

Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) adaptation to US Midwest agroecosystems

Maxwel C. Oliveira¹, Amit J. Jhala², Mark L. 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 School of Agriculture, Western Illinois University, Macomb, Illinois, United States

Correspondence*:

Rodrigo Werle

rwerle@uwisc.edu

2 ABSTRACT

Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri* S. Watson) is one of the most troublesome agronomic weed species in the United States. Palmer amaranth is prevalent in the Southern Great Plains and Southeastern United States, and its range is expanding northward through natural dispersal and human intervention. Palmer amaranth dispersal warrants studies assessing species adaptation into new geographies. A study was conducted to investigate morphology, flowering and gender from cohorts of Palmer amaranth growing under corn, soybean, and bareground across five locations in the US Midwest. Results demonstrated that the first cohort of Palmer amaranth, established in June, produced 42% more biomass than plants from the second cohort (established in July). The first Palmer amaranth cohort produced 75.5 g plant⁻¹ in bareground, 28.3 g plant⁻¹ in soybean and 16.3 g plant⁻¹ in corn, whereas the second Palmer amaranth cohort produced 62.6, 6.3, and 1.4 g plant⁻¹ in bareground, soybean and corn, respectively. Palmer amaranth height was most impacted when growing in corn, and averaged 85.2 cm tall in the first cohort, and 38.2 cm tall in the second cohort in corn. Moreover, Palmer amaranth flowering window shifted according to crop and cohort timings. Palmer amaranth growing in intense competition, such as under low light in corn, resulted in the longest flowering window. Palmer amaranth gender was slightly influenced by day of year, weight and height. We documented a high degree of plasticity in Palmer amaranth, which will presumably favor its adaptation and expansion in cropping systems north of its current range. Therefore, preventing Palmer amaranth dispersal into new habitats is the most effective management strategy.

Keywords: Evolution, Flowering, Weed management, Pigweed

INTRODUCTION

Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri* S. Watson) is currently ranked as one of the most economically detrimental weed species to cropping systems in the United States (Van Wychen, 2020). Unmanaged Palmer amaranth plants compete for water, light, and nutrients, which can drastically impact crop yields (Berger et al., 2015). For example, Palmer amaranth has been documented to reduce up to 91%, 68%, and

27 54% corn (Massinga et al., 2001), soybean (Klingaman and Oliver, 1994), and cotton (Morgan et al., 2001)
28 yields, respectively. Moreover, Palmer amaranth has shown a remarkable capacity to evolve resistance
29 to herbicides. To date, Palmer amaranth has evolved resistance to eight herbicide sites of action (Heap,
30 2022), increasing the weed management complexity (Lindsay et al., 2017) and posing an economical and
31 ecological risk to row-crop agriculture.

32 Palmer amaranth as a problem weed is a function of both inherent adaptations and selected management
33 practices. Palmer amaranth is a fast growing summer annual forb indigenous to the Sonoran Desert (Sauer,
34 1957). It became a serious problem weed in US agriculture in the 1990s (Ward et al., 2013). Palmer
35 amaranth weediness is likely a result of human-assisted selection combined with plant biology. Farm
36 mechanization, adoption of conservation agriculture (e.g., no-till), and intensive use of herbicides for weed
37 management are the main human-mediated selections of Palmer amaranth in cropping systems (Ward et
38 al., 2013). Palmer amaranth is a prolific seed producer with a C4 photosynthetic apparatus (Wang et al.,
39 1992). With dioecious nature, Palmer amaranth male and female plants are obligate outcrossers, increasing
40 the chances of exchanging adaptive traits among plants (Jhala et al., 2021; Oliveira et al., 2018). Also,
41 Palmer amaranth's small seeds (e.g., 1 mm) tend to thrive in no-tillage systems (Price et al., 2011), and
42 spread across locations through farm equipment (Sauer, 1972), seed mixes (Hartzler and Anderson, 2016),
43 wildlife (Farmer et al., 2017), etc., making it one of the most successful examples of weed adaptation to
44 current cropping systems.

45 Palmer amaranth's plasticity allows it to respond successfully to environmental changes. Palmer amaranth
46 demonstrates a high degree of plasticity to light, temperature, water availability, and human management
47 (Jha et al., 2010). Palmer amaranth has an extended germination period throughout the growing season
48 (Ward et al., 2013). Germination of Palmer amaranth was triggered by 18 C soil temperature at 5 cm
49 depth (Keeley et al., 1987), and optimal germination and biomass production occurred at 35/30 C day and
50 night temperatures (Guo and Al-Khatib, 2003). Palmer amaranth emergence can be influenced by tillage
51 and the use of preemergence herbicides (Chahal et al., 2021), and may result in weed germination shifts
52 within a population, as documented in *Bassia scoparia* (Sbatella and Wilson, 2010). In an experiment
53 where Palmer amaranth was subjected to continuous water stress, it survived and produced at least 14000
54 seeds plant⁻¹ (Chahal et al., 2018). Seeds from Palmer amaranth growing with limited water conditions
55 were heavier, less dormant, and prompt for germination (Matzrafi et al., 2021). Growing conditions and
56 management practices also influence Palmer amaranth sex dimorphism and flowering pattern (Korres et al.,
57 2017; Rumpa et al., 2019).

58 Palmer amaranth's current global range includes agronomic cropland in Italy (Milani et al., 2021),
59 soybean producing regions of Brazil and Argentina (Larran et al., 2017; Küpper et al., 2017), and the
60 Cotton Belt (Garetson et al., 2019; Bagavathiannan and Norsworthy, 2016) and southern Great Plains
61 of the United States Crespo et al. (2016). However, its range appears to be expanding steadily, and in
62 some cases rapidly, in the U.S. For example, in states with large Palmer amaranth infestations its range is
63 gradually pushing north as it displaces other weeds in agronomic row crops (R Werle, personal observation),
64 aided by wildlife (Farmer et al., 2017) and agricultural machinery (Ward et al., 2013). But there are other
65 examples where it has suddenly become a problem weed hundreds of miles away from known infestations.
66 New infestations in Michigan, Indiana and North Dakota appear to have resulted from Palmer amaranth
67 contaminated livestock feed. New infestations in Iowa and Minnesota were associated with planting
68 contaminated pollinator habitat seed (Yu et al., 2021). Palmer amaranth infestations have not been detected
69 in Canada, but Palmer amaranth seeds were found in sweet potato slips imported into the country (Page
70 et al., 2021). Global warming will create new opportunities for Palmer amaranth invasion. Although

71 agronomic crops in warm environments like Australia and Sub-Saharan Africa are currently at greatest risk
72 for Palmer amaranth invasion, warming temperatures will reduce barriers that may have limited Palmer
73 amaranths spread into cooler climates like Canada and Northern Europe (Kistner and Hatfield, 2018;
74 Briscoe Runquist et al., 2019).

75 There are many areas in the U.S. Corn Belt (North Central states) where Palmer amaranth is not yet
76 established, and its potential adaptability is untested. Nonetheless, the rapid expansion of Palmer amaranth
77 across the Northern U.S. is concerning and warrants investigations on its adaptability. We do know that
78 Palmer amaranth caused yield loss in Illinois soybean fields (Davis et al., 2015), but an Iowa study showed
79 that Palmer amaranth was not as well adapted as waterhemp (*Amaranthus tuberculatus*) to conditions in that
80 geography (Baker, 2021). We also know that Palmer amaranth plants that establish shortly after row-crop
81 planting have a much greater impact on crop yield than plants that emerge after the crop has produced
82 several leaves (MacRae et al., 2013). Understanding Palmer amaranth morphology and development under
83 different agroecosystems and across a wide geography can enhance our knowledge of its adaptability, and
84 may also aid in designing effective tactics to limit its range expansion and minimize its negative effects on
85 row crops. The objective of this study was to investigate the flowering pattern, gender, biomass production,
86 and height of Palmer amaranth cohorts growing in corn, soybean and bareground environments across five
87 locations in the North Central United States.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

88 Plant material and growing conditions

89 A Palmer amaranth accession (Kei3) from Perkins County, Nebraska susceptible to glyphosate was
90 selected for this study (Oliveira et al., 2021). Three weeks prior to the establishment of each cohort, seeds
91 were planted in plastic trays containing potting-mix. Emerged seedlings (1 cm) were transplanted into 200
92 cm^{-3} plastic pots (one plant pot^{-1}). Palmer amaranth seedlings were supplied with adequate water and kept
93 under greenhouse conditions at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, and
94 Western Illinois University; and kept outdoors at the Perkins Extension office in Grant, NE until the 2-3
95 leaf stage (5 to 8 cm height) when they were transported to the field.

96 Field study

97 The experiment was conducted in 2018 and 2019 under field conditions at five locations: Arlington, WI,
98 Clay Center, NE., Grant, NE, Lincoln, NE, and Macomb, IL.

99 Fields were conventionally tilled prior to crop planting. Corn and soybean were planted in 76-cm row
100 spacing (Table 1). Monthly mean air temperature and total precipitation were obtained using Daymet
101 weather data from June through September across the five locations in 2018 and 2019 (Correndo et al.,
102 2021) (Figure 2).

103 The field experimental units were three adjacent 9.1 m wide (12 rows at 76.2 cm row spacing) by 10.7 m
104 long. The experimental design were arranged in factorial design with three crops, two transplanting times
105 simulating two cohorts, repeated across five locations. Each field experimental unit was planted with corn,
106 soybean, or maintained as bareground. The two transplant timings were June 1 (first cohort) and July 1
107 (second cohort). Palmer amaranth seedlings (potting mix + two seedlings) were transplanted (6 cm deep
108 and 8 cm wide). Forty-eight plants were equidistantly placed (0.76 m apart) between rows within each
109 crop. After a week, one plant was eliminated and one was kept, resulting in 24 plants per experimental unit
110 and transplanting time (Figure 3). When needed, Palmer amaranth plants were supplied with water during
111 the first week after transplanting to assure seedling survival.

Table 1. Field study attributes from Arlington, WI, Clay Center, NE, Grant, NE, Lincoln, NE and Macomb, IL.

Attributes	Arlington, WI	Clay Center, NE	Grant, NE	Lincoln, NE	Macomb, IL	
Bareground						
Corn	Weed control ^a Hybrid Seeding rate Weed control Stage at 1 st cohort Stage at 2 nd cohort Planting day Fertilization	S-metolachor ^b fb glyphosate ^c NK0142 3120-EZ1 88956 S-metolachor fb glyphosate V2-3 V6-7 April 30, 2018 / May 5, 2019 N (46-0-0) at 157 kg ha ⁻¹	saflufenacil + imazethapyr + pyroxasulfone ^d DKC60-67 86487 S-metolachlor + trazine + mesotriione + bicyclopyrone ^e V2-3 V6-7 May 10, 2018/19	glyphosate ^e G03C84-5122-EZ1 79000 glyphosate V2-3 V6-7 May 5, 2018 / May 14, 2019	glyphosate + S-metolachor ^f fb glyphosate ^g P1197AM 865485 glyphosate + S-metolachor ^f fb glyphosate ^g V2-3 V6-7 V10-11 April 27, 2018 / May 3, 2019 N (46-0-0) at 336 kg ha ⁻¹	glyphosate + S-metolachor ^f DKC64-34RIB (2018) / G10T63-3000GT (2019) 88,000 (2018) / 79,000 (2019) glyphosate + S-metolachor V4-5 V10-11 May 8, 2018 / April 26, 2019 UAN-32, 202 kg N ha ⁻¹
Soybean	Variety Seeding rate Weed control Stage at 1 st cohort Stage at 2 nd cohort Planting day	DSR-1950 296400 glyphosate / S-metolachor V1-2 V5-6 May 5, 2018 / May 10, 2009	AG21X8 321237 saflufenacil + imazethapyr + pyroxasulfone V1-2 V5-6 May 14, 2018/19	AG28X7 220000 glyphosate V1-2 V5-6 May 5, 2018 / May 14, 2019	3017R2X (2018) / P31A22X (2019) 370650 glyphosate + S-metolachor fb glyphosate V1-2 V5-6 May 7, 2018 / May 17, 2019	AG33X8 (2018) / CZ3601 (2019) 395000 (2018) / 370000 (2019) glyphosate + S-metolachor V1-2 V7-8 May 8, 2018 / May 17, 2019
Soil	Type pH Organic matter (%)	Plano-silt-loam 6.6 3.5	Crete Silt Loam 6.5 3	2018: Mace silt loam / 2019: Kuma silt loam 2018: 6.1 / 2019: 5.1 2018: 2 / 2019: 1.7	Crete silty clay loam 5.2 3.4	

^aHoe weeding; ^bS-metolachor, 1324 g ai ha⁻¹; ^cglyphosate, 1262 g ae ha⁻¹; ^dsaflufenacil + imazethapyr + pyroxasulfone, 215 g ai ha⁻¹; ^eS-metolachor + trazine + mesotriione, + bicyclopyrone, 2409 g ai ha⁻¹; ^fS-metolachor, 1070 g ai ha⁻¹; ^gglyphosate, 870 g ae ha⁻¹

112 After transplanting, Palmer amaranth flowering was monitored until the end of the study. When a plant
 113 flowered, the day was recorded, plant gender was identified (male or female), plant height was measured
 114 from soil surface to the top of plant. Also, aboveground plant, and the aboveground plant organs were
 115 harvested, then oven dried at 65 C until a constant weight was reached, and dry biomass (g plant⁻¹) was
 116 recorded. Plants were harvested at flowering because Palmer amaranth infestations do not occur at the
 117 Wisconsin or Illinois research locations. In our study, all locations followed the methodology of plant
 118 harvest at flowering initiation, except in Grant, NE. At the Grant, NE, location, all plants from the first
 119 cohort were harvested on July 6, 2018 or July 6, 2019, and all plants from the second cohort were harvested
 120 on August 17, 2018 or July 31, 2019, regardless of flowering status.

121 Statistical analyses

122 The statistical analyses were performed using R statistical software version 4.0.1 (R Core Team, 2021).

123 Analyses of Palmer amaranth height and biomass were performed with a linear mixed model using *lmer*
 124 function from “lme4” package (Bates et al., 2015). Plant height and biomass were log transformed to meet
 125 model assumption of normality. In the model, crop (bareground, corn, soybean) and cohort time (first and
 126 second) were the fixed effects and year nested with location were the random effects. Analysis of variance
 127 at α 0.05 was performed with *anova* function from “car” package (Fox and Weisberg, 2018). Marginal
 128 means and compact letter display were estimated with *emmeans* and *cld* from packages “emmeans” (Lenth
 129 et al., 2021) and “multcomp” (Hothorn et al., 2008), respectively.

130 Palmer amaranth cumulative flowering estimation was determined across all locations, except Grant,
 131 NE. Cumulative flowering estimation was determined using an asymmetrical three parameter log logistic
 132 Weibull model of the drc package (Ritz et al., 2015):

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

133 In this model, Y is the cumulative flowering, d is the upper limit (set to 100), and e is the inflection point,
 134 and x is the day of year (doy).

135 The doy for 10, 50, and 90% cumulative flowering were determined using the *ED* function of drc package.
 136 Also, the 10, 50, and 90% Palmer amaranth cumulative flowering were compared among crops and cohorts
 137 using the *EDcomp* function of drc package. The *EDcomp* function compares the ratio of cumulative
 138 flowering using t-statistics, where P-value < 0.05 indicates that we fail to reject the null hypothesis.

139 A binary logistic regression was fitted to Palmer amaranth gender. Binary logistic regression is used for
140 predicting binary classes (Bangdiwala, 2018), such as the probability of a plant being female in a dioecious
141 species. Prior to the analysis, missing values were removed from the dataset (including all data from the
142 Grant location). The resulting dataset was split into 80% train and 20% test data. The 80% train is used
143 for model training and the 20% test is used for checking model performance on unseen dataset. Using the
144 80% train data, a generalized linear model (base R *glm* function) was fitted to binary response variable, the
145 probability of being female (0 to male and 1 to female). The independent variables were harvest day of year,
146 height, weight, and crop (without interaction). The model family was binomial with a logit function. The
147 model fit was assessed through pseudo R-squared values (McFadden, Cox and Snell, Cragg and Uhler) and
148 likelihood ratio using *nagelkerke* function from “rcompanion” package (Mangiafico, 2021). The marginal
149 effects computation was performed with Average Marginal Effects (AMEs) at every observed value of x
150 and averaged across the results (Leeper, 2017) using *margins* function from “margins” package (Leeper et
151 al., 2021). The 20% test data was predicted using the *predict* function with a cutoff estimation for male or
152 female using *performance* function from ROCR package (Sing et al., 2005). The model quality prediction
153 from the classification algorithm was measured with precision (*precision* function), recall (*recall* function)
154 and F1-score (*f_meas* function) using the “yardstick” package (Kuhn et al., 2021). The precision determines
155 the accuracy of positive predictions (female plants), recall determines the fraction of positives that were
156 correctly identified, and F1-score is a weighted harmonic mean of precision and recall with the best score
157 of 1 and the worst score of 0 (Raoniar, 2021). F1-score conveys the balance between the precision and the
158 recall (Yacoub and Axman, 2020). The area under the receiver operating curve (AUC-ROC) was also
159 estimated with *performance* function using the true positive and false positive rates. The higher the AUC,
160 better the model is at distinguishing between female and male Palmer amaranth.

RESULTS

161 Palmer amaranth height and biomass

162 Palmer amaranth plants accumulated more biomass when growing in bareground compared to plants
163 growing in soybean and corn (Figure 4A). Palmer amaranth plants in the first cohort produced 75.5, 28.3,
164 and 16.3 g plant⁻¹ in bareground, soybean and corn, respectively. Plants from the second cohort produced
165 62.6 g plant⁻¹ in bareground, followed by 6.3 g plant⁻¹ in soybean, and 1.4 g plant⁻¹ in corn.

166 Palmer amaranth height was less affected by cohort timing than was weight, with the exception of plants
167 growing in corn (Figure 4B). Plants from the first cohort were on average 69.2 cm tall in bareground, which
168 was not different from the 70.7 cm tall plants from the second cohort timing ($P = 0.74$). In addition, no
169 difference in Palmer amaranth height (69.3 cm) was detected from first cohort plants in soybean to first and
170 second cohort plants in bareground ($P > 0.75$). Palmer amaranth plants from the second cohort were nearly
171 10 cm shorter compared to the first cohort in soybeans ($P = 0.04$). The tallest (85.2 cm, first cohort) and
172 shortest (38.2 cm, second cohort) plants were observed in corn.

173 Palmer amaranth cumulative flowering

174 The initiation and duration of Palmer amaranth flowering were strongly influenced by cohort and
175 surrounding vegetation (Figure 5A, 4B). In the first cohort, floral initiation (10% flowering) occurred near
176 the end of June for all three treatments, at doy 180, 180.9, and 181.7 for soybean, bareground, and corn,
177 respectively. In the second cohort, floral initiation occurred earlier on plants growing in the bareground than
178 plants growing in soybean or corn (doy 203.8 versus doy 210.9 or 216.8, respectively). Palmer amaranth
179 growing in the bareground had the shortest flowering initiation (measured as the difference between 10%
180 and 90% cumulative flowering) in both the first (34 days) and second (28 days) cohorts. Palmer amaranth

181 growing in soybean had a shorter duration of flowering than corn in the first cohort (40 days vs 71 days),
 182 but a longer duration in the second cohort (50 vs 44 days).

183 Palmer amaranth cumulative flowering in the second cohort occurred from mid July to mid September
 184 (Figure 5B). Palmer amaranth growing in the bareground resulted in earlier flowering time compared to
 185 soybean and corn. Palmer amaranth growing in bareground reached 10%, 50%, and 90% flowering time at
 186 day 203.8, 214.4, and 232.2, respectively. Palmer amaranth growing in soybean reached 10% flowering at
 187 doy 210.9, which was 6 days prior to corn (P -value = 0.00). Similar trend was observed at 50% flowering,
 188 whereas Palmer amaranth reached 50% flowering in corn (doy 233.0) 4 days after soybeans (doy 228.9; P
 189 = 0.00). The 90% Palmer amaranth cumulative flowering occurred at same day in corn (260.9) and soybean
 190 (260.5; P = 0.66).

191 **Palmer amaranth gender**

192 The model goodness of fit was 0.23, 0.32, 0.40 using pseudo R-squared test from McFadden, Cox and
 193 Snell, and Cragg and Uhler, respectively. The likelihood ratio test showed a p-value of < 0.00. The average
 194 marginal effects showed that Palmer amaranth growing in corn resulted in 14.8% fewer females plants
 195 (Table 2). Moreover, increasing a cumulative flowering unit doy increases the probability of having a
 196 female plant by 0.4% (Table 2 and Figure 5A). A similar trend was observed for weight (Figure 6B) and
 197 height (Figure 6C), where the probability of being female increased 0.1% and 0.2% for each unit increase
 198 of weight and height, respectively (Table 2).

Table 2. Average marginal means of Palmer amaranth sex dimorphism logistic model. Factor pararamter values (crop_bareground and crop_corn) is shown compared to soybean.

Term	AME ^a	SE ^b	Lower	Upper	Z-score	P-value
crop_bareground	-0.048	0.054	-0.154	0.059	-0.876	0.381
crop_corn	-0.148	0.052	-0.250	-0.046	-2.842	0.004
doyh	0.004	0.001	0.003	0.006	4.959	0.000
height	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.003	2.953	0.003
weight	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.001	2.179	0.029

^a Average Marginal Effects. ^b Standard Error.

199 The model accuracy evaluation accuracy in the 20% test dataset was 0.62 with a cutoff value for female
 200 and male plants of 0.43. The model classification showed a precision of 0.64, recall of 0.66, and a F1-score
 201 of 0.65. In addition, the AUC was 0.64.

DISCUSSION

202 Our study demonstrate that Palmer amaranth is well adapted to growing conditions throughout the
 203 Midwestern United States, and is simply limited in its range by seed dispersal (Davis et al. 2015). We also
 204 confirmed Palmer amaranth's extraordinary plasticity to adapt to different agroecosystems. For example,
 205 Palmer amaranth mimicked crop architecture in competing for light (Figure 7), where plants growing in
 206 corn allocated resources to height, while plants growing in bareground allocated resources to numerous
 207 branches. Plants growing in the absence of a crop produced the greatest biomass, responding to a greater
 208 abundance of light, nutrient and water resources (Figure 4A, 3B). These results support the argument that
 209 Palmer amaranth can quickly evolve life-history traits to adapt to different cultural practices, similar to
 210 observations in a Palmer amaranth response to nitrogen study (Bravo et al., 2018). Our results highlight

211 Palmer amaranth as a threat to field crops and breeding more competitive crop varieties is likely to select
212 more competitive weed biotypes (Bravo et al., 2017).

213 Palmer amaranth growth and development in the second cohort was limited due to the crop competitive
214 ability at advanced developmental stages. Palmer amaranth seedling were transplanted at greater crop
215 height and width, which reduced Palmer amaranth competitiveness. As a result, Palmer amaranth height
216 and biomass were lower compared to its first cohort. Moreover, Palmer amaranth growing without crop
217 competition produced the highest amounts of biomass. The Palmer amaranth strategy in bareground was
218 to invest biomass in growing plant width and height. Nonetheless, Palmer amaranth produced 17% less
219 biomass in second cohort compared to first cohort timing. In a bareground study, early emerged Palmer
220 amaranth without competition was 50% taller than late emerged plants (Webster and Grey, 2015). These
221 results suggest that crop competition is not the only factor limiting late Palmer amaranth establishment.
222 The limited growth of Palmer amaranth at second cohort is likely a reduced plant response to day length,
223 light availability and thermal units (e.g, growing degree days). The *Amaranthus* species are sensitive to
224 photoperiod (Wu and Owen, 2014). We hypothesize that reduced day length or red/far-red effect contributed
225 to smaller plants at second cohort regardless the crop. A study in North Carolina and Illinois predicted
226 that less than 10% Palmer amaranth seedlings emergence occurred after June (Piskackova et al., 2021).
227 In addition, Palmer amaranth negative impact on soybean (Korres et al., 2020) and cotton (Webster and
228 Grey, 2015) yields was higher when plants were established close to crop planting. Therefore, early season
229 management is a key strategy to minimize the damaging impact of Palmer amaranth to US Midwest
230 cropping systems.

231 Seed production was not evaluated due to plant harvest at initiation of flowering. Nonetheless, a strong
232 positive correlation between Palmer amaranth biomass and seed production has been documented (Schwartz
233 et al., 2016; Spaunhorst et al., 2018). In our study, plants growing from the first cohort accumulated 42%
234 more biomass when compared to the second cohort. Therefore, Palmer amaranth plants growing in the
235 second cohort are likely to produce fewer seeds regardless of crop. Our observation is consistent with the
236 findings that the first Palmer amaranth cohort produced 50% more seeds per plant than Palmer amaranth
237 plants established six weeks later in bareground (Webster and Grey, 2015). Still, seed production at the
238 second cohort will replenish the soil seedbank. Seed production and deposition in the seedbank is also
239 a key factor for species perpetuation (Menges, 1987). Palmer amaranth can produce more than hundred
240 thousands seeds per plant (Schwartz et al., 2016; Keeley et al., 1987), which can stay viable in the soil
241 seedbank for at least 36 months (Sosnoskie et al., 2013). Therefore, preventing Palmer amaranth seed
242 production or/and seed migration to non-native habitats is an essential strategy to minimize the species
243 impact in agroecosystems.

244 An ecological approach to reduce Palmer amaranth seed production encompasses understanding plant
245 biology, including flowering pattern. Floral initiation depends on the complex interaction between a
246 plant's genetic makeup and environmental conditions (Lang, 1965). We observed a significant disruption
247 in flowering caused by surrounding vegetation and cohort timing. Although all three treatments began
248 flowering at the same time in the first cohort (about doy 180), it took much less time for the bareground
249 treatment to reach 90% flowering (34 days versus 40 for soybean and 71 for corn). The lack of competition
250 (and stress) in the bareground resulted in plants that flowered earlier, and were they not harvested, would
251 have had longer reproductive periods, thereby producing more seed. Similarly, in the second cohort, the
252 window for all plants to initiate flowering was much shorter for the bareground (28 days) compared to
253 Palmer amaranth in soybean (50 days) or corn (44 days). Significantly, plants in the bareground treatment
254 flowered one week earlier than soybean, and almost two weeks earlier than corn, again allowing for greater

255 seed production per plant had they not been harvested at initial flowering. In some cases, early flowering
256 may confer an evolutionary advantage, provided the plant has an indeterminate habit and flowering does
257 not restrict plant growth. In other cases, however, early flower initiation may be a response to stressful
258 conditions as a plant attempts to reproduce before running out of resources. In an Iowa study, Palmer
259 amaranth initiated flowering two weeks prior to waterhemp (Baker, 2021), and this characteristic may
260 partially explain why waterhemp can displace Palmer amaranth in Iowa, where Palmer amaranth is not
261 well adapted. In a dioecious species like Palmer amaranth, exerting stress on plants to manipulate flowering
262 may be beneficial in limiting seed production (McFarlane et al., 2018; Schliekelman et al., 2005). For
263 example, when growing under water stress, there was a seven days flowering mismatch between male and
264 female plants (Mesgaran et al., 2021), which can minimize plant outcrossing, reduce seed production and
265 the exchange of resistant alleles (Jhala et al., 2021).

266 The mechanisms of gender-determination in plant species is intriguing and has aroused the curiosity of
267 many scientists, including Charles Darwin (Darwin, 1888). In our study, the gender model performance was
268 decent (AUC 0.64) considering the biology of plant flowering. A 1:1 male and female sex ratio is a general
269 and evolutionarily stable strategy for plant species perpetuation (Fisher, 1930). However, a slight deviation
270 from 1:1 sex ratio occurs in some dioecious species. For example, the dioecious *Halophila stipulacea* is
271 a female-biased plant in its native habitat, but the naturalized *H. stipulacea* has a 1:1 ratio (Nguyen et
272 al., 2018). Naturalization of *H. stipulacea* reduced female-male ratio to expand into its non-native habitat
273 (Nguyen et al., 2018). Also, biotic and/or abiotic stress can influence plant gender determination. Palmer
274 amaranth male-to-female ratio was greater under high plant densities (Korres and Norsworthy, 2017) and
275 after herbicide application (Rumpa et al., 2019). We observed sexual dimorphism in Palmer amaranth
276 in response to surrounding vegetation and plant morphological attributes. Our model estimated that late
277 flowering, heavier and taller Palmer amaranth plants slightly deviated from 1:1 ratio in favor of female
278 plants. It was reported that female Palmer amaranth plants invested more in height, stem and biomass
279 while male plants invested more in leaf area and leaf dry weight under nutrient deficiency (Korres et al.,
280 2017). We observed more female plants in soybean and bareground compared to corn. Palmer amaranth
281 plants in the corn were more stressed by interspecific competition as evidenced by less biomass and
282 a lower weight:height ratio. Sexual dimorphism is documented in other dioecious species (Barrett and
283 Hough, 2013). For example, stronger female plant competition and greater male tolerance to herbivory was
284 reported in *Spinacia oleracea* (Pérez-Llorca and Sánchez Vilas, 2019). Research on candidate genes for
285 sex determination in *Amaranthus* species are currently underway but is far from complete (Montgomery et
286 al., 2021, 2019). Further studies are also needed to understand the ecological basis of Palmer amaranth
287 flowering, including plant behavior under climate change.

288 Our study demonstrated that Palmer amaranth is adapted to grow on arable land throughout the
289 Midwestern U.S. Palmer amaranth's range will continue to expand if current cropping practices are
290 continued. As waterhemp and Palmer amaranth begin to share the same habitat, it will increase weed
291 management complexity. Preventing Palmer amaranth seed dispersal must be a priority. Regional
292 collaboration is necessary to slow the spread of this aggressive and adaptable weed. Where Palmer
293 amaranth occurs, management tactics should focus on limiting Palmer amaranth establishment until row
294 crops can shade late-emerging plants. Increasing the diversity of crops in rotation, varying row crop planting
295 date, narrowing row width, and increasing residue cover through the use of cover crops are all tactics that
296 can minimize the growth and seed production of Palmer amaranth, and improve the sustainability of North
297 Central United States cropping systems.

DISCLOSURE/CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST STATEMENT

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

DATA ACCESSIBILITY

300 The data and scripts used to analyse the data presented in this work can be found at Zenodo (Oliveira,
301 2021).

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

302 RW and MO: designed the experiments; AJ, CP, MB, MO, and SS: conducted the experiments; MO:
303 analyzed the data; MO: wrote the manuscript and all authors revised; AJ, CP, MB, MO, SS, and RW:
304 conceptualized the research. All authors reviewed the manuscript.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

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

REFERENCES

- 307 Bagavathiannan, M. V., and Norsworthy, J. K. (2016). Multiple-Herbicide Resistance Is Widespread in
308 Roadside Palmer Amaranth Populations. *PLOS ONE* 11, e0148748. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0148748.
- 309 Baker, R. (2021). Comparative analysis of Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) and waterhemp (*A.
310 Tuberculatus*) in Iowa. doi:10.31274/etd-20210609-11.
- 311 Bangdiwala, S. I. (2018). Regression: Binary logistic. *International Journal of Injury Control and Safety
312 Promotion* 25, 336–338. doi:10.1080/17457300.2018.1486503.
- 313 Barrett, S. C. H., and Hough, J. (2013). Sexual dimorphism in flowering plants. *Journal of Experimental
314 Botany* 64, 67–82. doi:10.1093/jxb/ers308.
- 315 Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., and Walker, S. (2015). Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using
316 Lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software* 67, 1–48. doi:10.18637/jss.v067.i01.
- 317 Berger, S. T., Ferrell, J. A., Rowland, D. L., and Webster, T. M. (2015). Palmer Amaranth (*Amaranthus
318 palmeri*) Competition for Water in Cotton. *Weed Science* 63, 928–935. doi:10.1614/WS-D-15-00062.1.
- 319 Bravo, W., Leon, R. G., Ferrell, J. A., Mulvaney, M. J., and Wood, C. W. (2017). Differentiation of
320 Life-History Traits among Palmer Amaranth Populations (*Amaranthus palmeri*) and Its Relation to
321 Cropping Systems and Glyphosate Sensitivity. *Weed Science* 65, 339–349. doi:10.1017/wsc.2017.14.
- 322 Bravo, W., Leon, R. G., Ferrell, J. A., Mulvaney, M. J., and Wood, C. W. (2018). Evolutionary Adaptations
323 of Palmer Amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) to Nitrogen Fertilization and Crop Rotation History Affect
324 Morphology and Nutrient-Use Efficiency. *Weed Science* 66, 180–189. doi:10.1017/wsc.2017.73.
- 325 Briscoe Runquist, R. D., Lake, T., Tiffin, P., and Moeller, D. A. (2019). Species distribution models
326 throughout the invasion history of Palmer amaranth predict regions at risk of future invasion and reveal
327 challenges with modeling rapidly shifting geographic ranges. *Sci Rep* 9, 2426. doi:10.1038/s41598-
328 018-38054-9.

- 329 Chahal, P. S., Barnes, E. R., and Jhala, A. J. (2021). Emergence pattern of Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus*
330 *palmeri*) influenced by tillage timings and residual herbicides. *Weed Technology* 35, 433–439.
331 doi:10.1017/wet.2020.136.
- 332 Chahal, P. S., Irmak, S., Jugulam, M., and Jhala, A. J. (2018). Evaluating Effect of Degree of Water Stress
333 on Growth and Fecundity of Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) Using Soil Moisture Sensors.
334 *Weed Science* 66, 738–745. doi:10.1017/wsc.2018.47.
- 335 Correndo, A. A., Moro Rosso, L. H., and Ciampitti, I. A. (2021). Retrieving and processing agro-
336 meteorological data from API-client sources using R software. *BMC Research Notes* 14, 205.
337 doi:10.1186/s13104-021-05622-8.
- 338 Crespo, R. J., Wingeier, A. B., Borman, C. J., and Bernards, M. L. (2016). Baseline Sensitivity of
339 Nebraska Waterhemp and Palmer Amaranth to Dicamba and 2,4-D. *Agronomy Journal* 108, 1649–1655.
340 doi:10.2134/agronj2015.0465.
- 341 Darwin, C. (1888). *The Different Forms of Flowers on Plants of the Same Species*. J. Murray Available at:
342 <http://books.google.com?id=7uMEAAYAAJ>.
- 343 Davis, A. S., Schutte, B. J., Hager, A. G., and Young, B. G. (2015). Palmer Amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*)
344 Damage Niche in Illinois Soybean Is Seed Limited. *Weed Science* 63, 658–668. doi:10.1614/WS-D-14-
345 00177.1.
- 346 Farmer, J. A., Webb, E. B., Pierce, R. A., and Bradley, K. W. (2017). Evaluating the potential for weed seed
347 dispersal based on waterfowl consumption and seed viability. *Pest Management Science* 73, 2592–2603.
348 doi:10.1002/ps.4710.
- 349 Fisher, R. A. (1930). The genetical theory of natural selection. *Eugen Rev* 22, 127–130. Available at:
350 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2984947/> [Accessed August 12,
351 2021].
- 352 Fox, J., and Weisberg, S. (2018). *An R Companion to Applied Regression*. SAGE Publications Available at:
353 <http://books.google.com?id=uPNrDwAAQBAJ>.
- 354 Garetson, R., Singh, V., Singh, S., Dotray, P., and Bagavathiannan, M. (2019). Distribution of herbicide-
355 resistant Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) in row crop production systems in Texas. *Weed
356 Technology* 33, 355–365. doi:10.1017/wet.2019.14.
- 357 Guo, P., and Al-Khatib, K. (2003). Temperature effects on germination and growth of redroot pigweed
358 (*Amaranthus retroflexus*), Palmer amaranth (*A. palmeri*), and common waterhemp (*A. rudis*). *Weed
359 Science* 51, 869–875. doi:10.1614/P2002-127.
- 360 Hartzler, B., and Anderson, M. (2016). Palmer amaranth: It's here, now what? 10.
- 361 Heap, I. (2022). Internation Herbicide-Resistant Weed Database. Available at: <http://www.weedscience.org/Home.aspx> [Accessed January 26, 2022].
- 363 Hothorn, T., Bretz, F., and Westfall, P. (2008). Simultaneous Inference in General Parametric Models.
364 *Biometrical Journal* 50, 346–363. doi:10.1002/bimj.200810425.
- 365 Jha, P., Norsworthy, J. K., Riley, M. B., and Bridges, W. (2010). Annual Changes in Temperature and Light
366 Requirements for Germination of Palmer Amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) Seeds Retrieved from Soil.
367 *Weed Science* 58, 426–432. doi:10.1614/WS-D-09-00038.1.

- 368 Jhala, A. J., Norsworthy, J. K., Ganie, Z. A., Sosnoskie, L. M., Beckie, H. J., Mallory-Smith, C.
369 A., Liu, J., Wei, W., Wang, J., and Stoltzenberg, D. E. (2021). Pollen-mediated gene flow and
370 transfer of resistance alleles from herbicide-resistant broadleaf weeds. *Weed Technology* 35, 173–187.
371 doi:10.1017/wet.2020.101.
- 372 Keeley, P. E., Carter, C. H., and Thullen, R. J. (1987). Influence of Planting Date on Growth of Palmer
373 Amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*). *Weed Science* 35, 199–204. doi:10.1017/S0043174500079054.
- 374 Kistner, E. J., and Hatfield, J. L. (2018). Potential Geographic Distribution of Palmer
375 Amaranth under Current and Future Climates. *Agricultural & Environmental Letters* 3, 170044.
376 doi:10.2134/ael2017.12.0044.
- 377 Klingaman, T. E., and Oliver, L. R. (1994). Palmer Amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) Interference in
378 Soybeans (*Glycine max*). *Weed Science* 42, 523–527. doi:10.1017/S0043174500076888.
- 379 Korres, N. E., and Norsworthy, J. K. (2017). Palmer Amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) Demographic and
380 Biological Characteristics in Wide-Row Soybean. *Weed Science* 65, 491–503. doi:10.1017/wsc.2017.12.
- 381 Korres, N. E., Norsworthy, J. K., FitzSimons, T., Roberts, T. L., and Oosterhuis, D. M. (2017). Differential
382 Response of Palmer Amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) Gender to Abiotic Stress. *Weed Science* 65,
383 213–227. doi:10.1017/wsc.2016.34.
- 384 Korres, N. E., Norsworthy, J. K., Mauromoustakos, A., and Williams, M. M. (2020). Soybean density and
385 Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) establishment time: Effects on weed biology, crop yield, and
386 economic returns. *Weed Science* 68, 467–475. doi:10.1017/wsc.2020.41.
- 387 Kuhn, M., Vaughan, D., and RStudio (2021). *Yardstick: Tidy Characterizations of Model Performance*.
388 Available at: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=yardstick> [Accessed August 24,
389 2021].
- 390 Kumar, V., Liu, R., and Stahlman, P. W. (2020). Differential sensitivity of Kansas Palmer amaranth
391 populations to multiple herbicides. *Agronomy Journal* 112, 2152–2163. doi:10.1002/agj2.20178.
- 392 Küpper, A., Borgato, E. A., Patterson, E. L., Netto, A. G., Nicolai, M., Carvalho, S. J. P. de, Nissen, S.
393 J., Gaines, T. A., and Christoffoleti, P. J. (2017). Multiple Resistance to Glyphosate and Acetolactate
394 Synthase Inhibitors in Palmer Amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) Identified in Brazil. *Weed Science* 65,
395 317–326. doi:10.1017/wsc.2017.1.
- 396 Lang, A. (1965). “Physiology of flower initiation,” in *Differenzierung und Entwicklung / Differentiation
397 and Development* Handbuch der Pflanzenphysiologie / Encyclopedia of Plant Physiology., ed. A. Lang
398 (Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer), 1380–1536. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-50088-6_39.
- 399 Larran, A. S., Palmieri, V. E., Perotti, V. E., Lieber, L., Tuesca, D., and Permingeat, H. R. (2017). Target-site
400 resistance to acetolactate synthase (ALS)-inhibiting herbicides in *Amaranthus palmeri* from Argentina.
401 *Pest Management Science* 73, 2578–2584. doi:10.1002/ps.4662.
- 402 Leeper, T. J. (2017). Interpreting Regression Results using Average Marginal Effects with R’s margins. 31.
- 403 Leeper, T. J., Arnold, J., Arel-Bundock, V., and Long, J. A. (2021). *Margins: Marginal Effects
404 for Model Objects*. Available at: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=margins>
405 [Accessed August 24, 2021].

- 406 Lenth, R. V., Buerkner, P., Herve, M., Love, J., Riebl, H., and Singmann, H. (2021). *Emmeans: Estimated*
407 *Marginal Means, aka Least-Squares Means*. Available at: [https://CRAN.R-project.org/](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=emmeans)
408 package=emmeans [Accessed August 24, 2021].
- 409 Lindsay, K., Popp, M., Norsworthy, J., Bagavathiannan, M., Powles, S., and Lacoste, M. (2017). PAM:
410 Decision Support for Long-Term Palmer Amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) Control. *Weed Technology*
411 31, 915–927. doi:10.1017/wet.2017.69.
- 412 MacRae, A. W., Webster, T. M., Sosnoskie, L. M., Culpepper, A. S., and Kichler, J. M. (2013). Cotton
413 Yield Loss Potential in Response to Length of Palmer Amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) Interference.
414 17, 6.
- 415 Mangiafico, S. (2021). *Rcompanion: Functions to Support Extension Education Program Evaluation*.
416 Available at: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=rcompanion> [Accessed August
417 24, 2021].
- 418 Massinga, R. A., Currie, R. S., Horak, M. J., and Boyer, J. (2001). Interference of Palmer amaranth in corn.
419 *Weed Science* 49, 202–208. doi:10.1614/0043-1745(2001)049[0202:IOPAIC]2.0.CO;2.
- 420 Matzrafi, M., Osipitan, O. A., Ohadi, S., and Mesgaran, M. B. (2021). Under pressure: Maternal effects
421 promote drought tolerance in progeny seed of Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*). *Weed Science*
422 69, 31–38. doi:10.1017/wsc.2020.75.
- 423 McFarlane, G. R., Whitelaw, C. B. A., and Lillico, S. G. (2018). CRISPR-Based Gene Drives for Pest
424 Control. *Trends in Biotechnology* 36, 130–133. doi:10.1016/j.tibtech.2017.10.001.
- 425 Menges, R. M. (1987). Weed Seed Population Dynamics during Six Years of Weed Management Systems
426 in Crop Rotations on Irrigated Soil. *Weed Science* 35, 328–332. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4044593>.
- 427
- 428 Mesgaran, M. B., Matzrafi, M., and Ohadi, S. (2021). Sex dimorphism in dioecious Palmer amaranth
429 (*Amaranthus palmeri*) in response to water stress. *Planta* 254, 17. doi:10.1007/s00425-021-03664-7.
- 430 Milani, A., Panozzo, S., Farinati, S., Iamonico, D., Sattin, M., Loddo, D., and Scarabel, L. (2021). Recent
431 Discovery of *Amaranthus palmeri* S. Watson in Italy: Characterization of ALS-Resistant Populations
432 and Sensitivity to Alternative Herbicides. *Sustainability* 13, 7003. doi:10.3390/su13137003.
- 433 Montgomery, J. S., Giacomini, D. A., Weigel, D., and Tranel, P. J. (2021). Male-specific Y-chromosomal
434 regions in waterhemp (*Amaranthus tuberculatus*) and Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*). *New*
435 *Phytologist* 229, 3522–3533. doi:10.1111/nph.17108.
- 436 Montgomery, J. S., Sadeque, A., Giacomini, D. A., Brown, P. J., and Tranel, P. J. (2019). Sex-specific
437 markers for waterhemp (*Amaranthus tuberculatus*) and Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*). *Weed*
438 *Science* 67, 412–418. doi:10.1017/wsc.2019.27.
- 439 Morgan, G. D., Baumann, P. A., and Chandler, J. M. (2001). Competitive Impact of Palmer Amaranth
440 (*Amaranthus palmeri*) on Cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum*) Development and Yield. *Weed Technology* 15,
441 408–412. doi:10.1614/0890-037X(2001)015[0408:CIOPAA]2.0.CO;2.
- 442 Nguyen, H. M., Kleitou, P., Kletou, D., Sapir, Y., and Winters, G. (2018). Differences in flowering sex
443 ratios between native and invasive populations of the seagrass *Halophila stipulacea*. *Botanica Marina*
444 61, 337–342. doi:10.1515/bot-2018-0015.

- 445 Oliveira, M. C. (2021). *Maxwelco/palmer_adaptation*. Zenodo Available at: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5236831>.
- 446
- 447 Oliveira, M. C., Gaines, T. A., Patterson, E. L., Jhala, A. J., Irmak, S., Amundsen, K., and Knezevic, S.
448 Z. (2018). Interspecific and intraspecific transference of metabolism-based mesotrione resistance in
449 dioecious weedy Amaranthus. *The Plant Journal* 96, 1051–1063. doi:10.1111/tpj.14089.
- 450 Oliveira, M. C., Giacomini, D. A., Arsenijevic, N., Vieira, G., Tranel, P. J., and Werle, R. (2021).
451 Distribution and validation of genotypic and phenotypic glyphosate and PPO-inhibitor resistance in
452 Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) from southwestern Nebraska. *Weed Technology* 35, 65–76.
453 doi:10.1017/wet.2020.74.
- 454 Page, E. R., Nurse, R. E., Meloche, S., Bosveld, K., Grainger, C., Obeid, K., Filotas, M., Simard, M.-J., and
455 Laforest, M. (2021). Import of Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri* S. Wats.) Seed with sweet potato
456 (*Ipomea batatas* (L.) Lam) slips. *Can. J. Plant Sci.*, CJPS-2020-0321. doi:10.1139/CJPS-2020-0321.
- 457 Pérez-Llorca, M., and Sánchez Vilas, J. (2019). Sexual dimorphism in response to herbivory and
458 competition in the dioecious herb *Spinacia oleracea*. *Plant Ecol* 220, 57–68. doi:10.1007/s11258-
459 018-0902-7.
- 460 Piskackova, T. A. R., Reberg-Horton, S. C., Richardson, R. J., Jennings, K. M., Franca, L., Young, B. G.,
461 and Leon, R. G. (2021). Windows of action for controlling palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*)
462 using emergence and phenology models. *Weed Research* 61, 188–198. doi:10.1111/wre.12470.
- 463 Price, A. J., Balkcom, K. S., Culpepper, S. A., Kelton, J. A., Nichols, R. L., and Schomberg, H. (2011).
464 Glyphosate-resistant Palmer amaranth: A threat to conservation tillage. *Journal of Soil and Water
465 Conservation* 66, 265–275. doi:10.2489/jswc.66.4.265.
- 466 Raoniar, R. (2021). Modelling Binary Logistic Regression Using R (research-oriented modelling and
467 interpretation). Available at: <https://bit.ly/3BhucN3> [Accessed August 11, 2021].
- 468 Ritz, C., Baty, F., Streibig, J. C., and Gerhard, D. (2015). Dose-Response Analysis Using R. *PLOS ONE*
469 10, e0146021. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0146021.
- 470 Rumpa, M. M., Krausz, R. F., Gibson, D. J., and Gage, K. L. (2019). Effect of PPO-Inhibiting Herbicides
471 on the Growth and Sex Ratio of a Dioecious Weed Species *Amaranthus palmeri* (Palmer Amaranth).
472 *Agronomy* 9, 275. doi:10.3390/agronomy9060275.
- 473 Sauer, J. (1957). Recent Migration and Evolution of the Dioecious Amaranths. *Evolution* 11, 11–31.
474 doi:10.2307/2405808.
- 475 Sauer, J. D. (1972). The dioecious amaranths: A new species name and major range extensions. *Madroño*
476 21, 426–434. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41423815>.
- 477 Sbatella, G. M., and Wilson, R. G. (2010). Isoxaflutole Shifts Kochia (*Kochia scoparia*) Populations in
478 Continuous Corn. *Weed Technology* 24, 392–396. doi:10.1614/WT-D-09-00023.1.
- 479 Schliekelman, P., Ellner, S., and Gould, F. (2005). Pest Control by Genetic Manipulation of Sex Ratio.
480 *Journal of Economic Entomology* 98, 18–34. doi:10.1093/jee/98.1.18.
- 481 Schwartz, L. M., Norsworthy, J. K., Young, B. G., Bradley, K. W., Kruger, G. R., Davis, V. M., Steckel,
482 L. E., and Walsh, M. J. (2016). Tall Waterhemp (*Amaranthus tuberculatus*) and Palmer amaranth
483 (*Amaranthus palmeri*) Seed Production and Retention at Soybean Maturity. *Weed Technology* 30,
484 284–290. doi:10.1614/WT-D-15-00130.1.

- 485 Sing, T., Sander, O., Beerenwinkel, N., and Lengauer, T. (2005). ROCR: Visualizing classifier performance
486 in R. *Bioinformatics* 21, 3940–3941. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/bti623.
- 487 Sosnoskie, L. M., Webster, T. M., and Culpepper, A. S. (2013). Glyphosate Resistance Does Not
488 Affect Palmer Amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) Seedbank Longevity. *Weed Science* 61, 283–288.
489 doi:10.1614/WS-D-12-00111.1.
- 490 Spaunhorst, D. J., Devkota, P., Johnson, W. G., Smeda, R. J., Meyer, C. J., and Norsworthy, J. K. (2018).
491 Phenology of Five Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) Populations Grown in Northern Indiana and
492 Arkansas. *Weed Science* 66, 457–469. doi:10.1017/wsc.2018.12.
- 493 R Core Team (2021). *R: The R Project for Statistical Computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for
494 Statistical Computing Available at: <https://www.r-project.org/> [Accessed August 24,
495 2021].
- 496 Van Wychen, L. (2020). 2020 Survey of the most common and troublesome weeds in grass crops, pasture,
497 and turf in the United States and Canada. Available at: https://wssa.net/wp-content/uploads/2020-Weed-Survey_grass-crops.xlsx.
- 499 Wang, J. L., Klessig, D. F., and Berry, J. O. (1992). Regulation of C4 Gene Expression in Developing
500 Amaranth Leaves. *The Plant Cell* 4, 173–184. doi:10.1105/tpc.4.2.173.
- 501 Ward, S. M., Webster, T. M., and Steckel, L. E. (2013). Palmer Amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*): A Review.
502 *Weed Technology* 27, 12–27. doi:10.1614/WT-D-12-00113.1.
- 503 Webster, T. M., and Grey, T. L. (2015). Glyphosate-Resistant Palmer Amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*)
504 Morphology, Growth, and Seed Production in Georgia. *Weed Science* 63, 264–272. doi:10.1614/WS-D-
505 14-00051.1.
- 506 Wu, C., and Owen, M. D. K. (2014). When Is the Best Time to Emerge: Reproductive Phenology and
507 Success of Natural Common Waterhemp (*Amaranthus rudis*) Cohorts in the Midwest United States?
508 *Weed Science* 62, 107–117. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43700638>.
- 509 Yacoubi, R., and Axman, D. (2020). Probabilistic Extension of Precision, Recall, and F1 Score for
510 More Thorough Evaluation of Classification Models. in *Proceedings of the First Workshop on*
511 *Evaluation and Comparison of NLP Systems* (Online: Association for Computational Linguistics),
512 79–91. doi:10.18653/v1/2020.eval4nlp-1.9.
- 513 Yu, E., Blair, S., Hardel, M., Chandler, M., Thiede, D., Cortilet, A., Gunsolus, J., and Becker, R. (2021).
514 Timeline of Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) invasion and eradication in Minnesota. *Weed*
515 *Technology*, 1–31. doi:10.1017/wet.2021.32.



Figure 1. Field research locations in the United States North Central region.

FIGURES




Figure 2. Mean average temperature (C) and total monthly precipitation (mm) at Arlington, WI, Clay Center, NE, Grant, NE and Macomb, IL.




Figure 3. Palmer amaranth adaptation study layout of a plant cohort timing in bareground, corn, and soybean. Twenty-four Palmer amaranth plants were place 76.2 cm apart in each field experimental unit.




Figure 4. Palmer amaranth biomass (A) and height (B) growing in corn, bareground, and soybean nested across Arlington, WI, Clay Center, NE, Grant, NE, Lincoln, NE and Macomb, IL.




Figure 5. 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 cohort transplanting time (B) nested across Arlington, WI, Clay Center, NE, Grant, NE, Lincoln, NE and Macomb, IL.




Figure 6. The probability (P) of being female Palmer amaranth by day of year (A), weight (B), and height (C). Black line represents the model estimation and shaded green the confidence intervals.




Figure 7. MCO (first manuscript author, 180 cm) holds harvested Palmer amaranth plants at 40 days after first cohort transplanting (A) and 33 days after second cohort transplanting (B) time. From left to right in each image, Palmer amaranth growing in bareground, soybean and corn in Arlington, Wisconsin.