Supplementary information

Processing tomato production is expected to decrease by 2050 due to the projected increase in temperature

In the format provided by the authors and unedited

We applied the non-parametric Mann-Kendall test^{1,2,3} to detect the monotonic trend of yield changes in future climate scenarios. A monotonic trend refers to a statistically consistent upward or downward trend (linear or non-linear) of a variable over time. The Man-Kendall test first determines the sign of the difference between each data point of a time series (x) at timestep (i) to the rest of data points measured at later timesteps (x_i where j > i):

$$S = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} sgn(x_j - x_i) \quad \& \quad sgn(x_j - x_i) = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{if } x_j - x_i > 0\\ 0 & \text{if } x_j - x_i = 0\\ -1 & \text{if } x_j - x_i < 0 \end{cases}$$

where n is the number of data points, and *sgn* is the sign function. The method then computes the variance of *S* as:

$$Var(s) = \frac{1}{18} \left[n(n-1)(2n+5) - \sum_{p=1}^{g} t_p(t_p-1)(2t_p+5) \right]$$

where g is the number of tied groups (i.e., group of equals values) and t_p is the number of observations in the p^{th} group. The method then computes the test statistic as:

$$Z = \begin{cases} \frac{S-1}{\sqrt{Var(s)}} & \text{if } S > 0\\ 0 & \text{if } S = 0\\ \frac{S+1}{\sqrt{Var(s)}} & \text{if } S < 0 \end{cases}$$

A positive (negative) Z value signifies that the data trend increases (decreases) monotonically. For all trend evaluations, we considered a significance level of α = 0.05. Additionally, we employed the Thiel-Sen estimator method to quantify the magnitude of yield change. Thiel-Sen estimator is a non-parametric approach that applies the following equation to quantify the slope (β) in a time series:

$$\beta = median\left(\frac{x_j - x_i}{j - i}\right), j > i$$

We applied the Man-Kendal test to statistically assess the trends in yield and temperature changes during future scenarios (i.e., 2010-2100) and used Thiel-Sen estimator to quantify the magnitudes of the changes. These statistical approaches were applied spatially to consider both temporal and spatial changes in tomatoes yield.

Supplemental Table 1. Crop coefficients calibrated using field experiment data. Foggia is missing because the results are published and publicly available from another study⁴.

Locations	EM-FL	SD-PM	FL-LF	LFMAX	SLAVR	SIZLF	XFRT	WTPSD	SFDUR	SDPDV	PODUR	THRSH	TRIFL
California	37	29	25	2.9	400	400	0.85	0.004	26	300	55	8.5	0.95
Inner Mongolia + Gansu	30	50	52	1.36	290	100	1.9	0.008	25	300	59	9.5	0.45
Emilia	67	25	17	1.96	500	400	1.1	0.008	30	400	50	8.5	0.45
Xinjiang	30	45	52	1.36	290	100	1.9	0.008	25	300	59	9.5	0.45

TRILF: Rate of appearance of leaves on the mainstem (leaves per thermal day)

EM-FL: Time between plant emergence and flower appearance (R1)

SD-PM: Time between first seed (R5) and end of leaf expansion (photothermal days)

FL-LF: Time between first flower (R1) and end of leaf expansion (photothermal days)

LFMAX: Maximum leaf photosynthesis rate at 30 C, 350 vpm CO2, and high light (mg CO2/m2-s)

SLAVR: Specific leaf area of cultivar under standard growth conditions (cm2/g)

SIZLF: Maximum size of full leaf (three leaflets) (cm2)

XFRT: Maximum fraction of daily growth that is partitioned to seed + shell

WTPSD: Maximum weight per seed (g)

SFDUR: Seed filling duration for pod cohort at standard growth conditions (photothermal days)

SDPDV: Average seed per pod under standard growing conditions (#/pod)

PODUR: Time required for cultivar to reach final pod load under optimal conditions (photothermal days)

THRSH: Threshing percentage. The maximum ratio of (seed/(seed+shell)) at maturity. Causes seed to stop growing as their dry weight increases until the shells are filled in a cohort.

Supplemental Table 2. Bias-adjusted⁵ climate models used in this study. Equilibrium climate sensitivity (ECS) represents the global surface air temperature increase in an equilibrium state after doubling pre-industrial atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations [CO2]. Transient climate response (TCR) represents the global surface air temperature warming by the time pre-industrial [CO2] is reached under a scenario in which there is a 1% per year increase in [CO2]⁶.

Global Climate Model	Equilibrium Climate Sensitivity (°C)	Transient Climate Response (°C)
1. GFDL-ESM4	2.6	1.6
2. IPSL-CM6A-LR	4.6	2.3
3. MPI-ESM1-2-HR	3.0	1.7
4. MRI-ESM2-0	3.2	1.6
5. UKESM1-0	5.3	2.8

CCM	Sconario	enario — Mean air temperature							Yield			Yield vs. mean air temperature						
GCIVI	Scenario	P_{value}	Ζ*	T**	Slope***	trend	P_{value}	Z	Ţ	slope	trend	P_{value}	Z	Ţ	slope	trend		
	SSP1-2.6	0.137	-1.490	-0.090	-0.006	no trend	0.14	-1.49	-0.090	-0.006	no trend	0.14	-1.49	-0.090	-0.006	no trend		
GCM1	SSP3-7.0	0.011	-2.530	-0.160	-0.013	decreasing	0.01	-2.53	-0.160	-0.013	decreasing	0.01	-2.53	-0.160	-0.013	decreasing		
	SSP5-8.5	< 0.001	-3.770	-0.230	-0.019	decreasing	< 0.001	-3.77	-0.230	-0.019	decreasing	< 0.001	-3.77	-0.230	-0.019	decreasing		
	SSP1-2.6	0.010	-2.580	-0.160	-0.009	decreasing	0.01	-2.58	-0.160	-0.009	decreasing	0.01	-2.58	-0.160	-0.009	decreasing		
GCM2	SSP3-7.0	< 0.001	-6.420	-0.400	-0.028	decreasing	< 0.001	-6.42	-0.400	-0.028	decreasing	< 0.001	-6.42	-0.400	-0.028	decreasing		
	SSP5-8.5	< 0.001	-7.680	-0.470	-0.048	decreasing	< 0.001	-7.68	-0.470	-0.048	decreasing	< 0.001	-7.68	-0.470	-0.048	decreasing		
	SSP1-2.6	0.194	-1.300	-0.080	-0.005	no trend	0.19	-1.30	-0.080	-0.005	no trend	0.19	-1.30	-0.080	-0.005	no trend		
GCM3	SSP3-7.0	0.254	-1.140	-0.070	-0.005	no trend	0.25	-1.14	-0.070	-0.005	no trend	0.25	-1.14	-0.070	-0.005	no trend		
	SSP5-8.5	< 0.001	-5.220	-0.320	-0.030	decreasing	< 0.001	-5.22	-0.320	-0.030	decreasing	< 0.001	-5.22	-0.320	-0.03	decreasing		
	SSP1-2.6	0.548	-0.600	-0.040	-0.002	no trend	0.55	-0.60	-0.040	-0.002	no trend	0.55	-0.60	-0.040	-0.002	no trend		
GCM4	SSP3-7.0	0.006	-2.770	-0.170	-0.014	decreasing	0.01	-2.77	-0.170	-0.014	decreasing	0.01	-2.77	-0.170	-0.014	decreasing		
	SSP5-8.5	< 0.001	-4.050	-0.250	-0.021	decreasing	< 0.001	-4.05	-0.250	-0.021	decreasing	< 0.001	-4.05	-0.250	-0.021	decreasing		
	SSP1-2.6	< 0.001	-6.130	-0.380	-0.030	decreasing	< 0.001	-6.13	-0.380	-0.03	decreasing	< 0.001	-6.13	-0.380	-0.03	decreasing		
GCM5	SSP3-7.0	< 0.001	-10.700	-0.660	-0.068	decreasing	< 0.001	-10.70	-0.660	-0.068	decreasing	< 0.001	-10.70	-0.660	-0.068	decreasing		
	SSP5-8.5	< 0.001	-10.570	-0.650	-0.075	decreasing	< 0.001	-10.57	-0.650	-0.075	decreasing	< 0.001	-10.57	-0.650	-0.075	decreasing		

Supplemental Table 3. statistical details of the Man-Kendall test and Thein-Slope estimator for the U.S. (California) considering each model and future scenario

** T is the rank correlation coefficient that shows the monotony of the slope

CCM	Cooporio	Scenario — Mean air temperature							Yield			Yield vs. mean air temperature						
GCIVI	Scenario	\mathbf{P}_{value}	Z*	T**	Slope***	trend	P _{value}	Z	Ţ	slope	trend	P_{value}	Z	Ţ	slope	trend		
	SSP1-2.6	0.991	0.010	0.001	0.001	no trend	0.99	0.01	0.001	0.001	no trend	0.99	0.01	0.001	0.001	no trend		
GCM1	SSP3-7.0	< 0.001	-3.290	-0.200	-0.013	decreasing	< 0.001	-3.29	-0.200	-0.013	decreasing	< 0.001	-3.29	-0.200	-0.013	decreasing		
	SSP5-8.5	< 0.001	-4.430	-0.270	-0.018	decreasing	< 0.001	-4.43	-0.270	-0.018	decreasing	< 0.001	-4.43	-0.270	-0.018	decreasing		
	SSP1-2.6	< 0.001	-5.060	-0.310	-0.010	decreasing	< 0.001	-5.06	-0.310	-0.010	decreasing	< 0.001	-5.06	-0.310	-0.010	decreasing		
GCM2	SSP3-7.0	< 0.001	-8.010	-0.490	-0.032	decreasing	< 0.001	-8.01	-0.490	-0.032	decreasing	< 0.001	-8.01	-0.490	-0.032	decreasing		
	SSP5-8.5	< 0.001	-10.330	-0.640	-0.065	decreasing	< 0.001	-10.33	-0.640	-0.065	decreasing	< 0.001	-10.33	-0.640	-0.065	decreasing		
	SSP1-2.6	0.897	0.130	0.010	0.000	no trend	0.90	0.13	0.010	0.000	no trend	0.90	0.13	0.010	0.001	no trend		
GCM3	SSP3-7.0	< 0.001	-4.340	-0.270	-0.013	decreasing	< 0.001	-4.34	-0.270	-0.013	decreasing	< 0.001	-4.34	-0.270	-0.013	decreasing		
	SSP5-8.5	< 0.001	-6.980	-0.430	-0.030	decreasing	< 0.001	-6.98	-0.430	-0.030	decreasing	< 0.001	-6.98	-0.430	-0.03	decreasing		
	SSP1-2.6	0.046	-2.000	-0.120	-0.004	decreasing	0.05	-2.00	-0.120	-0.004	decreasing	0.05	-2.00	-0.120	-0.004	decreasing		
GCM4	SSP3-7.0	0.011	-2.540	-0.160	-0.006	decreasing	0.01	-2.54	-0.160	-0.006	decreasing	0.01	-2.54	-0.160	-0.006	decreasing		
	SSP5-8.5	< 0.001	-7.800	-0.480	-0.026	decreasing	< 0.001	-7.80	-0.480	-0.026	decreasing	< 0.001	-7.80	-0.480	-0.026	decreasing		
	SSP1-2.6	< 0.001	-6.330	-0.390	-0.014	decreasing	< 0.001	-6.33	-0.390	-0.014	decreasing	< 0.001	-6.33	-0.390	-0.014	decreasing		
GCM5	SSP3-7.0	< 0.001	-11.000	-0.680	-0.067	decreasing	< 0.001	-11.00	-0.680	-0.067	decreasing	< 0.001	-11.00	-0.680	-0.067	decreasing		
	SSP5-8.5	< 0.001	-11.890	-0.730	-0.073	decreasing	< 0.001	-11.89	-0.730	-0.073	decreasing	< 0.001	-11.89	-0.730	-0.073	decreasing		

Supplemental Table 4. statistical details of the Man-Kendall test and Thein-Slope estimator for Italy (Emilia) considering each model and future scenario

** T is the rank correlation coefficient that shows the monotony of the slope

CCM	Sconario		Mea	n air ten	nperature				Yield			Yield vs. mean air temperature						
GCIVI	Scenario	P_{value}	Ζ*	T**	Slope***	trend	P _{value}	Z	Ţ	slope	trend	P_{value}	Z	Ţ	slope	trend		
	SSP1-2.6	< 0.001	-3.280	-0.200	-0.005	decreasing	< 0.001	-3.28	-0.200	-0.005	decreasing	< 0.001	-3.28	-0.200	-0.005	decreasing		
GCM1	SSP3-7.0	< 0.001	-5.670	-0.350	-0.018	decreasing	< 0.001	-5.67	-0.350	-0.018	decreasing	< 0.001	-5.67	-0.350	-0.018	decreasing		
	SSP5-8.5	< 0.001	-5.900	-0.360	-0.028	decreasing	< 0.001	-5.90	-0.360	-0.028	decreasing	< 0.001	-5.90	-0.360	-0.028	decreasing		
	SSP1-2.6	< 0.001	-5.320	-0.330	-0.012	decreasing	< 0.001	-5.32	-0.330	-0.012	decreasing	< 0.001	-5.32	-0.330	-0.012	decreasing		
GCM2	SSP3-7.0	< 0.001	-9.080	-0.560	-0.046	decreasing	< 0.001	-9.08	-0.560	-0.046	decreasing	< 0.001	-9.08	-0.560	-0.046	decreasing		
	SSP5-8.5	< 0.001	-10.420	-0.650	-0.071	decreasing	< 0.001	-10.42	-0.650	-0.071	decreasing	< 0.001	-10.42	-0.650	-0.071	decreasing		
	SSP1-2.6	0.575	0.560	0.030	0.001	no trend	0.58	0.56	0.030	0.001	no trend	0.58	0.56	0.030	0.001	no trend		
GCM3	SSP3-7.0	< 0.001	-4.190	-0.260	-0.015	decreasing	< 0.001	-4.19	-0.260	-0.015	decreasing	< 0.001	-4.19	-0.260	-0.015	decreasing		
	SSP5-8.5	< 0.001	-6.630	-0.410	-0.036	decreasing	< 0.001	-6.63	-0.410	-0.036	decreasing	< 0.001	-6.63	-0.410	-0.036	decreasing		
	SSP1-2.6	0.002	-3.130	-0.200	-0.007	decreasing	0.00	-3.13	-0.200	-0.007	decreasing	0.00	-3.13	-0.200	-0.007	decreasing		
GCM4	SSP3-7.0	< 0.001	-6.610	-0.410	-0.037	decreasing	< 0.001	-6.61	-0.410	-0.037	decreasing	< 0.001	-6.61	-0.410	-0.037	decreasing		
	SSP5-8.5	< 0.001	-9.240	-0.580	-0.051	decreasing	< 0.001	-9.24	-0.580	-0.051	decreasing	< 0.001	-9.24	-0.580	-0.051	decreasing		
	SSP1-2.6	< 0.001	-6.700	-0.420	-0.016	decreasing	< 0.001	-6.70	-0.420	-0.016	decreasing	< 0.001	-6.70	-0.420	-0.016	decreasing		
GCM5	SSP3-7.0	< 0.001	-10.380	-0.640	-0.066	decreasing	< 0.001	-10.38	-0.640	-0.066	decreasing	< 0.001	-10.38	-0.640	-0.066	decreasing		
	SSP5-8.5	< 0.001	-11.510	-0.710	-0.073	decreasing	< 0.001	-11.51	-0.710	-0.073	decreasing	< 0.001	-11.51	-0.710	-0.073	decreasing		

Supplemental Table 5. statistical details of the Man-Kendall test and Thein-Slope estimator for Italy (Foggia) considering each model and future scenario

** T is the rank correlation coefficient that shows the monotony of the slope

CCM	Cooporio		Mea	n air ten	nperature				Yield			Yield vs. mean air temperature						
GCIVI	Scenario	P_{value}	Z*	T**	Slope***	trend	\mathbf{P}_{value}	Z	Ţ	slope	trend	P_{value}	Z	Ţ	slope	trend		
	SSP1-2.6	0.003	2.960	0.180	0.005	increasing	0.00	2.96	0.180	0.005	increasing	0.00	2.96	0.180	0.005	increasing		
GCM1	SSP3-7.0	< 0.001	8.840	0.550	0.019	increasing	< 0.001	8.84	0.550	0.019	increasing	< 0.001	8.84	0.550	0.019	increasing		
	SSP5-8.5	< 0.001	9.780	0.610	0.022	increasing	< 0.001	9.78	0.610	0.022	increasing	< 0.001	9.78	0.610	0.022	increasing		
	SSP1-2.6	0.006	2.760	0.180	0.005	increasing	0.01	2.76	0.180	0.005	increasing	0.01	2.76	0.180	0.005	increasing		
GCM2	SSP3-7.0	< 0.001	7.560	0.480	0.018	increasing	< 0.001	7.56	0.480	0.018	increasing	< 0.001	7.56	0.480	0.018	increasing		
	SSP5-8.5	< 0.001	4.350	0.280	0.010	increasing	< 0.001	4.35	0.280	0.010	increasing	< 0.001	4.35	0.280	0.01	increasing		
	SSP1-2.6	< 0.001	3.290	0.200	0.006	increasing	< 0.001	3.29	0.200	0.006	increasing	< 0.001	3.29	0.200	0.006	increasing		
GCM3	SSP3-7.0	< 0.001	8.930	0.560	0.022	increasing	< 0.001	8.93	0.560	0.022	increasing	< 0.001	8.93	0.560	0.022	increasing		
	SSP5-8.5	< 0.001	9.680	0.600	0.021	increasing	< 0.001	9.68	0.600	0.021	increasing	< 0.001	9.68	0.600	0.021	increasing		
	SSP1-2.6	0.058	1.890	0.120	0.003	no trend	0.06	1.89	0.120	0.003	no trend	0.06	1.89	0.120	0.003	no trend		
GCM4	SSP3-7.0	< 0.001	9.790	0.620	0.024	increasing	< 0.001	9.79	0.620	0.024	increasing	< 0.001	9.79	0.620	0.024	increasing		
	SSP5-8.5	< 0.001	9.600	0.600	0.024	increasing	< 0.001	9.60	0.600	0.024	increasing	< 0.001	9.60	0.600	0.024	increasing		
	SSP1-2.6	< 0.001	3.270	0.210	0.005	increasing	< 0.001	3.27	0.210	0.005	increasing	< 0.001	3.27	0.210	0.005	increasing		
GCM5	SSP3-7.0	< 0.001	6.450	0.410	0.019	increasing	< 0.001	6.45	0.410	0.019	increasing	< 0.001	6.45	0.410	0.019	increasing		
	SSP5-8.5	< 0.001	5.740	0.370	0.015	increasing	< 0.001	5.74	0.370	0.015	increasing	< 0.001	5.74	0.37	0.015	increasing		

Supplemental Table 6. statistical details of the Man-Kendall test and Thein-Slope estimator for China (Gansu) considering each model and future scenario

** T is the rank correlation coefficient that shows the monotony of the slope

CCM	Sconario		Mea	n air ten	nperature				Yield			Yield vs. mean air temperature						
GCIVI	Scenario	P_{value}	Z*	** J	Slope***	trend	P_{value}	Z	Ţ	slope	trend	P_{value}	Z	Ţ	slope	trend		
	SSP1-2.6	< 0.001	4.840	0.300	0.008	increasing	< 0.001	4.84	0.300	0.008	increasing	< 0.001	4.84	0.300	0.008	increasing		
GCM1	SSP3-7.0	< 0.001	10.100	0.620	0.025	increasing	< 0.001	10.10	0.620	0.025	increasing	< 0.001	10.10	0.620	0.025	increasing		
	SSP5-8.5	< 0.001	10.350	0.640	0.028	increasing	< 0.001	10.35	0.640	0.028	increasing	< 0.001	10.35	0.640	0.028	increasing		
	SSP1-2.6	< 0.001	5.010	0.310	0.008	increasing	< 0.001	5.01	0.310	0.008	increasing	< 0.001	5.01	0.310	0.008	increasing		
GCM2	SSP3-7.0	< 0.001	8.830	0.550	0.022	increasing	< 0.001	8.83	0.550	0.022	increasing	< 0.001	8.83	0.550	0.022	increasing		
	SSP5-8.5	< 0.001	4.770	0.290	0.016	increasing	< 0.001	4.77	0.290	0.016	increasing	< 0.001	4.77	0.290	0.016	increasing		
	SSP1-2.6	< 0.001	4.200	0.260	0.007	increasing	< 0.001	4.20	0.260	0.007	increasing	< 0.001	4.20	0.260	0.007	increasing		
GCM3	SSP3-7.0	< 0.001	9.800	0.610	0.025	increasing	< 0.001	9.80	0.610	0.025	increasing	< 0.001	9.80	0.610	0.025	increasing		
	SSP5-8.5	< 0.001	10.070	0.620	0.026	increasing	< 0.001	10.07	0.620	0.026	increasing	< 0.001	10.07	0.620	0.026	increasing		
	SSP1-2.6	< 0.001	6.020	0.370	0.010	increasing	< 0.001	6.02	0.370	0.010	increasing	< 0.001	6.02	0.370	0.01	increasing		
GCM4	SSP3-7.0	< 0.001	11.440	0.710	0.027	increasing	< 0.001	11.44	0.710	0.027	increasing	< 0.001	11.44	0.710	0.027	increasing		
	SSP5-8.5	< 0.001	8.950	0.550	0.023	increasing	< 0.001	8.95	0.550	0.023	increasing	< 0.001	8.95	0.550	0.023	increasing		
	SSP1-2.6	< 0.001	6.900	0.430	0.011	increasing	< 0.001	6.90	0.430	0.011	increasing	< 0.001	6.90	0.430	0.011	increasing		
GCM5	SSP3-7.0	< 0.001	5.510	0.340	0.015	increasing	< 0.001	5.51	0.340	0.015	increasing	< 0.001	5.51	0.340	0.015	increasing		
	SSP5-8.5	0.007	2.680	0.170	0.010	increasing	0.01	2.68	0.170	0.01	increasing	0.01	2.68	0.170	0.01	increasing		

Supplemental Table 7. statistical details of the Man-Kendall test and Thein-Slope estimator for China (Inner Mongolia) considering each model and future scenario

** T is the rank correlation coefficient that shows the monotony of the slope

CCM	Sconario		Mea	ın air ten	nperature				Yield vs. mean air temperature							
GCIVI	Scenario	P_{value}	Ζ*	T**	Slope***	trend	\mathbf{P}_{value}	Ζ	Ţ	slope	trend	P_{value}	Z	Ţ	slope	trend
	SSP1-2.6	0.080	1.750	0.110	0.002	no trend	0.08	1.75	0.110	0.002	no trend	0.08	1.75	0.110	0.002	no trend
GCM1	SSP3-7.0	< 0.001	3.320	0.210	0.005	increasing	< 0.001	3.32	0.210	0.005	increasing	< 0.001	3.32	0.210	0.005	increasing
	SSP5-8.5	0.277	1.090	0.070	0.002	no trend	0.28	1.09	0.070	0.002	no trend	0.28	1.09	0.070	0.002	no trend
	SSP1-2.6	< 0.001	-3.180	-0.200	-0.005	decreasing	< 0.001	-3.18	-0.200	-0.005	decreasing	< 0.001	-3.18	-0.200	-0.005	decreasing
GCM2	SSP3-7.0	< 0.001	-6.940	-0.430	-0.013	decreasing	< 0.001	-6.94	-0.430	-0.013	decreasing	< 0.001	-6.94	-0.430	-0.013	decreasing
	SSP5-8.5	< 0.001	-8.870	-0.550	-0.020	decreasing	< 0.001	-8.87	-0.550	-0.020	decreasing	< 0.001	-8.87	-0.550	-0.02	decreasing
	SSP1-2.6	< 0.001	3.990	0.250	0.005	increasing	< 0.001	3.99	0.250	0.005	increasing	< 0.001	3.99	0.250	0.005	increasing
GCM3	SSP3-7.0	0.048	1.980	0.120	0.003	increasing	0.05	1.98	0.120	0.003	increasing	0.05	1.98	0.120	0.003	increasing
	SSP5-8.5	0.365	-0.910	-0.060	-0.002	no trend	0.37	-0.91	-0.060	-0.002	no trend	0.37	-0.91	-0.060	-0.002	no trend
	SSP1-2.6	0.059	1.890	0.120	0.002	no trend	0.06	1.89	0.120	0.002	no trend	0.06	1.89	0.120	0.002	no trend
GCM4	SSP3-7.0	0.125	1.540	0.090	0.002	no trend	0.13	1.54	0.090	0.002	no trend	0.13	1.54	0.090	0.002	no trend
	SSP5-8.5	0.034	-2.130	-0.130	-0.003	decreasing	0.03	-2.13	-0.130	-0.003	decreasing	0.03	-2.13	-0.130	-0.003	decreasing
	SSP1-2.6	< 0.001	-6.100	-0.380	-0.007	decreasing	< 0.001	-6.10	-0.380	-0.007	decreasing	< 0.001	-6.10	-0.380	-0.007	decreasing
GCM5	SSP3-7.0	< 0.001	-6.190	-0.380	-0.009	decreasing	< 0.001	-6.19	-0.380	-0.009	decreasing	< 0.001	-6.19	-0.380	-0.009	decreasing
	SSP5-8.5	< 0.001	-8.280	-0.510	-0.015	decreasing	< 0.001	-8.28	-0.510	-0.015	decreasing	< 0.001	-8.28	-0.510	-0.015	decreasing

Supplemental Table 8. statistical details of the Man-Kendall test and Thein-Slope estimator for China (Xinjiang) considering each model and future scenario

** T is the rank correlation coefficient that shows the monotony of the slope



Supplemental Figure 1. Mean processing tomato production for the period 2010-2019 for the main producing countries (the error bar represents the standard deviation of the mean). The production data were retrieved from the World Processing Tomato Council (WPTC), http://www.tomatonews.com/en/wptc_3_411002.html



Supplemental Figure 2. Yearly relative changes in **(A)** mean air temperature; **(B)** maximum air temperature; **(C)** minimum air temperature; and **(D)** with respect to the baseline (1980-2009). Each panel provides data for the tomato growing regions and for the SSP1-2.6, SSP3-7.0, and SSP5-8.5 scenarios.



Supplemental Figure 3. Temperature changes with respect to the baseline period (1980-2009) for the A) mean air temperature; B) maximum air temperature; and C) minimum air temperature for the six locations of the study during 2010-2039; 2040-2069; 2070-2099. For each box-and-whiskers plot, the end of the whisker line represents the 10th and 90th percentiles. The lines of the box represent the 25th, median, and 75th percentiles.



Supplemental Figure 4. Mean air temperature changes with respect to the baseline period (1980-2009) for the five Global Circulation Models (GCM) and for the six locations of the study during 2010-2039; 2040-2069; 2070-2099. For each box-and-whiskers plot, the end of the whisker line represents the 10th and 90th percentiles. The lines of the box represent the 25th, median, and 75th percentiles.



Supplemental Figure 5. The distribution of the simulated processing tomato yield (expressed as ton of dry matter per ha, "t DM/ha") for **(A)** the United States; **(B)** Italy; **(C)** China; and **(D)** global for SSP1-2.6 (yellow distribution), SSP3-7.0 (violet distribution), and SSP5-8.5 (green distribution). This plot considers the average of the five global circulation models considered in the study. For each box-and-whiskers plot, the end of the whisker line represents the 10th and 90th percentiles. The lines of the box represent the 25th, median, and 75th percentiles. The red dots and lines represent the mean simulated yield.



Supplemental Figure 6. The distribution of the simulated processing tomato yield (expressed as ton of dry matter per ha, "t DM/ha") for **(A)** The United States; **(B)** Italy; **(C)** China; and **(D)** global for SSP1-2.6 (yellow distribution), SSP3-7.0 (violet distribution), and SSP5-8.5 (green distribution). This plot represents the data for all global circulation models considered in the study. For each box-and-whiskers plot, the end of the whisker line represents the 10th and 90th percentiles. The lines of the box represent the 25th, median, and 75th percentiles. The red dots and lines represent the mean simulated yield.



Supplemental Figure 7. Distribution of mean air temperature at different latitude during **(A)** 1980-2009; **(B)** 2010-2039; **(C)** 2040-2069; **(D)** 2070-2099. The color of each distribution corresponds to each growing tomato region.



Supplemental Figure 8. Spatial distribution of **(A)** yield change per degree of air temperature, **(B)** yield change per year; and **(C)** average temperature change per year for the Xinjiang Province (China). The hatched areas show the locations where the changes in yield (A, and B) and temperature (C) were not statistically significant based on the Man-Kendall tests.



Supplemental Figure 9. Spatial distribution of **(A)** yield change per degree of air temperature, **(B)** yield change per year; and **(C)** average temperature change per year for the Gansu Province (China). The hatched areas show the locations where the changes in yield (A, and B) and temperature (C) were not statistically significant based on the Man-Kendall tests.



Supplemental Figure 10. Spatial distribution of *(A)* yield change per degree of air temperature, *(B)* yield change per year; and *(C)* average temperature change per year for Inner Mongolia Province (China). The hatched areas show the locations where the changes in yield (A, and B) and temperature (C) were not statistically significant based on the Man-Kendall tests.



Supplemental Figure 11. Spatial distribution of (*A*, *D*) yield change per degree of air temperature, (*B*, *E*) yield change per year; and (*C*, *F*) average temperature change per year for Foggia (*A*-*C*) and Emilia-Romagna (*E*-*F*) Provinces (Italy). The hatched areas show the locations where the changes in yield (*A*, *B*, *D*, *E*) and temperature (*C*, *F*) were not statistically significant based on the Man-Kendall tests.



Supplemental Figure 12. Spatial distribution of *(A)* yield change per degree of air temperature, *(B)* yield change per year; and *(C)* average temperature change per year for California (USA). The hatched areas show the locations where the changes in yield (A, and B) and temperature (C) were not statistically significant based on the Man-Kendall tests.



Supplemental Figure 13. Rainfall changes with respect to the baseline period (1980-2009) for the six locations of the study during 2010-2039; 2040-2069; 2070-2099. For each box-and-whiskers plot, the end of the whisker line represents the 10th and 90th percentiles. The lines of the box represent the 25th, median, and 75th percentiles.



Supplemental Figure 14. Precipitation changes with respect to the baseline period (1980-2009) for the five GCMs and for the six locations of the study and during 2010-2039; 2040-2069; 2070-2099. For each box-and-whiskers plot, the end of the whisker line represents the 10th and 90th percentiles. The lines of the box represent the 25th, median, and 75th percentiles.



Supplemental Figure 15. Simulated **(***A***)** relative irrigation changes with respect to the baseline (1980-2009) for RCP2.6 (green boxplots), RCP7.0 (blue boxplots), and RCP8.5 (red boxplots); **(***B***)** total irrigation water and **(***C***)** irrigation unit for the 1980-2009 (red boxplots), 2010-2039 (green boxplots), 2040-2069 (blue boxplots), and 2070-2099 (violet boxplots). For each boxplot, the end of the vertical line represents, from top to bottom, the 10th and 90th percentile. The horizontal line of the box, from top to bottom, represents the 25th, median, and 75th percentile, respectively.



Supplemental Figure 16. Calibration of tomato yield for the different locations and for different variables available. Results of the phenology calibration were not shown because the model was fitted to simulate flowering and harvesting within +/- 4 days. Calibration did not happen in Foggia (Italy) because the DSSAT-Tomato model was calibrated and evaluated in that province in a previous study¹.



Supplemental Figure 17. Evaluation of regional tomato yield simulation vs. observed regional yield for each of the six locations. The horizontal standard deviation represents the reported observed yield by each province to the World Processing Tomato Council⁷ and corresponds to the period of 2005-2019, except for Gansu and Inner Mongolia (China), where observed data were only available for one year. The vertical standard deviation bar represents the variability of multi-year (1980-2019) simulations.



Supplemental Figure 18. Atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO₂) concentration progress over time for SSP1-2.6 (full line), SSP3-7.0 (dotted line), and SSP5-8.5 (dot-dash line).

References cited

- 1 Mann, H.B. Nonparametric tests against trend. *Econometrica* **13**(3): 245-259 (1945).
- 2 Kendall, M.G. Rank Correlation Methods. Charles Griffin, London, UK (1975).
- 3 Sen, P.K. Estimates of the regression coefficient based on Kendall's tau. *Journal of the American statistical association*, **63**(324), 1379-1389 (1968).
- 4 Cammarano, D., Ronga, D., Di Mola, I., Mori, M. & Parisi, M. Impact of climate change on water and nitrogen use efficiencies of processing tomato cultivated in Italy. *Agricultural Water Management* **241**, 106336, doi:<u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2020.106336</u> (2020).
- 5 Meehl, G. A. et al. Context for interpreting equilibrium climate sensitivity and transient climate response from the CMIP6 Earth system models. Sci. Adv. 6, 1-11 https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/sciadv.aba1981 (2020)
- 6 Lange, S. Trend-preserving bias adjustment and statistical downscaling with ISIMIP3BASD 797 (v1.0). *Geosci. Model Dev.* **12**, 3055–3070 https://gmd.copernicus.org/articles/12/3055/2019/ (2019).
- 7 WPTC. *World Processing Tomato Council,* <<u>http://www.tomatonews.com/en/wptc_3_411002.html</u>>(2021).