PAPER • OPEN ACCESS

The vulnerability of European agricultural areas to anthesis heat stress increases with climate change

To cite this article: Lioba Lucia Martin *et al* 2025 *Environ. Res.: Food Syst.* **2** 025002

View the article online for updates and enhancements.

You may also like

ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH
FOOD SYSTEMS

PAPER

The vulnerability of European agricultural areas to anthesis heat stress increases with climate change

Lioba Lucia Martin[1,*] , Andrew Smerald[1] , Ralf Kiese[1] , Tatiana Klimiuk[2] , Patrick Ludwig[2] , Antonio Sanchéz-Benítez[3] , Helge Goessling[3] and Clemens Scheer[1]

[1] Institute of Meteorology and Climate Research Atmospheric Environmental Research, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany
[2] Institute of Meteorology and Climate Research, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Karlsruhe, Germany
[3] Alfred Wegener Institute, Helmholtz Centre for Polar and Marine Research, Bremerhaven, Germany
[*] Author to whom any correspondence should be addressed.

E-mail: lioba.martin@kit.edu

Abstract

Climate change poses a significant threat to agriculture, primarily through yield losses due to droughts and heatwaves. The flowering phase is a particularly critical period during which many crops are highly susceptible to heat, resulting in long-term damage and substantial yield reduction. By imposing the large-scale atmospheric circulation of the 2018 to 2022 heatwaves in a CMIP6 model, we explore the potential impact of such a multi-year event within future climate scenarios as a storyline. We developed a heat stress index to quantify the amount of stress experienced by crops due to heat exposure during flowering relative to unstressed conditions. This index was then applied to the storylines over the European domain and evaluated for major cereal crops (maize and wheat). Extrapolating 2022 conditions to a scenario with global warming of +4 K, we show that over 30% of the harvested area would experience severe heat stress, resulting in a 10% yield reduction across Europe. Our investigations highlight that the timing and severity of a heatwave can have a much higher impact than the mean warming level, emphasizing the need for accurate seasonal forecasts. Addressing these challenges will require proactive management adaptations, including dynamic forecast-based decisions on planting dates, crop, and variety selection.

1. Introduction

Climate change and food security are undeniably linked (Challinor *et al* 2014). While it has been shown that a rise in mean temperatures may endanger the future of our current food system (Asseng *et al* 2015, Zhao *et al* 2017), the primary threat comes from the increasing intensity and frequency of extreme events such as droughts and heatwaves (Ciais *et al* 2005, Vogel *et al* 2019). As a result, crop yield losses are expected to show considerable temporal and spatial heterogeneity, with crop failure minimal in some years but widespread in others (Straussberger 2015). Significant heat-induced yield cuts have already been observed in Europe, especially during the frequent and widespread heatwaves from 2018 to 2022 (Beillouin *et al* 2020, Baruth *et al* 2022).

A rise in the frequency and intensity of extreme events is considered highly likely (Rahmstorf and Coumou 2011, Hoegh-Guldberg *et al* 2018), continuing the trend of recent decades (Lesk *et al* 2016, Perkins-Kirkpatrick and Lewis 2020). Future heatwaves will also come on top of a hotter baseline temperature, leading to an even higher impact on crop yields than observed in recent years (Heino *et al* 2023). Furthermore, unless heatwave forecasting can be improved beyond the current limits of a few weeks in advance (Domeisen *et al* 2023), crops will be sown with little idea of the likelihood of extreme events in the crucial late spring and summer periods. Consequently, agile, forecast-based mitigation strategies, such as yearly adaption of crop type, cultivar or planting date will be made difficult.

When assessing the impact of climate change on agriculture, the standard approach is to drive crop models using coupled climate models, such as those participating in the Coupled Model Intercomparison

Project (CMIP) (e.g. Rosenzweig *et al* (2014), Muller *et al* (2017), Zhao *et al* (2017), Zabel *et al* (2021), Bathiany *et al* (2023), Schmidt and Felsche (2024)). However, it is well known that CMIP6 (and earlier iterations) under-represent the likelihood and severity of future heatwaves (Davini and D'Andrea 2020, Fan *et al* 2020, Hirsch *et al* 2021, Domeisen *et al* 2023), e.g. the 2003 heatwave could not even be captured in re-forecasts (Weisheimer *et al* 2011). Furthermore, assessments of future crop yields are typically averaged over multiple CMIP6 climate models, which themselves have differences in the spatial and temporal occurrence of heatwaves. As such, the effect of heatwaves is blurred out and absorbed into the uncertainty bounds of the crop yield predictions (Muller *et al* 2021), leading to unrealistically low spatial and temporal variance.

Here we instead follow an event-based storyline approach, which has recently emerged as an alternative way of studying extreme events under climate change (Wehrli *et al* 2020, Van Garderen *et al* 2021). A storyline is a physically consistent representation of a plausible future event such as a heatwave (Shepherd *et al* 2018). By applying the dynamical forcing of a past event to future scenarios, the inherent intermodel spread due to dynamical changes is eliminated. Here, we reconstruct these extreme events in Europe by running a global-to-regional model chain. We first run a coupled climate model in which the global large-scale atmospheric circulation patterns are similar to those of the 2018–2022 period but in a +2, +3 or +4 K warmer climate (Sanchez-Benitez *et al* 2022). Then, we apply dynamical downscaling of the global storylines to produce high-resolution regional storylines of the same period (Klimiuk *et al* 2025).

We focus on the effect of high temperatures in a period of a few days before and after flowering. During this critical period, crops are highly sensitive to heat stress, and excessive heat may result in long-term damage to the plant and substantial yield reduction in wheat (Porter and Gawith 1999, Prasad and Djanaguiraman 2014, Balla *et al* 2019, Bheemanahalli *et al* 2022) and in maize (Wahid *et al* 2007, Cicchino *et al* 2010, Rattalino and Otegui 2012). Temperatures around anthesis are what constitute our definition of a heatwave; a period of time, starting from one day, above a certain crop-specific threshold temperature. While the increased temperatures during the growing season may contribute to water stress, they are unlikely to cause plant heat stress (Cairns *et al* 2013, Schmidt *et al* 2022). Increased temperatures due to low soil moisture are considered in ICON-CLM, however, our model inherently does not include compounding effects of heat, as the crops are grown annually and heat levels experienced by crops therefore have no relation to heat experienced in the previous year. This would, of course, be different for perennial crops, which were not included in this study but is still an ongoing research topic (e.g. De Boeck *et al* (2018), Zeng *et al* (2021), Lesk *et al* (2022)), since previous heat stress can either have exacerbating or alleviating effects in case of a second stress event.

As part of assessing the impact of future heatwaves, we consider the effect of potential management adaptions aimed at mitigating the effect of heat stress. These include climate-driven changes to planting dates (Sacks *et al* 2010, Moriondo *et al* 2011, Waha *et al* 2012, Iizumi *et al* 2019) and crop cultivars that are better suited towards higher peak temperatures (Stone and Nicolas 1994, Martre 2017, Bezner Kerr *et al* 2023).

The purpose of this work is thus to make tangible the effect of plausible future heatwaves on European crop yields in warmer climates (+2, +3 and +4 K), complementing traditional probabilistic scenario-based approaches that faithfully track changes in average temperatures, but often fail to capture heat extremes adequately. As part of this approach, we assess to what extent plausible management adaption strategies can mitigate the effect of future heatwaves.

2. Methods and materials

We examine the effects of heat stress during the flowering periods on wheat (*Triticum aestivum L.*) and maize (*Zea mays*), Europe's most grown winter and spring-sown cereals (EuroStat 2024). Flowering times of most winter crops are quite similar, and winter wheat can therefore be seen as representative of crops such as winter barley or rye. Maize is highly vulnerable to yield loss due to extreme events and is therefore particularly interesting for such an analysis (Vogel *et al* 2019).

2.1. Storyline simulations

We used storylines from the AWI-CM1 climate model (Sanchez-Benitez *et al* 2022). These simulations were branched off from CMIP scenario simulations at +2, +3 and +4 K global-mean surface warming when the respective warming levels are reached. The simulations are then nudged towards ERA5 (Hersbach *et al* 2020) reanalysis of large-scale wind data for the period 2017–2022, in which 2017 acts as a spinup year for the different model components. Thermodynamical variables and small-scale winds were allowed to develop freely (Van Garderen *et al* 2021, Sanchez-Benitez *et al* 2022). Here we use five members of the AWI-CM1 simulations for CMIP6 (E1–E5) which branched off from different ensemble members of the free-running climate model with different initial states for the atmosphere and ocean (Semmler *et al* 2020,

Sanchez-Benitez *et al* 2022). The members are dynamically downscaled using the ICON (ICOsahedral Non-hydrostatic) model, Version 2.6.5.1 (Zangl *et al* 2015) and configured for regional climate applications as ICON-CLM (ICON in Climate Limited-area Mode, see Pham *et al* (2021)) from a 1° global grid to a 0.11° grid over the Euro-CORDEX domain. In ICON-CLM, the Land-Feedback is integrated, and thus also spun up in the year 2017. To ensure that the present-day weather patterns are properly reproduced, we applied additional grid-point nudging of horizontal winds to the driving AWI-CM1 simulations at heights above 5000 m (Klimiuk *et al* 2025). As shown in Klimiuk *et al* (2025), dynamical downscaling improved the representation of near-surface temperature patterns in most of Europe and added essential regional details to global AWI-CM1 stories. Thorough reality-checks and model performance evaluation for AWI-CM1 and ICON-CLM have been demonstrated in the respective papers (Sanchez-Benitez *et al* 2022, Klimiuk *et al* 2025). As this event-based nudging methodology is novel and has not yet been applied widely, we only apply the aforementioned model-chain (AWI-CM1 to ICON-CLM) to our data.

2.2. Plant growth and flowering

Grid-cell-specific flowering dates across Europe were determined using the concept of growing degree days (GDDs). The GDD calculation follows that implemented in the plant development module *PlaMo^x* of the process-based model Landscape DeNitrification-DeComposition (LandscapeDNDC) (Haas *et al* 2013, Petersen *et al* 2021). GDDs are accumulated throughout the growing season between sowing and maturity according to

$$aGDD = \sum GDD \tag{1}$$

$$GDD = \left(T_{avg} - T_{base}\right) * f_{chill} \tag{2}$$

where aGDD is the accumulated GDDs, T_{avg} the average daily temperature, T_{base} the species-specific baseline temperature and f_{chill} the vernalisation factor. This concept is widespread and used by many crop-system models (e.g. Jones *et al* (2003), Moriondo *et al* (2011), Nendel (2012), etc.).

Sowing for winter cultivars was started in 2017, since soil and atmosphere were spun up sufficiently by the time of sowing in October, while spring sown cultivars were introduced for 2018. For the baseline scenario planting and maturity dates were taken from the global crop calendar produced by Jagermeyr *et al* (2021). This was constructed by combining national datasets spanning recent decades. We determined the associated flowering dates by first determining the grid-cell dependent a GDD at maturity, and then applying a species-specific fraction at which flowering occurs (54% for wheat, 55% for maize). For winter crops f_{chill} was calculated following the vernalisation routines described below, for spring and summer crops it is set to 1.

2.2.1. Vernalisation requirements of winter wheat

Vernalisation is one of the main determinants of flowering date (Hyles *et al* 2020) in winter crops. For winter crops plant development is delayed by a retardation factor f_{chill} if temperatures are insufficiently low for crop vernalisation. This is dependent on the accumulation of chill units (*aCU*) in the period before flowering according to

$$f_{chill} = \frac{aCU}{req\_CU} * chill\_influence \tag{3}$$

where

$$chill\_influence = \frac{aGDD - 0.5 \cdot GDD\_flowering}{0.5 \cdot GDD\_flowering} \tag{4}$$

with *req_CU* being the species-specific chill unit requirement for full vernalisation and *GDD_flowering* the species and grid-cell dependent accumulated GDDs at which flowering occurs. *chill_influence* is a unit-less factor gradually increasing from 0 at half of the GDDs required for flowering to 1 at flowering.

The calculation of vernalisation requirements was also used to quantify the suitability of a region for growing winter wheat. If 70% of the required chill units (*req_CU* = 35 for winter wheat) were not met in a grid cell in at least one year, the grid cell was deemed unsuitable for growing winter wheat. The results were then compared with the suitability maps from the Global Gridded Crop Model Intercomparison Project (GGCMI) project.

Figure 1. Rule-based decision tree for planting date adaptation. Planting is either advanced or postponed based on the climatological conditions of temperature, soil frost, snow cover, rainfall and soil moisture.

2.3. Rule-based shifting of planting dates under future climate

Planting date adaption was based on changes to the mean climate in the +2, +3 and +4 K storylines and to year-specific conditions in the planting period. The crop calendar by Jagermeyr *et al* (2021) was used as a first guess, and planting dates adjusted using a rule-based algorithm summarised in figure 1. The planting date was thus moved earlier if all conditions of no snow, no soil frost, and no heavy rainfall greater than 10 mm d^{-1} in the last 10 d were met. In case of heavy precipitation, it was additionally checked if the soil moisture exceeded the field capacity. If true, the planting date is delayed, since the soil was deemed unsuitable for heavy machinery. This approach is similar to the rules established by Sacks *et al* (2010) and Iizumi *et al* (2019), which also form the basis for the Jagermeyr *et al* (2021) planting calendar. By adjusting the planting date stepwise day-by-day, we ensure that the risk of late spring frosts is not higher than in the planting calendar, since our method would stop advancing at the latest date when conditions would still be suitable for planting. To explore the mitigation potential of planting date adaption we compare the results of our calculations using the Jagermeyr *et al* (2021) cropping calendar (henceforth referred to as static planting dates) with those arising from the adjusted planting dates (henceforth dynamic planting dates).

2.4. Heat Stress Index (HSI)

The impact of heat stress on crop yield was modelled via a Heat Stress Index (HSI) that is determined in the critical period starting 6 d before anthesis and continuing until 12 d after anthesis (Challinor *et al* 2005, Moriondo *et al* 2011, Nendel 2012). The HSI gives the fractional yield reduction due to heat stress and runs from 0 (full yield reduction due to heat stress) to 1 (no yield reduction due to heat stress). It is modelled as the minimum value of a heat stress factor (HSF),

$$\mathrm{HSI} = \min\left(\mathrm{HSF}_1, ... \mathrm{HSF}_n\right) \tag{5}$$

where

$$\mathrm{HSF} = 1 - \frac{T_{\max} - T_{\mathrm{cr}}}{T_{\mathrm{zero}} - T_{\mathrm{cr}}} \cdot F_{\mathrm{f}} \qquad \text{if} \quad T_{\max} > T_{\mathrm{cr}}. \tag{6}$$

The HSF is calculated for each separate period of heat stress within the anthesis period, defined as a set of consecutive days in which the maximum daily temperature ($T_{\max}$) exceeds a critical temperature (T_{cr}). T_{cr}

depends on both the timing of the heat stress relative to anthesis (t) and on the duration of the heat stress (d) according to

$$-6 \leqslant t \leqslant 0 \begin{cases} T_{cr}(t) = \min\left[T_{cr}^{min}, 36 + S_c(t-6)\right] \\ T_{zero}(t) = 60 + S_l(t-6) \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

$$0 < t \leqslant 12 \begin{cases} T_{cr}(t,d) = \min\left[T_{cr}^{min}, 37.8 + 1.8t - 3d\right] \\ T_{zero}(t,d) = 52 + 0.75t - 1.5d \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

where T_{cr}^{min} is a species specific constant, $S_c = 0.3$ and $S_l = 2.5$. T_{zero} is the temperature of zero pod-set (i.e. maximum possible heat stress) and is also dependent on the timing of the heat stress relative to anthesis and the duration of the heat stress period. HSF also depends on the fraction of flowers (F_f) open during the high-temperature episode. For each event, the HSF is multiplied with the generalized flowering distribution following the approach used by Moriondo *et al* (2011) in CropSyst, given by

$$F_f = \frac{1}{1 + \left(\frac{1}{0.015}\right) \cdot \exp\left(-1.4 \cdot daf\right)} \tag{9}$$

where *daf* is the number of days since flowering.

The lowest value of HSI per growing season is treated as the maximum impact. This model directly links heat stress to crop yield reduction, which was shown by Jin *et al* (2016) to be the best way to model the impact of heat stress. The importance of including timing and duration-dependent parameters has been demonstrated by Barlow *et al* (2015), Rezaei *et al* (2015), Rotter *et al* (2018). Similar anthesis heat stress models have been included in crop models such as GLAM (Challinor *et al* 2005), CropSyst (Moriondo *et al* 2011) MONICA (Nendel 2012), WOFOST (de Wit and Boogaard 2021), SIMPLACE (Webber *et al* 2016) and PEGASUS (Deryng *et al* 2014) and used to study the impact of heat stress on a global scale (Osborne *et al* 2013, Teixeira *et al* 2013).

Model parametrisation was based on literature values determined via comparison to field measurements. Wheat has a relatively low threshold for heat stress of around 27 °C close to anthesis, while for maize this lies between 32 °C (Lobell *et al* 2013) up to 37 °C (Teixeira *et al* 2013). Temperature thresholds for kernel abortion are around 35 °C (Rezaei *et al* 2015) and at temperatures above 38 °C the pollen viability can also be affected, though Rattalino and Otegui (2012) found kernel sterility to be the primary cause of grain reduction. These findings are well reproduced using a T_{cr}^{min} of 25 °C for wheat and 32 °C for maize (Deryng *et al* 2014)

HSI was determined on a yearly basis for each gridcell. Values were then grouped by increments of 0.1 from 0.5 to 1, as 0.5 was the largest observed reduction. The HSI was divided into five groups, labelled as *very severe* (0.5–0.6), *severe* (0.6–0.7), *medium* (0.7–0.8), *mild* (0.8–0.9), *weak* (0.9–1.0). A harvest index reduction would be equal to $1 - \text{HSI}$. To determine crop yield reductions on a European scale the HSI in each grid cell was combined with the crop-specific harvested area of each grid cell. This was determined by updating the MIRCA2000 dataset (Portmann *et al* 2010) using country-specific harvested areas for 2018–2022 reported by FAOSTAT (2023).

2.5. Cultivar adaptation potential

Cultivar adaption is an obvious management strategy for decreasing the impact of heat stress during the flowering period, and can be achieved either through spatial shifting of cultivars or through breeding. While T_{cr} is adjusted by length and duration, making it dependent on the specific event, it is still constrained by T_{cr}^{min} for each crop. We vary the parameter T_{cr}^{min}, mimicking the heat stress resistance of different crop cultivars (Browne *et al* 2021). For both wheat and maize we vary T_{cr}^{min} by ± 2 K relative to the default value. By showing how different cultivars would react to elevated temperatures, we demonstrate the potential for exploring different cultivars either through shifting spatially or through breeding.

3. Results

3.1. Changes in crop growing suitability due to warming

The area suitable for growing winter wheat changes drastically throughout the different storyline scenarios (figure 2). The warm summers coincided with mild winters, proving large areas of France to be unsuitable for winter wheat cultivation due to the winters not providing sufficient vernalisation, moving the share of winter wheat from 92% of the wheat growing area estimated in GGCMI to 83% (Jagermeyr *et al* 2021), and causing 24.1% of the traditional winter wheat area to be lost already in the present day climate. For +2 K and +3 K, this increases from 31 to 36% and up to 44% in the warmest scenarios of +4 K background warming.

Figure 2. Shift in the suitability to grow winter wheat in the different storyline scenarios (present day, +2 K, +3 K, +4 K). A pixel is deemed suitable for winter wheat if at least 70% of the chill units required for vernalisation were accumulated in at least one of the five winters.

Figure 3. Average heat stress indices (HSI) for wheat (upper row) and maize (lower row) over the years 2018–2022 in the storyline scenarios (present day, +2 K, +3 K, +4 K). Heat stress for wheat is determined by combining winter and spring wheat according to the suitability maps shown in figure 2. *Very severe* heat stress corresponds to expected yield reductions between 40% and 50%.

Comparing data within the approach shows that a quarter of the suitable winter wheat growing area is lost between the present day and +4 K climate. At the end of the century, the share of spring wheat would therefore increase from a current estimation of ca. 8% (GGCMI data) to up to 40%.

3.2. Importance of heat stress during 2018–2022 (present day)

First, we analyse the impact of heat stress on wheat and maize during the heat episodes between 2018 and 2022 in the present climate. The temperatures during the growing seasons in those years were quite different from one another in the development of the heat in terms of timing and duration. Large extents of Europe experienced heat stress at least once during the reoccurring heatwaves throughout 2018–2022 for both maize and winter wheat.

3.2.1. Wheat

The HSI for wheat is displayed as the combination of winter and spring wheat, combined according to suitability for growing winter wheat (see section 3.1).

During present day conditions, the reduction in potential yields due to anthesis heat stress is on average 6.5% over the European domain (figure 3). In 2018 we calculate 84% (24 Mha) of the harvested area for rain-fed wheat to have been affected by some form of heat stress, though the majority of the affected area (63%, 18 Mha) was only affected *weakly* (see figures 3, A1). Most of these *weakly* affected areas were located in the northeast of Europe. In 2019 and 2022 around 80% of the harvested area was affected by at least *weak* heat stress, with 2.3% (670 kha) and 2.6% (750 kha) affected by *severe* heat stress. The mean reduction of the harvest index over the entire domain was approximately 10% in 2019 and 2022. In 2019 parts of France also became more exposed to heat around anthesis, transitioning from only being *mildly* affected to *severely* affected, while in 2022 the main mechanism driving the reduction of the harvest index was an increase in *severely* affected areas predominantly in Spain. The majority of affected areas lie within regions considered spring wheat growing regions, such as Spain or Italy (see figures 3, A1). For spring wheat around 93% to 99% of the area was affected by some form of heat stress, with the majority lying in the *severely* affected category, potentially reducing yield between 30% and 40% due to anthesis heat stress. For winter-grown crops like winter wheat, the danger of heat stress is not as imminent, since the plants have the chance to develop in

Figure 4. Sum of the wheat harvested area affected by anthesis heat stress over the European domain for the different storylines scenarios (present day, +2 K, +3 K and +4 K). Every pixel where the Heat Stress Index (HSI) is less than 1 is considered affected, i.e. there is some yield reduction due to anthesis heat stress. Shading represents the full spread of the five ensemble members.

autumn, causing the flowering to occur earlier during milder weather. On average 27% of winter wheat area experienced heat stress under the present day scenario, with 69% only *weakly* affected, showing the current effect of heat stress on winter wheat is almost negligible. The results were similar if the whole of Europe was considered suitable for winter wheat (30% *not* affected and 66% *weakly* affected).

3.2.2. Maize
We estimate that during the 2018–2022 period between 68% and 98% of maize harvested area was affected by some form of heat stress, with up to 6.7% of maize harvested area experiencing severe heat stress in 2022 causing a yield loss due to heat stress of approximately 10% in the affected area (see figure A3). From 2018 to 2019 an increase in affected areas is evident, but in 2020, 12% less area than in the previous year was affected by heat stress since 2020 was a non-extreme heat year compared to all other years (see figure 5). The Mediterranean is one of the most affected areas. However, this changed depending on the timing of the heatwave, e.g. in 2021 most of the Iberian Peninsula was affected only *mildly*, whereas in 2018, 2020 and 2022 more than 50% of the Peninsula was affected by *very severe* heat stress levels, leading to a loss of between 40% and 50% of maize yields in those areas (figure A3). Most of central Europe showed no to mild affection levels of heat stress, especially in 2019 and 2021, despite record-breaking temperatures. It seems that the timing of the heatwave and the plant flowering did not align in a way of causing anthesis heat stress.

3.3. Heat stress in the storylines of the 2018–2022 period
By applying the storylines of the 2018 to 2022 period (section 2.1), which included multiple heatwaves (Kueh and Lin 2020, Wehrli *et al* 2020, Lhotka and Kysely 2022), we can demonstrate how the impact of heatwaves could change under climate change. These storylines enable us to extrapolate present day results and make the impacts of climate change more tangible.

3.3.1. Wheat
The intensity of the heat stress for wheat increases across the climate change scenarios. From a 6.5% reduction of potential yields during the present day the HSI increases to an average 7.5%, 9% and 11% reduction on average over Europe in the considered scenarios (see figure 3).

In the +2 K scenario, the heat stress on wheat is not significantly different to present day conditions. Most changes are visible in the Iberian peninsula, where the areas affected would suffer from 40% up to 50% yield losses due to anthesis heat stress, although much of these areas do not primarily grow wheat. For wheat, 2018 is throughout all scenarios the year with the lowest HSI and also the highest harvest area affected (figure 4), particularly in north-eastern Europe (figures A1, A2). The differences between the years is similar within the storyline simulations and the present day (section 3.2.1). For the +3 K and the +4 K scenarios, there is a clear reduction of the HSI for the areas still cold enough for growing winter wheat (figure 4), but also a significant reduction in areas meeting this criterion. Conversely, for spring wheat the trend is reversed. The modelled heat stress becomes much more relevant, with the affected area increasing from 4.3 ± 0.3 Mha to 12 ± 0.9 Mha and the *severely* affected areas increasing from 2.3 Mha to 6.4 Mha comparing present day and +4 K.

3.3.2. Maize
When examining the +2, +3 and +4 K scenarios, a steady intensification of stress in areas already affected in the present day is evident (figure 3). Flowering occurs on average 6 d earlier per storyline scenario due to higher temperatures during the growing season leading to a faster plant development (figure 6). On average,

Figure 5. Same as figure 4 but for maize.

Figure 6. Frequency distribution of flowering dates of maize over the European domain for the different storylines scenarios (present day, +2 K, +3 K and +4 K).

the +4 K scenarios show the largest affected area, but individual years in the +2 K and +3 K, and sometimes even in the present day scenario, show much larger affected areas due to the changes in flowering date relative to the heat episode (figure 5). In comparing different years, 2021 and 2022 emerge as the most heat stress affected, with a yield loss of up to 15% across Europe in the +4 K storyline. In 2021 large areas of eastern Europe, specifically south eastern Europe are affected by intense anthesis heat stress in the warming storylines. In terms of affected area, 2021 and 2022 show the highest shares throughout all future scenarios (10–11.8 Mha, see figure 5) and the *severely* affected area increases from 6% in 2022 in the present day to over 15% considering the +4 K scenario, with potential yield losses of up to 45% in Italy, Slovenia or Spain provided maize is grown there. Together with losses from less affected areas, Europe wide this could lead to a 10% reduction of maize yields. Germany remains non-heat stressed in 2021 up until the +4 K scenario (figure A3). 2022 also shows high levels of stress throughout most of Europe, albeit the entire affected harvested area decreasing slightly in the +4 K scenario as parts of northern Europe become less heat-stressed compared even to the present day.

As visible in figure 5, while the present day, +2 K and the +3 K scenarios for 2022 all show an increase in the affected area from 2021 of an additional 1.6 Mha (1Mha; 0.7 Mha), in the +4 K scenario affected area decreases by 0.3 Mha. This is mostly due to the 2021 heatwave initially being locally quite constrained to the western part of Europe, and Central Europe having quite low HSI levels, while 2022 showing are more homogeneous distribution in Europe (figures A3, A4). Throughout the warming levels, the 2021 heatwave spatially expands significantly, while the 2022 patterns show more of an intensification within already affected areas, leading to the overall affected area even decreasing as parts of northern Germany and Poland become unaffected.

3.4. South-east Europe
The mean HSI over the heatwave period (figure 3) generally shows a stronger impact in the south of Europe, but the yearly indices (figure A3) show that the warming can have diverging effects in different years. Our analysis identifies southeast Europe as a climate change hot spot, warranting a closer analysis. The mean HSI over southeastern Europe shows a higher level of heat stress than the European average, resulting in a stronger reduction of the harvest index. For present day, the area affected is on average 0.8 Mha, with a mean HSI of 0.86, corresponding to a reduction of the harvest index of over 20% in southeastern Europe.

Despite 2019 having a considerable impact on HSI (0.88), only 33 kha of the harvested area was affected, leading to a weak overall impact (figure A3). In 2021, the HSI had a much larger impact (0.76), and over ten

Figure 7. The Heat Stress Index (HSI) for south-eastern Europe in the heat year 2021 for the different storyline scenarios (present day, +2 K, +3 K and +4 K).

times more area was affected (400 kha), with the main impact restricted to the eastern part of the study area. Figure 7 shows the dramatic increase in affected area when the year 2021 is transferred into +2 K, +3 K and +4 K storyline scenarios. In the +4 K storyline, there is a dramatic increase in severity, with almost all the study area affected by *severe* (33%; 2.8 Mha) or *very severe* conditions (43%; 2.11 Mha).

3.5. Mitigation strategies

In order to assess whether planting adaptation can help alleviate heat stress we compare the static planting dates from the Jagermeyr *et al* (2021) crop calendar with the dynamically derived planting dates under future climate scenarios (see section 2.3). We applied the dynamic planting scheme to the present day scenario to compare with the static planting dates but saw no significant difference, demonstrating that the scheme does not introduce artefacts.

3.5.1. Differences due to management adaptations

Applying the dynamic planting scheme leads to a general advance of the planting day on average one week earlier compared to static planting under the +4 K scenario, which in turn leads to the flowering date also being reached earlier (see figure 8). The effect varies between the years in the storylines, but on average anthesis is reached around 2 d earlier for every storyline (figure 8), albeit with local differences. The north-east of Europe shows slightly later flowering under the dynamic conditions in the colder years 2017 and 2020. The differences in flowering between the dynamic and static planting dates become slightly higher with increasing warming. Some regions, such as north-east Europe and the Iberian peninsula show almost no change, while in Germany and the north of France, flowering occurs up to 10 d earlier. The earliest flowering is found in 2018 under the +4 K storyline and is on average 6 d earlier than in the static planting scheme. Parts of central Europe, especially the Czech Republic, show flowering dates up to 20 d earlier.

Our results show that planting date adaptation would affect the experienced heat stress throughout most of Europe. On average, the reduction in the HSI is around 5% relative to the static planting dates. Generally, the difference between dynamic and static planting become more significant with increasing climate change signal, with regions experiencing up to 20% less heat stress under the dynamic planting scheme. However, one can also see that not all of Europe experiences this alleviating effect and in many southern regions, a weather-adapted planting did not reduce heat stress at flowering. Especially in southern Europe the adjusted planting in some years even leads to a worsening of the HSI, with maize crops 10% more stressed under the earlier planting date in the +4 K scenario. However, the effect is heterogeneous between years. In 2019 and its storylines the alleviating effect is quite strong, especially in central Europe, causing up to 20% less heat stress within the +4 K scenario, while 2018 and 2022 show an increase in the HSI with the dynamic planting compared to keeping the current planting dates in France and Slovenia (figure 9).

3.5.2. Cultivar variances

While the HSI is a simplified concept to integrate the complexities of plant physiology, it is still possible to study the potential effect of cultivar adaptation. The parameters of T_{cr} can be seen as unified and simplified versions of plant genetics. By varying parameters, it is possible to give an idea of the behaviour of different cultivars. Figures A6 and A7 show that, while the absolute values of HSI differ if different T_{cr} values are used, changes vary locally. For wheat, the highest negative impact of a more sensitive cultivar is visible in France, where different varieties could make up to a 20% difference in yield. It is also evident that spring wheat is much more susceptible to cultivar differences, whereas the differences in the winter wheat growing areas are negligible, all keeping a weak stress level. Maize also shows local behaviour, though spatially more granular

Figure 8. Left: Frequency distribution of planting dates for static and rule-based (dynamic) planting date adaption. The static planting dates from the Jagermeyr *et al* (2021) crop calendar (present-day) are compared with the dynamic, storyline-dependent planting dates (+2 K, +3 K, +4 K). Right: Differences flowering date between static and dynamic planting dates aggregated over Europe and averaged over all years (2018–2022).

Figure 9. Differences in the Heat Stress Index (HSI) between static and dynamic planting dates in the years 2019 and 2022 of the +4 K storyline. Blue colour denotes less heatstress with dynamic planting, brown shows more stress under dynamic planting. The years 2018, 2020 and 2021 can be found in figure A8.

compared to the modelled stress levels. By changing the anthesis stress threshold by $\pm 2\,^{\circ}\mathrm{C}$, only a 5% difference in yield limitation is noticeable, much less as compared to spring wheat.

4. Discussion

In this study, we developed a framework allowing us to quantify the impact of anthesis heat stress on European crop yields during the reoccurring heatwaves between 2018 and 2022. Additionally, using storyline simulations, we assessed how these anomalous warm summers would have played out under an even warmer climate (+2, +3 and +4 K). Our results show that the variability between years in one warming storyline is bigger than the difference between the warming storylines for both maize and wheat cropping systems. This suggests that the way a heat stress event unfolds in terms of timing and duration can be more important for agricultural production than the regional mean warming levels. Especially for maize, this is visible in both 2019 and 2022. 2019 showed some record-breaking peaks of the heatwave (Klimiuk *et al* 2025), but this did not align with the plant flowering, leading to relatively low HSI levels in the present day scenario. 2022 showed some of the strongest effects of anthesis heat stress, with present-day yield losses higher than projected in the +4 K storyline for 2018, despite 2018 also being considered an extreme year in terms of heat, because in 2022 the timing of the heatwave fell closer to plant anthesis. Results show that the most vulnerable areas for maize are the Iberian Peninsula, Italy and south-eastern Europe, of which south-east Europe is currently the largest maize grower with up to 30% of a grid cell growing maize (according to MIRCA2000). Our calculation of a yield loss of around 10% for maize in 2022 is similar but slightly higher than the reported values in Baruth *et al* (2022), who attribute ca 8.6% yield loss to the 2022 heatwave in Europe. One reason for this discrepancy may be that our calculations are only applicable to the rainfed cropping area, which experienced higher losses than irrigated systems.

Similar HSI-based methods have been applied by Deryng *et al* (2014) and Teixeira *et al* (2013) for the RCP 8.5 and A1B scenarios, showing a global doubling of yield losses due to heat stress at anthesis for maize and wheat in the last decade of the century. While their results do not show large impacts over Europe, this may be due to the choice of scenarios. While the RCP8.5 has a similar impact in regards to warming levels to the +4 K storyline, extreme events are often not captured in the CMIP6 models, and even more so in

previous CMIP iterations (Davini and D'Andrea 2020, Hirsch *et al* 2021, Domeisen *et al* 2023). Our results show that the difference between a 'normal' and an 'extreme' year can have much higher impacts on stress levels, making it easy to miss these nuances, especially on the coarser resolution of a global model. Attribution studies such as Zampieri *et al* (2017) and Vogel *et al* (2019) show similar patterns, with 18%–43% of the variance in yields being attributed to extreme events. Furthermore, Semenov and Shewry (2011) highlight how in Europe heat stress is highly likely to become more important than drought stress.

The storyline approach is a physically consistent method, thus allowing us to study the consequences of recently observed extreme heat periods if they would happen in different plausible future warmer climates. Therefore, as pointed out by Shepherd *et al* (2018), this methodology provides a very effective way of making the impacts of climate change more tangible not only for experts but also for the general public and stakeholders (e.g. politicians, media, etc), thus facilitating decision-making in adaptation and mitigation. However, it does have the drawback of not producing probabilistic predictions. As such, changes in likelihood are out of the scope of this methodology. However, it is known from other methods that an increase in extreme events is highly likely (Trnka *et al* 2014). Furthermore, since only few models have performed nudged storyline simulations, we were only able to work with data from one model chain (AWI-CM1 with ICON-CLM). In the future, we hope that the method is applied more frequently, thus making model-ensembles possible. For now we are happy to be able to present the whole modelling chain from global scale modelling (Sanchez-Benitez *et al* 2022), to downscaling (Klimiuk *et al* 2025) to direct impact analysis on agriculture.

Our findings also highlight how important the differentiation between spring and autumn sown cultivars will become in the future. While winter wheat can cope fairly well with warmer years due to its phenological advantage , spring wheat and maize are already vulnerable to anthesis stress, which will only worsen in the future (Webber *et al* 2018) (for flowering dates see figure A5). The warming-induced reduction of the area suitable for winter wheat thus exacerbates the problem of anthesis heat stress since it makes agriculture more dependent on spring-sown wheat, which is more susceptible to heat stress during the anthesis phase.

One striking result is that the alleviation of heat stress due to planting date adaption was heterogeneous between the years. When the heatwaves occur mainly in summer, like in 2019, the planting date adaptation is most effective. If the heatwaves were instead due to an extended blocking situation starting earlier in the year, like in 2018 or 2022 (Kueh and Lin 2020), an adaptive planting that only looks at sowing-time conditions sometimes leads to an increased anthesis heat stress, if it happens to shift the flowering period into alignment with the heatwave. In 2019 the heatwave above central Europe peaked only in June, whereas in 2018 and 2022 it was already warm throughout May. This means that simply looking at the current conditions for sowing might not be sufficient to ensure a secure harvest in the future. Trnka *et al* (2014) also argue that earlier planted crops often have a reduced global radiation available, reducing the yield potential of these crops. However, earlier planting could open up the possibility of multi-cropping (Iizumi *et al* 2019, Waha *et al* 2020), which might be able to balance out the effect of reduced global radiation (Porter *et al* 2014), but with the drawback of increased evapotranspiration. These findings highlight the need for improved seasonal forecasting since there is still low reliability in predicting European heatwaves using seasonal forecasts (Weisheimer *et al* 2011, Prodhomme *et al* 2022, Domeisen *et al* 2023). Since we did not see significant yield cuts to winter wheat due to anthesis heat stress, we did not apply the adaptation of planting dates to winter wheat. Murakami *et al* (2024) developed an improved version of the Iizumi *et al* (2019) crop calendar specifically for winter wheat, which showed earlier flowering despite later planting dates under warmer climates, further showing the potential in winter cultivars for evading anthesis heat stress.

Heat stress is not the only important factor that might increase under climate change. As a side effect of temperatures getting hotter and planting dates shifting earlier under climate change, the danger of late frosts may become more unpredictable. While currently farmers planting after the cold periods in early spring still have sufficient season length to get a good yield from their crop, as temperatures get higher planting dates not only can but need to be shifted earlier to get sufficient yields or to be able to grow a second rotation, compensating for the lower yields of the single crop. While the risk of late spring frosts is likely to increase (Trnka *et al* 2014), the risk is comparatively low when looking at the risk of anthesis heat stress.

Southern Europe, specifically the Mediterranean region, have shown higher warming (Perkins-Kirkpatrick and Lewis 2020, Cos *et al* 2022) and drying (Samaniego *et al* 2018) levels than the rest of Europe, proving it to be a climate change hot spot (Lionello and Scarascia 2018). This creates a feedback loop where the lack of moisture causes a shift towards more latent energy (Miralles *et al* 2019) leading to moisture-limited regions like the Mediterranean are heating up even quicker (Perkins 2015, Seneviratne *et al* 2021). Bras *et al* (2021) show that yields have already seen large impacts in southern Europe during past heatwaves, which is in line with our results for the present-day scenario. While in 2021 the effect of heat stress was already quite noticeable, the interaction of this type of heatwave with climate change has extensive effects. The *severely* affected area under the +2 K scenario coincides with the Danube plains, which are some

of the most highly harvested areas in Europe. While other regions of Europe might seem to be similarly affected (figure 3), not all highly affected areas are major cereal producers. In the Mediterranean region, we find that earlier planting could also not improve heat stress for spring-sown crops. Moriondo *et al* (2011) show similar results for sunflowers, as the plant development cannot be advanced enough in spring to avoid heat stress periods. Ludwig and Asseng (2010) showed that there is also no benefit on yields, since the lower initial biomass limits grain yields. In their assessment of yield reduction with anthesis heat stress for durum wheat in the Mediterranean, Moriondo *et al* (2016) show a decrease of 9% in Spain and 5.1% in Greece. This is comparable with the HSI of 0.93 (meaning a 7% decrease in the harvest index) in the southeast of Europe in a non-extreme year (2017) of our +2 K scenario. However, we also see that the extreme years in the same warming scenario have a much higher HSI value between 0.75 to 0.86 (figure 7), though these values need to be taken with caution due to the slight overestimation of T_{max} in the ICON model close to the black sea (Klimiuk *et al* 2025). The IPCC dedicated a special chapter to the Mediterranean in their last report, synthesizing that wheat yields under rainfed conditions could decline up to 59% and that decreases are also expected for maize due to a shorter growing season length (Ali *et al* 2022).

What we explicitly did not do in this study is calculate potential yields. The purpose of the HSI is to give a clear picture of one stressor, specifically heat stress due to high temperatures at flowering. While Deryng *et al* (2014) and Teixeira *et al* (2013) normalize for yields, we believe that normalizing with yield introduces more uncertainties than normalizing over the harvested area. The harvested area in a region is representative of more fixed state parameters, such as soil and location. Yield also depends on many other stresses, such as nutrient stress, drought stress or extreme precipitation. Modelling yield failures under current conditions already poses a large challenge in disentangling the sources (Webber *et al* 2020). These factors are also subject to change with climate change, making it difficult to isolate the impact of heat stress alone. We also did not consider the effect of CO_2 fertilization in this work. While this is a strong determinant of the balance of future crop yields, multiple studies show that it is also still one of the largest uncertainties in crop modelling (Muller *et al* 2021). It is quite certain that CO_2 will have an alleviating effect on the otherwise negative impacts of climate change (Schauberger *et al* 2017, Jagermeyr *et al* 2021), however, the predictions are not conclusive enough to show that it will be sufficient to compensate for yield losses, especially in the context of (multiple) extreme events (Bezner Kerr *et al* 2023). Generally, wheat, being a C3 plant, is expected to profit more from increased CO_2 than maize (Jagermeyr *et al* 2021). However, yield increases often coincide with a loss of nutritional value, and therefore do not add to food security (Mbow *et al* 2022). Another uncertainty lies in the thresholds used for the specific crops. While there is extensive research on the physiological reaction of crops to heat shocks (Wahid *et al* 2007, Farooq *et al* 2011, Akter and Islam 2017, Rezaei *et al* 2018), the results are not directly transferable as one threshold per crop (Rezaei *et al* 2015). Multiple papers apply the same approach, but each uses a different threshold per crop (Teixeira *et al* 2013, Deryng *et al* 2014). While this type of model only conceptually accounts for different plant cultivars, the notion of heat stress tolerant and sensitive cultivars is based on wheat genetic background (Browne *et al* 2021). Our comparison of applying different threshold temperatures shows that there could be a larger spread in the potential impact. Zabel *et al* (2021) also find that a redistribution of current cultivars can offset climate change effects up to 2 °C, and after that new cultivar adaptations need to be found, emphasizing the need for fast breeding strategies.

Of course, heatwaves do not only negatively affect crops with high temperatures at anthesis, periods of high temperatures often lead to low soil moisture and therefore drought stress (Fahad *et al* 2017, Webber *et al* 2018, Strer 2020). Additionally, the low soil moisture creates a positive feedback loop, exacerbating the temperature increase on both a regional scale (Tripathy and Mishra 2023, Xoplaki *et al* 2025, Bevacqua *et al* 2024), but also at the canopy level (Webber *et al* 2016). Combining the storylines with a full process-based crop model also including soil moisture dynamics could therefore add to the understanding of the full scale of the impact of heatwaves under climate change. Also, other extremes, such as late frosts or extreme rainfall, can have detrimental impacts on crop production (Lesk *et al* 2016, Beillouin *et al* 2020, Schmidt *et al* 2022), which could warrant a future analysis into specific events captured in the storylines.

5. Conclusion

We have studied the effects of anthesis heat stress on European cropping systems. By employing a HSI method to analyse the reoccurring heatwaves between 2018 to 2022 and its projections under climate change (+2 K, +3 K, +4 K) we show that anthesis heat stress will become more important through the century as heatwaves become more frequent and intense. As winters become warmer, the area where winter wheat can be potentially be grown with sufficient vernalization would diminish, leading to a higher need for spring sown cultivars. These however are much more prone to experience anthesis heat stress, as they do not have a growth advantage in spring, leading to later flowering and therefore making high temperatures during

anthesis more likely. Our findings underscore that the timing and intensity of a heatwave outweigh the underlying climate change signal, emphasizing the importance of accurate seasonal forecasting and understanding heatwave dynamics for effective management adaptations. Especially in the southern regions of Europe anthesis heat stress will gain importance, especially in a heatwave situation similar to that of 2022. Additionally, our study suggests that moving the planting date earlier may not always be beneficial, highlighting the complexity of mitigating heat stress impacts in agricultural systems.

Data availability statement

The data cannot be made publicly available upon publication because they are not available in a format that is sufficiently accessible or reusable by other researchers. The data that support the findings of this study are available upon reasonable request from the authors.

Acknowledgment

Conflict of interest

The contact author has declared that none of the authors has any competing interests.

Code availability

The scripts for calculating the heat stress and plotting the data are available at https://codebase.helmholtz.cloud/lioba.martin/scenic-heatstress.

Appendix A. Supplementary materials

Figure A1. Heat Stress Index (HSI) for wheat anthesis heat stress ($T_{cr} = 25\,^\circ$C), which is both winter and spring wheat combined. HSI values are grouped by increments of 0.1 from 0.5 to 1, as 0.5 was the largest observed impact. The potential yield reduction per pixel corresponds to $1 - $HSI.

Figure A2. Spread of the wheat Heat Stress Index (HSI) in the present day and +4 K scenario for all ensemble members. Mann–Whitney U test showed no significant differences between ensemble members ($p < 0.05$).

Figure A3. Heat Stress Index (HSI) for maize anthesis heat stress ($T_{\mathrm{cr}} = 32\,^{\circ}\mathrm{C}$), values are grouped by increments of 0.1 from 0.5 to 1, as 0.5 was the largest observed impact. The potential yield reduction per pixel corresponds to $1-\mathrm{HSI}$.

Figure A4. Spread of the maize Heat Stress Index (HSI) in the present day and +4 K scenario for all ensemble members. Mann–Whitney U test showed no significant differences between ensemble members ($p < 0.05$).

Figure A5. Day of the year where flowering occurs in maize, spring wheat and winter wheat throughout Europe.

Table A1. Harvested area in million hectares for the different levels of heat stress in south-eastern Europe.

| Year	Very severe	Severe	Strong	Moderate	Weak	None
2021	0.40	1.31	0.48	0.62	3.65	0.07
2042	1.12	1.70	0.97	1.34	1.32	0.02
2069	2.11	2.46	0.91	0.63	0.34	0.00
2097	2.78	2.15	0.42	0.66	0.43	0.00

Figure A6. Differences in the Heat Stress Index (HSI) index between different threshold values used in wheat. Left: Difference between the 'default' T_{cr} and $T_{cr} - 2$ K, the HSI for the default setting and the $T_{cr} + 2$ K.


Figure A7. Differences in the Heat Stress Index (HSI) index between different threshold values used in maize. Left: Difference between the 'default' T_{cr} and $T_{cr} - 2$ K, the HSI for the default setting and the $T_{cr} + 2$ K.

Figure A8. Differences in the Heat Stress Index (HSI) between static and dynamic planting dates in 2018, 2020 and 2021 of the +4 K storyline.

ORCID iDs

Lioba Lucia Martin ⓘ https://orcid.org/0009-0004-6220-2668
Andrew Smerald ⓘ https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2026-273X
Ralf Kiese ⓘ https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2814-4888
Tatiana Klimiuk ⓘ https://orcid.org/0009-0006-2438-2674
Patrick Ludwig ⓘ https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3655-7890
Antonio Sanchéz-Benítez ⓘ https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2505-6014
Helge Goessling ⓘ https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9018-1383
Clemens Scheer ⓘ https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5396-2076

References

Akter N and Islam M R 2017 Heat stress effects and management in wheat. A review *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* **37** 9
Ali E *et al* 2022 Cross-chapter paper 4: Mediterranean region *Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* 1st edn (Cambridge University Press)
Asseng S *et al* 2015 Rising temperatures reduce global wheat production *Nat. Clim. Change* **5** 143–7
Balla K, Karsai I, Bónis P, Kiss T, Berki Z, Horvath I, Mayer M, Bencze S and Veisz O 2019 Heat stress responses in a large set of winter wheat cultivars (Triticum aestivum L.) depend on the timing and duration of stress *PLoS One* **14** 1–20
Barlow K M, Christy B P, O'Leary G J, Riffkin P A and Nuttall J G 2015 Simulating the impact of extreme heat and frost events on wheat crop production: a review *Field Crops Res.* **171** 109–19
Baruth B *et al* 2022 JRC MARS Bulletin - Crop monitoring in Europe - August 2022 - Vol. 30 No 8 (available at: https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/handle/JRC127964)
Bathiany S, Belleflamme A, Zohbi J E, Ney P, Goergen K and Rechid D 2023 Increasing interannual climate variability during crop flowering in Europe *Environ. Res. Lett.* **18** 044037
Beillouin D, Schauberger B, Bastos A, Ciais P and Makowski D 2020 Impact of extreme weather conditions on European crop production in 2018 *Phil. Trans. R. Soc.* B **375** 20190510
Bevacqua E, Rakovec O, Schumacher D L, Kumar R, Thober S, Samaniego L, Seneviratne S I and Zscheischler J 2024 Direct and lagged climate change effects intensified the 2022 European drought *Nat. Geosci.* **17** 1100–7
Bezner Kerr R *et al* 2022 IPCC 6 chapter 5 - food, fibre and other ecosystem products *Climate Change 2022 - Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Gropu II to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* ed H-O Portner (Cambridge University Press) pp 713–906
Bheemanahalli R, Ramamoorthy P, Poudel S, Samiappan S, Wijewardane N and Reddy K R 2022 Effects of drought and heat stresses during reproductive stage on pollen germination, yield and leaf reflectance properties in maize (Zea mays L.) *Plant Direct* **6** e434
Bras T A, Seixas J, Carvalhais N and Jägermeyr J 2021 Severity of drought and heatwave crop losses tripled over the last five decades in Europe *Environ. Res. Lett.* **16** 065012
Browne R G, Li S F, Iacuone S, Dolferus R and Parish R W 2021 Differential responses of anthers of stress tolerant and sensitive wheat cultivars to high temperature stress *Planta* **254** 4
Cairns J E *et al* 2013 Identification of drought, heat and combined drought and heat tolerant donors in maize *Crop Sci.* **53** 1335–46
Challinor A J, Watson J, Lobell D B, Howden S M, Smith D R and Chhetri N 2014 A meta-analysis of crop yield under climate change and adaptation *Nat. Clim. Change* **4** 287–91
Challinor A J, Wheeler T R, Craufurd P Q and Slingo J M 2005 Simulation of the impact of high temperature stress on annual crop yields *Agric. For. Meteorol.* **135** 180–9
Ciais P *et al* 2005 Europe-wide reduction in primary productivity caused by the heat and drought in 2003 *Nature* **437** 529–33
Cicchino M, Edreira J I R and Otegui M E 2010 Heat stress during late vegetative growth of maize: effects on phenology and assessment of optimum temperature *Crop Sci.* **50** 1431–7
Cos J, Doblas-Reyes F, Jury M, Marcos R, Bretonniére P-A and Samsó M 2022 The Mediterranean climate change hotspot in the CMIP5 and CMIP6 projections *Earth Syst. Dyn.* **13** 321–40
Davini P and D'Andrea F 2020 From CMIP3 to CMIP6: Northern Hemisphere atmospheric blocking simulation in present and future climate *J. Clim.* **33** 10021–38
De Boeck H J, Hiltbrunner E, Verlinden M, Bassin S and Zeiter M 2018 Legacy effects of climate extremes in alpine grassland *Front. Plant Sci.* **9** 86

de Wit A and Boogaard H 2021 *A Gentle Introduction to WOFOST* (Wageningen Envirionmental Research) p 47

Deryng D, Conway D, Ramankutty N, Price J and Warren R 2014 Global crop yield response to extreme heat stress under multiple climate change futures *Environ. Res. Lett.* **9** 034011

Domeisen D I V *et al* 2023 Prediction and projection of heatwaves *Nat. Rev. Earth Environ.* **4** 36–50

EuroStat 2024 Crop production in EU standard humidity by NUTS 2 regions (available at: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/apro_cpshr__custom_11231571/default/bar?lang = en)

Fahad S *et al* 2017 Crop production under drought and heat stress: plant responses and management options *Front. Plant Sci.* **8** 1147

Fan X, Miao C, Duan Q, Shen C and Wu Y 2020 The performance of CMIP6 versus CMIP5 in simulating temperature extremes over the global land surface *J. Geophys. Res.* **125** 31

FAOSTAT 2023 Production/Crops and livestock products (available at: www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/QCL/)

Farooq M, Bramley H, Palta J A and Siddique K H 2011 Heat stress in wheat during reproductive and grain-filling phases *Crit. Rev. Plant Sci.* **30** 491–507

Haas E, Klatt S, Fröhlich A, Kraft P, Werner C, Kiese R, Grote R, Breuer L and Butterbach-Bahl K 2013 LandscapeDNDC: a process model for simulation of biosphere-atmosphere-hydrosphere exchange processes at site and regional scale *Landscape Ecol.* **28** 615–36

Heino M, Kinnunen P, Anderson W, Ray D, Puma M J, Varis O, Siebert S and Kummu M 2023 Increased probability of hot and dry weather extremes during the growing season threatens global crop yields *Sci. Rep.* **13** 2

Hersbach H *et al* 2020 The ERA5 global reanalysis *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.* **146** 1999–2049

Hirsch A L, Ridder N N, Perkins-Kirkpatrick S E and Ukkola A 2021 CMIP6 multimodel evaluation of present-day heatwave attributes *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **48** e2021GL095161

Hoegh-Guldberg O, Jacob D and Taylor M 2018 Impacts of 1.5°C of Global Warming on Natural and Human Systems *Global Warming of 1.5°C - An IPCC Special Report on the Impacts of Global Warming of 1.5°C Above pre-Industrial Levels and Related Global Greenhouse gas Emission Pathways, in the Context of Strengthening the Global Response to the Threat of Climate Change, Sustainable Development and Efforts to Eradicate Poverty*

Hyles J, Bloomfield M T, Hunt J R, Trethowan R M and Trevaskis B 2020 Phenology and related traits for wheat adaptation *Heredity* **125** 417–30

Iizumi T, Kim W and Nishimori M 2019 Modeling the global sowing and harvesting windows of major crops around the year 2000 *J. Adv. Modeling Earth Syst.* **11** 99–112

Jägermeyr J *et al* 2021 Climate impacts on global agriculture emerge earlier in new generation of climate and crop models *Nat. Food* **2** 873–85

Jin Z, Zhuang Q, Tan Z, Dukes J S, Zheng B and Melillo J M 2016 Do maize models capture the impacts of heat and drought stresses on yield? Using algorithm ensembles to identify successful approaches *Glob. Change Biol.* **22** 1–15

Jones J, Hoogenboom G, Porter C, Boote K, Batchelor W, Hunt L, Wilkens P, Singh U, Gijsman A and Ritchie J 2003 The DSSAT cropping system model *Eur. J. Agron.* **18** 235–65

Klimiuk T, Ludwig P, Sanchez-Benitez A, Goessling H F, Braesicke P and Pinto JG 2025 The European summer heatwave 2019 - a regional storyline perspective *Earth Syst. Dyn.* **16** 239–55

Kueh M-T and Lin C-Y 2020 The 2018 summer heatwaves over northwestern Europe and its extended-range prediction *Sci. Rep.* **10** 19283

Lesk C *et al* 2022 Compound heat and moisture extreme impacts on global crop yields under climate change *Nat. Rev. Earth Environ.* **3** 872–89

Lesk C, Rowhani P and Ramankutty N 2016 Influence of extreme weather disasters on global crop production *Nature* **529** 84–87

Lhotka O and Kyselý J 2022 The 2021 European heat wave in the context of past major heat waves *Earth Space Sci.* **9** e2022EA002567

Lionello P and Scarascia L 2018 The relation between climate change in the Mediterranean region and global warming *Reg. Environ. Change* **18** 1481–93

Lobell D B, Hammer G L, McLean G, Messina C, Roberts M J and Schlenker W 2013 The critical role of extreme heat for maize production in the United States *Nat. Clim. Change* **3** 497–501

Ludwig F and Asseng S 2010 Potential benefits of early vigor and changes in phenology in wheat to adapt to warmer and drier climates *Agri. Syst.* **103** 127–36

Martre P 2017 The International Heat Stress Genotype Experiment for modeling wheat response to heat: field experiments and AgMIP-Wheat multi-model simulations *Open Data J. Agric. Res.* **3** 1–6

Mbow C *et al* 2022 Food security *climate Change and Land: An IPCC Special Report on Climate Change, Desertification, Land Degradation, Sustainable Land Management, Food Security and Greenhouse Gas Fluxes in Terrestrial Ecosystems*, 1st edn (Cambridge University Press)

Miralles D G, Gentine P, Seneviratne S I and Teuling A J 2019 Land-atmospheric feedbacks during droughts and heatwaves: state of the science and current challenges *Ann. New York Acad. Sci.* **1436** 19–35

Moriondo M, Argenti G, Ferrise R, Dibari C, Trombi G and Bindi M 2016 Heat stress and crop yields in the Mediterranean basin: impact on expected insurance payouts *Reg. Environ. Change* **16** 1877–90

Moriondo M, Giannakopoulos C and Bindi M 2011 Climate change impact assessment: the role of climate extremes in crop yield simulation *Clim. Change* **104** 679–701

Müller C *et al* 2017 Global gridded crop model evaluation: benchmarking, skills, deficiencies and implications *Geosci. Model Dev.* **10** 1403–22

Müller C *et al* 2021 Exploring uncertainties in global crop yield projections in a large ensemble of crop models and CMIP5 and CMIP6 climate scenarios *Environ. Res. Lett.* **16** 034040

Murakami K, Iizumi T and Shimoda S 2024 An improved crop calendar model for winter wheat incorporating vernalization and winter survival to project changes in phenology *Environ. Res.* **1** 011002

Nendel C 2012 Monica - Das Modell fur Stickstoff und Kohlenstoff in Agrarokosystemen

Osborne T, Rose G and Wheeler T 2013 Variation in the global-scale impacts of climate change on crop productivity due to climate model uncertainty and adaptation *Agri. For. Forest Meteorol.* **170** 183–94

Perkins S E 2015 A review on the scientific understanding of heatwaves-their measurement, driving mechanisms and changes at the global scale *Atmos. Res.* **164-165** 242–67

Perkins-Kirkpatrick S E and Lewis S C 2020 Increasing trends in regional heatwaves *Nat. Commun.* **11** 3357

Petersen K, Kraus D, Calanca P, Semenov M A, Butterbach-Bahl K and Kiese R 2021 Dynamic simulation of management events for assessing impacts of climate change on pre-alpine grassland productivity *Eur. J. Agron.* **128** 126306

Pham T V *et al* 2021 ICON in Climate Limited-area Mode (ICON release version 2.6.1): a new regional climate model *Geosci. Model Dev.* **14** 985–1005

Porter J R and Gaxwith M 1999 Temperatures and the growth and development of wheat: a review *Eur. J. Agron.* **10** 23–36

Porter J R, Xie L, Challinor A J, Cochorane K, Howden S M, Iqbal M M, Lobell D B and Travasso M 2014 IPCC 2014 - Chapter 7 food security and food production systems

Portmann F T, Siebert S and Doll P 2010 MIRCA2000-Global monthly irrigated and rainfed crop areas around the year 2000: a new high-resolution data set for agricultural and hydrological modeling *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles* **24** 35

Prasad P V V and Djanaguiraman M 2014 Response of floret fertility and individual grain weight of wheat to high temperature stress: sensitive stages and thresholds for temperature and duration *Funct. Plant Biol.* **41** 1261–9

Prodhomme C, Materia S, Ardilouze C, White R H, Batté L, Guemas V, Fragkoulidis G and García-Serrano J 2022 Seasonal prediction of European summer heatwaves *Clim. Dyn.* **58** 2149–66

Rahmstorf S and Coumou D 2011 Increase of extreme events in a warming world *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **108** 17905–9

Rattalino Edreira J I and Otegui M E 2012 Heat stress in temperate and tropical maize hybrids: differences in crop growth, biomass partitioning and reserves use *Field Crops Res.* **130** 87–98

Rezaei E E *et al* 2018 Quantifying the response of wheat yields to heat stress: the role of the experimental setup *Field Crops Res.* **217** 93–103

Rezaei E E, Siebert S and Ewert F 2015 Impact of data resolution on heat and drought stress simulated for winter wheat in Germany *Eur. J. Agro.* **65** 69–82

Rosenzweig C *et al* 2014 Assessing agricultural risks of climate change in the 21st century in a global gridded crop model intercomparison *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **111** 3268–73

Rötter R, Appiah M, Fichtler E, Kersebaum K C, Trnka M and Hoffmann M 2018 Linking modelling and experimentation to better capture crop impacts of agroclimatic extremes-a review *Field Crops Res.* **221** 142–56

Sacks W J, Deryng D, Foley J A and Ramankutty N 2010 Crop planting dates: an analysis of global patterns *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.* **19** 607–20

Samaniego L, Thober S, Kumar R, Wanders N, Rakovec O, Pan M, Zink M, Sheffield J, Wood E F and Marx A 2018 Anthropogenic warming exacerbates European soil moisture droughts *Nat. Clim. Change* **8** 421–6

Sánchez-Benítez A, Goessling H, Pithan F, Semmler T and Jung T 2022 The July 2019 European heat wave in a warmer climate: storyline scenarios with a coupled model using spectral nudging *J. Clim.* **35** 2373–90

Schauberger B *et al* 2017 Consistent negative response of US crops to high temperatures in observations and crop models *Nat. Commun.* **8** 13931

Schmidt M and Felsche E 2024 The effect of climate change on crop yield anomaly in Europe *Clim. Resil. Sustain.* **3** e61

Schmitt J, Offermann F, Soder M, Fruhauf C and Finger R 2022 Extreme weather events cause significant crop yield losses at the farm level in German agriculture *Food Policy* **112** 102359

Semenov M A and Shewry P R 2011 Modelling predicts that heat stress, not drought, will increase vulnerability of wheat in Europe *Sci. Rep.* **1** 66

Semmler T *et al* 2020 Simulations for CMIP6 With the AWI Climate Model AWI-CM-1-1 *J. Adv. Modeling Earth Syst.* **12** e2019MS002009

Seneviratne S I *et al* 2021 *Weather and Climate Extreme Events in a Changing Climate* ed V P Masson-Delmotte, A Zhai, S L Pirani and C Connors (Cambridge University Press) pp 1513–766

Shepherd T G *et al* 2018 Storylines: an alternative approach to representing uncertainty in physical aspects of climate change *Clim. Change* **151** 555–71

Stone P J and Nicolas M E 1994 Wheat cultivars vary widely in their responses of grain yield and quality to short periods of post-anthesis heat stress *Funct. Plant Biol.* **21** 887

Straussberger L 2015 Disaggregating the effect of drought and heat stress during flowering on spikelet fertility in rice Masterarbeit, University of Arkansas, Arkansas

Strer M 2020 Between heat death and drought stress, the impact of adverse environmental conditions on critical development stages of agricultural production in the North German Plain Dissertation, CAU, Kiel

Teixeira E I, Fischer G, van Velthuizen H, Walter C and Ewert F 2013 Global hot-spots of heat stress on agricultural crops due to climate change *Agric. For. Forest Meteorol.* **170** 206–15

Tripathy K P and Mishra A K 2023 How unusual is the 2022 European compound drought and heatwave event? *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **50** e2023GL105453

Trnka M *et al* 2014 Adverse weather conditions for European wheat production will become more frequent with climate change *Nat. Clim. Change* **4** 637–43

van Garderen L, Feser F and Shepherd T G 2021 A methodology for attributing the role of climate change in extreme events: a global spectrally nudged storyline *Nat. Haz. Earth Syst. Sci.* **21** 171–86

Vogel E, Donat M G, Alexander L V, Meinshausen M, Ray D K, Karoly D, Meinshausen N and Frieler K 2019 The effects of climate extremes on global agricultural yields *Environ. Res. Lett.* **14** 054010

Waha K, Dietrich J P, Portmann F T, Siebert S, Thornton P K, Bondeau A and Herrero M 2020 Multiple cropping systems of the world and the potential for increasing cropping intensity *Glob. Environ. Change* **64** 102131

Waha K, van Bussel L G J, Müller C and Bondeau A 2012 Climate driven simulation of global crop sowing dates *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.* **21** 247–59

Wahid A, Gelani S, Ashraf M and Foolad M 2007 Heat tolerance in plants: an overview *Environ. Exp. Bot.* **61** 199–223

Webber H *et al* 2018 Diverging importance of drought stress for maize and winter wheat in Europe *Nat. Commun.* **9** 1–10

Webber H, Ewert F, Kimball B A, Siebert S, White J W, Webber H, Ottman M J, Trawally D and Gaiser T 2016 Simulating canopy temperature for modelling heat stress in cereals *Environ. Modelling Softw.* **77** 143–55

Webber H, Lischeid G, Sommer M, Finger R, Nendel C, Gaiser T and Ewert F 2020 No perfect storm for crop yield failure in Germany *Environ. Res. Lett.* **15** 104012

Wehrli K, Hauser M and Seneviratne S I 2020 Storylines of the 2018 Northern Hemisphere heatwave at pre-industrial and higher global warming levels *Earth Syst. Dyn.* **11** 855–73

Weisheimer A, Doblas-Reyes F J, Jung T and Palmer T N 2011 On the predictability of the extreme summer 2003 over Europe *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **38** 55

Xoplaki E *et al* 2025 Compound events in Germany in 2018: drivers and case studies *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.* **25** 541–64

Zabel F *et al* 2021 Large potential for crop production adaptation depends on available future varieties *Glob. Change Biol.* **27** 3870–82

Zampieri M, Ceglar A, Dentener F and Toreti A 2017 Wheat yield loss attributable to heat waves, drought and water excess at the global, national and subnational scales *Environ. Res. Lett.* **12** 064008

Zängl G, Reinert D, Rípodas P and Baldauf M 2015 The ICON (ICOsahedral Non-hydrostatic) modelling framework of DWD and MPI-M: description of the non-hydrostatic dynamical core *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.* **141** 563–79

Zeng Z *et al* 2021 Legacy effects of spring phenology on vegetation growth under preseason meteorological drought in the Northern Hemisphere *Agric. For. Forest Meteorol.* **310** 108630

Zhao C *et al* 2017 Temperature increase reduces global yields of major crops in four independent estimates *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **114** 9326–31