

Research



Cite this article: Couper LI, Farner JE, Lyberger KP, Lee AS, Mordecai EA. 2024 Mosquito thermal tolerance is remarkably constrained across a large climatic range. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **291**: 20232457. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2023.2457>

Received: 3 November 2023
Accepted: 15 December 2023

Subject Category:

Ecology

Subject Areas:

ecology

Keywords:

mosquito, climate adaptation, thermal tolerance, common garden experiment

Author for correspondence:

Lisa I. Couper
e-mail: lcouper@berkeley.edu

Electronic supplementary material is available online at <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.c.7007833>.

Mosquito thermal tolerance is remarkably constrained across a large climatic range

Lisa I. Couper, Johannah E. Farner, Kelsey P. Lyberger, Alexandra S. Lee and Erin A. Mordecai

Department of Biology, Stanford University, 327 Campus Drive, Stanford, CA 94305, USA

LIC, 0000-0002-7417-8675; KPL, 0000-0003-4903-380X; EAM, 0000-0002-4402-5547

How mosquitoes may respond to rapid climate warming remains unknown for most species, but will have major consequences for their future distributions, with cascading impacts on human well-being, biodiversity and ecosystem function. We investigated the adaptive potential of a wide-ranging mosquito species, *Aedes sierrensis*, across a large climatic gradient by conducting a common garden experiment measuring the thermal limits of mosquito life-history traits. Although field-collected populations originated from vastly different thermal environments that spanned over 1200 km, we found limited variation in upper thermal tolerance between populations. In particular, the upper thermal limits of all life-history traits varied by less than 3°C across the species range and, for most traits, did not differ significantly between populations. For one life-history trait—pupal development rate—we did detect significant variation in upper thermal limits between populations, and this variation was strongly correlated with source temperatures, providing evidence of local thermal adaptation for pupal development. However, we found that maximum environmental temperatures across most of the species' range already regularly exceed the highest upper thermal limits estimated under constant temperatures.

This result suggests that strategies for coping with and/or avoiding thermal extremes are likely key components of current and future mosquito thermal tolerance.

1. Introduction

How mosquitoes respond in the face of rapid anthropogenic climate warming is a key open question of ecological and public health concern. As temperature impacts nearly all aspects of mosquito life cycles, climate warming may cause large shifts in their distributions and dynamics [1,2]. In particular, current predictions suggest that mosquito distributions may shift higher in latitude and elevation, expanding into temperate regions as they become newly suitable, and contracting in some tropical regions as they become too warm [3–6]. However, these predictions have not typically incorporated the potential for mosquito adaptive responses, and thus may overestimate declines at current warm edges.

Temperature sets fundamental limits on mosquito distributions as mosquito survival and reproduction are inhibited beyond critical thermal limits. As temperatures exceed those limits under warming, mosquito populations could persist through a variety of mechanisms including range shifts to track suitable temperatures, shifts in daily and/or seasonal activity patterns to avoid high temperatures, behavioural thermoregulation (i.e. actively seeking out cooler microhabitats), and increased heat tolerance through evolutionary adaptation [7]. Of these responses, evolutionary adaptation may be particularly important for enabling long-term persistence, but the potential for mosquito thermal adaptation remains poorly understood, owing to several empirical knowledge gaps [8–10].

A key component of whether a given mosquito species can evolutionarily adapt to warming is the presence of standing variation in upper thermal




Figure 1. Sample collection locations and experimental design used to measure mosquito thermal performance. Ten populations were collected as larvae from tree holes across the Western USA, reared in the laboratory under common conditions for one generation, then randomly designated into one of six temperature treatments. The total number of larvae assigned to each treatment is noted above (n_{total}) as is the range of larvae from each population (n_{pop}); electronic supplementary material, table S2 indicates the full breakdown of larvae per population and treatment. Individuals were checked daily for life stage transitions (e.g. larvae to pupae, pupae to adult) or death. Map colours denote the average maximum annual temperature (°C) from 1991 to 2020 from PRISM data. Electronic supplementary material, figure S1 shows the average minimum and mean temperature across this same extent. Population metadata, including full site names, latitude, longitude and elevation are provided in electronic supplementary material, table S1.

tolerance within a species [10]. Decades of research on mosquito thermal biology have demonstrated variation in thermal performance between species (e.g. [1,11,12]). Further, several studies have identified within-species variation in response to other aspects of climate, such as cold tolerance in *Aedes albopictus* [13,14] and aridity tolerance in *Anopheles gambiae* [15,16]. Only a few studies have investigated within-species variation in upper thermal tolerance in mosquitoes, and have generally found some evidence of standing variation (i.e. differing rates of survival, reproduction or development among populations at high temperatures), but little evidence of local thermal adaptation (i.e. higher heat tolerance observed in populations from warmer environments than those from cooler environments) [17–21].

However, these studies typically investigated relatively few mosquito populations from a limited portion of the species range, owing to logistical challenges of collecting, rearing and experimenting on many wide-ranging populations. Furthermore, mosquito thermal tolerance was typically measured on select life-history traits or metabolic rates, potentially obscuring patterns of thermal adaptation evident across the full life cycle [9,22,23]. Thus, the extent of variation in upper thermal tolerance among populations within a species and the evidence for thermal adaptation is still unknown.

We set out to rigorously investigate the evidence for mosquito thermal adaptation by using *Aedes sierrensis*, the western tree hole mosquito, as a novel model system. *Ae. sierrensis* makes an ideal model species for this investigation because it is commonly occurring across its distribution (ranging from Southern California to British Columbia and coastal to montane environments [24,25]), which covers a large range of thermal environments, presenting varying selection pressures and opportunities for local thermal adaptation. This species has a seasonal life cycle driven by temperature, precipitation and day length cues, and which occurs in discrete, easy-to-sample habitat (water-filled tree

holes) [25], facilitating field collection of individuals at the same life stage across the species range. Further, although *Ae. sierrensis* is not a known vector of human pathogens, it is congeneric to major human disease vectors (i.e. *Ae. aegypti*, *Ae. albopictus*) and is itself a vector of dog heartworm, making results potentially informative for understanding warming responses in these vector species. Leveraging this model system, we set out to answer the following specific research questions: (i) how much does thermal tolerance vary between populations across the species range? (ii) Is variation in thermal tolerance, if observed, correlated with the source thermal environment? (i.e. is there evidence of local thermal adaptation?) (iii) At present, how often do environmental temperatures exceed mosquito populations' laboratory-estimated upper thermal limits?

To answer these questions, we conducted a common garden experiment using 10 *Ae. sierrensis* populations spanning nearly the entire species range (1200 km; figure 1). The thermal environments of collected populations varied widely, with annual mean temperatures varying by greater than 7°C, and average daily maxima in the spring and summer varying by greater than 5°C. We reared these field-collected populations in the laboratory for one generation at common temperatures, then separated F₁ individuals into one of six temperature treatments ranging from 5 to 32°C. We tracked individuals daily to measure individual life-history traits including larval and pupal survival and development rates, and adult lifespan. We then fit thermal performance curves to these experimental data to estimate upper and lower thermal limits and thermal optima for each population and trait. In our investigation of variation in mosquito thermal tolerance, we compared variation in these estimated upper thermal limits for each trait and population. We note that prior studies of mosquito thermal tolerance have used a variety of methods to measure thermal tolerance including static and dynamic heat tolerance assays (e.g. 'thermal knockdowns') [12,26], reciprocal transplants

[13] and comparisons of niche-based distribution models [27]. These methods may each capture a slightly different component of thermal tolerance (e.g. capacity for heat shock responses, combined genetic and plastic responses), thus our metric of thermal tolerance may not be comparable across all approaches. We focused on upper thermal limits from trait thermal performance curves as they capture high temperature constraints across the lifespan.

Despite originating from a wide range of thermal environments, populations differed little in their thermal limits for most life-history traits. For pupal development rate, we did find significant variation in upper thermal limits between populations, with five times greater variation in upper thermal limits than previously found in ectotherm species across this same range. Further, this variation corresponded with populations' source thermal environments, providing evidence of local thermal adaptation. Whether this evidence indicates the capacity for adaptation to climate warming will depend, in part, on current and future temperatures. We found that maximum environmental temperatures across most of the species range frequently exceed the highest upper thermal limits we estimated for any trait or population. While not directly comparable, this suggests that *Ae. sierrensis* populations already experience short-term temperatures beyond what they can tolerate during longer, constant exposures. Strategies for coping with and avoiding these thermal extremes such as night-time repair, diapause and behavioural thermoregulation are thus likely important aspects of mosquito thermal tolerance and life histories.

2. Methods

(a) Field collection

Ae. sierrensis typically completes one life cycle per year, with adults laying eggs in naturally occurring tree holes. Eggs hatch when the tree holes fill with water beginning in the late autumn and advance through four larval instars and one pupal life stage throughout the winter before eclosing as adults in the spring and summer [24]. Most North American *Ae. sierrensis* populations (e.g. those from 26 to 46°N), including all of our collected populations, undergo diapause between the fourth larval instar and pupal life stage, and all populations undergo embryonic diapause [28]. We collected larval *Ae. sierrensis* from 346 tree holes spanning over 1200 km across the Western USA between October 2021 and April 2022 (figure 1; electronic supplementary material, table S1 for collection metadata). We collected *Ae. sierrensis* and tree hole water in plastic cups and maintained these at cold temperatures (less than 10°C) during transportation to the laboratory, then at 4°C until processing. We visually inspected individuals from each sampled tree hole for the presence of *Lambornella clarki*—a ciliate parasite that can infect larval *Ae. sierrensis*. Only larvae from tree holes without the parasite were used in this experiment. Further, to maintain sufficient genetic variation and avoid excessive inbreeding, we reared only larvae from tree holes with at least 30 collected individuals.

(b) Laboratory rearing

After processing, we maintained select populations (i.e. those from tree holes with ≥ 30 individuals and no *L. clarki*) under shared laboratory conditions of 21.5°C, and a 13 h : 11 h light : dark cycle. We periodically fed larvae a finely ground mix of Tetra-min fish flakes (48% by weight), guinea pig chow (48%) and liver powder (2%). Once reaching the adult stage, we housed

populations in 8 × 8 × 8 cm aluminium collapsible cages (Bio-Quip, Rancho Dominguez, CA, USA) with continuous access to a 10% sugar solution. We offered each population a blood meal of defibrinated sheep's blood approximately once per week and placed an oviposition cup, consisting of a paper cup lined with water-soaked coffee filter paper, inside each cage within 4 days of the first blood-feeding. We collected eggs and held these at room temperature for 2 weeks, then in the refrigerator at 4°C and near 24 h darkness to mimic winter conditions and promote hatching (potentially because these cold, dark conditions cause eggs to enter and exit diapause, as would occur in the field; B Barner 2021, personal communication, Solano County vector control), which occurred 1 to 3 months later.

To ensure sufficient sample sizes for each treatment of the experiment, we only used populations that produced greater than 300 eggs in total. This resulted in 10 populations for use in the experiment (figure 1), wherein 'population' refers to a group of individuals originating from the same tree hole. These collections are highly likely to represent distinct populations, as the minimum distance between any pair of populations used in the experiment was 3.4 km, and *Ae. sierrensis* adults are weak fliers and typically do not disperse far from their larval tree hole [29]. We note that a more precise definition of a population would incorporate specific dispersal capabilities and/or genetic structuring, but this has not yet been investigated for *Ae. sierrensis*.

To hatch eggs, we prepared a separate tray for each population, which consisted of 500 ml Arrowhead distilled water, 300 ml autoclaved tree hole water (combined from all sampled tree holes) and three-quarters teaspoon of Brewers' yeast. We submerged egg papers from each population in trays between 4 and 6 July 2022, 24 h after the respective hatching tray was prepared.

We note that by using F_1 individuals in our experiment, we have not eliminated maternal/cross-generational effects, which may impact thermal tolerance [30]. That is, while we sought to minimize direct environmental effects on thermal tolerance (i.e. 'phenotypic plasticity') and capture genetically based differences, environmental effects from prior generations could still impact F_1 thermal tolerance.

(c) Experimental design

The experiment consisted of tracking life histories for individual *Ae. sierrensis* from 1 of 10 populations, held at one of six temperature treatments (figure 1; see electronic supplementary material, table S2 for sample sizes). The temperature treatments—5, 13, 17, 24, 28 and 32°C—were chosen based on the range of temperatures realistically experienced by *Ae. sierrensis* in the field and based on survival rates assessed during pilot experiments conducted in the laboratory (figure 1; electronic supplementary material, figure S1). These constant temperatures were maintained using Fisher Scientific Isotemp incubators (for the 13°C, 24°C, 28°C and 32°C treatments) and climate-controlled rooms (for the 5°C and 17°C treatments). Although fluctuating temperatures could have more closely mimicked natural conditions, we chose to use constant temperatures here as it provides a baseline for characterizing thermal responses and because measuring all possible combinations of temperature mean and variability would have been intractable.

The experiment began with larvae emerging 48 h after egg paper submersion (i.e. approximately 1-day old larvae). For each individual, we measured the following traits: larval survival, larval development rate, pupal survival, pupal development rate and adult lifespan. We intentionally included more larvae from each population in the higher temperature treatments as we expected greater mortality at these temperatures based on pilot experiments. We visually inspected each individual on a daily basis, recording life stage transitions and deaths, and moving

individuals into the appropriate housing for the given life stage. We maintained larvae in plastic containers in groups of five with approximately 100 ml of water and 4 mg of larval food, in accordance with *Aedes* rearing protocols that promote high larval survivorship in the absence of other factors [31,32]. We maintained pupae individually in glass vials with approximately 5 ml deionized water. Upon eclosion, we transferred adults to individual 4 oz plastic specimen cups with one 10% sugar-soaked cotton ball and observed each individual until death. Any larva that was alive but had not pupated by 28 September 2022 (i.e. 82–84 days after larval emergence) was counted as survived for the larval survival trait and considered to be in diapause.

(d) Characterizing the source thermal environment

We characterized the source thermal environment of each population using climate data from PRISM, which we accessed and analysed using Google Earth Engine [33]. PRISM provides gridded climate data at a 4 km resolution by downscaling data from a network of monitoring stations [34]. We used either daily or monthly temperature data from 2000 to 2020 to calculate key variables capturing temperature means, variations and extremes. We specifically sought to include only biologically meaningful temperature variables, such as those previously associated with thermal tolerance in ectotherms [35], rather than many possible characterizations of climate (e.g. all 19 WorldClim bioclimatic variables). These variables included annual mean temperature, mean temperature in January–March (the period when eggs typically exit diapause and hatch as larvae), seasonal variation in temperature (defined as the difference between the mean warmest month temperature and the mean coolest month temperature), average warm-season maximum (defined as the mean daily maxima in the spring and summer) and the number of days where maximum temperatures exceeded 35°C (the highest upper thermal limit for any trait estimated from our experimental data) excluding periods of potential dormancy (e.g. August–October).

Variables were calculated at a 1 km buffer around the sampled tree hole for each population, approximating the geographical range of an individual mosquito. We investigated Pearson's correlations between these temperature variables and select thermal performance parameters and traits (i.e. those with significant between-population variation).

While the above estimates of source environmental temperature likely capture the thermal conditions for populations at a broad spatial scale, they may not reflect the exact temperatures within a given tree hole. We sought to directly measure tree hole temperatures for each population by placing iButton temperature loggers (DS1921G, manufactured by Maxim Integrated, San Jose, CA, USA) in each sampled tree hole at the time of location; however, only two iButtons were recovered the following year. For these two tree holes, we compare the direct temperature measurements made using the Buttons to the estimates from the PRISM data described above.

To qualitatively understand how populations' estimated upper thermal limits compared with source environmental conditions, we also calculated the number of days exceeding 31.6°C during the adult activity period (e.g. March–July), as this was the estimated upper thermal limit for adult lifespan (the lowest limit for any trait). However, we did not investigate correlations between this environmental variable and thermal performance characteristics to minimize multiple testing. The *Ae. sierrensis* dormancy and adult activity windows described above were informed by prior research in this system [36,37], as well as extensive *Ae. sierrensis* surveillance data available from VectorSurv (<https://gateway.vectorsurv.org>). Specifically, we examined variation in trapped adult abundance across the year using surveillance data from 2000 to 2020 for the trap closest to each of our collection sites (electronic supplementary material, figure S2).

(e) Analysis: fitting thermal response curves

To estimate the thermal limits and performance characteristics of each trait and population, we fit thermal response curves to the experimental data using a Bayesian approach following methods described in detail in Shocket *et al.* [38]. We first visually inspected the temperature-performance data to determine the most appropriate functional form of the thermal response for each trait. Consistent with prior work, we used quadratic fits truncated to a maximum of 1 for larval and pupal survival, quadratic fits for adult lifespan, and Briere fits for larval and pupal development rate [38,39] (electronic supplementary material, table S3).

We fit a first set of Bayesian models for each combination of trait and population across temperatures using uniform priors for the thermal limit parameters bounded by biologically plausible temperature cut-offs as in prior studies [11,38–41] (i.e. trait performance was set to zero below 0°C and above 40–45°C depending on the trait; electronic supplementary material, table S3). For larval and pupal development rate, and adult lifespan, we modelled the observed data as normally distributed with the mean predicted by the thermal response function at that temperature and the standard deviation, σ , as a gamma distributed parameter, $1/\sigma^2$, with shape parameter $\alpha=0$ and rate parameter $\beta=1000$. For larval and pupal survival probabilities, we modelled the observed data as binomially distributed with the probability and number of trials based on the proportional survival and sample size for that temperature–population combination. We truncated thermal response functions at zero for all traits, as well as at one for survival probability traits. We fit models using Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampling, which uses simulation to approximate the posterior distribution, using the 'R2jags' package [42]. For each thermal response, we ran three independent chains with a 5000-iteration burn-in, and thinned the chains by saving every eighth iteration. This fitting process produced 7500 values in the posterior distribution for each parameter of the thermal response function (i.e. $T_{\min}$, $T_{\max}$ and q) and enabled us to calculate additional derived quantities for each trait and population including the maximum trait performance value ($P_{\max}$), the temperature at maximum performance (T_{opt}) and the temperature range where performance is at least 50% of the maximum (T_{breath} ; see electronic supplementary material, figure S3 for theoretical thermal performance curve). We refer to the above fitting process as our 'low information' model specification.

To reduce the uncertainty in our parameter estimates, we then fit a second set of models—the main models presented in the text—using informative priors generated using a two-step process. In the first step, we specified low information priors as described above for each population and trait but using only the temperature-performance data from the other nine populations (i.e. a 'leave-one-out' approach [38]). We fit a Gamma probability distribution to the posterior distributions of each thermal response parameter using the 'MASS' package [43]. We then used these hyperparameters as informative priors in a second round of model fitting. To ensure the hyperparameters did not have an outsized influence on the resulting posterior distributions, we increased the variance of the priors through multiplication by a constant k , set at 0.1 or 0.01, depending on the trait (electronic supplementary material, table S3). The parameter estimates from this 'informative' model specification are presented as the main results in the text but did not differ qualitatively from those made through the 'low information' model specification presented in the supplement. When investigating variation in thermal performance parameters, we interpreted non-overlapping credible intervals as biologically meaningful and statistically supported differences between populations and/or traits [44–48]. It is worth noting that the leave-one-out informative prior approach biases our thermal performance curve fits to be more similar




Figure 2. For most life-history traits, thermal performance varies minimally between populations. Each curve denotes the average thermal performance for one population for a given trait. Populations are coloured and ordered in the legend by their latitude of collection.

across populations, making the resulting estimates of differences among populations conservative. On the other hand, this approach has the advantage of realistically constraining uncertainty, for example in cases where a trait was poorly quantified at a given temperature (i.e. few individuals in a given population survived to the relevant life stage).

3. Results

(a) How much does thermal tolerance vary between populations across the species range?

We investigated variation in mosquito thermal performance between 10 populations across the species range. For each population, we characterized the thermal performance of life-history traits by fitting thermal response curves (figure 2) to our experimental data and estimating the thermal limits and thermal optima (figure 3).

We found minimal variation in thermal tolerance between populations for most life-history traits (figures 2 and 3; electronic supplementary material, figures S4–S8). In particular, for all life-history traits, both upper and lower thermal limits varied by less than 3°C across populations (figure 3; electronic supplementary material, figure S9). For upper

thermal limits, we found the greatest variation across populations in adult lifespan (2.8°C variation), and the least variation in larval survival (0.6°C); thermal limits were not significantly different between populations for either trait (i.e. 95% credible intervals overlapped). Similarly, thermal optima varied by less than 1.5°C for all traits except larval and pupal survival, for which our estimates had the greatest uncertainty (partly due to high juvenile survivorship across the intermediate temperature treatments). Variation between populations was non-significant for nearly all life-history traits and thermal performance parameters, with three exceptions: the upper thermal limits ($T_{\max}$) of larval and pupal development rates and the thermal optima (T_{opt}) of pupal development rates. Upper thermal limits for larval and pupal development rates each varied by 1.6°C across populations (33.3–34.9°C and 32.1–33.7°C, respectively), while the thermal optima of pupal development rate varied by 1.4°C (26.3–27.7°C).

(b) Is variation in thermal performance correlated with the source thermal environment?

To assess evidence of local thermal adaptation, we investigated the relationship between the source thermal




Figure 3. Thermal limits and optima vary between life-history traits, but minimally between populations. Lower thermal limits, thermal optima and upper thermal limits for each life-history trait and population (left, middle and right points and error bars in each panel, respectively). Thermal performance parameter estimates are derived from the thermal performance curves for traits for which the means are depicted in figure 2. Points and error bars denote the mean and 95% credible intervals for each parameter, respectively. Populations (listed on the right) are coloured and ordered by latitude of collection. Units of development rates and lifespan are 1/days and days, respectively. Note that survival probability curves that are truncated at one have very uncertain optimal temperatures because a wide range of temperatures have similarly high survival probability.

environment (table 1) and experimentally measured thermal performance parameters, using only the parameters with biologically significant between-population variation (i.e. those where populations had non-overlapping 95% credible intervals). This included the upper thermal limits ($T_{\max}$) of larval and pupal development rates, and the thermal optima (T_{opt}) of pupal development rates.

We found several correlations that reflected patterns of local thermal adaptation. In particular, we found that $T_{\max}$ and T_{opt} of pupal development were positively correlated with annual mean temperature, maximum daily temperatures in the spring and summer, and the number of days exceeding 35°C (r : 0.64–0.71; figure 4). Together, this is consistent with local thermal adaptation of pupal development rate to high temperatures. By contrast, $T_{\max}$ of larval development rate was not strongly correlated with any source temperature variable. We note that these reported

correlations are only statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) prior to adjustment for multiple comparisons, the necessity of which is debated when making only specific, biologically meaningful comparisons (as we have done here) rather than all possible comparisons [49,50]. The majority of the above correlations remained significant after removing ‘POW’ (electronic supplementary material, table S6), the lowest latitude population, indicating that our findings of thermal adaptation are not solely driven by this population.

(c) At present, how often do environmental temperatures exceed mosquito populations’ laboratory-estimated upper thermal limits?

We found that for all populations, maximum temperatures in the surrounding environment already exceed our estimated




Figure 4. Evidence of local thermal adaptation. Correlations between the source thermal environment and population thermal performance provide evidence of local thermal adaptation (right). Statistically significant Pearson's correlations (r ; $p < 0.05$) are denoted with (*). Note that correlations were only examined for traits with significant between-population variation. The relationship between upper thermal limits for pupal development rate and the number of days with temperatures exceeding 35°C (one of the significant correlations noted in the table) is visualized in the plot on the left.

Table 1. Thermal characteristics of the source environment for each population listed in order of decreasing latitude (i.e. north to south). Values represent averages from 2000 to 2020, calculated from PRISM climate data at a 1 km buffer around the sampled tree hole. See *Methods: Characterizing the source thermal environment* for definitions of each temperature variable. See electronic supplementary material, figure S10 for correlations between temperature variables and electronic supplementary material, figure S11 for comparisons between the PRISM and iButton temperature estimates for the 'SB' and 'POW' populations.

Pop.	annual mean temp. (°C)	Jan–March mean temp. (°C)	seasonal temp. variation (°C)	warm-season maximum (°C)	no. days > 35°C		no. days > 31.6°C	
					across year	Jan–July	across year	March–July
EUG	11.48	6.33	16.01	22.69	4.29	2.23	18.33	9.45
HOP	14.57	9.41	15.38	26.77	24.90	11.95	57.67	28.863
PLA	16.08	9.91	18.08	28.04	29.95	17.00	76.24	40.27
MAR2	14.24	10.31	11.62	24.77	8.71	4.18	25.95	12.81
MAR1	14.04	10.18	11.29	24.41	6.33	3.05	20.86	10.36
JRA	15.45	11.49	11.61	25.29	10.43	4.77	27.14	13.54
WAW	15.83	8.73	20.51	28.19	41.57	20.95	87.76	44.18
PAR	14.40	9.88	13.26	26.52	14.71	5.77	46.67	22.73
SB	16.44	11.82	13.51	27.86	26.81	11.77	59.95	29.72
POW	18.75	15.08	11.65	27.77	18.14	5.09	50.62	21.09

upper thermal limits. In particular, the number of days per year with an hourly temperature exceeding 35°C—above the highest upper thermal limit we estimated for any population or life-history trait at constant temperature—ranged from 2 to 20 days (table 1). This metric specifically excluded times of the year when *Ae. sierrensis* populations are likely in dormancy (i.e. August–October) – if all months were included, there were an average of 4–42 days exceeding this threshold. Similarly, the number of days exceeding 31.6°C—the lowest estimated upper thermal limit (adult lifespan)—ranged from 9 to 40 days during adult activity season (i.e. March–July) or 18–88 days across the entire year.

The above estimates are based on PRISM climate data, which captures air temperature in the broader surrounding environment, but not necessarily the precise temperature experienced in a given tree hole. For two populations, we were able to record temperatures within the tree hole for approximately 1 year following larval collection. We found that these direct measurements were strongly correlated with temperature estimates from the PRISM climate data ($r = 0.91$

and $r = 0.87$ for daily temperature estimates for the SB and POW populations, respectively; electronic supplementary material, figure S11). For these populations, the iButton recorded daily temperatures that were, on average, 0.70°C higher (SB) or 3.0°C lower (POW) than the PRISM estimates. In both locations, tree hole temperatures exceeded 31.6°C on several days (electronic supplementary material, figure S11), indicating that populations are exposed to temperatures above their estimated upper thermal limits for adult survival at constant temperatures even within this microhabitat.

4. Discussion

In one of the largest-ranging studies of standing variation in mosquito thermal tolerance to date, we found limited evidence of variation between populations in the thermal responses of life-history traits. Specifically, in our common garden experiment using 10 *Ae. sierrensis* populations spanning over 1200 km, we found that upper thermal limits and thermal

optima varied by $<3^{\circ}\text{C}$ for all life-history traits, and was typically not biologically meaningful (i.e. the credible intervals overlapped for all populations; figure 2). In particular, upper thermal limits varied between populations by as little as 0.6°C (larval survival) and up to 2.8°C (adult lifespan). This level of variation in trait upper thermal limits across latitude (i.e. $\geq 0.6^{\circ}\text{C}$ across populations spanning 10° of latitude) is large relative to previous studies in terrestrial ectotherms (0.3°C per 10° latitude [51]); however, it is considerably less than the level of variation in environmental temperature across this range [52].

Our finding of minimal variation in mosquito thermal tolerance across the species range is consistent with prior findings in a broad range of ectotherm species [53,54]. For taxa including insects, arachnids, reptiles and amphibians, upper thermal limits typically vary little across wide climatic and latitudinal gradients [51,54–56], a pattern that has been suggested to reflect hard evolutionary constraints on heat tolerance [57,58]. Although the underlying mechanism remains unclear, the evolution of heat tolerance may be limited by genetic constraints (e.g. low heritability) and/or biochemical constraints (e.g. limits on enzyme stability at high temperatures) [53,59,60]. Alternatively, this pattern could be driven by behavioural strategies enabling populations to experience and adapt to similar thermal regimes across their range [61], and/or trade-offs in adapting to temperature versus other abiotic or biotic selection pressures [62].

Despite generally limited variation in thermal tolerance between populations, we did observe meaningful variation in the thermal responses of larval and pupal development rates (figure 2). For both traits, variation in upper thermal limits was biologically meaningful, and was approximately 1.6°C across populations—five times the average variation for terrestrial ectotherms spanning a similar latitudinal extent [51] (electronic supplementary material, table S4). Further, for pupal development rate, we found that variation in populations' thermal optima and upper thermal limits was strongly correlated with variation in the source thermal environment. Specifically, populations from environments with higher mean and extreme temperatures had higher thermal optima and limits for pupal development rate than those from cooler source environments, providing clear evidence for local thermal adaptation in this trait (figure 4).

That thermal adaptation was observed specifically in pupal development rate may be due to the seasonal ecology of *Ae. sierrensis* making the pupal life stage the most vulnerable to high temperatures. In particular, *Ae. sierrensis* eggs and larvae undergo a period of dormancy and are primarily active earlier in the season, which may buffer these life stages from high temperature extremes, while adults may avoid high temperatures through movement to cooler microhabitats [24,36]. Conversely, pupae have limited capacity for movement, no period of dormancy and typically begin development in the spring, which can have highly variable thermal conditions across years and include high temperature extremes. This life-history trait may thus experience the strongest thermal selection pressure given the exposure to thermal stress and a lack of other coping strategies. By measuring the thermal performance of traits across the species life cycle, and using many populations from across a wide thermal gradient, we were able to detect this specific evidence of thermal adaptation, which has not been clearly identified in prior investigations of thermal adaptation in other mosquito species [17,18,20].

While we found evidence of local thermal adaptation, whether mosquitoes can adapt to ongoing warming also depends on current and future environmental temperatures. We found that hourly maximum temperatures across most of the species' range already exceed our estimated upper thermal limits (table 1). In particular, environmental temperatures at each of our collection sites reached at or above 35°C —exceeding the highest upper thermal limit we estimated for any trait or population at constant temperature—for an average of 2–20 days out of the potential *Ae. sierrensis* activity season (January–July). Similarly, environmental temperatures exceeded 31.6°C —the lowest upper thermal limit across measured life-history traits (adult lifespan, figure 3)—for 9–40 days during this period. As we estimated mosquito upper thermal limits under constant temperature conditions, we cannot assess the impact of these short-term thermal extremes on mosquito life histories and adaptive capacity. That is, short-term thermal extremes (e.g. one to several hours) that are followed by cooler temperatures could be tolerated through heat stress repair, as has been found to occur during night-time in other ectotherm species [63]. In addition to short-term heat repair, other strategies besides evolutionary adaptation, such as seasonal life cycles and microhabitat selection may be important for sustaining *Ae. sierrensis* under rapid climate warming. Accordingly, the majority of days exceeding the 35°C and 31.6°C thresholds at our collection sites occurred after July, when most individuals in the population are likely in the dormant egg stage (electronic supplementary material, figure S2). Further, the tree hole microhabitat in which *Ae. sierrensis* completes most of its life cycle may be cooler than the surrounding environment, further buffering individuals from thermal extremes (although we found this was not consistently the case; electronic supplementary material, figure S11). In general, our finding that populations' estimated upper thermal limits are already exceeded over short time scales suggest that strategies for acute heat tolerance and avoidance such as night-time repair, diapause and behavioural thermoregulation may be key components of *Ae. sierrensis* thermal tolerance.

As changes in short-term thermal extremes and temperature fluctuations are key components of climate warming projections, understanding their impact on mosquito life histories is a critical future direction [64–68]. Our experiment focused on the impacts of constant temperatures on mosquito trait performance—an important first step in characterizing thermal tolerance for a given species. However, coping with daily and seasonal temperature fluctuations and thermal extremes likely requires a different set of physiological or behavioural strategies than coping with constant warm temperatures [69–71]. Thus, patterns of mosquito thermal adaptation to these aspects of temperature could differ from those estimated here. Prior studies in other ectotherm species have tested whether thermal performance under fluctuating temperatures can be predicted qualitatively from thermal performance curves estimated at constant temperatures, finding mixed results [72,73]. Experimentally testing this approach in mosquitoes and estimating mosquito performance under thermal regimes that reflect natural conditions using populations from across the species range are important future directions, which would improve estimates of potential mosquito responses to climate warming.

Ethics. This study involved collection of western tree hole mosquitoes—a native, non-vector species, for which no special permits were required for collection or laboratory housing.

Data accessibility. All data and code used in this project are available on Dryad Digital Repository: <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.80gb5mkxd> [74].

All data and code are also publicly and freely available at the following GitHub repository: <https://github.com/lcouper/MosquitoThermalAdaptation>.

Supplementary material is available online [75].

Declaration of AI use. We have not used AI-assisted technologies in creating this article.

Authors' contributions. L.I.C.: conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, project administration, visualization, writing—original draft, writing—review and editing; J.E.F.: conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, project administration, writing—review and editing; K.P.L.: conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, methodology, project administration, writing—review and editing; A.S.L.: methodology, project administration, writing—review and editing; E.M.: conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, funding acquisition, investigation, methodology, project administration, resources, supervision, writing—review and editing.

All authors gave final approval for publication and agreed to be held accountable for the work performed therein.

Conflict of interest declaration. The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

References

- Mordecai EA *et al.* 2019 Thermal biology of mosquito-borne disease. *Ecol. Lett.* **22**, 1690–1708. (doi:10.1111/ele.13335)
- Deutsch CA, Tewksbury JJ, Huey RB, Sheldon KS, Ghalambor CK, Haak DC, Martin PR. 2008 Impacts of climate warming on terrestrial ectotherms across latitude. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **105**, 6668–6672. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0709472105)
- Ryan SJ, Carlson CJ, Mordecai EA, Johnson LR. 2019 Global expansion and redistribution of Aedes-borne virus transmission risk with climate change. *PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis.* **13**, e0007213. (doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0007213)
- Servadio JL, Rosenthal SR, Carlson L, Bauer C. 2018 Climate patterns and mosquito-borne disease outbreaks in South and Southeast Asia. *J. Infect. Public Health* **11**, 566–571. (doi:10.1016/j.jiph.2017.12.006)
- Lafferty KD. 2009 The ecology of climate change and infectious diseases. *Ecology* **90**, 888–900. (doi:10.1890/08-0079.1)
- Gething PW, Smith DL, Patil AP, Tatem AJ, Snow RW, Hay SI. 2010 Climate change and the global malaria recession. *Nature* **465**, 342–345. (doi:10.1038/nature09098)
- Aitken SN, Yeaman S, Holliday JA, Wang T, Curtis-McLane S. 2008 Adaptation, migration or extirpation: climate change outcomes for tree populations. *Evol. Appl.* **1**, 95–111. (doi:10.1111/j.1752-4571.2007.00013.x)
- Couper LI *et al.* 2021 How will mosquitoes adapt to climate warming? *eLife* **10**, e69630. (doi:10.7554/eLife.69630)
- Pawar S, Huxley PJ, Smallwood TRC, Nesbit ML, Chan AHH, Shocket MS, Johnson LR, Kontopoulos D-G, Cator L. 2023 Variation in temperature of peak trait performance will constrain adaptation of arthropod populations to climatic warming. *bioRxiv* 2023. (doi:10.1101/2023.01.18.524448)
- Sternberg ED, Thomas MB. 2014 Local adaptation to temperature and the implications for vector-borne diseases. *Trends Parasitol.* **30**, 115–122. (doi:10.1016/j.pt.2013.12.010)
- Villena OC, Ryan SJ, Murdock CC, Johnson LR. 2022 Temperature impacts the environmental suitability for malaria transmission by *Anopheles gambiae* and *Anopheles stephensi*. *Ecology* **103**, e3685. (doi:10.1002/ecy.3685)
- Oliveira BF, Yogo WIG, Hahn DA, Yongxing J, Scheffers BR. 2021 Community-wide seasonal shifts in thermal tolerances of mosquitoes. *Ecology* **102**, e03368. (doi:10.1002/ecy.3368)
- Medley KA, Westby KM, Jenkins DG. 2019 Rapid local adaptation to northern winters in the invasive Asian tiger mosquito *Aedes albopictus*: a moving target. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **56**, 2518–2527. (doi:10.1111/1365-2664.13480)
- Urbanski J, Mogi M, O'Donnell D, Decotiis M, Toma T, Armbruster P. 2012 Rapid adaptive evolution of photoperiodic response during invasion and range expansion across a climatic gradient. *Am. Nat.* **179**, 490–500. (doi:10.1086/664709)
- Fouet C, Gray E, Besansky NJ, Costantini C. 2012 Adaptation to aridity in the malaria mosquito *Anopheles gambiae*: chromosomal inversion polymorphism and body size influence resistance to desiccation. *PLoS ONE* **7**, e34841. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0034841)
- Gray EM, Rocca KA, Costantini C, Besansky NJ. 2009 Inversion 2La is associated with enhanced desiccation resistance in *Anopheles gambiae*. *Malar. J.* **8**, 215. (doi:10.1186/1475-2875-8-215)
- Ruybal JE, Kramer LD, Kilpatrick AM. 2016 Geographic variation in the response of *Culex pipiens* life history traits to temperature. *Parasit. Vectors* **9**, 116. (doi:10.1186/s13071-016-1402-z)
- Reisen W. 1995 Effect of temperature on *Culex tarsalis* (Diptera: Culicidae) from the Coachella and San Joaquin valleys of California. *J. Med. Entomol.* **32**, 636–645. (doi:10.1093/jmedent/32.5.636)
- Vorhees AS, Gray EM, Bradley TJ. 2013 Thermal resistance and performance correlate with climate in populations of a widespread mosquito. *Physiol. Biochem. Zool.* **86**, 73–81. (doi:10.1086/668851)
- Chu VM, Sallum MAM, Moore TE, Lainhart W, Schlichting CD, Conn JE. 2019 Regional variation in life history traits and plastic responses to temperature of the major malaria vector *Myzorrhynchus darlingi* in Brazil. *Sci. Rep.* **9**, 5356. (doi:10.1038/s41598-019-41651-x)
- Zani PA, Swanson SET, Corbin D, Cohnstaedt LW, Agotsch MD, Bradshaw WE, Holzapfel CM. 2005 Geographic variation in tolerance of transient thermal stress in the mosquito *Wyeomyia smithii*. *Ecology* **86**, 1206–1211. (doi:10.1890/04-1248)
- Orr HA. 2009 Fitness and its role in evolutionary genetics. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **10**, 531–539. (doi:10.1038/nrg2603)
- Dobson FS, Murie JO, Viblanc VA. 2020 Fitness estimation for ecological studies: an evaluation in Columbian ground squirrels. *Front. Ecol. Evol.* **8**, 216. (doi:10.3389/fevo.2020.00216)
- Hawley WA. 1985 The effect of larval density on adult longevity of a mosquito, *Aedes sierrensis*: epidemiological consequences. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **54**, 955. (doi:10.2307/4389)
- Garcia R, Pontig G. 1972 Studies on the ecology of the treehole mosquito *Aedes sierrensis* (Ludlow). *Calif. Mosq. Control Assoc. Proc.* **40**, 63–65.
- Ware-Gilmore F, Novelo M, Sgrò CM, Hall MD, McGraw EA. 2023 Assessing the role of family level variation and heat shock gene expression in the thermal stress response of the mosquito *Aedes aegypti*. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **378**, 20220011. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2022.0011)

27. Medley KA. 2010 Niche shifts during the global invasion of the Asian tiger mosquito, *Aedes albopictus* Skuse (Culicidae), revealed by reciprocal distribution models. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.* **19**, 122–133. (doi:10.1111/j.1466-8238.2009.00497.x)
28. Sims SR. 1982 Larval diapause in the eastern tree-hole mosquito, *Aedes triseriatus*1: latitudinal variation in induction and intensity. *Ann. Entomol. Soc. Am.* **75**, 195–200. (doi:10.1093/aesa/75.2.195)
29. Chaves LF, Reissen N, White GS, Gordon S, Faraji A. 2020 Trap comparison for surveillance of the western tree hole mosquito, *Aedes sierrensis* (Diptera: Culicidae). *J. Insect Sci.* **20**, 3. (doi:10.1093/jisesa/iez131)
30. Verheyen J, Tüzün N, Stoks R. 2019 Using natural laboratories to study evolution to global warming: contrasting altitudinal, latitudinal, and urbanization gradients. *Curr. Opin. Insect Sci.* **35**, 10–19. (doi:10.1016/j.cois.2019.06.001)
31. Puggioli A, Carrieri M, Dindo ML, Medici A, Lees RS, Gilles JRL, Bellini R. 2017 Development of *Aedes albopictus* (Diptera: Culicidae) larvae under different laboratory conditions. *J. Med. Entomol.* **54**, 142–149. (doi:10.1093/jme/tjw127)
32. International Atomic Energy Agency. 2017 Guidelines for routine colony maintenance of *Aedes* mosquito species. <https://www.iaea.org/sites/default/files/21/06/nafa-ipc-manual-guidelines-for-routine-colony-maintenance-of-aedes-mosquito-species-v1.0.pdf>.
33. Gorelick N, Hancher M, Dixon M, Ilyushchenko S, Thau D, Moore R. 2017 Google Earth Engine: planetary-scale geospatial analysis for everyone. *Remote Sens. Environ.* **202**, 18–27. (doi:10.1016/j.rse.2017.06.031)
34. Daly C, Halbleib M, Smith JI, Gibson WP, Doggett MK, Taylor GH, Curtis J, Pasteris PP. 2008 Physiographically sensitive mapping of climatological temperature and precipitation across the conterminous United States. *Int. J. Climatol.* **28**, 2031–2064. (doi:10.1002/joc.1688)
35. Sunday J *et al.* 2019 Thermal tolerance patterns across latitude and elevation. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **374**, 20190036. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2019.0036)
36. Washburn JO, Anderson JR, Mercer DR. 1989 Emergence characteristics of *Aedes sierrensis* (Diptera: Culicidae) from California treeholes with particular reference to parasite loads. *J. Med. Entomol.* **26**, 173–182. (doi:10.1093/jmedent/26.3.173)
37. Jordan RG, Bradshaw WE. 1978 Geographic variation in the photoperiodic response of the western tree-hole mosquito, *Aedes sierrensis*. *Ann. Entomol. Soc. Am.* **71**, 487–490. (doi:10.1093/aesa/71.4.487)
38. Shocket MS, Verwillow AB, Numazu MG, Slamani H, Cohen JM, El Moustaid F, Rohr J, Johnson LR, Mordecai EA. 2020 Transmission of West Nile and five other temperate mosquito-borne viruses peaks at temperatures between 23°C and 26°C. *eLife* **9**, e58511. (doi:10.7554/eLife.58511)
39. Mordecai EA *et al.* 2017 Detecting the impact of temperature on transmission of Zika, dengue, and chikungunya using mechanistic models. *PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis.* **11**, e0005568. (doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0005568)
40. Johnson LR, Ben-Horin T, Lafferty KD, McNally A, Mordecai E, Paaijmans KP, Pawar S, Ryan SJ. 2015 Understanding uncertainty in temperature effects on vector-borne disease: a Bayesian approach. *Ecology* **96**, 203–213. (doi:10.1890/13-1964.1)
41. Tesla B, Demakovsky LR, Mordecai EA, Ryan SJ, Bonds MH, Ngonghala CN, Brindley MA, Murdock CC. 2018 Temperature drives Zika virus transmission: evidence from empirical and mathematical models. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **285**, 20180795. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2018.0795)
42. Su Y, Yajima M. 2009 R2jags: A Package for Running jags from R. <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/R2jags/index.html>.
43. Venables W, Ripley B. 2002 *Modern applied statistics with S*. Berlin, Germany: Springer.
44. Hespanhol L, Vallio CS, Costa LM, Saragiotto BT. 2019 Understanding and interpreting confidence and credible intervals around effect estimates. *Braz. J. Phys. Ther* **23**, 290–301. (doi:10.1016/j.bjpt.2018.12.006)
45. Kelter R. 2020 Bayesian alternatives to null hypothesis significance testing in biomedical research: a non-technical introduction to Bayesian inference with JASP. *BMC Med. Res. Methodol.* **20**, 142. (doi:10.1186/s12874-020-00980-6)
46. Kunze C, Luijckx P, Jackson AL, Donohue I. 2022 Alternate patterns of temperature variation bring about very different disease outcomes at different mean temperatures. *eLife* **11**, e72861. (doi:10.7554/eLife.72861)
47. Stefanovic DI, Manzon LA, McDougall CS, Boreham DR, Somers CM, Wilson JY, Manzon RG. 2016 Thermal stress and the heat shock response in embryonic and young of the year juvenile lake whitefish. *Comp. Biochem. Physiol. A. Mol. Integr. Physiol.* **193**, 1–10. (doi:10.1016/j.cbpa.2015.12.001)
48. Whitehouse LM, McDougall CS, Stefanovic DI, Boreham DR, Somers CM, Wilson JY, Manzon RG. 2017 Development of the embryonic heat shock response and the impact of repeated thermal stress in early stage lake whitefish (*Coregonus clupeaformis*) embryos. *J. Therm. Biol.* **69**, 294–301. (doi:10.1016/j.jtherbio.2017.08.013)
49. Rothman KJ. 1990 No adjustments are needed for multiple comparisons. *Epidemiology* **1**, 43–46. (doi:10.1097/00001648-199001000-00010)
50. Frane AV. 2015 Planned hypothesis tests are not necessarily exempt from multiplicity adjustment. *J. Res. Pract.* **11**, P2.
51. Sunday JM, Bates AE, Dulvy NK. 2011 Global analysis of thermal tolerance and latitude in ectotherms. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **278**, 1823–1830. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2010.1295)
52. Walton D, Berg N, Pierce D, Maurer E, Hall A, Lin YH, Rahimi S, Cayan D. 2020 Understanding differences in California climate projections produced by dynamical and statistical downscaling. *J. Geophys. Res. Atmosph.* **125**, e2020JD032812. (doi:10.1029/2020JD032812)
53. Tüzün N, Stoks R. 2018 Evolution of geographic variation in thermal performance curves in the face of climate change and implications for biotic interactions. *Curr. Opin. Insect Sci.* **29**, 78–84. (doi:10.1016/j.cois.2018.07.004)
54. Klepsatel P, Gáliková M, De Maio N, Huber CD, Schlötterer C, Flatt T. 2013 Variation in thermal performance and reaction norms among populations of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Evolution* **67**, 3573–3587. (doi:10.1111/evo.12221)
55. Addo-Bediako A, Chown SL, Gaston KJ. 2000 Thermal tolerance, climatic variability and latitude. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B* **267**, 739–745. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2000.1065)
56. Maclean HJ, Sørensen JG, Kristensen TN, Loeschcke V, Beedholm K, Kellermann V, Overgaard J. 2019 Evolution and plasticity of thermal performance: an analysis of variation in thermal tolerance and fitness in 22 *Drosophila* species. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **374**, 20180548. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2018.0548)
57. Bennett JM *et al.* 2021 The evolution of critical thermal limits of life on Earth. *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 1198. (doi:10.1038/s41467-021-21263-8)
58. González-Tokman D, Córdoba-Aguilar A, Dáttilo W, Lira-Noriega A, Sánchez-Guillén RA, Villalobos F. 2020 Insect responses to heat: physiological mechanisms, evolution and ecological implications in a warming world. *Biol. Rev.* **95**, 802–821. (doi:10.1111/brv.12588)
59. Angilletta MJ, Wilson RS, Navas CA, James RS. 2003 Tradeoffs and the evolution of thermal reaction norms. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **18**, 234–240. (doi:10.1016/S0169-5347(03)00087-9)
60. Bodensteiner BL, Agudelo-Cantero GA, Andis Arietta AZ, Gunderson AR, Muñoz MM, Refsnider JM, Gangloff EJ. 2021 Thermal adaptation revisited: how conserved are thermal traits of reptiles and amphibians? *J. Exp. Zool. A Ecol. Integr. Physiol.* See <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/jez.2414>.
61. Sunday JM, Bates AE, Kearney MR, Colwell RK, Dulvy NK, Longino JT, Huey RB. 2014 Thermal-safety margins and the necessity of thermoregulatory behavior across latitude and elevation. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **111**, 5610–5615. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1316145111)
62. Pörtner HO, Bennett AAF, Bozinovic F, Clarke A, Lardies MA, Lucassen M, Pelster B, Schiemer F, Stillman JAH. 2006 Trade-offs in thermal adaptation: the need for a molecular to ecological integration. *Physiol. Biochem. Zool.* **79**, 295–313. (doi:10.1086/499986)
63. Bai C-M, Ma G, Cai W-Z, Ma C-S. 2019 Independent and combined effects of daytime heat stress and night-time recovery determine thermal performance. *Biol. Open* **8**, bio038141. (doi:10.1242/bio.038141)
64. Paaijmans KP, Heinig RL, Seliga RA, Blanford JJ, Blanford S, Murdock CC, Thomas MB. 2013 Temperature variation makes ectotherms more sensitive to climate change. *Glob. Change Biol.* **19**, 2373–2380. (doi:10.1111/gcb.12240)

65. Lambrechts L, Paaijmans KP, Fansiri T, Carrington LB, Kramer LD, Thomas MB, Scott TW. 2011 Impact of daily temperature fluctuations on dengue virus transmission by *Aedes aegypti*. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **108**, 7460–7465. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1101377108)
66. Alto BW, Wiggins K, Eastmond B, Ortiz S, Zirbel K, Lounibos LP. 2018 Diurnal temperature range and chikungunya virus infection in invasive mosquito vectors. *J. Med. Entomol.* **55**, 217–224. (doi:10.1093/jme/tjx182)
67. Paaijmans KP, Blanford S, Bell AS, Blanford JI, Read AF, Thomas MB. 2010 Influence of climate on malaria transmission depends on daily temperature variation. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **107**, 15 135–15 139. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1006422107)
68. Beck-Johnson LM, Nelson WA, Paaijmans KP, Read AF, Thomas MB, Bjørnstad ON. 2017 The importance of temperature fluctuations in understanding mosquito population dynamics and malaria risk. *R. Soc. Open Sci.* **4**, 160969. (doi:10.1098/rsos.160969)
69. Hoffmann AA. 2010 Physiological climatic limits in *Drosophila*: patterns and implications. *J. Exp. Biol.* **213**, 870–880. (doi:10.1242/jeb.037630)
70. Dowd WW, King FA, Denny MW. 2015 Thermal variation, thermal extremes and the physiological performance of individuals. *J. Exp. Biol.* **218**, 1956–1967. (doi:10.1242/jeb.114926)
71. Clusella-Trullas S, Blackburn TM, Chown SL. 2011 Climatic predictors of temperature performance curve parameters in ectotherms imply complex responses to climate change. *Am. Nat.* **177**, 738–751. (doi:10.1086/660021)
72. Bernhardt JR, Sunday JM, Thompson PL, O'connor MI. 2018 Nonlinear averaging of thermal experience predicts population growth rates in a thermally variable environment. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **285**, 20181076. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2018.1076)
73. Marshall KE, Anderson KM, Brown NEM, Dytneriski JK, Flynn KL, Bernhardt JR, Konecny CA, Gurney-Smith H, Harley CDG. 2021 Whole-organism responses to constant temperatures do not predict responses to variable temperatures in the ecosystem engineer *Mytilus trossulus*. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **288**, 20202968. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2020.2968)
74. Couper LI, Farner JE, Lyberger KP, Lee AS, Mordecai EA. 2024 Data from: Mosquito thermal tolerance is remarkably constrained across a large climatic range. Dryad Digital Repository. (doi:10.5061/dryad.80gb5mkxd)
75. Couper LI, Farner JE, Lyberger KP, Lee AS, Mordecai EA. 2024 Mosquito thermal tolerance is remarkably constrained across a large climatic range. Figshare. (doi:10.6084/m9.figshare.c.7007833)