

Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) adaptation to agroecosystems

Maxwel C Oliveira¹, Amit J Jhala², Mark Bernards³, Chris Proctor², Strahinja Stepanovic², Rodrigo Werle^{1*}

¹ Department of Agronomy, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin, United States

² Department of Agronomy and Horticulture, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, Nebraska, United States

³ Department of Agronomy, Western Illinois University, Macomb, Illinois, United States

Correspondence*:

Rodrigo Werle

rwerle@uwisc.edu

2 ABSTRACT

Abstract length and content varies depending on article type. Refer to <http://www.frontiersin.org/about/AuthorGuidelines> for abstract requirement and length according to article type.

Keywords: Evolution Flowering Management Pigweed Weed

INTRODUCTION

Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri* S. Watson) is currently considered one of the most economically damaged weed species to cropping systems in the United States (Ward et al., 2013). The species has showed a remarkable capacity to evolve resistance to herbicides. Palmer amaranth has evolved resistance to eight herbicide sites of action (Heap, 2021), increasing the weed management complexity (Lindsay et al., 2017). Uncontrolled Palmer amaranth in competition for water, light and nutrients can drastically reduce crop yields (Berger et al., 2015). Palmer amaranth is documented with potential to reduce 91%, 68%, and 54% of corn (Massinga et al., 2001), soybean (Klingaman and Oliver, 1994), and cotton (Morgan et al., 2001) yields, respectively.

Palmer amaranth is a fast growing summer annual forb indigenous to Sonoran Desert (Sauer, 1957). The species would eventually emerge as a threat to US agriculture in the 1990s. Palmer amaranth weediness is likely a result of human-assisted selection in combination with species biology. Farm mechanization, conservation agriculture (e.g., no-till), and reliance on herbicides for weed management are the main human mediated selection of Palmer amaranth to cropping systems. On the other hand, Palmer amaranth is a prolific seed producer with a C4 photosynthetic apparatus (Ward et al., 2013). With a dioecy nature, Palmer amaranth male and female plants are obligate outcrosser species, increasing the chances of exchanging herbicide resistant alleles among plants (Oliveira et al., 2018). Also, Palmer amaranth small seed size (e.g., 1 mm) tend to thrive in no-tillage systems (Price et al., 2011), and spread across locations through farm equipment (Sauer, 1972), manure (Hartzler and Anderson, 2016), animals (Farmer et al., 2017), and plant

25 propagules (Yu et al., 2021). Therefore, Palmer amaranth dispersal capacity make the species one of the
26 most successful cases of weed adaption to cropping systems.

27 Light and temperature are likely the main environment requirements for Palmer amaranth successful
28 adaptation. Palmer amaranth is reported with an extended germination period (Jha et al., 2010). Germination
29 of Palmer amaranth is triggered by 18 C soil temperature (Keeley et al., 1987), and optimal germination
30 and biomass production occur at 35/30 C day and night temperatures (Guo and Al-Khatib, 2003). Water
31 has not shown to limit Palmer amaranth fitness. Under continuous water stress, Palmer amaranth survived
32 and produced at least 14000 seeds plant-1 (Chahal et al., 2018). Also, seeds from Palmer amaranth growing
33 under water stress conditions were heavier, less dormant, and prompt for germination (Matzrafi et al.,
34 2021). The continuous global temperature warming can impact agriculture and promote niches for Palmer
35 amaranth invasion/adaptation into new environments. Currently, it is estimated that the greatest climatic
36 risk of Palmer amaranth establishment are agronomic crops in Australia and Sub-Saharan Africa (Kistner
37 and Hatfield, 2018). Temperature is a key factor limiting Palmer amaranth expansion to cooler geographies
38 (Briscoe Runquist et al., 2019); however, under future climate change Palmer amaranth is likely to expand
39 northward into Canada and Northern Europe (Kistner and Hatfield, 2018; Briscoe Runquist et al., 2019).

40 Palmer amaranth is already documented in agronomic crops of South America (Larran et al., 2017;
41 Küpper et al., 2017) and Southern Europe (Milani et al., 2021). In the US, Palmer amaranth is established
42 at crop (Garetson et al., 2019) and non-crop land (Bagavathiannan and Norsworthy, 2016) in the warm
43 southern United States but its range is expanding to cool temperatures northward. For example, herbicide
44 resistant Palmer amaranth is widespread in Nebraska (Oliveira et al., 2021), Michigan (Kohrt et al., 2017),
45 and Connecticut (Aulakh et al., 2021). Successful cases of Palmer amaranth invasion and near to eradication
46 is reported in Minnesota (Yu et al., 2021). No Palmer amaranth actively growing was found in Canada;
47 however, Palmer amaranth seeds was detected in sweet potato slips (Page et al., 2021). Nonetheless, it seems
48 fated the need to manage Palmer amaranth in agronomic crops throughout multiple environments in the
49 near future. Therefore, strategies on Palmer amaranth management should encompass the agroecosystem
50 level but not only attempts to eradicate the weed. Most tactics to manage Palmer amaranth are based on
51 technology fixes (Scott, 2011), which are short-term (e.g., herbicide and/or tillage) rather than long-term
52 weed management.

53 The continuous Palmer amaranth dispersal and potential establishment into northern United States warrant
54 investigations on species morphology growing in such environments. Understanding Palmer amaranth
55 biology and growing strategies under different agroecosystems can enhance our knowledge on species
56 adaptation. It can also aid on designing proactive and ecological tactics to limit the species range expansion,
57 reduce its negative impact, and design resilient and sustainable farming systems (MacLaren et al., 2020).
58 Therefore, the objective of this study was to investigate the flowering pattern, biomass production, and
59 height of Palmer amaranth growing under in corn, soybean and fallow at two timings across five locations
60 in the mid/upper United States Midwest.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

61 Plant material and growing conditions

62 The study was performed with a *A. palmeri* accession (Per1) from Perkins County, Nebraska. Per1
63 accession collection is documented with no reported herbicide resistance (Oliveira et al., 2021). Three
64 weeks prior to the field experiment, seeds were planted in plastic trays containing potting-mix. Emerged
65 seedlings (1 cm) were transplanted into 200 cm⁻³ plastic pots (a plant pot-1). Palmer amaranth seedlings
66 were supplied with adequate water and kept under greenhouse conditions at Arlington, Clay Center, Lincoln,

67 and Macomb; and kept outdoors in Grant. Palmer amaranth seedlings were kept under greenhouse/outdoors
68 until the onset of the experiment (7 to 10 cm height).

69 Field study

70 The experiment was conducted in 2018 and 2019 under field conditions at five locations: Arlington
71 (Washington County, Wisconsin), Clay Center (Clay County, Nebraska), Grant (Perkins County, Nebraska),
72 Lincoln (Lancaster County, Nebraska), and Macomb (McDonough County, Illinois).

73 The field experimental unit were six adjacent 9.1 m wide (12 rows at 72.2 cm row spacing) by 10.7 m
74 long. Each experimental unit was planted with corn or soybean (DSR-1950 R2Y at 296,400 seeds ha⁻¹), or
75 under fallow condition. Palmer amaranth seedlings were transplanted to the field experiment by making
76 a whole in the soil (6 cm deep and 8 cm wide); and gently transferring to the ground (potting mix + two
77 seedlings). After a week, one was eliminated and one was kept. There were two transplant timing: first
78 (June 1) and second (July 1). There were 24 Palmer amaranth plants in each experimental unit, with a total
79 of 144 plants. The study was repeated twice.

80 After transplanting, Palmer amaranth flowering was monitored until the end of the study. When a plant
81 started flowering, the day was recorded, plant sex was identified as male or female, and plant height
82 was measured from soil surface to the plant top. Then, aboveground plant biomass was harvest near soil
83 surface and oven dried at 65 C until reaching constant weight before the weight of biomass (g plant⁻¹) was
84 recorded.

85 Statistical analyses

86 The statistical analyses were performed using R statistical software version 4.0.1. Data across locations
87 and year were combined.

88 The cumulative Palmer amaranth flowering estimation was determined using a asymmetrical three
89 parameter log logistic Weibull model of the drc package (Ritz et al., 2015).

$$Y(x) = 0 + (d - 0)\exp(-\exp(b(\log(x) - e)))$$

90 In this model, Y is the Palmer amaranth cumulative flowering, d is the upper limit (set to 100), and e is the
91 XXX, and x day of year (doy).

92 The doy for 10, 50, and 90% Palmer amaranth cumulative flowering were determined using the *ED*
93 function of drc package. Also, the 10, 50, and 90% Palmer amaranth cumulative flowering were compared
94 among crop/fallow and timings using the *EDcomp* function of drc package. The EDcomp function compares
95 the ratio of cumulative flowering using t-statistics, where P-value < 0.05 indicates that we fail to reject the
96 null hypothesis.

97 Palmer amaranth height and biomass were performed with a linear mixed model using *lmer* function
98 from “lme4” package (Bates et al., 2015). Plant height and biomass were transformed to meet model
99 assumption of normality . In the model, agroecosystem (crop, soybean, fallow) was the fixed effect and
100 year nested with location the random effects. Analysis of variance was performed with *anova* function
101 from “car” package (Fox and Weisberg, 2018). Marginal means and compact letter display were estimated
102 with *emmeans* and *cld* from packages “emmeans” and multcomp (Hothorn et al., 2008)

RESULTS

103 Cumulative flowering

104 You can use R chunks directly to plot graphs.

105 Height and biomass

106 Frontiers requires figures to be submitted individually, in the same order as they are referred to in the
107 manuscript. Figures will then be automatically embedded at the bottom of the submitted manuscript. Kindly
108 ensure that each table and figure is mentioned in the text and in numerical order. Permission must be
109 obtained for use of copyrighted material from other sources (including the web). Please note that it is
110 compulsory to follow figure instructions. Figures which are not according to the guidelines will cause
111 substantial delay during the production process.

1 DISCUSSION**DISCLOSURE/CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST STATEMENT**

112 The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial
113 relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

114 RW: designed the experiments; AJ, CP, MB, MO, and SS: conducted the experiments; MO: analyzed the
115 data and wrote the manuscript; AJ, CP, MB, MO, SS, and RW: conceptualized the research. All authors
116 reviewed the manuscript.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

117 Funding: This work received no specific grant from any funding agency, commercial, or not-for-profit
118 sectors

2 SUPPLEMENTAL DATA

119 Supplementary Material should be uploaded separately on submission, if there are Supplementary Figures,
120 please include the caption in the same file as the figure. LaTeX Supplementary Material templates can be
121 found in the Frontiers LaTeX folder

3 REFERENCES

122 A reference list should be automatically created here. However it won't. Pandoc will place the list of
123 references at the end of the document instead. There are no convenient solution for now to force Pandoc to
124 do otherwise. The easiest way to get around this problem is to edit the LaTeX file created by Pandoc before
125 compiling it again using the traditional LaTeX commands.

FIGURES

126 Aulakh, J. S., Chahal, P. S., Kumar, V., Price, A. J., and Guillard, K. (2021). Multiple herbicide-resistant
127 Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) in Connecticut: Confirmation and response to POST herbicides.
128 *Weed Technology* 35, 457–463. doi:10.1017/wet.2021.6.

129 Bagavathiannan, M. V., and Norsworthy, J. K. (2016). Multiple-Herbicide Resistance Is Widespread in
130 Roadside Palmer Amaranth Populations. *PLOS ONE* 11, e0148748. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0148748.

131 Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., and Walker, S. (2015). Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using
132 Lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software* 67, 1–48. doi:10.18637/jss.v067.i01.

133 Berger, S. T., Ferrell, J. A., Rowland, D. L., and Webster, T. M. (2015). Palmer Amaranth (*Amaranthus*
134 *palmeri*) Competition for Water in Cotton. *Weed Science* 63, 928–935. doi:10.1614/WS-D-15-00062.1.




Figure 1. Mean average temperature (C) and monthly sum precipitation (mm) at Arlington, WI, Clay Center, NE, Grant, NE, Lincoln, NE and Macomb, IL

- 135 Briscoe Runquist, R. D., Lake, T., Tiffin, P., and Moeller, D. A. (2019). Species distribution models
136 throughout the invasion history of Palmer amaranth predict regions at risk of future invasion and reveal
137 challenges with modeling rapidly shifting geographic ranges. *Sci Rep* 9, 2426. doi:10.1038/s41598-
138 018-38054-9.
- 139 Chahal, P. S., Irmak, S., Jugulam, M., and Jhala, A. J. (2018). Evaluating Effect of Degree of Water Stress
140 on Growth and Fecundity of Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) Using Soil Moisture Sensors.
141 *Weed Science* 66, 738–745. doi:10.1017/wsc.2018.47.
- 142 Farmer, J. A., Webb, E. B., Pierce, R. A., and Bradley, K. W. (2017). Evaluating the potential for weed seed
143 dispersal based on waterfowl consumption and seed viability. *Pest Management Science* 73, 2592–2603.
144 doi:10.1002/ps.4710.
- 145 Fox, J., and Weisberg, S. (2018). *An R Companion to Applied Regression*. SAGE Publications Available at:
146 <http://books.google.com?id=uPNrDwAAQBAJ>.
- 147 Garetson, R., Singh, V., Singh, S., Dotray, P., and Bagavathiannan, M. (2019). Distribution of herbicide-
148 resistant Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) in row crop production systems in Texas. *Weed
149 Technology* 33, 355–365. doi:10.1017/wet.2019.14.
- 150 Guo, P., and Al-Khatib, K. (2003). Temperature effects on germination and growth of redroot pigweed
151 (*Amaranthus retroflexus*), Palmer amaranth (*A. palmeri*), and common waterhemp (*A. rudis*). *Weed
152 Science* 51, 869–875. doi:10.1614/P2002-127.
- 153 Hartzler, B., and Anderson, M. (2016). Palmer amaranth: It's here, now what? 10.




Figure 2. Cumulative flowering of Palmer amaranth at first and second transplant timing (A) and day of year of 10, 50, and 90 cumulative flowering at first and second transplant timing (B)




Figure 3. Palmer amaranth biomass (A) and height (B) growing in corn, fallow, and soybean across Arlington, Clay Center, Grant, Lincoln, and Macomb



Figure 4. Harvest Palmer amaranth plants at 40 days after first transplant timing. From left to right, Palmer amaranth growing in fallow, soybean and corn in Arlington, Wisconsin

- 154 Heap, I. (2021). International Herbicide-Resistant Weed Database. Available at: <http://www.weedscience.org/Home.aspx> [Accessed July 26, 2021].
- 155
- 156 Hothorn, T., Bretz, F., and Westfall, P. (2008). Simultaneous Inference in General Parametric Models.
157 *Biometrical Journal* 50, 346–363. doi:10.1002/bimj.200810425.
- 158 Jha, P., Norsworthy, J. K., Riley, M. B., and Bridges, W. (2010). Annual Changes in Temperature and Light
159 Requirements for Germination of Palmer Amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) Seeds Retrieved from Soil.
160 *Weed Science* 58, 426–432. doi:10.1614/WS-D-09-00038.1.
- 161 Keeley, P. E., Carter, C. H., and Thullen, R. J. (1987). Influence of Planting Date on Growth of Palmer
162 Amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*). *Weed Science* 35, 199–204. doi:10.1017/S0043174500079054.
- 163 Kistner, E. J., and Hatfield, J. L. (2018). Potential Geographic Distribution of Palmer
164 Amaranth under Current and Future Climates. *Agricultural & Environmental Letters* 3, 170044.
165 doi:10.2134/ael2017.12.0044.
- 166 Klingaman, T. E., and Oliver, L. R. (1994). Palmer Amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) Interference in
167 Soybeans (*Glycine max*). *Weed Science* 42, 523–527. doi:10.1017/S0043174500076888.
- 168 Kohrt, J. R., Sprague, C. L., Nadakuduti, S. S., and Douches, D. (2017). Confirmation of a Three-Way
169 (Glyphosate, ALS, and Atrazine) Herbicide-Resistant Population of Palmer Amaranth (*Amaranthus
170 palmeri*) in Michigan. *Weed Science* 65, 327–338. doi:10.1017/wsc.2017.2.
- 171 Küpper, A., Borgato, E. A., Patterson, E. L., Netto, A. G., Nicolai, M., Carvalho, S. J. P. de, Nissen, S.
172 J., Gaines, T. A., and Christoffoleti, P. J. (2017). Multiple Resistance to Glyphosate and Acetolactate
173 Synthase Inhibitors in Palmer Amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) Identified in Brazil. *Weed Science* 65,
174 317–326. doi:10.1017/wsc.2017.1.
- 175 Larran, A. S., Palmieri, V. E., Perotti, V. E., Lieber, L., Tuesca, D., and Permingeat, H. R. (2017). Target-site
176 resistance to acetolactate synthase (ALS)-inhibiting herbicides in *Amaranthus palmeri* from Argentina.
177 *Pest Management Science* 73, 2578–2584. doi:10.1002/ps.4662.

- 178 Lindsay, K., Popp, M., Norsworthy, J., Bagavathiannan, M., Powles, S., and Lacoste, M. (2017). PAM:
179 Decision Support for Long-Term Palmer Amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) Control. *Weed Technology*
180 31, 915–927. doi:10.1017/wet.2017.69.
- 181 MacLaren, C., Storkey, J., Menegat, A., Metcalfe, H., and Dehnen-Schmutz, K. (2020). An ecological
182 future for weed science to sustain crop production and the environment. A review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.*
183 40, 24. doi:10.1007/s13593-020-00631-6.
- 184 Massinga, R. A., Currie, R. S., Horak, M. J., and Boyer, J. (2001). Interference of Palmer amaranth in corn.
185 *Weed Science* 49, 202–208. doi:10.1614/0043-1745(2001)049[0202:IOPAIC]2.0.CO;2.
- 186 Matzrafi, M., Osipitan, O. A., Ohadi, S., and Mesgaran, M. B. (2021). Under pressure: Maternal effects
187 promote drought tolerance in progeny seed of Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*). *Weed Science*
188 69, 31–38. doi:10.1017/wsc.2020.75.
- 189 Milani, A., Panozzo, S., Farinati, S., Iamonico, D., Sattin, M., Loddo, D., and Scarabel, L. (2021). Recent
190 Discovery of *Amaranthus palmeri* S. Watson in Italy: Characterization of ALS-Resistant Populations
191 and Sensitivity to Alternative Herbicides. *Sustainability* 13, 7003. doi:10.3390/su13137003.
- 192 Morgan, G. D., Baumann, P. A., and Chandler, J. M. (2001). Competitive Impact of Palmer Amaranth
193 (*Amaranthus palmeri*) on Cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum*) Development and Yield. *Weed Technology* 15,
194 408–412. doi:10.1614/0890-037X(2001)015[0408:CIOPAA]2.0.CO;2.
- 195 Oliveira, M. C., Gaines, T. A., Patterson, E. L., Jhala, A. J., Irmak, S., Amundsen, K., and Knezevic, S.
196 Z. (2018). Interspecific and intraspecific transference of metabolism-based mesotrione resistance in
197 dioecious weedy Amaranthus. *The Plant Journal* 96, 1051–1063. doi:10.1111/tpj.14089.
- 198 Oliveira, M. C., Giacomini, D. A., Arsenijevic, N., Vieira, G., Tranel, P. J., and Werle, R. (2021).
199 Distribution and validation of genotypic and phenotypic glyphosate and PPO-inhibitor resistance in
200 Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) from southwestern Nebraska. *Weed Technology* 35, 65–76.
201 doi:10.1017/wet.2020.74.
- 202 Page, E. R., Nurse, R. E., Meloche, S., Bosveld, K., Grainger, C., Obeid, K., Filotas, M., Simard, M.-J., and
203 Laforest, M. (2021). Import of Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri* S. Wats.) Seed with sweet potato
204 (*Ipomea batatas* (L.) Lam) slips. *Can. J. Plant Sci.*, CJPS-2020-0321. doi:10.1139/CJPS-2020-0321.
- 205 Price, A. J., Balkcom, K. S., Culpepper, S. A., Kelton, J. A., Nichols, R. L., and Schomberg, H. (2011).
206 Glyphosate-resistant Palmer amaranth: A threat to conservation tillage. *Journal of Soil and Water
207 Conservation* 66, 265–275. doi:10.2489/jswc.66.4.265.
- 208 Ritz, C., Baty, F., Streibig, J. C., and Gerhard, D. (2015). Dose-Response Analysis Using R. *PLOS ONE*
209 10, e0146021. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0146021.
- 210 Sauer, J. (1957). Recent Migration and Evolution of the Dioecious Amaranths. *Evolution* 11, 11–31.
211 doi:10.2307/2405808.
- 212 Sauer, J. D. (1972). The dioecious amaranths: A new species name and major range extensions. *Madroño*
213 21, 426–434. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41423815>.
- 214 Scott, D. (2011). The Technological Fix Criticisms and the Agricultural Biotechnology Debate. *J Agric
215 Environ Ethics* 24, 207–226. doi:10.1007/s10806-010-9253-7.
- 216 Ward, S. M., Webster, T. M., and Steckel, L. E. (2013). Palmer Amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*): A Review.
217 *Weed Technology* 27, 12–27. doi:10.1614/WT-D-12-00113.1.

- 218 Yu, E., Blair, S., Hardel, M., Chandler, M., Thiede, D., Cortilet, A., Gunsolus, J., and Becker, R. (2021).
219 Timeline of Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) invasion and eradication in Minnesota. *Weed*
220 *Technology*, 1–31. doi:10.1017/wet.2021.32.