

Journal: TREE

Document type: Opinion

Title: The Impact of Climate Change on Fertility

Keywords: reproduction, species distributions, thermal tolerance, thermal fertility limits, critical thermal limits

Author details: Benjamin S Walsh^{1*}, Steven R Parratt^{1*}, Ary A Hoffmann², David Atkinson¹, Rhonda R Snook³, Amanda Bretman⁴, Tom A R Price¹

*Authors contributed equally

¹Institute of Integrative Biology, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK

²School of BioSciences, Bio21 Institute, the University of Melbourne, Australia

³Department of Zoology, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden

⁴Faculty of Biological Sciences, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

Glossary

Critical thermal limits (CTL): CTLs are a suite of commonly used measures of the maximum and minimum temperatures at which organisms can viably function. Individuals are exposed to either static stressful temperatures or gradually ramping temperatures and observed for physiological failure; e.g., uncoordinated movement, heat coma, or death [1]. Typically, either the duration of exposure or the temperature at which loss of viability is observed is recorded as the thermal limit.

Fecundity: The total number of offspring an individual can produce across a set interval or lifetime.

Fertility: The ability of an organism to produce viable offspring. Fertility can be measured in a number of ways but always reaches its lower limit when conditions prevent an individual from producing any offspring (i.e. sterility).

Hardening: Increased thermal tolerance shown by organisms after a short period of exposure to a stressful but non-lethal temperature within the same life stage. Hardening tests are one component of a species plastic response when exposed to stressful temperatures [2].

Sterility: Describes an individual that cannot produce any offspring over a defined period, and thus is synonymous with complete infertility.

Thermal fertility limits (TFL): Outlined here for the first time, TFLs refer to a level and duration of thermal stress that renders individuals unable to reproduce. For populations and species this can be defined as the temperature at which a given proportion of individuals are qualitatively sterile and it includes both higher (TF_{MAX}) and lower (TF_{MIN}) thermal stress

limits. For example, the upper TF_{MAX} of male *Drosophila buzzatii* – measured as sterility of 80% of individuals after 6 hours – is 36°C [3].

1 **Abstract**

2 Rising global temperatures are threatening biodiversity. Studies on the impact of
3 temperature on natural populations usually use lethal or viability thresholds, termed the
4 'critical thermal limit'. However, this overlooks important sub-lethal impacts of temperature
5 that could affect species' persistence. Here, we discuss a critical but overlooked trait,
6 fertility, which can deteriorate at temperatures less severe than an organism's lethal limit.
7 We argue that studies examining the ecological and evolutionary impacts of climate change
8 should consider the 'Thermal Fertility Limit' (TFL) of species; we propose that a framework
9 for designing TFL studies across taxa be developed. Given the importance of fertility for
10 population persistence, understanding how climate change affects TFLs is vital for assessing
11 future biodiversity impacts.

12 **1. Biodiversity Under Climate Change**

13 Climate change will continue to have an increasingly dramatic effect on the global thermal
14 environment [4], including increases in average local temperatures and the frequency of
15 heat waves [5, 6]. These shifts present a major threat to biodiversity and are starting to
16 have severe impacts on the distribution and abundance of natural populations and species
17 [7, 8]. The capacity of species to respond ecologically and evolutionarily to the challenges of
18 global thermal change will affect future biodiversity. Determining key thermally-sensitive
19 traits across species, and quantifying the ability of species to buffer the effects of thermal
20 stress on these traits, is therefore a critical research priority [9].

21 Understanding the long-term impacts of climate change on populations requires robust
22 predictive models that can project responses to both current global temperatures and
23 future climate change scenarios. Currently, many such models are based on empirically
24 derived 'critical thermal limit' (CTL, see Glossary) estimates, which describe the upper and
25 lower temperature bounds beyond which critical biological functions (e.g. movement or
26 respiration) fail [8, 10]. Comparative studies have shown that measures of such viability
27 limits more robustly predict the current distributions of many species than measures
28 derived from changes in mean fitness traits under thermal stress [11]. For this reason, CTLs
29 have also been used to infer species' sensitivity to climate change [8, 12-14]. However, using
30 only thermal limits to viability may be misleading because different measures of CTLs do not
31 always correlate within a single species or population, leading to inconsistent estimates of
32 population persistence [15]. It has been suggested that a multi-trait approach to thermal
33 tolerance may give more robust estimates of species responses to climate change [15]. In
34 particular, the focus of thermal limits needs to move away from the incapacitating and
35 lethal effects of thermal stress, to investigate how sub-lethal temperatures impact fitness-
36 related traits such as reproduction, which are critical for population stability and
37 persistence.

38 **2. Sensitivity of Fertility to Temperature**

39 Fertility is a major component of individual fitness and is a central determinant of
40 population growth and persistence. Evidence from a wide variety of taxa suggest that the
41 germ line and associated reproductive physiology is sensitive to thermal stress, particularly
42 high temperatures [16-20]. Evidence, mostly from pollen development, suggests that

43 meiosis is a more thermally sensitive process than mitosis [reviewed in 21, 22]. In mammals,
44 the descended testicle has evolved to ensure that spermatogenesis occurs at cooler-than-
45 body temperatures [23 and references therein]. Indeed, temperature induced infertility
46 imposes major economic costs in tropical climates ([Pena 2008](#)). However, although a
47 number of studies have examined how temperature impacts reproductive traits (Table 1),
48 these often use vastly different methodologies and measure different aspects of
49 reproductive biology. This collection of disparate studies makes quantitative comparisons
50 of the impact of high temperature on reproduction very difficult. Possibly for this reason,
51 thermal limits to fertility have not been systematically incorporated into predictions of
52 species responses to climate change.

53 Here, we argue that the effect of temperature on fertility requires a broad analogue of CTL,
54 termed the 'Thermal Fertility Limit' (TFL). This term would capture both the upper (TF_{MAX})
55 and lower (TF_{MIN}) temperature boundaries at which a species loses fertility. This new term
56 will facilitate researchers in bringing together related work on how environmental stress
57 impacts this broadly important component of biology, and will highlight the important
58 biological and ecological distinction between fertility and survival when assessing species'
59 response to climate change. We suggest that a framework be developed that will allow
60 researchers to design and conduct thermal fertility studies in a way that generates
61 comparable datasets across taxa. A large database of TFL measures across multiple species
62 and populations relevant to thermal stress levels encountered in nature would provide the
63 power to answer important evolutionary and ecological questions regarding the impact of
64 climate change on natural populations at risk (Box 1 and Figure 1). We do not propose that
65 TFL measures would replace CTLs. Rather, we suggest that the combination of these

66 measures, the geographic distribution of these two limits, and the extent to which they
67 correlate within and among species, will give valuable insight into species' ability to persist
68 and adapt to global thermal change. To do this, we need to consider how temperature is
69 likely to affect fertility at a mechanistic level, and how researchers can design and conduct
70 studies of TFLs in a standardised and broadly comparable way.

71 **3. Towards a Methodological Framework for the Study of TFLs**

72 The adoption of standardised measures for CTLs [11, 24], typically either a direct or proxy
73 measure of viability, has facilitated large-scale comparative studies of species' responses to
74 climate change [8]. A challenge for the study of TFLs will be to develop a similarly
75 standardised measure for fertility. This is a non-trivial task given the inherent complexity
76 and potential species-specificity of reproductive components that contribute to fertility
77 (Figure 2). This complexity is highlighted by the diverse methodologies and metrics of
78 fertility employed in the existing literature on the effect of temperature on fertility (Table
79 1). For maximum utility, TFL studies should be carefully designed to either produce a
80 quantitative point estimate of temperature limits for fertility for comparative species
81 distribution modelling, or to generate effect size estimates for fertility loss at a given
82 thermal stress level for future meta-analyses between groups.

83 ***Factors in Designing TFL Studies***

84 Despite the diverse elements of fertility described in Figure 2, we argue that the most
85 ecologically precise limit to fertility is the point at which the qualitative ability of an
86 organism to produce viable adult offspring under controlled conditions is lost. This limit
87 yields a precise metric that can be applied to quantitative comparisons among taxa.

88 However, for many species, measuring offspring production directly may be impractical, for
89 instance if generation times are extremely slow. In such instances, proxy measurements
90 that can be empirically correlated with fertility may also serve to capture the effect of
91 temperature. For example, in some *Drosophila*, qualitative sperm motility has been used to
92 quantify male fertility following heat stress, as this correlates strongly with reproductive
93 output [reviewed in 29]. In plants, the percentage of pollen grains that germinate *in vitro*
94 correlates with fruit productivity and has been employed as a measure of TFLs [21, 30]. It
95 would be unrealistic to attempt to identify a trait that captures the effect of temperature on
96 fertility across all of biology, but taxa-specific proxies like these may be sufficient to enable
97 meaningful comparative studies.

98 Whichever measurement is used, assessing fertility over a range of static temperatures will
99 allow us to generate a fertility reaction norm. From these reaction norms we can determine
100 the temperature at which fertility drops by a given percentage compared to benign controls;
101 a measure analogous to a 'Lethal Dosage' in toxicology and one already used for some
102 measures of CTLs [31]. The exact proportion of fertility loss that is ecologically relevant for
103 population stability and thus represents a true thermal fertility limit, is likely to vary from
104 species to species. With enough data on the reproductive and population biology of a given
105 organism, these thresholds could be explicitly modelled. Or, if reaction norms are
106 established across a broad enough range of temperatures then it should be possible to
107 determine any threshold and to assess if these are correlated across species.

108 Further, unlike viability limits, fertility is not necessarily an irreversible binary trait. Evidence
109 suggests that complete sterility at extreme temperatures is preceded by quantitative
110 fertility loss at intermediate conditions [25, 26]. Furthermore, recovery of fertility can occur

111 in some heat-sterilised animals if they are returned to benign conditions [27, 28], although
112 under severe thermal stress sterility can be permanent [3, pers. obs., 19]. Researchers
113 should carefully consider the time frame over which qualitative fertility is assessed following
114 heat stress, and potentially account for the recovery of fertility over time; a two-day knock-
115 down in fertility may be inconsequential for long-lived species but catastrophic for
116 organisms that exist as adults for only days. This highlights an important consideration when
117 comparing the utility of CTLs and TFLs, reinforcing that TFLs have a much more complicated
118 relationship with time than CTLs.

119 A second important practical consideration arises when selecting an ecologically relevant
120 temperature treatment. Researchers have shown that the response of organisms to thermal
121 stress is affected by both the intensity of the temperature chosen and also the duration of
122 exposure [24]. This is further complicated when one considers the effect that hardening
123 treatments [1], ramping [13], and the observed differences between static and cyclic
124 temperature treatments [32, and references therein] have on thermal performance in many
125 organisms. Unlike CTLs, where the effect of temperature is often immediately visible, loss of
126 fertility requires subsequent assays following exposure to heat, and so ramping assays are
127 unlikely to be useful. Instead, researchers must choose regimes of static or fluctuating
128 temperature stress that reflect current or future thermal extremes for natural populations.
129 The need to finely balance high-throughput, standardised repeatable assays with ecological
130 realism will be a major challenge for TFL research.

131 To summarise, if researchers think about the exact trait they are going to measure, the
132 thermal regime under which it will be measured, and consider that fertility may recover
133 over time, then they will be well on their way to having a robust framework for studying

134 TFLs (Box 2). Investigating this in model species, and testing whether it predicts species
135 distributions better than current methods, will be a key step in determining how important
136 TFLs are in nature.

137 **4. Can Species Maintain Fertility in the Face of Thermal Change?**

138 Many species are predicted to have populations pushed beyond their critical thermal
139 maxima (CT_{MAX}) by climate change [14]. As thermal fertility maxima (TF_{MAX}) are expected to
140 often be lower than CT_{MAX} , rapid climate change is likely to push many populations and
141 species beyond their TF_{MAX} . Developing standardised measures of TFLs will provide tools to
142 investigate how species might physiologically acclimate and adapt to these changing
143 thermal environments.

144 ***Are Thermal Fertility Limits Plastic?***

145 Organisms could show phenotypic plasticity in TFLs within their own lifetime or through
146 intergenerational carry-over effects. Sub-optimal temperatures experienced at early life-
147 history stages can affect traits such as adult size [33]. Experiencing some level of thermal
148 stress can increase the fitness of individuals for a similar stress later in life, a process known
149 as acclimation. For CTLs there is significant, but very limited, scope for coping with rising
150 temperatures through plasticity [34]. For instance, the degree of plasticity in upper thermal
151 tolerance appears weakly associated with species distribution ranges [13]. However, it is not
152 known if similar plasticity exists for TFLs, and whether plasticity in TFLs is greater than that
153 for CTLs. Exposing organisms to acclimation treatments followed by TFL measurement, or

154 investigating inter-generation carry-over effects for TFLs, may shed new light on the ability
155 of organisms to buffer the effects on fitness of ecological change.

156 There is mixed evidence for the impact of acclimation on temperature-induced sterility.
157 Male *Drosophila buzzatti* regain fertility faster following a heat stress if they had previous
158 experienced a heat-shock [3]. However, both *Drosophila subobscura* and *Tribolium*
159 *castaneum* have been shown to exhibit more extreme fertility loss when exposed to
160 multiple rather than single periods of heat stress, which does not indicate an acclimation
161 response [17]. Where plasticity in thermal fertility traits does exist, the underlying
162 mechanisms remain largely unknown. However, individuals are likely to cope with stress in
163 part by using heat-shock proteins, which are important in mediating upper thermal limits in
164 insect species [35]. Many, including Hsp70, are up-regulated during hardening treatments,
165 helping individuals to offset the negative fitness consequences of thermal stress [36]. Heat
166 shock proteins are a ubiquitous component in living systems: importantly, they are found in
167 gametes, including human spermatozoa [37]. Exploring the scope for heat-shock protein
168 expression to buffer the deleterious effect of high temperature on fertility, and the variation
169 in this within closely related species might explain patterns of variation in TFLs.

170 ***Can Thermal Fertility Limits Evolve?***

171 Over long periods of environmental change, selection should favour more thermally-
172 tolerant genotypes and a rise in both CTLs and TFLs. Including the evolvability of thermally
173 sensitive traits into models of species' response to climate change generates vastly different
174 predictions than equivalent models parameterised with only current measure of thermal
175 sensitivity [8]. However, current evidence suggests there is very little standing genetic
176 variation and evolvability for high temperature CTLs [8], although this is debated [reviewed

177 in 24]. Whether TFLs can evolve rapidly is unknown. Limited evidence in *Drosophila* has
178 shown male sterility under heat stress can be variable within species and may be under
179 selection to be locally adapted across populations originating from different thermal
180 regimes [17, 19, 27, 39], suggesting that TFLs may be evolvable. Quantifying standing
181 variation in TFLs across genotypes and populations of multiple species would be a good first
182 approach for testing this.

183 Species with CTLs that are low and evolutionarily constrained are predicted to be at
184 particular risk from climate change [12]. For instance, tropical species have been shown to
185 often lack genetic variation that would enable rapid evolution to cope with changing
186 climatic variables such as temperature and desiccation [14, 40]. Establishing how these
187 species' TFLs respond to increasing temperatures may be critical for predicting how they will
188 be impacted by climate change. If TFLs are substantially lower than CTLs, then these species
189 may be more vulnerable than currently predicted. However, if TFLs are more evolvable than
190 CTLs, this may compensate for their initially low TFLs, making CTLs more important
191 predictors of distributions in a warming world. Until both CTLs and TFLs are examined across
192 a variety of taxa, and the evolvability of TFLs determined, confidence in predictions about
193 which taxa are going to be particularly vulnerable will be low (Box 1).

194 Whether populations or species can respond to thermally-induced loss of fertility, either
195 through short-term plasticity or long-term adaptive change, is unclear. This is partly because
196 of knowledge gaps regarding the impact of extreme temperature on fertility in animals and
197 plants. A fundamental understanding of how extreme increases and decreases in
198 temperature influence reproduction with negative effects on fertility is required before the
199 ecological relevance and potential evolution of TFLs can be determined. However, it is

200 precisely these answers that are ultimately among the most important to know, as they will
201 improve predictions on how climate change may affect species abundance and distribution,
202 and thereby change biodiversity across the globe.

203 **Concluding Remarks**

204 Here, we have introduced and discussed the idea that measuring the thermal limit of
205 fertility across multiple species and a broad range of taxa could be critical when assessing
206 the impacts of global thermal change on biodiversity. While the use of critical thermal limits
207 has proven to be informative for modelling current and future distributions of species [8, 13,
208 14], CTLs may overestimate species' ability to cope with stressful temperatures. Research
209 exploring TFLs (see Outstanding Questions) is needed to ascertain the extent to which they
210 correlate with CTLs. To this end, we propose a general framework for TFL studies to
211 promote large-scale cross-taxa assessments of this important but largely neglected trait.
212 Focusing on TFLs with broadly standardised methodologies may improve our knowledge of
213 how climate change will affect species' abundance, distribution, and persistence. However,
214 the current literature on how thermal stress impacts fertility is fragmented. Stronger and
215 more unified thermal fertility research might radically improve our predictions about the
216 impacts of global thermal change.

217 **Box 1: Groups at Risk**

218 **Figure 1 Examples of organisms that may be particularly at risk to losing fertility due to**
219 **high temperatures. Clockwise from top left: broadcast spawning fish such as carp, small**
220 **ectothermic insects including pollinating bees, endemic animals with limited latitudinal or**
221 **elevation ranges such as the flightless cormorant, disease vectors including mosquitos,**
222 **coral species that are important to highly diverse reefs, and endemic plant species**
223 **including the Scottish primrose. All photos in this figure are licensed under CC BY 2.0,**
224 **Credits: Joaquim Alves Gaspar, Charles Sharp, Toby Hudson & David Glass).**

225 Certain groups of organisms are likely to be most vulnerable to temperature-driven fertility
226 loss. These groups may provide important case studies and primary avenues of research (Fig
227 1).

228 **Ectothermic Species**

229 Most plant species cannot regulate the temperature of their tissues (excluding a number of
230 species of flower [41]), forcing them to withstand ambient temperatures. Likewise,
231 ectothermic animals may also be vulnerable [5], as they rely on behavioural rather than
232 physiological thermoregulation to avoid stressful microenvironments. Smaller ectothermic
233 animals are even more at risk, as they will reach ambient temperatures faster.

234 **Endemic Species and Species with Small Ranges**

235 Rare or endemic species with small latitudinal ranges are likely to be particularly at risk to
236 losing fertility as ambient temperatures increase because i) they are likely to lack the
237 genetic variation and gene flow required to adapt to novel stressors [7], and ii) in many

238 cases they may be unable to shift their distribution range to track changing climates. This
239 will be particularly true for island endemics and species that live within specialised
240 elevational niches in mountains.

241 **Aquatic Species**

242 Aquatic species, particularly broadcast spawners, are likely to be at risk because the specific
243 heat capacity of water will result in rapid changes in tissue temperatures. Further, gametes
244 in the water from spawning organisms will be exposed directly to stressful temperatures, so
245 they will need to evolve robust physiological responses to high temperatures to retain form and
246 function. This is likely to be a greater issue for freshwater and shallow water organisms, as
247 these environments experience greater fluctuations in temperatures, exposing these
248 organisms to acute stress events.

249 **Sessile Species and Life Stages**

250 Sessile organisms, such as plants, corals and juvenile stages (e.g. pupal stages in
251 holometabolous insects), in which movement to cooler areas during temperature spikes is
252 not possible, may be particularly vulnerable. Similarly, due to their limited dispersal ability,
253 belowground communities may be especially vulnerable to fertility loss under climate
254 change [42].

255 **Box 2 Considerations When Designing TFL Experiments**

256 1. **Trait selection:** We suggest that wherever possible researchers measure both
257 qualitative and quantitative offspring production in order to capture the ecological
258 impact of high temperature on fertility. Where this is impossible, careful selection of

259 proxy measures of fertility that can be empirically correlated with an individual's
260 ability to produce offspring could be considered. Holistic measures such as these are
261 most likely to generate broadly comparable data sets across taxa.

262

263 2. **Life-history stage:** Whilst reproduction occurs almost invariably during adult life-
264 history stages, reproductive development and maturation can begin much earlier.
265 Researchers should therefore consider which life stage(s) of their organism to
266 expose to stress. For instance, do heat-treated juveniles mature into sterile adults
267 whilst heated adults remain fertile?

268

269 3. **Ecologically valid thermal environment:** Careful attention should be given to
270 selecting temperature regimes that reflect the current or future extremes that
271 organisms are likely to face. For instance, are temperature spikes over a matter of a
272 few hours more likely to impact a species' fertility than a rise in mean daytime
273 temperature? A large body of work on CTLs has demonstrated that measures of
274 thermal performance can be highly sensitive to the duration of stress [24], rates of
275 temperature ramping [13] and the intensity and frequency of any temperature
276 fluctuations [43]. The latter point in particular may be key for thermal fertility, as
277 some animals can recover fertility during periods of benign temperatures including
278 night time [44]. Once researchers have selected a regime of temperature delivery
279 they should strive, where possible, to measure thermal fertility over a range of
280 temperature values. This will help capture the thermal fertility reaction norm of their
281 organism.

282

283 4. **Implications for population stability:** To estimate the population-level effects of
284 high temperature on fertility, researchers should consider what percentage loss of
285 fertility represents a meaningful threat to population stability. Factors such as the
286 effective population size of the organism in a nature, the potential fecundity of
287 individuals and their generation time could be used to estimate a specie's sensitivity
288 to fertility loss. Researchers can then determine the degree of thermal stress
289 required to push their study organism beyond this threshold.

290

291 5. **Critical thermal and fertility limits:** The power of TFLs to predict species' response to
292 climate change will be related to the extent to which fertility and viability limits
293 correlate with each other and across species. Low correlation would suggest that
294 one metric cannot be substituted for the other. Which species have high and which
295 species have low correlation and what impacts this relationship? Thus, researchers
296 should determine both fertility and viability limits of their organism under relevant
297 thermal regimes.

298

Table 1: Examples of Thermal Impacts on Fertility

Taxonomic group	Organism	Species	Impact of temperature on fertility	Measure	Refs
Cnidarian	Coral	<i>Acropora digitifera</i>	Increase of 2°C reduced the number of sperm bundles by almost 50%, and reduced egg size	Gamete number	[45]
Insect	Bed bug	<i>Cimex lectularius</i>	Egg production and hatching success can fall to almost zero as a result of thermal stress	Fecundity	[26]
	Red mason bee	<i>Osmia bicornis</i>	Changed odour profile, altering female mating preference	Mating preference	[46]
	Beetle	<i>Callosobruchus maculatus</i>	Males reared at extreme high temperatures produce smaller sperm than benign controls	Sperm form and function	[47]
	Beetle	<i>Tribolium castaneum</i>	Stressed males reduce sperm viability, competitiveness. Inseminated sperm within female storage organs less viable when female stressed. Transgenerational impact reducing longevity of offspring sired by stressed males	Sperm form and function, offspring production	[48]
	Dragonfly	<i>Micrathyria spp.</i>	Species within the genus that struggle to maintain optimal body temperatures are less efficient at defending perches at high temperatures, and lose out on breeding sites to larger species	Courtship behaviour	[49]
	Fruit fly	<i>Bactrocera tryoni</i>	Reduced mating latency at cold temperatures, reduced mating frequency at cold temperatures	Mating latency, mating frequency,	[50]
	Fruit fly	Family: Drosophilidae	Reduced mating success. Impairment of sperm elongation, resulting in loss of sperm motility and thus lower fertility	Offspring production, mating success, sperm motility	[17, 25, 27, 29, 51-53]
	Oriental fruit moth	<i>Grapholita molesta</i>	A 2h heat stress during pupation reduced fecundity but increased other adult fitness traits such as survival	Fecundity, gamete viability	[54]
Wasp	<i>Aphidius avenae</i>	Low mating success rate due to reduced courtship behaviour. Reduced sperm count after developmental stress, with males at high stress fully sterile. Reduced fertilisation results in fewer females, secondarily altering sex ratios. Stressed females produce fewer eggs	Courtship behaviour, gamete number, fertilisation success and offspring production	[28, 55]	

Poales	Barley	<i>Hordeum vulgare</i>	Developing anther cells are compromised during thermal stress, while developing ovule cells are not	Gamete viability	[56]
	Rice	<i>Oryza sativa</i>	High temperature during flowering increased pollen sterility, with greater sterility if CO ₂ levels were high	Gamete viability	[57]
Polemoniales	Tomato	<i>Solanum lycopersicum</i>	Under thermal stress pollen viability was reduced and anthers developed abnormalities. Thermally tolerant genotypes showed resistance	Gamete viability	[58]
Vertebrate	Chicken	<i>Gallus gallus domesticus</i>	An 8 week thermal stress results in increased sperm death and associated drop in fertility	Sperm concentration	[18]
	Cow	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Ovulation failure and abortion rate is higher in cows inseminated during warm seasons	Fertilization	[59]
	Guppy fish	<i>Poecilia reticulata</i>	Males raised at stressful temperatures have shorter, slower sperm than individuals raised at benign temperatures	Sperm form and function	[60]
	Mouse	<i>Mus musculus</i>	Reduced sperm count for over 60 days after 30 minute heat shock	Gamete number	[16]
	Pig	<i>Sus sp.</i>	Sperm DNA damage higher and sperm concentration lower during warm wet season.	Sperm form and function	[61]
	Sea lion	<i>Otaria flavescens</i>	Stressed males desert females to thermoregulate, foregoing mating opportunities	Courtship and mating behaviour	[62]
	Zebra finch	<i>Taeniopygia guttata</i>	Daily heat waves reduced the proportion of sperm exhibiting normal morphology	Sperm form and function	[63]

302

303

304 **Figure 2: A Generalized and Simplified Schematic of the Stages in**
305 **Sexual Reproduction and Examples of Organisms for which the**
306 **Effect of Temperature has been Measured on these Stages (see**
307 **Table 1)**

308 Fertility is the emergent product of multiple physiological, developmental and behavioural
309 processes. Not all steps are relevant to all organisms, indeed the diversity and complexity of
310 this cascade across sexual organisms is not fully captured here. However, in all cases the
311 'success' of fertility begins by generating gametes and ends with the production of viable
312 offspring. High temperature may perturbate single or multiple steps in this process but early
313 meiotic stages can be particularly thermally sensitive [21]. High temperature may affect
314 several of these traits simultaneously within an individual, for example by both arresting
315 gametogenesis and reducing investment in copulation behaviours. On the other hand, the
316 effect of high temperature on a single trait, say testis development, may subsequently have
317 cascading effects on downstream elements of reproduction such as sperm counts and
318 motility. Photo credits: A (barley) = Raul Dupagne, B (guppy) = Baskua, C (*Drosophila* mating)
319 = D. Chai, D (coral reef) = Toby Hudson, E (rooster) = Pete Linforth. All photos licensed under
320 CC BY 2.0.

321

322

323

324 **Acknowledgements**

325 The authors thank the Editor and three anonymous reviewers for their constructive
326 comments on this paper. This work was funded by the UK Natural Environment Research
327 Council (grant NE/P002692/1 to TP, AB and RS).

328 References

- 329 1. Overgaard, J. et al. (2012) Validity of thermal ramping assays used to assess thermal
330 tolerance in arthropods. *PLoS One* 7 (3), e32758.
- 331 2. Loeschcke, V. and Hoffmann, A.A. (2007) Consequences of heat hardening on a field
332 fitness component in *Drosophila* depend on environmental temperature. *Am. Nat.* 169 (2),
333 175-183.
- 334 3. Jørgensen, K.T. et al. (2006) Heat tolerance and the effect of mild heat stress on
335 reproductive characters in *Drosophila buzzatii* males. *J. Therm. Biol.* 31 (3), 280-286.
- 336 4. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2014) Climate Change 2014–Impacts,
337 Adaptation and Vulnerability: Regional Aspects, Cambridge University Press.
- 338 5. Kingsolver, J.G. et al. (2013) Heat stress and the fitness consequences of climate change
339 for terrestrial ectotherms. *Funct. Ecol.* 27 (6), 1415-1423.
- 340 6. Buckley, L.B. and Huey, R.B. (2016) Temperature extremes: geographic patterns, recent
341 changes, and implications for organismal vulnerabilities. *Glob. Chang. Biol.* 22 (12), 3829-
342 3842.
- 343 7. Hoffmann, A. (2010) Physiological climatic limits in *Drosophila*: patterns and implications.
344 *J. Exp. Biol.* 213 (6), 870-880.
- 345 8. Kellermann, V. et al. (2012) Upper thermal limits of *Drosophila* are linked to species
346 distributions and strongly constrained phylogenetically. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 109
347 (40), 16228-16233.
- 348 9. Moritz, C. and Agudo, R. (2013) The future of species under climate change: resilience or
349 decline? *Science* 341 (6145), 504-508.
- 350 10. Geerts, A. et al. (2015) Rapid evolution of thermal tolerance in the water flea *Daphnia*.
351 *Nat. Clim. Chang.* 5 (7), 665-668.
- 352 11. Overgaard, J. et al. (2014) Sensitivity to thermal extremes in Australian *Drosophila*
353 implies similar impacts of climate change on the distribution of widespread and tropical
354 species. *Glob. Chang. Biol.* 20 (6), 1738-1750.
- 355 12. Bush, A. et al. (2016) Incorporating evolutionary adaptation in species distribution
356 modelling reduces projected vulnerability to climate change. *Ecol. Lett.* 19 (12), 1468-1478.
- 357 13. Mitchell, K.A. et al. (2011) Phenotypic plasticity in upper thermal limits is weakly related
358 to *Drosophila* species distributions. *Funct. Ecol.* 25 (3), 661-670.
- 359 14. Kellermann, V. et al. (2009) Fundamental evolutionary limits in ecological traits drive
360 *Drosophila* species distributions. *Science* 325 (5945), 1244-1246.
- 361 15. Blackburn, S. et al. (2014) Evolutionary capacity of upper thermal limits: beyond single
362 trait assessments. *J. Exp. Biol.* 217 (11), 1918-1924.
- 363 16. Pérez-Crespo, M. et al. (2008) Scrotal heat stress effects on sperm viability, sperm DNA
364 integrity, and the offspring sex ratio in mice. *Mol. Reprod. Dev.* 75 (1), 40-47.
- 365 17. Porcelli, D. et al. (2016) Local adaptation of reproductive performance during thermal
366 stress. *J. Evol. Biol.* 30 (2), 422-429.
- 367 18. Karaca, A. et al. (2002) The effects of heat stress and sperm quality classification on
368 broiler breeder male fertility and semen ion concentrations. *Br. Poult. Sci.* 43 (4), 621-628.
- 369 19. Vollmer, J. et al. (2004) Heat and cold-induced male sterility in *Drosophila buzzatii*:
370 genetic variation among populations for the duration of sterility. *Heredity* 92 (3), 257-262.
- 371 20. Reinhardt, K. et al. (2015) An ecology of sperm: sperm diversification by natural
372 selection. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 46, 435-459.

- 373 21. Sage, T.L. et al. (2015) The effect of high temperature stress on male and female
374 reproduction in plants. *Field Crops Res.* 182, 30-42.
- 375 22. Paupière, M.J. et al. (2014) The metabolic basis of pollen thermo-tolerance: perspectives
376 for breeding. *Metabolites* 4 (4), 889-920.
- 377 23. Moreno, R.D. et al. (2012) Molecular basis of heat stress damage in mammalian testis. In
378 Testis: Anatomy, Physiology and Pathology (Nemoto, Y. and Inaba, N. eds), pp. 127-155,
379 Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- 380 24. Terblanche, J.S. et al. (2007) Critical thermal limits depend on methodological context.
381 *Proc. R. Soc. Lond., B, Biol. Sci.* 274 (1628), 2935-2943.
- 382 25. Chakir, M. et al. (2002) Male sterility thermal thresholds in *Drosophila*: *D. simulans*
383 appears more cold-adapted than its sibling *D. melanogaster*. *Genetica* 114 (2), 195-205.
- 384 26. Rukke, B.A. et al. (2018) Temperature stress deteriorates bed bug (*Cimex lectularius*)
385 populations through decreased survival, fecundity and offspring success. *PLoS One* 13 (3),
386 e0193788.
- 387 27. Rohmer, C. et al. (2004) Heat induced male sterility in *Drosophila melanogaster*:
388 adaptive genetic variations among geographic populations and role of the Y chromosome. *J.*
389 *Exp. Biol.* 207 (16), 2735-2743.
- 390 28. Nguyen, T.M. et al. (2013) Heat stress affects male reproduction in a parasitoid wasp. *J.*
391 *Insect. Physiol.* 59 (3), 248-254.
- 392 29. David, J. et al. (2005) Male sterility at extreme temperatures: a significant but neglected
393 phenomenon for understanding *Drosophila* climatic adaptations. *J. Evol. Biol.* 18 (4), 838-
394 846.
- 395 30. Acar, I. and Kakani, V.G. (2010) The effects of temperature on in vitro pollen germination
396 and pollen tube growth of *Pistacia* spp. *Sci. Hort.* 125 (4), 569-572.
- 397 31. Lutterschmidt, W.I. and Hutchison, V.H. (1997) The critical thermal maximum: history
398 and critique. *Can. J. Zool.* 75 (10), 1561-1574.
- 399 32. Sgrò, C.M. et al. (2016) What can plasticity contribute to insect responses to climate
400 change? *Annu. Rev. Entomol.* 61, 433-451.
- 401 33. Atkinson, D. (1994) Temperature and organism size: a biological law for ectotherms?
402 *Adv. Ecol. Res.* 25, 1-58.
- 403 34. Sørensen, J.G. et al. (2016) Evolutionary and ecological patterns of thermal acclimation
404 capacity in *Drosophila*: is it important for keeping up with climate change? *Curr. Opin.*
405 *Insect. Sci.* 17, 98-104.
- 406 35. Krebs, R. and Loeschcke, V. (1994) Costs and benefits of activation of the heat-shock
407 response in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Funct. Ecol.*, 730-737.
- 408 36. Sørensen, J. et al. (2001) Genetic variation in thermal tolerance among natural
409 populations of *Drosophila buzzatii*: down regulation of Hsp70 expression and variation in
410 heat stress resistance traits. *Funct. Ecol.* 15 (3), 289-296.
- 411 37. Miller, D. et al. (1992) Characterization and cellular distribution of human spermatozoal
412 heat shock proteins. *Hum. Reprod.* 7 (5), 637-645.
- 413 38. Miller, G.T. and Pitnick, S. (2002) Sperm-female coevolution in *Drosophila*. *Science* 298
414 (5596), 1230-1233.
- 415 39. Pedersen, L.D. et al. (2011) The effects of inbreeding and heat stress on male sterility in
416 *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Biol. J. Linn. Soc. Lond.* 104 (2), 432-442.
- 417 40. Deutsch, C.A. et al. (2008) Impacts of climate warming on terrestrial ectotherms across
418 latitude. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 105 (18), 6668-6672.

- 419 41. Watling, J.R. et al. (2008) Mechanisms of thermoregulation in plants. *Plant Signal.*
420 *Behav.* 3 (8), 595-597.
- 421 42. Berg, M.P. et al. (2010) Adapt or disperse: understanding species persistence in a
422 changing world. *Glob. Chang. Biol.* 16 (2), 587-598.
- 423 43. Davies, C. et al. (2016) Effect of stable and fluctuating temperatures on the life history
424 traits of *Anopheles arabiensis* and *An. quadriannulatus* under conditions of inter- and intra-
425 specific competition. *Parasit. Vectors* 9 (1), 342.
- 426 44. Zhao, F. et al. (2014) Night warming on hot days produces novel impacts on
427 development, survival and reproduction in a small arthropod. *J. Anim. Ecol.* 83 (4), 769-778.
- 428 45. Paxton, C.W. et al. (2016) Effect of elevated temperature on fecundity and reproductive
429 timing in the coral *Acropora digitifera*. *Zygote* 24 (4), 511-516.
- 430 46. Conrad, T. et al. (2017) The effect of temperature on male mating signals and female
431 choice in the red mason bee, *Osmia bicornis* (L.). *Ecol. Evol.* 7 (21), 8966-8975.
- 432 47. Vasudeva, R. et al. (2014) Developmental temperature affects the expression of
433 ejaculatory traits and the outcome of sperm competition in *Callosobruchus maculatus*. *J.*
434 *Evol. Biol.* 27 (9), 1811-1818.
- 435 48. Sales, K. et al. (2018) Experimental heatwaves compromise sperm function and cause
436 transgenerational damage in a model insect. *Nat. Commun.* 9 (1), 4771.
- 437 49. May, M.L. (1977) Thermoregulation and reproductive activity in tropical dragonflies of
438 the genus *Micrathyria*. *Ecology* 58 (4), 787-798.
- 439 50. Meats, A. and Fay, F. (2000) Distribution of mating frequency among males of the
440 Queensland fruit fly, '*Bactrocera tryoni*' (Froggatt), in relation to temperature, acclimation
441 and chance. *Gen. Appl. Ent.* 29, 27.
- 442 51. Gefen, E. and Gibbs, A.G. (2009) Interactions between environmental stress and male
443 mating success may enhance evolutionary divergence of stress-resistant *Drosophila*
444 populations. *Evolution* 63 (6), 1653-1659.
- 445 52. Araripe, L. et al. (2004) Male sterility thresholds in a tropical cosmopolitan drosophilid,
446 *Zaprionus indianus*. *J. Therm. Biol.* 29 (2), 73-80.
- 447 53. Batista, M.R.D. et al. (2018) Altitudinal distribution of two sibling species of the
448 *Drosophila tripunctata* group in a preserved tropical forest and their male sterility thermal
449 thresholds. *J. Therm. Biol.* 71, 69-73.
- 450 54. Zheng, J. et al. (2017) Are adult life history traits in oriental fruit moth affected by a mild
451 pupal heat stress? *J. Insect. Physiol.* 102, 36-41.
- 452 55. Roux, O. et al. (2010) How does heat shock affect the life history traits of adults and
453 progeny of the aphid parasitoid *Aphidius avenae* (Hymenoptera: Aphidiidae)? *Bull. Entomol.*
454 *Res.* 100 (5), 543-549.
- 455 56. Oshino, T. et al. (2007) Premature progression of anther early developmental programs
456 accompanied by comprehensive alterations in transcription during high-temperature injury
457 in barley plants. *Mol. Genet. Genomics* 278 (1), 31-42.
- 458 57. Matsui, T. et al. (1997) Effects of high temperature and CO₂ concentration on spikelet
459 sterility in indica rice. *Field Crops Res.* 51 (3), 213-219.
- 460 58. Müller, F. et al. (2016) High-temperature-induced defects in tomato (*Solanum*
461 *lycopersicum*) anther and pollen development are associated with reduced expression of B-
462 class floral patterning genes. *PLoS One* 11 (12), e0167614.
- 463 59. De Rensis, F. et al. (2017) Causes of declining fertility in dairy cows during the warm
464 season. *Theriogenology* 91, 145-153.

- 465 60. Breckels, R.D. and Neff, B.D. (2013) The effects of elevated temperature on the sexual
466 traits, immunology and survivorship of a tropical ectotherm. *J. Exp. Biol.* 216 (14), 2658-
467 2664.
- 468 61. Peña, S.T. et al. (2018) Tropical summer induces DNA fragmentation in boar
469 spermatozoa: implications for evaluating seasonal infertility. *Reprod. Fertil. Dev.*
- 470 62. Campagna, C. and Le Boeuf, B.J. (1988) Thermoregulatory behaviour of southern sea
471 lions and its effect on mating strategies. *Behaviour* 107 (1), 72-89.
- 472 63. Hurley, L.L. et al. (2018) Experimental heatwaves negatively impact sperm quality in the
473 zebra finch. *Proc. R. Soc. B* 285 (1871), 20172547.
- 474