climate patterns and crop varieties. The selected indicators can provide insights on the impact of specific climatic conditions on cereals grown also under Northern European, including under future climates.

Under conditions like those of the Northern Europe, warming is often presumed to be beneficial for crops thanks to lengthened growing season (Slafer et al., 2023; Wiréhn, 2018). Rising CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations could further support crop production by increasing photosynthesis and improving water-use efficiency (Rezaei et al., 2023). In Sweden, the average annual temperature is expected to increase by 2-6 °C by the end of the century, depending on greenhouse gas emission scenarios (IPCC, 2021). At the same time, Total annual precipitation is projected to increase with climate change in Sweden (Grusson et al., 2021; Teutschbein et al., 2023b), but but precipitation with increases are expected to concentrated in occur during the winter and, with no change or even a slight decrease during summer (Breinl et al., 2020). The average annual temperature is expected to increase by 2-6 °C by the end of the century, depending on greenhouse gas emission scenarios (IPCC, 2021). At the same time Furthermore, Climate change is expected to intensify hot and dry damaging periods, such as making the the prolonged 2018 warm drought common- (Toreti et al., 2019), potentially making these conditions the new norm and shifting precipitation toward more frequent short, intense events while reducing growing-season water availability (Toreti et al., 2019). Considering the projected warming, plant water availability is likely to decrease during the (main) growing season, when it is most relevant for the crops. Short term intense precipitation can also become more frequent (Westra et al., 2014).

Our models clearly show that :

In most locations globally, warming has negative effects on crops yields, as it accelerates development, leading to shorter growth periods, and reduced accumulation of biomass before flowering and grains (Foulkes et al., 2011).

525 ~~Although this pattern has been observed also at high latitudes e.g. in Finland (Peltonen-Sainio et al., 2011, 2015),~~  
~~in the Nordic regions warmer temperatureswarming is are often expected to be benefit crops~~~~cial by lengthening~~  
~~the growing season (Slafer et al., 2023; Wiréhn, 2018), whereas in already warm regions additional warming~~  
~~generally reduces yields (Foulkes et al., 2011). R~~

530 ~~(Rezaei et al., 2023), using CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations may further support cereal production in these regions by~~  
~~increasing photosynthesis and improving water use efficiency (Rezaei et al., 2023). Our results show that warming~~  
~~benefited yields only when precipitation increased or dry spells shortened, otherwise; warming reduced~~  
~~the yields declined across all crops~~~~Although this pattern has been observed also at high latitudes e.g. in Finland~~  
~~(Peltonen-Sainio et al., 2011, 2015). However, our results showed that benefits from higher temperatures were~~  
~~were beneficial only achieved when precipitation was higherincreased or dry spells shortened at the same time.~~  
535 ~~Conversely, warming reduced yields of all crops with reduced or maintained average precipitation and maximum~~  
~~length of dry spells (Fig. 4). As such, the joint-combined effects of projectedthe expected changes in temperature~~  
~~and precipitation in Sweden mayight beis negative (Grusson et al., 2021), particularly in southern Sweden where~~  
~~precipitation is already limited and crops correlated negatively with temperature (Sjulgård et al., 2023; Skoglund,~~  
~~2022; Wallén, 1917). In line with our results, yields were reduced by 50% on average in 2018 in Sweden (Beillouin~~  
540 ~~et al., 2020; Statistiska-Meddlanden, 2018), when summer temperature was on average 2.8 °C warmer than the~~  
~~1981-2010 average temperatures and CDDthe maximum dry spell length was on average 37 days, against a~~  
~~mean ofmore than three times the long-term mean of 11.5 days in May August 1950-2020 (Teutschbein et al.,~~  
~~2023a; Wilcke et al., 2020). Our results also point to Climate change is expected to make more frequent and~~  
~~intensify dry and hot periods, like the persistent long and dry conditions that occurred in 2018 (included in our~~  
545 ~~data), making the adverse climatic conditions the new norm in the near future (Toreti et al., 2019).~~

~~Short term intense precipitation can also become more frequent (Westra et al., 2014), causing mechanical~~  
~~damage or increase excessive soil water (Iizumi et al., 2024). Aabundant precipitation currently werebeing~~  
~~associated towith reduced yields, althoughalthough they had low explanatory power (Fig. 3, SI, Tables S1-S4). As~~  
~~their frequency increases, the mechanical damage or increased frequency of excessive soil water (Iizumi et al.,~~  
550 ~~2024) might become more common, partly due to infrequent occurrence of extreme precipitation events during~~  
~~the study period.~~

Crops had their highest yields at (main) growing season temperature averages between of 12 and 14 °C during  
~~the (main) growing season~~. Cultivars bred and sown in Sweden have so far been selected to perform best under  
~~these~~ cool temperatures, with and short growing seasons, compensated by long days lengths (Hakala et al., 2012).  
555 ~~If w~~Warmer conditions locally result in exceeding this range, might call for new, betterwarm-adapted varieties  
~~will be necessary~~. At the same time, with-increasing temperatures, might push northward the optimal ranges of  
~~can be achieved~~ climatic conditions for crop growth beyond central-Sweden, opening new possibilities for wheat  
where it has been historically difficult to cultivate it (Elsgaard et al., 2012).

~~The timing of sowing of spring erocrops is and will remain critical under climate change, offering and~~  
560 ~~represent~~ an important adaptation measure. High soil water contentmoisture in spring can delays sowing of spring  
~~crops, while warmer temperatures may might allow an earlier start, enabling better use of winter-stored soil~~  
~~water. Increasing temperatures allows an earlier start of the growing season, thus facilitating the use of winter~~  
~~accumulated soil water can be used better and increase yields. However, higher summer temperatures counteract~~

565 this positive effect by e.g. shortening the grain filling period (Sofield et al., 1977; Zhou et al., 2024). ~~Thus, the negative effect of increasing temperatures can to some extent be alleviated by shifting the growing season.~~

570 ~~The timing of sowing of spring crop is and will remain critical under climate change. High soil water content in spring delays sowing of spring crops. On the contrary, soon after the optimal sowing time, soil moisture in superficial soil layers becomes too low to allow satisfactory germination and establishment of crops. There is therefore a relatively small time-window that allows for sowing of spring crops between these two contrasting contributions of water. Climate change may could further reduce this window, as higher temperatures increase soil water evaporation, While early-season precipitation, already limited in Sweden, may is expected to decline further, potentially compromising crop establishment without irrigation. It is possible that future climates will not only shift but also further reduce such window of opportunity. Higher temperatures will cause faster soil water evaporation. This can advance sowing, by allowing earlier access to the field by the heavy machinery required for crop establishment. At the same time, low precipitation early in the growing season is common even for current climates in Sweden. Under climate change, insufficient precipitation can become more intense (Peltonen-Sainio et al., 2021), making establishment of spring crops difficult without irrigation.~~

580 ~~Another common-promising~~ adaptation to warmer and drier growing seasons is to replace spring cereals with winter wheat and other winter cereals. Winter cereals are already well established at the onset of the main growing season. They can, thus, handle precipitation deficits better than spring cereals, thanks to their more extensive root system that allow access to water deeper in the soil (Thorup-Kristensen et al., 2020). However, high precipitation in winter through climate change, combined with high temperatures will result in lower snow accumulation (Tootoonchi et al., 2023) that can negatively impact winter crops, due to the damaging effects of cold spells without the mitigating effects of snow (Vico et al., 2014). Milder winters can also facilitate damage from repeated freezing and thawing cycles or snow mold development (Andrews, 1996). As such, the net effects of altered winter and spring conditions on winter crops need further examination. An alternative adaptation measure to reduce failure risk from both insufficient and excessive water is mixing crops or varieties with different rooting depths and architectures allowing for the use of water at different depths (Manevska-Tasevska et al., 2024).

## 5 Conclusions

590 We systematically evaluated the role of various climatic indicators on explaining county-level cereal yields in Sweden for the period 1965-2020. Average growing season temperatures and precipitation totals, or maximum dry spell length explained yields best. Pre- and post- flowering, as well as pre- (main) growing season climatic conditions had a comparable range of explained variance, whereas short-term potentially damaging conditions, such as hot days and intense rainfall events, had the lowest explanatory power. High temperatures were associated with high yields, but only with adequate precipitation or sufficiently short dry spells. While we focused on crop yields in Sweden, our findings are likely applicable also to other high latitude regions.

600 Our results provide insights into the potential effects of climate change on crop yields at high latitudes. While warmer temperatures allow for wider areas to be cultivated by current crops, increasing temperature through climate change will not necessarily result in higher yields, if total precipitation during the main growing season does not increase. The potentially damaging short-term conditions were rare in the study period and did not explain yields, but they can become more frequent in the future. Adaptation to climate change will thus likely be necessary.

*Code and data availability:* Crop yield data is freely available from Statistics Sweden (Statistikdatabasen). Climatic data and land cover data are publicly available from E-Obs dataset (Cornes et al., 2018) and Corine land cover maps (European Environment Agency, 2020). All runs and analysis were performed with the Matlab coding language.

*Author contributions.* FT: Conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, data curation, visualization, software, writing and editing. GB: review and editing. GV: Conceptualization, methodology, supervision, funding acquisition, review and editing.

*Competing interests.* Authors declare no competing interests.

*Acknowledgments.* We acknowledge the partial support of the Swedish Research Council for Sustainable Development (FORMAS) (grant number 2023-02530). We also acknowledge the E-OBS dataset from the Copernicus Climate Change Service (C3S, <https://surfobs.climate.copernicus.eu>) and the data providers in the ECA&D project (<https://www.ecad.eu>).

## References

- 615 Addor, N., Nearing, G., Prieto, C., Newman, A. J., Le Vine, N., and Clark, M. P.: A Ranking of Hydrological Signatures Based on Their Predictability in Space, *Water Resour. Res.*, 54, 8792–8812, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018WR022606>, 2018.
- Adger, W. N.: Vulnerability, *Glob. Environ. Change*, 16, 268–281, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2006.02.006>, 2006.
- 620 Alizadeh, M. R., Adamowski, J., Nikoo, M. R., AghaKouchak, A., Dennison, P., and Sadegh, M.: A century of observations reveals increasing likelihood of continental-scale compound dry-hot extremes, *Sci. Adv.*, 6, 1–12, <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aaz4571>, 2020.
- Anand, M., Hamed, R., Linscheid, N., Silva, P. S., Andre, J., Zscheischler, J., Garry, F. K., and Bastos, A.: Winter climate preconditioning of summer vegetation extremes in the Northern Hemisphere, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 19, 094045, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ad627d>, 2024.
- 625 Andrews, C. J.: How Do Plants Survive Ice?, *Ann. Bot.*, 78, 529–536, <https://doi.org/10.1006/anbo.1996.0157>, 1996.
- Climate indicator - Snow | SMHI: <https://www.smhi.se/en/climate/climate-indicators/climate-indicator-snow-1.188971>, last access: 28 December 2023.
- 630 Barnabás, B., Jäger, K., and Fehér, A.: The effect of drought and heat stress on reproductive processes in cereals, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 31, 11–38, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3040.2007.01727.x>, 2008.
- Barnes, C. J., van der Gast, C. J., McNamara, N. P., Rowe, R., and Bending, G. D.: Extreme rainfall affects assembly of the root-associated fungal community, *New Phytol.*, 220, 1172–1184, <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.14990>, 2018.
- 635 Barron-Gafford, G. A., Scott, R. L., Jenerette, G. D., Hamerlynck, E. P., and Huxman, T. E.: Temperature and precipitation controls over leaf- and ecosystem-level CO<sub>2</sub> flux along a woody plant encroachment gradient, *Glob. Change Biol.*, 18, 1389–1400, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2011.02599.x>, 2012.

- 640 Becker, P.: Chapter 4 - Our Disturbances, Disruptions and Disasters in a Dynamic World, in: Sustainability Science, edited by: Becker, P., Elsevier, 57–119, <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-62709-4.00004-X>, 2014.
- Beillouin, D., Schauburger, B., Bastos, A., Ciais, P., and Makowski, D. M.: Impact of extreme weather conditions on European crop production in 2018, *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*, 2020.
- 645 Bindi, M. and Olesen, J. E.: The responses of agriculture in Europe to climate change, *Reg. Environ. Change*, 11, 151–158, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-010-0173-x>, 2011.
- Breinl, K., Di Baldassarre, G., Mazzoleni, M., Lun, D., and Vico, G.: Extreme dry and wet spells face changes in their duration and timing, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 15, 2020.
- 650 Bürger, J., Günther, A., de Mol, F., and Gerowitt, B.: Analysing the influence of crop management on pesticide use intensity while controlling for external sources of variability with Linear Mixed Effects Models, *Agric. Syst.*, 111, 13–22, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agry.2012.05.002>, 2012.
- Caparros-Santiago, J. A., Rodriguez-Galiano, V., and Dash, J.: Land surface phenology as indicator of global terrestrial ecosystem dynamics: A systematic review, *ISPRS J. Photogramm. Remote Sens.*, 171, 330–347, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isprsjprs.2020.11.019>, 2021.
- 655 Carter, E. K., Melkonian, J., Steinschneider, S., and Riha, S. J.: Rainfed maize yield response to management and climate covariability at large spatial scales, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 256–257, 242–252, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2018.02.029>, 2018.
- Copernicus Climate Change Service: Agroclimatic indicators from 1951 to 2099 derived from climate projections, <https://doi.org/10.24381/CDS.DAD6E055>, 2019.
- 660 Cornes, R. C., van der Schrier, G., van den Besselaar, E. J. M., and Jones, P. D.: An Ensemble Version of the E-OBS Temperature and Precipitation Data Sets, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmospheres*, 123, 9391–9409, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2017JD028200>, 2018.
- 665 Costa, A., Bommarco, R., Smith, M. E., Bowles, T., Gaudin, A. C. M., Watson, C. A., Alarcón, R., Berti, A., Blecharczyk, A., Calderon, F. J., Culman, S., Deen, W., Drury, C. F., Garcia y Garcia, A., García-Díaz, A., Hernández Plaza, E., Jonczyk, K., Jäck, O., Navarrete Martínez, L., Montemurro, F., Morari, F., Onofri, A., Osborne, S. L., Tenorio Pasamón, J. L., Sandström, B., Santín-Montanyá, I., Sawinska, Z., Schmer, M. R., Stalenga, J., Strock, J., Tei, F., Topp, C. F. E., Ventrella, D., Walker, R. L., and Vico, G.: Crop rotational diversity can mitigate climate-induced grain yield losses, *Glob. Change Biol.*, 30, e17298, <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.17298>, 2024.
- 670 De Toro, A., Eckersten, H., Nkurunziza, L., and Von Rosen, D.: Effects of extreme weather on yield of major arable crops in Sweden, *Rapp. För Energi Och Tek. SLU*, 2015.
- Díaz-Torres, J. J., Hernández-Mena, L., Murillo-Tovar, M. A., León-Becerril, E., López-López, A., Suárez-Plascencia, C., Aviña-Rodríguez, E., Barradas-Gimate, A., and Ojeda-Castillo, V.: Assessment of the modulation effect of rainfall on solar radiation availability at the Earth's surface, *Meteorol. Appl.*, 24, 180–190, <https://doi.org/10.1002/met.1616>, 2017.
- 675 Dolferus, R., Ji, X., and Richards, R. A.: Abiotic stress and control of grain number in cereals, *Plant Sci. Int. J. Exp. Plant Biol.*, 181, 331–341, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plantsci.2011.05.015>, 2011.
- Elsgaard, L., Børgesen, C. D., Olesen, J. E., Siebert, S., Ewert, F., Peltonen-Sainio, P., Rötter, R. P., and Skjelvåg, A. O.: Shifts in comparative advantages for maize, oat and wheat cropping under

- 680 climate change in Europe, *Food Addit. Contam. Part A*, 29, 1514–1526, <https://doi.org/10.1080/19440049.2012.700953>, 2012.
- European Environment Agency: CORINE Land Cover 2006 (raster 100 m), Europe, 6-yearly - version 2020\_20u1, May 2020, <https://doi.org/10.2909/08560441-2fd5-4eb9-bf4c-9ef16725726a>, 2020.
- 685 Ewel, J. J.: Natural systems as models for the design of sustainable systems of land use, *Agrofor. Syst.*, 45, 1–21, <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006219721151>, 1999.
- Fischer, R. A.: Number of kernels in wheat crops and the influence of solar radiation and temperature, *J. Agric. Sci.*, 105, 447–461, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021859600056495>, 1985.
- 690 Fontrodona-Bach, A., Schaeffli, B., Woods, R., Teuling, A. J., and Larsen, J. R.: NH-SWE: Northern Hemisphere Snow Water Equivalent dataset based on in situ snow depth time series, *Earth Syst. Sci. Data*, 15, 2577–2599, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-15-2577-2023>, 2023.
- Foulkes, M. J., Slafer, G. A., Davies, W. J., Berry, P. M., Sylvester-Bradley, R., Martre, P., Calderini, D. F., Griffiths, S., and Reynolds, M. P.: Raising yield potential of wheat. III. Optimizing partitioning to grain while maintaining lodging resistance, *J. Exp. Bot.*, 62, 469–486, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erq300>, 2011.
- 695 François, B. and Vrac, M.: Time of emergence of compound events: contribution of univariate and dependence properties, *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, 23, 21–44, <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-23-21-2023>, 2023.
- 700 Grusson, Y., Wesström, I., and Joel, A.: Impact of climate change on Swedish agriculture: Growing season rain deficit and irrigation need, *Agric. Water Manag.*, 251, 106858, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2021.106858>, 2021.
- Guo, Z., Zhang, Y., Zhao, J., Shi, Y., and Yu, Z.: Nitrogen use by winter wheat and changes in soil nitrate nitrogen levels with supplemental irrigation based on measurement of moisture content in various soil layers, *Field Crops Res.*, 164, 117–125, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2014.05.016>, 2014.
- 705 Hakala, K., Jauhiainen, L., Himanen, S. J., Rötter, R., Salo, T., and Kahiluoto, H.: Sensitivity of barley varieties to weather in Finland, *J. Agric. Sci.*, 150, 145–160, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021859611000694>, 2012.
- 710 Hakala, K., Jauhiainen, L., Rajala, A. A., Jalli, M., Kujala, M., and Laine, A.: Different responses to weather events may change the cultivation balance of spring barley and oats in the future, *Field Crops Res.*, 259, 107956, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2020.107956>, 2020.
- Hamed, R., Vijverberg, S., Van Loon, A. F., Aerts, J., and Coumou, D.: Persistent La Niña's favor joint soybean harvest failures in North and South America, *EGUsphere*, 1–25, <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-960>, 2022.
- 715 Hamon, W. R.: Estimating potential evaporation, in: *Proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers, Division, J.o.H.*, 107–120, 1961.
- Hatfield, J. L. and Prueger, J. H.: Temperature extremes: Effect on plant growth and development, *Weather Clim. Extrem.*, 10, 4–10, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wace.2015.08.001>, 2015.

- 720 He, D., Fang, S., Liang, H., Wang, E., and Wu, D.: Contrasting yield responses of winter and spring wheat to temperature rise in China, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 15, 124038, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/abc71a>, 2020.
- Heikonen, S., Heino, M., Jalava, M., Siebert, S., Viviroli, D., and Kummu, M.: Climate change threatens crop diversity at low latitudes, *Nat. Food*, 6, 331–342, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-025-01135-w>, 2025.
- 725 Hoffman, A. L., Kemanian, A. R., and Forest, C. E.: The response of maize, sorghum, and soybean yield to growing-phase climate revealed with machine learning, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 15, 094013, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab7b22>, 2020.
- 730 Iizumi, T., Iseki, K., Ikazaki, K., Sakai, T., Shiogama, H., Imada, Y., and Batieno, B. J.: Increasing heavy rainfall events and associated excessive soil water threaten a protein-source legume in dry environments of West Africa, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 344, 109783, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2023.109783>, 2024.
- IPCC: Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Masson-Delmotte, V., P. Zhai, A. Pirani, S. L. Connors, C. Péan, S. Berger, N. Caud, Y. Chen, Camb. Univ. Press, 3949, 2021.
- 735 Jackson, E. D., Casolaro, C., Nebeker, R. S., Scott, E. R., Dukes, J. S., Griffin, T. S., and Orians, C. M.: Current and legacy effects of precipitation treatments on growth and nutrition in contrasting crops, *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, 352, 108513, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2023.108513>, 2023.
- Juhola, S., Klein, N., Käyhkö, J., and Schmid Neset, T.-S.: Climate change transformations in Nordic agriculture?, *J. Rural Stud.*, 51, 28–36, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2017.01.013>, 2017.
- 740 Kaseva, J., Hakala, K., Högnäsbacka, M., Jauhiainen, L., Himanen, S. J., Rötter, R. P., Balek, J., Trnka, M., and Kahiluoto, H.: Assessing climate resilience of barley cultivars in northern conditions during 1980–2020, *Field Crops Res.*, 293, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2023.108856>, 2023.
- Lesk, C., Coffel, E., and Horton, R.: Net benefits to US soy and maize yields from intensifying hourly rainfall, *Nat. Clim. Change*, 10, 819–822, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-020-0830-0>, 2020.
- 745 Lesk, C., Anderson, W., Rigden, A., Coast, O., Jägermeyr, J., McDermid, S., Davis, K. F., and Konar, M.: Compound heat and moisture extreme impacts on global crop yields under climate change, *Nat. Rev. Earth Environ.*, 3, 872–889, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-022-00368-8>, 2022.
- Li, Y., Guan, K., Schnitkey, G. D., DeLucia, E., and Peng, B.: Excessive rainfall leads to maize yield loss of a comparable magnitude to extreme drought in the United States, *Glob. Change Biol.*, 25, 2325–2337, <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14628>, 2019.
- 750 Luan, X., Bommarco, R., Scaini, A., and Vico, G.: Combined heat and drought suppress rainfed maize and soybean yields and modify irrigation benefits in the USA, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 16, 064023, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/abfc76>, 2021.
- 755 Luan, X., Bommarco, R., and Vico, G.: Coordinated evaporative demand and precipitation maximize rainfed maize and soybean crop yields in the USA, *Ecohydrology*, <https://doi.org/10.1002/eco.2500>, 2022.

- Lüttger, A. B. and Feike, T.: Development of heat and drought related extreme weather events and their effect on winter wheat yields in Germany, *Theor. Appl. Climatol.*, 132, 15–29, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-017-2076-y>, 2018.
- 760 Mäkinen, H., Kaseva, J., Trnka, M., Balek, J., Kersebaum, K. C., Nendel, C., Gobin, A., Olesen, J. E., Bindi, M., Ferrise, R., Moriondo, M., Rodríguez, A., Ruiz-Ramos, M., Takáč, J., Bezák, P., Ventrella, D., Ruget, F., Capellades, G., and Kahiluoto, H.: Sensitivity of European wheat to extreme weather, *Field Crops Res.*, 222, 209–217, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2017.11.008>, 2018.
- 765 Manevska-Tasevska, G., Huang, V. W., Chen, Z., Jäck, O., Adam, N., Ha, T. M., Weih, M., and Hansson, H.: Economic outcomes from adopting cereal-legume intercropping practices in Sweden, *Agric. Syst.*, 220, 104064, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2024.104064>, 2024.
- Manning, C., Widmann, M., Maraun, D., Van Loon, A. F., and Bevacqua, E.: Large spread in the representation of compound long-duration dry and hot spells over Europe in CMIP5, *Weather Clim. Dyn.*, 4, 309–329, <https://doi.org/10.5194/wcd-4-309-2023>, 2023.
- 770 Marini, L., St-Martin, A., Vico, G., Baldoni, G., Berti, A., Blecharczyk, A., Malecka-Jankowiak, I., Morari, F., Sawinska, Z., and Bommarco, R.: Crop rotations sustain cereal yields under a changing climate, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 15, 124011, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/abc651>, 2020.
- Martin, R. J., Jamieson, P. D., Gillespie, R. N., and Maley, S.: Effect of timing and intensity of drought on the yield of Oats (*Avena sativa* L.), 2012.
- 775 Martyniak, L.: Response of spring cereals to a deficit of atmospheric precipitation in the particular stages of plant growth and development, *Agric. Water Manag.*, 95, 171–178, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2007.10.014>, 2008.
- Masupha, T. E., Moeletsi, M. E., and Tsubo, M.: Dry spells assessment with reference to the maize crop in the Luvuvhu River catchment of South Africa, *Phys. Chem. Earth Parts ABC*, 92, 99–111, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pce.2015.10.014>, 2016.
- 780 Matiu, M., Ankerst, D. P., and Menzel, A.: Interactions between temperature and drought in global and regional crop yield variability during 1961-2014, *PLOS ONE*, 12, e0178339, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0178339>, 2017.
- McMillan, H. K.: A review of hydrologic signatures and their applications, *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Water*, 8, 1–23, <https://doi.org/10.1002/wat2.1499>, 2021.
- 785 Miedema, P.: The Effects of Low Temperature on Zea mays, in: *Advances in Agronomy*, vol. 35, edited by: Brady, N. C., Academic Press, 93–128, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2113\(08\)60322-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2113(08)60322-3), 1982.
- 790 Minoli, S., Jägermeyr, J., Asseng, S., Urfels, A., and Müller, C.: Global crop yields can be lifted by timely adaptation of growing periods to climate change, *Nat. Commun.*, 13, 7079, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-34411-5>, 2022.
- Mitra, M. K. and Stickler, F. C.: Excess Water Effects on Different Crops, *Trans. Kans. Acad. Sci.* 1903-, 64, 275–286, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3626753>, 1961.
- 795 Nakagawa, S. and Schielzeth, H.: A general and simple method for obtaining R<sup>2</sup> from generalized linear mixed-effects models, *Methods Ecol. Evol.*, 4, 133–142, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-210x.2012.00261.x>, 2013.

- Olesen, J. E., Trnka, M., Kersebaum, K. C., Skjelvåg, A. O., Seguin, B., Peltonen-Sainio, P., Rossi, F., Kozyra, J., and Micale, F.: Impacts and adaptation of European crop production systems to climate change, *Eur. J. Agron.*, 34, 96–112, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2010.11.003>, 2011.
- 800 Olesen, J. E., Børjesen, C. D., Elsgaard, L., Palosuo, T., Rötter, R. P., Skjelvåg, A. O., Peltonen-Sainio, P., Börjesson, T., Trnka, M., Ewert, F., Siebert, S., Brisson, N., Eitzinger, J., van Asselt, E. D., Oberforster, M., and van der Fels-Klerx, H. J.: Changes in time of sowing, flowering and maturity of cereals in Europe under climate change, *Food Addit. Contam. Part A*, 29, 1527–1542, <https://doi.org/10.1080/19440049.2012.712060>, 2012.
- 805 Ortiz-Bobea, A., Ault, T. R., Carrillo, C. M., Chambers, R. G., and Lobell, D. B.: Anthropogenic climate change has slowed global agricultural productivity growth, *Nat. Clim. Change*, 11, 306–312, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-021-01000-1>, 2021.
- Pan, M., Zhao, F., Ma, J., Zhang, L., Qu, J., Xu, L., and Li, Y.: Effect of Snow Cover on Spring Soil Moisture Content in Key Agricultural Areas of Northeast China, *Sustainability*, 14, 1527, <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031527>, 2022.
- 810 Peltonen-Sainio, P., Jauhiainen, L., Sorvali, J., Laurila, H., and Rajala, A.: Field characteristics driving farm-scale decision-making on land allocation to primary crops in high latitude conditions, *Land Use Policy*, 71, 49–59, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2017.11.040>, 2018.
- 815 Peltonen-Sainio, P., Sorvali, J., and Kaseva, J.: Finnish farmers' views towards fluctuating and changing precipitation patterns pave the way for the future, *Agric. Water Manag.*, 255, 107011, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2021.107011>, 2021.
- Porter, J. R. and Semenov, M. A.: Crop responses to climatic variation, *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*, 360, 2021–2035, <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2005.1752>, 2005.
- 820 Praba, M. L., Cairns, J. E., Babu, R. C., and Lafitte, H. R.: Identification of Physiological Traits Underlying Cultivar Differences in Drought Tolerance in Rice and Wheat, *J. Agron. Crop Sci.*, 195, 30–46, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-037X.2008.00341.x>, 2009.
- Ray, D. K., Gerber, J. S., MacDonald, G. K., and West, P. C.: Climate variation explains a third of global crop yield variability, *Nat. Commun.*, 6, 5989, <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms6989>, 2015.
- 825 Rezaei, E. E., Webber, H., Asseng, S., Boote, K., Durand, J. L., Ewert, F., Martre, P., and MacCarthy, D. S.: Climate change impacts on crop yields, *Nat. Rev. Earth Environ.*, 4, 831–846, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-023-00491-0>, 2023.
- Riha, S. J., Wilks, D. S., and Simoens, P.: Impact of temperature and precipitation variability on crop model predictions, *Clim. Change*, 32, 293–311, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00142466>, 1996.
- 830 Sadok, W., Wiersma, J. J., Steffenson, B. J., Snapp, S. S., and Smith, K. P.: Improving winter barley adaptation to freezing and heat stresses in the U.S. Midwest: bottlenecks and opportunities, *Field Crops Res.*, 286, 108635, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2022.108635>, 2022.
- Statistikdatabasen:  
[https://www.statistikdatabasen.scb.se/pxweb/sv/ssd/START\\_\\_JO\\_\\_JO0601/SkordarL2/](https://www.statistikdatabasen.scb.se/pxweb/sv/ssd/START__JO__JO0601/SkordarL2/).
- Schauberger, B., Archontoulis, S., Arneth, A., Balkovic, J., Ciais, P., Deryng, D., Elliott, J., Folberth, C., Khabarov, N., Müller, C., Pugh, T. A. M., Rolinski, S., Schaphoff, S., Schmid, E., Wang, X., Schlenker,

- 835 W., and Frieler, K.: Consistent negative response of US crops to high temperatures in observations and crop models, *Nat. Commun.*, 8, 13931, <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms13931>, 2017.
- Schmidt, M. and Felsche, E.: The effect of climate change on crop yield anomaly in Europe, *Clim. Resil. Sustain.*, 3, e261, <https://doi.org/10.1002/cli2.61>, 2024.
- 840 Schneider, D. P., Deser, C., Fasullo, J., and Trenberth, K. E.: Climate Data Guide Spurs Discovery and Understanding, *Eos Trans. Am. Geophys. Union*, 94, 121–122, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2013EO130001>, 2013.
- Schreiber, J. D.: Nutrient Leaching from Corn Residues under Simulated Rainfall, *J. Environ. Qual.*, 28, 1864–1870, <https://doi.org/10.2134/jeq1999.00472425002800060024x>, 1999.
- 845 Senapati, N., Halford, N. G., and Semenov, M. A.: Vulnerability of European wheat to extreme heat and drought around flowering under future climate, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 16, 024052, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/abdcd3>, 2021.
- Siebert, S., Webber, H., Zhao, G., and Ewert, F.: Heat stress is overestimated in climate impact studies for irrigated agriculture, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 12, 054023, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aa702f>, 2017.
- 850 Sjulgård, H., Keller, T., Garland, G., and Colombi, T.: Relationships between weather and yield anomalies vary with crop type and latitude in Sweden, *Agric. Syst.*, 211, 103757, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2023.103757>, 2023.
- Skoglund, M. K.: Climate variability and grain production in Scania, 1702–1911, *Clim. Past*, 18, 405–433, <https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-18-405-2022>, 2022.
- 855 Slafer, G. A., Savin, R., and Sadras, V. O.: Wheat yield is not causally related to the duration of the growing season, *Eur. J. Agron.*, 148, 126885, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2023.126885>, 2023.
- Smith, A. B., Cullis, B. R., and Thompson, R.: The analysis of crop cultivar breeding and evaluation trials: an overview of current mixed model approaches, *J. Agric. Sci.*, 143, 449–462, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021859605005587>, 2005.
- 860 Sofield, I., Evans, L. T., Cook, M. G., and Wardlaw, I. F.: Factors Influencing the Rate and Duration of Grain Filling in Wheat, *Funct. Plant Biol.*, 4, 785–797, <https://doi.org/10.1071/pp9770785>, 1977.
- Song, B., Niu, S., and Wan, S.: Precipitation regulates plant gas exchange and its long-term response to climate change in a temperate grassland, *J. Plant Ecol.*, 9, 531–541, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jpe/rtw010>, 2016.
- 865 Spearman, C.: The {Proof} and {Measurement} of {Association} between {Two} {Things}, *Am J Psychol*, 15, 72–101, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyq191>, 1904.
- Statistiska-Meddelanden: Skörd av spannmål, trindsäd, oljeväxter och slåttervall 2018. Sveriges officiella statistik., 2018.
- 870 Suliman, M., Scaini, A., Manzoni, S., and Vico, G.: Soil properties modulate actual evapotranspiration and precipitation impacts on crop yields in the USA, *Sci. Total Environ.*, 949, 175172, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2024.175172>, 2024.

- Suzuki, N., Rivero, R. M., Shulaev, V., Blumwald, E., and Mittler, R.: Abiotic and biotic stress combinations, *New Phytol.*, 203, 32–43, <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.12797>, 2014.
- 875 Tack, J., Barkley, A., and Nalley, L. L.: Effect of warming temperatures on US wheat yields, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 112, 6931–6936, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1415181112>, 2015.
- Teutschbein, C., Albrecht, F., Blicharska, M., Tootoonchi, F., Stenfors, E., and Grabs, T.: Drought hazards and stakeholder perception: Unraveling the interlinkages between drought severity, perceived impacts, preparedness, and management, *Ambio*, 52, 1262–1281, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-023-01849-w>, 2023a.
- 880 Teutschbein, C., Jonsson, E., Todorović, A., Tootoonchi, F., Stenfors, E., and Grabs, T.: Future drought propagation through the water-energy-food-ecosystem nexus – A Nordic perspective, *J. Hydrol.*, 617, 128963, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2022.128963>, 2023b.
- 885 Thiery, W., Lange, S., Rogelj, J., Schleussner, C.-F., Gudmundsson, L., Seneviratne, S. I., Andrijevic, M., Frieler, K., Emanuel, K., Geiger, T., Bresch, D. N., Zhao, F., Willner, S. N., Büchner, M., Volkholz, J., Bauer, N., Chang, J., Ciais, P., Dury, M., François, L., Grillakis, M., Gosling, S. N., Hanasaki, N., Hickler, T., Huber, V., Ito, A., Jägermeyr, J., Khabarov, N., Koutroulis, A., Liu, W., Lutz, W., Mengel, M., Müller, C., Ostberg, S., Reyer, C. P. O., Stacke, T., and Wada, Y.: Intergenerational inequities in exposure to climate extremes, *Science*, 374, 158–160, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abi7339>, 2021.
- 890 Thorup-Kristensen, K., Halberg, N., Nicolaisen, M., Olesen, J. E., Crews, T. E., Hinsinger, P., Kirkegaard, J., Pierret, A., and Dresbøll, D. B.: Digging Deeper for Agricultural Resources, the Value of Deep Rooting, *Trends Plant Sci.*, 25, 406–417, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2019.12.007>, 2020.
- Tian, L., Zhang, Y., Chen, P., Zhang, F., Li, J., Yan, F., Dong, Y., and Feng, B.: How Does the Waterlogging Regime Affect Crop Yield? A Global Meta-Analysis, *Front. Plant Sci.*, 12, 634898, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2021.634898>, 2021.
- 895 Todorovic, A., Grabs, T., and Teutschbein, C.: Advancing Traditional Strategies for Testing Hydrological Model Fitness in a Changing Climate, *J. Hydrol.*, 2022.
- Tootoonchi, F., Haerter, J. O., Rätty, O., Todorovic, A., Grabs, T., and Teutschbein, C.: Uni- and multivariate bias adjustment methods in Nordic catchments: Complexity and performance in a changing climate, *Sci. Total Environ.*, 2022.
- 900 Tootoonchi, F., Todorović, A., Grabs, T., and Teutschbein, C.: Uni- and multivariate bias adjustment of climate model simulations in Nordic catchments: Effects on hydrological signatures relevant for water resources management in a changing climate, *J. Hydrol.*, 129807, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2023.129807>, 2023.
- 905 Toreti, A., Belward, A., Perez-Dominguez, I., Naumann, G., Luterbacher, J., Cronie, O., Seguni, L., Manfron, G., Lopez-Lozano, R., Baruth, B., van den Berg, M., Dentener, F., Ceglar, A., Chatzopoulos, T., and Zampieri, M.: The Exceptional 2018 European Water Seesaw Calls for Action on Adaptation, *Earths Future*, 7, 652–663, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019EF001170>, 2019.
- 910 Trnka, M., Olesen, J. E., Kersebaum, K. C., Skjelvåg, A. O., Eitzinger, J., Seguin, B., Peltonen-Sainio, P., Rötter, R., Iglesias, A., Orlandini, S., Dubrovský, M., Hlavinka, P., Balek, J., Eckersten, H., Cloppet, E., Calanca, P., Gobin, A., Vučetić, V., Nejedlik, P., Kumar, S., Lalic, B., Mestre, A., Rossi, F., Kozyra, J., Alexandrov, V., Semerádová, D., and Žalud, Z.: Agroclimatic conditions in Europe under climate change, *Glob. Change Biol.*, 17, 2298–2318, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2011.02396.x>, 2011.

- 915 Trnka, M., Rötter, R. P., Ruiz-Ramos, M., Kersebaum, K. C., Olesen, J. E., Žalud, Z., and Semenov, M. A.: Adverse weather conditions for European wheat production will become more frequent with climate change, *Nat. Clim. Change*, 4, 637–643, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2242>, 2014.
- 920 Trnka, M., Semerádová, D., Novotný, I., Dumbrovský, M., Drbal, K., Pavlík, F., Vopravil, J., Štěpánková, P., Vizina, A., Balek, J., Hlavinka, P., Bartošová, L., and Žalud, Z.: Assessing the combined hazards of drought, soil erosion and local flooding on agricultural land: a Czech case study, *Clim. Res.*, 70, 231–249, 2016.
- Troy, T. J., Kipgen, C., and Pal, I.: The impact of climate extremes and irrigation on US crop yields, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 10, 054013, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/10/5/054013>, 2015.
- 925 Vico, G., Hurry, V., and Weih, M.: Snowed in for survival: Quantifying the risk of winter damage to overwintering field crops in northern temperate latitudes, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 197, 65–75, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2014.06.003>, 2014.
- Vogel, E., Donat, M. G., Alexander, L. V., Meinshausen, M., Ray, D. K., Karoly, D., Meinshausen, N., and Frieler, K.: The effects of climate extremes on global agricultural yields, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 14, 054010, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab154b>, 2019.
- 930 Wallén, A.: Sur la corrélation entre les récoltes et les variations de la température et de l'eau tombée en Suède, A & W, Stockholm, 1917.
- 935 Wang, E., Martre, P., Zhao, Z., Ewert, F., Maiorano, A., Rötter, R. P., Kimball, B. A., Ottman, M. J., Wall, G. W., White, J. W., Reynolds, M. P., Alderman, P. D., Aggarwal, P. K., Anothai, J., Basso, B., Biernath, C., Cammarano, D., Challinor, A. J., De Sanctis, G., Doltra, J., Dumont, B., Fereres, E., Garcia-Vila, M., Gayler, S., Hoogenboom, G., Hunt, L. A., Izaurrealde, R. C., Jabloun, M., Jones, C. D., Kersebaum, K. C., Koehler, A.-K., Liu, L., Müller, C., Naresh Kumar, S., Nendel, C., O'Leary, G., Olesen, J. E., Palosuo, T., Priesack, E., Eyshi Rezaei, E., Ripoche, D., Ruane, A. C., Semenov, M. A., Shcherbak, I., Stöckle, C., Stratonovitch, P., Streck, T., Supit, I., Tao, F., Thorburn, P., Waha, K., Wallach, D., Wang, Z., Wolf, J., Zhu, Y., and Asseng, S.: The uncertainty of crop yield projections is reduced by improved temperature response functions, *Nat. Plants*, 3, 1–13, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nplants.2017.102>, 2017.
- 940 Westra, S., Fowler, H. J., Evans, J. P., Alexander, L. V., Berg, P., Johnson, F., Kendon, E. J., Lenderink, G., and Roberts, N. M.: Future changes to the intensity and frequency of short-duration extreme rainfall, *Rev. Geophys.*, 52, 522–555, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014RG000464>, 2014.
- 945 Wilcke, R. A. I., Kjellström, E., Lin, C., Matei, D., Moberg, A., and Tyrlis, E.: The extremely warm summer of 2018 in Sweden – set in a historical context, *Earth Syst. Dyn.*, 11, 1107–1121, <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-11-1107-2020>, 2020.
- Wiréhn, L.: Nordic agriculture under climate change: A systematic review of challenges, opportunities and adaptation strategies for crop production, *Land Use Policy*, 77, 63–74, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2018.04.059>, 2018.
- 950 Wiréhn, L.: Climate indices for the tailoring of climate information – A systematic literature review of Swedish forestry and agriculture, *Clim. Risk Manag.*, 34, 100370, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crm.2021.100370>, 2021.
- 955 Wiréhn, L., Opach, T., and Neset, T.-S.: Assessing agricultural vulnerability to climate change in the Nordic countries – an interactive geovisualization approach, *J. Environ. Plan. Manag.*, 60, 115–134, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09640568.2016.1143351>, 2017.

Wood, R. R., Janzing, J., van Hamel, A., Götze, J., Schumacher, D. L., and Brunner, M. I.: Comparison of high-resolution climate reanalysis datasets for hydro-climatic impact studies, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 29, 4153–4178, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-29-4153-2025>, 2025.

960 Zampieri, M., Ceglar, A., Dentener, F., and Toreti, A.: Wheat yield loss attributable to heat waves, drought and water excess at the global, national and subnational scales, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 12, 064008, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aa723b>, 2017.

Zhou, L., Han, X., Yang, Q., Feng, H., and Siddique, K. H. M.: Optimizing sowing date to mitigate loss of growing degree days and enhance crop water productivity of groundwater-irrigated spring maize, *Agric. Water Manag.*, 305, 109097, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2024.109097>, 2024.

965 Zhu, P., Kim, T., Jin, Z., Lin, C., Wang, X., Ciais, P., Mueller, N. D., Aghakouchak, A., Huang, J., Mulla, D., and Makowski, D.: The critical benefits of snowpack insulation and snowmelt for winter wheat productivity, *Nat. Clim. Change*, 12, 485–490, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-022-01327-3>, 2022.

Zhu, X. and Troy, T. J.: Agriculturally Relevant Climate Extremes and Their Trends in the World's Major Growing Regions, *Earths Future*, 6, 656–672, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017EF000687>, 2018.

970