This is a “preproof” accepted article for Weed Science. This version may be subject to change in the production process, *and does not include access to supplementary material*.
DOI: 10.1017/wet.2025.5

Short title: Peanut and Trifludimoxazin

Cultivar Response and Weed Control in Peanut with Trifludimoxazin

Chad C. Abbott[1], Nicholas J. Shay[1], and Eric P. Prostko[2]*

[1]Graduate Research Assistant, Department of Crop & Soil Sciences, The University of Georgia, Tifton, GA, USA;

[2]Professor/Extension Weed Specialist, Department of Crop & Soil Sciences, The University of Georgia, Tifton, GA, USA (ORCHID 0000-0002-7896-5545).

*__Corresponding author:__ Eric P. Prostko: Email: eprostko@uga.edu

ABSTRACT

Trifludimoxazin is a new PPO-inhibiting herbicide that is being evaluated for the control of small-seeded annual broadleaf weeds and grasses in several crops. Currently, no information is available regarding peanut cultivar response to trifludimoxazin and its utility in peanut weed control systems. Three unique field experiments were conducted and replicated in time from 2019 through 2022 to determine the response of seven peanut cultivars (AU-NPL 17; FloRun 331; GA-06G; GA-16HO; GA-18RU; GA-20VHO; and TifNV High O/L) to preemergence (PRE) applications of trifludimoxazin and to determine the efficacy of trifludimoxazin at multiple rates and tank-mixtures with acetochlor, diclosulam, dimethenamid-*P*, pendimethalin, and *S*-metolachlor for weed management. Cultivar sensitivities to trifludimoxazin were not observed. Peanut density was not reduced by any trifludimoxazin rate. Trifludimoxazin at 75 g ai ha^{-1} increased leaf necrosis by 18%, peanut stunting by 10%, and reduced yield by 6% when compared to the non-treated control in 2019. However, this rate only increased leaf necrosis by 4%, stunting by 3% to 5%, and had no negative impact on yield in 2020-2021. Generally, peanut injury from PRE applied trifludimoxazin was similar to or less than that observed from flumioxazin at 2 wk after application (WAA). Peanut yield in the weed control study was reduced 11 to 12% when treated with trifludimoxazin at 150 g ha^{-1} rate (4X) when compared to the 75 g ha^{-1} rate. However, yield was not different from the flumioxazin treatment. Palmer amaranth control with trifludimoxazin systems was ≥ 91% at 13 WAA, wild radish control was ≥ 96% at 5 WAA, and annual grass control was ≥ 97% at 13 WAA. Peanut is sufficiently tolerant of 38 g ha^{-1} of trifludimoxazin and when tank-mixed with other residual herbicides provides weed control similar to flumioxazin-based systems.

Nomenclature: acetochlor; diclosulam; dimethenamid-*P*; flumioxazin; pendimethalin; *S*-metolachlor; trifludimoxazin; Palmer amaranth, *Amaranthus palmeri* S. Watson AMAPA; wild radish, *Raphanus raphanistrum* L. RAPRA; peanut, *Arachis hypogaea* L.

Key words: BAS-850-01H; crop injury; imazapic; variety; weed control; yield.

Introduction

Peanut harvest for the U.S. in 2023 totalled 637,247 ha (USDA-NASS 2024). Georgia, the nation's top peanut-producing state, produced 1.43 million kg (~53% of the U.S. total). Despite the high value of peanut in Georgia and the U.S., agrichemicals for weed control are primarily developed for the major agronomic crops [field corn (*Zea mays* L.), rice (*Oryza sativa* L.), soybean (*Glycine max* L. Merr.), and wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.)] that are produced around the world and not specifically for peanut.

Trifludimoxazin is a new PPO-inhibiting herbicide belonging to the *N*-phenyl-imide family. Trifludimoxazin is being developed for potential use as a pre-plant burndown herbicide in soybean, field corn, and cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.), and for vegetation management in chemical fallow areas (Armel et al. 2017; Asher et al. 2021; PMRA 2020; Steppig 2022).

Previously, it has been reported that trifludimoxazin is active on *Amaranthus* biotypes that exhibit target-site resistance to PPO-inhibiting herbicides (Armel et al. 2017; Porri et al. 2023). However, it was recently discovered that a PPO-resistant Palmer amaranth population in Georgia has a relative resistance factor (RRF) of 8 to 49 for trifludimoxazin applied preemergence (PRE) or postemergence (POST) (Randell et al. 2024).

Asher et al. (2021) evaluated trifludimoxazin applied 14-day preplant or PRE on cotton across three Texas soils and discovered that the downward movement of trifludimoxazin from 2.5 cm of irrigation caused unacceptable injury to cotton and reduced biomass when compared to the non-treated control (NTC). Trifludimoxazin had the greatest downward movement in the Amarillo soil series, which classifies as a loamy sand, with less than 1% organic matter when it was irrigated with 2.5 cm of water (Asher et al. 2021). This data is important since peanut grown in Georgia on deep sands or sandy loams could be subjected to unacceptable levels of injury when trifludimoxazin is applied PRE.

Prior research has reported differential peanut cultivar response to herbicides (Richburg et al. 1995; Wilcut et al. 2001). However, very little is known regarding peanut cultivar tolerance to trifludimoxazin. Additionally, little is understood about how trifludimoxazin would perform as part of a peanut weed management system.

Therefore, the objectives of this research were 1) to determine the effects of PRE-applied trifludimoxazin on the growth and development of seven commercially available peanut cultivars, and 2) to determine the effectiveness of trifludimoxazin in controlling common weeds in comparison to current recommended weed control systems.

Materials and Methods

Peanut Cultivar Experiment One

A field experiment was conducted each year from 2019 through 2021 at the University of Georgia Ponder Research Farm in Ty Ty, Georgia (31.507654° N, -83.658395° W) to determine the effects of trifludimoxazin on three peanut cultivars. Soil type was a Tifton sand (fine-loamy, kaolinitic, thermic Plinthic Kandiudults) with 92% to 94% sand, 4% to 6% silt, 2% clay, 0.6% to 0.93% organic matter, and a pH of 6.0. Treatments were arranged in a split-plot design with main plots consisting of three peanut cultivars [‘Georgia-06G’ (Branch 2007), ‘Georgia-16HO’ (Branch 2017), and ‘Georgia-18RU’ (Branch 2019)] and sub-plots with four rates of trifludimoxazin applied PRE (0, 25, 38, and 75 g ai ha^{-1}), with all twelve treatments replicated four times. Peanut cultivars were planted into conventionally tilled seedbeds using a vacuum planter calibrated to deliver 18 peanut seed/m at a depth of 5 cm (Monosem Precision Planters, 1001 Blake St., Edwardsville, KS). Peanuts were planted in twin rows spaced 23 cm apart on a 91 cm centers. Plots were 1.8 m (two sets of twin rows) wide and 7.6 m in length.

Preemergence (PRE) herbicide treatments were applied 1 d after planting (DAP) using a CO_2-pressurized backpack sprayer calibrated to deliver 140 L/ha at 248 kPa and at 5.3 km/hr with TeeJet AIXR11002 nozzles (TeeJet Technologies Inc., Glendale Heights, IL). Immediately following herbicide applications, treatments were activated with 1.3 cm of overhead irrigation. Plots were maintained weed-free throughout the season by applying pendimethalin [1066 g ha^{-1}] plus diclosulam [26 g ha-1] over the experimental area PRE followed by hand-weeding when necessary. Production, irrigation, and pest management practices other than specific herbicide treatments were constant throughout the experiment to optimize peanut growth and development (Monfort 2022).

Data collected included peanut density (stand) at 27 to 34 DAP, visible estimates of peanut injury (necrosis and stunting), and yield. Peanut plant density was obtained by counting the number of emerged plants per 1-row m. Visible estimates of crop injury were obtained at 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 10 wks after PRE application (WAA) using a subjective scale of 0 to 100 (0=no injury; 100=plant death). Peanut yield was determined using commercial harvesting equipment. Yields were adjusted to 10% moisture. A complete summary of planting, vine inversion, and harvesting dates can be found in Table 1. Rainfall and supplemental irrigation totals for the first 30 DAP are presented in Table 2.

Data for all parameters were analysed as a split-plot design and subjected to ANOVA using PROC GLIMMIX in SAS, version 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC). Peanut cultivar and trifludimoxazin rate were set as fixed effects. Replications within years and cultivars by replications within years were set as random effects. Peanut density, necrosis, stunting, and yield were set as the response variables. Trifludimoxazin rate-by-year interactions for 2019 prevented the pooling of data across all years. All data for 2019 were separated from 2020 and 2021 data. There was no cultivar-by-trifludimoxazin rate-by-year, cultivar-by-year, or trifludimoxazin rate-by-year interaction for 2020 and 2021, thus data is pooled across those years. All P-values for tests of differences between least-square means were compared and separated using the Tukey-Kramer method at $P < 0.10$. The $P<0.10$ value was chosen prior to trial initiation because it has been our experience that biologically or practically significant differences in data are often overlooked when $P<0.05$.

Peanut Cultivar Experiment 2.

A second field experiment was conducted to determine the effects of trifludimoxazin PRE on four addition cultivars. Production practices, location, soil type, and pest management were identical to that noted in the first experiment. The split-plot design with main-plots consisted of four different peanut cultivars [‘AUNPL-17’ (Chen et al. 2017), ‘FloRun331’ (Tillman 2021), ‘Georgia-20VHO’ (Branch 2021), and ‘TifNV High O/L’ (Holbrook et al. 2017)] and sub-plots with three trifludimoxazin rates applied PRE (0, 38, or 75 g ha^{-1}), with all twelve treatments replicated three times. A complete summary of peanut planting, vine inversion, and harvesting dates can be found in Table 1. The statistical analysis was identical to that noted with cultivar experiment one with the exception that no year interactions were observed allowing data to be pooled across years.

Weed Control Experiment.

Cultural production practices, location, and soil characteristics for the weed control experiment were identical to those provided for the cultivar experiments except for including only one cultivar, GA-16HO (Branch 2017). Planting, herbicide application, vine inversion, and harvest dates are presented in Table 1.

Ten herbicide treatments were arranged in a randomized complete block design with 3 to 4 replications. Trifludimoxazin at 25, 38, 75, and 150 g ha^{-1} was tank-mixed with pendimethalin at 1066 g ha^{-1} and applied PRE. Additionally, trifludimoxazin at 38 g ha^{-1} was applied with tank-mixtures of diclosulam, *S*-metolachlor, and/or dimethenamid-*P*. Trifludimoxazin treatments were directly compared to a standard recommended peanut PRE-tank-mixes of flumioxazin + pendimethalin + diclosulam (1066 + 91 + 13 g ha^{-1}). All PRE-herbicide treatments were applied 1 DAP using a CO_2-pressurized backpack sprayer calibrated to deliver 140 L/ha at 248 kPa and at 5.3 kph. Immediately following herbicide applications, treatments were activated with 1.3 cm of overhead irrigation. The entire study received a POST application of imazapic + 2,4-DB, and *S*-metolachlor or dimethenamid-*P* with application dates in Table 1. All POST herbicide treatments were applied ~ 4 wk after planting using application techniques that were identical to the PRE-application. Two nontreated checks were also included for comparison. A complete list of treatment rates, combinations, and rates are presented in Table 3.

Data collection included visible estimates of peanut stunting and necrosis, visible estimations of weed control, and yield. Visible estimates of crop injury were obtained at 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7 WAA using a subjective scale of 0 to 100 (0 = no injury; 100 = plant death). Weed control ratings were collected using a scale of 0 to 100 (0 = no weed control; 100 = weed free). Weed control ratings were collected during injury ratings along with additional ratings from 11 and 13 WAA. Peanut yield data were obtained using commercial harvesting equipment. Yields were adjusted to 10% moisture.

Data were subjected to ANOVA using PROC GLIMMIX in SAS, version 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC). Peanut injury, weed control, and yield were set as the response variables with replication within year included in the model as random factors. There was not a year-by-treatment interaction, thus data were pooled over years. All P-values for tests of differences between least-square means were compared and separated using the Tukey-Kramer method ($P<0.10$).

Results and Discussion

Peanut Density

Cultivar Experiment One

In 2019, peanut density was not influenced by either cultivar or trifludimoxazin rate ($P>0.24$) (Table 4). However, peanut density for 2020-2021 was influenced by cultivar ($P<0.0001$) but not trifludimoxazin rate ($P=0.4119$) (Table 4). Relative peanut density for cultivars in 2020-2021 was GA-16HO>GA-06G>GA-18RU. Peanut cultivar emergence is often dependent upon the management, harvest, and storage of each cultivars seed lot, thus giving reasons why cultivars can vary widely in final plant density (Morton et al. 2008)

Cultivar Experiment Two

Peanut density was not influenced by the interaction of cultivar and trifludimoxazin rate ($P=0.8879$). Cultivar effects were significant ($P=0.003$) but trifludimoxazin rates were not ($P=0.9727$). FloRun 331 density was lower than GA-20VHO with no other cultivar differences observed (Table 5).

Peanut Injury

Cultivar Experiment One

Necrosis was not influenced by the interaction of cultivar and trifludimoxazin rate (P=0.126) in 2019 (Table 4). The main effect of cultivar did not influence necrosis when averaged across all rates of trifludimoxazin (P=0.6153). Foliar necrosis was 18% across all cultivars with trifludimoxazin at 75 g ha^{-1}, but no other rate differences were observed. For peanut stunting, a significant interaction between trifludimoxazin rate and cultivars was not observed. The trifludimoxazin rate of 75 g ha^{-1} resulted in 10% visible stunting when averaged across all cultivars.

Foliar necrosis and stunting ratings for 2020-2021 are presented in Table 4. Necrosis ratings are reported at 2 WAA, and stunting injury is reported at 8 WAA. Cultivar (P=0.5814) did not influence foliar necrosis but trifludimoxazin at 75 g ha^{-1} resulted in 4% leaf necrosis. Peanut stunting was influenced by trifludimoxazin rate (P=0.0006) but 75 g ha^{-1} only resulted in 3% stunting. Cultivar (P=0.1088) differences were not observed.

Cultivar Experiment Two

There was no interaction between cultivar and rate for leaf necrosis or stunting ratings in 2021-2022 (Table 5). Rate was significant with 75 g ha^{-1} resulting in 4% leaf necrosis and 5% stunting. Cultivar (P=0.0857) was significant for stunting at 8 WAA, and when averaged over rate, GA-20 VHO exhibited more stunting than FloRun 331 and TifNV High O/L.

Weed Control Experiment

Peanut stunting with flumioxazin at 2 WAA was 20% in 2020-2022 (Table 6). Trifludimoxazin rates ≥ 75 g ha^{-1} resulted in 13-24% peanut stunting. Trifludimoxazin rates of 75 and 150 g ha^{-1} represent a 2X and 4X rate, respectively. Trifludimoxazin rates ≤ 38 g ha^{-1} resulted in significantly less peanut stunting than flumioxazin. Leaf necrosis at 3 WAA was 27% when treated with the 150 g ha^{-1} rate of trifludimoxazin. Stunting and necrosis symptoms were transient and dissipated as the season progressed.

Peanut Plant Height/ Width

Cultivar Experiment Two

Peanut canopy height was significantly influenced by cultivar but not rate in 2021-2022 (Table 5). Peanut canopy heights as influenced by cultivar when averaged across herbicide rates are reported as TifNV High O/L = FloRun 331 > AU-NPL 17 > GA-20 VHO. Peanut canopy width was significantly influenced by rate but not cultivar. Canopy width averaged across cultivars was reduced by 2-3% by the 75 g ha^{-1} rate. No width differences were observed between cultivars.

Weed Control

Weed control evaluations were pooled over years and are reported at 3, 5, and 13 WAA (Table 6). The standard preemergence herbicide program for which all other PRE and POST herbicide combinations were compared included the pendimethalin + flumioxazin + diclosulam (PRE) followed by imazapic + *S*-metolachlor + 2,4-DB (POST).

Palmer amaranth Control

Palmer amaranth control was 99% up to 13 WAA (~9 wk after POST) when treated with pendimethalin + flumioxazin + diclosulam PRE followed by (FB) a POST application of imazapic + *S*-metolachlor + 2,4-DB. Palmer amaranth control at 2 WAA was ≥ 93% with all herbicide treatment combinations. However, the pendimethalin + trifludimoxazin (1066 + 38 g ha^{-1}) treatment was significantly different (6%) from the pendimethalin + flumioxazin + diclosulam treatment. The pendimethalin + trifludimoxazin treatment with the two lowest rates of trifludimoxazin showed a reduction of 8% Palmer amaranth control at 13 WAA when compared to the standard PRE program. Palmer amaranth control was ≥ 91% with any herbicide treatment at 13 WAA. Control of Palmer amaranth with trifludimoxazin was improved with either increased rates or the addition of diclosulam. However, increasing rates of trifludimoxazin in peanut could potentially increase the risk of peanut injury.

Wild Radish Control

Wild radish control is reported for only the 3 and 5 WAA observations as it was either senesced or unobservable at the 13 WAA rating. The standard PRE treatment resulted in 99% control of wild radish up to 3 WAA. The pendimethalin + trifludimoxazin treatments [1066 + (25 or 38) g ha^{-1}] provided only 79% and 87% control of wild radish at 3 WAA. Pendimethalin is effective at controlling small seeded-broadleaf weeds and annual grasses, thus, without the addition of diclosulam radish control was dependent upon trifludimoxazin. The dimethenamid-*P* + trifludimoxazin + diclosulam treatment provided only 88% control at 3 WAA. No other wild radish control observations were different from the standard at that time. Wild radish control is important to maximizing crop yield potential, and work conducted by Roncatto et al. (2022) reports the efficacy of diclosulam in reducing radish density and biomass. Diclosulam was able to reduce the density of wild radish by 68% when compared to the untreated control, and that resulted in a biomass reduction of 89% (Roncatto et al. 2022). Control of wild radish early is important, as this weed can be highly troublesome, competitive, and widespread (Eslami et al. 2006; Hashem et al. 2001). Wild radish control at 5 WAA was ≥ 96% with all herbicide treatment combinations. ALS inhibiting herbicides are effective at controlling wild radish from POST applications, for example, imazethapyr was able to reduce biomass of wild radish by 82% per square meter. Improved control from the POST application can be attributed to imazapic.

Annual Grass Control

Annual grass control consisting of a non-uniform mixture of Texas millet [*Urochloa texana* (Buckley) R. Webster], crabgrass (*Digitaria* spp.), goosegrass [*Eleusine indica* (L.) Gaertn.], and crowfootgrass [*Dactyloctenium aegyptium* (L.) Willd.] was ≥ 96% for the standard PRE herbicide program up to 3 WAA. Pendimethalin + trifludimoxazin (1066 + 25 g ha^{-1}) had 8% less weed control for annual grasses at 3 WAA. The dimethenamid-*P* + trifludimoxazin treatment resulted in 6% less control at 3 WAA. All herbicide treatment combinations resulted in similar control to the standard PRE + POST program at 5 and 13 WAA. The pendimethalin + trifludimoxazin (1066 + 150 g ha^{-1}) resulted in 5% better grass control than the dimethenamid-*P* + trifludimoxazin treatment when evaluated at 5 WAA. However, by 13 WAA, no differences in control were observed.

Peanut Yield

Cultivar Experiment One

Peanut yield in 2019 was influenced by cultivar (P=0.0601) and trifludimoxazin rate (P=0.0013), but there was not a cultivar-by-herbicide interaction (P=0.3643) (Table 4). Georgia-18RU yields were 8% higher than Georgia-16HO when averaged across trifludimoxazin rates. Trifludimoxazin at 75 g ha^{-1} reduced yields by 6% when averaged across peanut cultivars. Increased leaf necrosis and prolonged plant stunting from the 75 g ha^{-1} rate of trifludimoxazin as noted in Table 4, could be attributed to the environmental conditions noted in Table 2. Greater rainfall/irrigation in the first 14 DAP likely increased the uptake of trifludimoxazin resulting in increased peanut injury and yield reductions (Table 2). Other research has also documented the potential negative effects of residual herbicides associated with excessive moisture (Askew et al. 1999; Burke et al. 2002). Peanut yield in 2020-2021 was not influenced by either cultivar (P=0.1025) or trifludimoxazin rate (P=0.5095) (Table 5). These results indicated adequate cultivar tolerance to trifludimoxazin when applied at rates ≤ 75 g ha^{-1}.

Cultivar Experiment Two

Peanut yield in 2021-2022 was influenced by cultivar but not trifludimoxazin rate (Table 6). AU-NPL 17 had 9-16% greater yields than the three other cultivars. In previous studies with older peanut cultivars and conditions, PRE applications of flumioxazin did not influence yield (Basinger et al. 2021; Grichar et al. 2004; Main et al. 2003; Wilcut et al. 2001).

Weed Control Experiment

Peanut yield for 2020-2022 was influenced by herbicide treatment (P=0.0155). The non-treated controls are not included in the pairwise means comparison as those plots were unable to be harvested. The pendimethalin + trifludimoxazin (1066 + 75 g ha^{-1}) and pendimethalin + trifludimoxazin + diclosulam (1066 + 75 + 13 g ha^{-1}) treatments resulted in 11-12% higher yields than the pendimethalin + trifludimoxazin (1066 + 150 g ha^{-1}). The 150 g ha^{-1} rate of trifludimoxazin is four times greater than the proposed use rate. No other yield differences were observed.

Practical Implications

Historically, herbicide discovery, specifically for U.S. peanut production, has been limited due to lower planted hectarage in comparison to other major agronomic crops such as field corn, soybean, and wheat. Peanut producers will need additional herbicides in the future as herbicide-resistance continues to evolve. This research confirms that numerous peanut cultivars are sufficiently tolerant of PRE applications of trifludimoxazin. Additionally, trifludimoxazin can be applied at lower rates, is less injurious, and provides similar weed control to comparable flumioxazin-based systems in peanut.

Acknowledgments

This research could not have been conducted without the technical support of Charlie Hilton, Tim Richards, and Dewayne Dales. The contributions of A.S. Culpepper, W.S. Monfort, M.A. Abney, W.C. Johnson III, and C.J. Bryant were also greatly appreciated.

Funding

Partial funding for this research was provided by BASF.

Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Literature Cited

Armel GR, Hanzlik K, Witschel M, Hennigh DS, Bowe S, Simon A, Liebl R, Mankin L (2017). Trifludimoxazin: a new PPO inhibitor that controls PPO resistant weed biotypes. Abstract #218 *in* Proceedings of the Weed Science Society of America. Arlington, VA; Weed Science Society of America

Asher BS, Dotray PA, Liebl RA, Keeling JW, Ritchie GD, Udeigwe TK, Reed JD, Keller KE, Bowe SJ, Aldridge RB, Simon A (2021) Vertical mobility and cotton tolerance to trifludimoxazin, a new protoporphyrinogen oxidase-inhibiting herbicide, in three West Texas soils. Weed Technol. 35:144-148

Askew SD, Wilcut JW, Cranmer JR (1999) Weed management in peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*) with flumioxazin preemergence. Weed Technol. 13:594–598

Basinger NT, Randell TM, Prostko EP (2021) Peanut response to flumioxazin and *S*-metolachlor under high moisture conditions. Peanut Sci. 48:113-117

Branch WD (2007) Registration of ‘Georgia-06G’ peanut. J. of Plant Reg. 1(2):120

Branch WD (2017) Registration of ‘Georgia-16HO’ peanut. J. of Plant Reg. 11:231-234

Branch WD (2019) Registration of ‘Georgia-18RU’ peanut. J. of Plant Reg. 13:326-329

Branch WD (2021) Registration of ‘Georgia-20VHO’ peanut. Crop Sci. 43:1883-1884

Burke IC, Price AJ, Wilcut JW, Jordan DL, Culpepper AS, Tredaway-Ducar J (2004) Annual grass control in peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*) with clethodim and imazapic. Weed Tech. 18:88-92

Chen C., Balkcom K, Hagan A, Dang P, Lamb M, Mingli W (2017) Characteristics of a newly released runner-type peanut cultivar ‘AU-NPL 17’. National Peanut Laboratory. Pub. #342753

Eslami SV, Gill GS, Bellotti B, McDonald G (2006) Wild radish (*Raphanus raphanistrum*) interference in wheat. Weed Sci. 54:749-756

Grichar WJ, Besler BA, Brewer KD (2004) Control of weeds in peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*) using flumioxazin. Peanut Sci. 31:17-21

Hashem A, Bowran D, Piper T, Dhammu H (2001) Resistance of wild radish (*Raphanus raphanistrum*) to acetolactate synthase-inhibiting herbicides in the western Australia wheat belt. Weed Tech. 15:68-74

Holbrook CC, Ozias-Akins P, Chu YE, Culbreath AK, Kvien CK, Brenneman TB (2017) Registration of ‘TifNV-High O/L’ peanut. J. of Plant Reg. 11:228-230

Main, CL, Ducar JT, Whitty EB, Macdonald GE (2003) Response of three runner-type peanut cultivars to flumioxazin. Weed Tech. 17:89-93

Monfort, WS (editor). 2022. Peanut Production Guide. University of Georgia Extension Bulletin 1146. Pp 179. Available on-line at: https://extension.uga.edu/publications/detail.html?number=B1146.

Morton BR, Tillman BL, Gorbet DW, Boote KJ (2008) Impact of seed storage environment on field emergence of peanut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) cultivars. Peanut Sci. 35:108-115

[PMRA] Pest Management Regulatory Agency (2020) Proposed registration decision PRD2020- 15, trifludimoxazin, Vulcarus and Voraxor. Available on-line at: https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2020/sc-hc/h113-9/H113-9-2020-15-eng.pdf

Porri A, Betz M, Seebruck K, Knapp M, Johnen P, Witschel M, Aponte R, Liebl R, Tranel PJ, Lerchl J (2023) Inhibition profile of trifludimoxazin towards PPO2 target site mutations. Pest Manag. Sci. 79:507-519

Randell TM, Hand LC, Vance JC, Wright HE, Culpepper AS (2024) Confirming resistance to PPO-inhibiting herbicides applied preemergence and postemergence in a Georgia Palmer amaranth population. Weed Technol. 38:1-10

Richburg III JS, Wilcut JW, Culbreath AK, Kvien CK (1995) Response of eight peanut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) cultivars to the herbicide AC 263,222. Peanut Sci. 22:76-80

Roncatto E, Barroso AAM, Novello BDP, Goncalves R, Jarek T, Young M (2022) Residual herbicides and cover crops interactions for soybean weed control. J. of Agric. Sci. 14(9):47-58

Steppig NR (2022) Evaluation of trifludimoxazin, a new protoporphyrinogen oxidase-inhibiting herbicide, for use in soybean. Purdue University Graduate School. Thesis. https://doi.org/10.25394/PGS.19674336.v1

Tillman BL (2021) Registration of ‘FloRun ‘331’’ peanut. J. of Plant Reg. 15:294-299

[USDA-NASS] U. S. Dept. of Agriculture - National Agricultural Statistics Service. 2024. Crop Production – 2023 Summary. Available on-line at: https://downloads.usda.library.cornell.edu/usda-esmis/files/k3569432s/ns 065v292/tm70ph00b/cropan24.pdf.

Wilcut JW, Askew SD, Bailey WA, Spears JF, Isleib TG (2001) Virginia market-type peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*) cultivar tolerance and yield response to flumioxazin preemergence. Weed Technol. 15:137-140

Table 1. Planting, inversion, and harvest dates of trifludimoxazin peanut trials in Ty Ty, Georgia 2019-2022.

Year	Planting	Inversion	Harvest
Cultivar Study 1:			
2019	May 1	Sep 19	Sep 25
2020	Apr 28	Sep 21	Sep 24
2021	May 7	Sep 23	Sep 28
Cultivar Study 2:			
2021	Apr 29	Sep 23	Sep 27
2022	May 4	Sep 16	Sep 20
Weed Control Study[a]:			
2020[b]	May 12	Sep 30	Oct 5
2021[c]	May 10	Sep 24	Sep 29
2022[d]	Apr 27	Sep 15	Sep 19

[a] GA-16HO planted in all years.

[b] 2020 Herbicide application dates: preemergence (PRE) - May 13; postemergence (POST) - June 4.

[c] 2021 Herbicide application dates: PRE May 11; POST June 4.

[d] 2022 Herbicide application dates: PRE Apr 28; POST May 24.

Table 2. Weather comparison for trifludimoxazin cultivar experiment one during the first 30 d after planting (DAP) in Ty Ty, Georgia, 2019-2021.

	2019	2020	2021
Daily Avg. Max Air Temp (C)	32	28	30
Daily Avg. Min Air Temp (C)	19	16	16
Average 5 cm Soil Temp (C)	30	26	28
Total Rainfall (cm)	5.1	11.1	7.3
Total Irrigation (cm)	4.1	3.4	6.1
Total Rainfall/ Irrigation – 14 DAP	7.6 cm of 9.2 cm	5.7 cm of 14.5 cm	3.7 cm of 13.4 cm

Table 3. Weed control programs, rates, and application timings for weed control study with trifludimoxazin in Ty Ty, Georgia, 2020-2022.

Herbicide		Rate	
PRE[a]	POST[b]	PRE	POST
		----g ai ha^{-1}----	
pendimethalin + flumioxazin + diclosulam	imazapic + *S*-metolachlor + 2,4-DB	1066 + 91 + 13	71 + 1069 + 281
pendimethalin + trifludimoxazin	imazapic + *S*-metolachlor + 2,4-DB	1066 + 25	71 + 1069 + 281
pendimethalin + trifludimoxazin	imazapic + *S*-metolachlor + 2,4-DB	1066 + 38	71 + 1069 + 281
pendimethalin + trifludimoxazin	imazapic + *S*-metolachlor + 2,4-DB	1066 + 75	71 + 1069 + 281
pendimethalin + trifludimoxazin	imazapic + *S*-metolachlor + 2,4-DB	1066 + 150	71 + 1069 + 281
pendimethalin + trifludimoxazin + diclosulam	imazapic + *S*-metolachlor + 2,4-DB	1066 + 25+ 13	71 + 1069 + 281
pendimethalin + trifludimoxazin + diclosulam	imazapic + *S*-metolachlor + 2,4-DB	1069 + 38 +13	71 + 1069 + 281
pendimethalin + trifludimoxazin + diclosulam	imazapic + *S*-metolachlor + 2,4-DB	1069 + 75 +13	71 + 1069 + 281
S-metolachlor + trifludimoxazin + diclosulam	imazapic + *S*-metolachlor + 2,4-DB	1069 + 38 +13	71 + 1069 + 281
dimethenamid-*P* + trifludimoxazin + diclosulam	imazapic + dimethenamid-*P* + 2,4-DB	552 + 38+ 13	71 + 552 + 281

[a] PRE = preemergence; POST = postemergence.

[b] POST treatments were applied approximately 4 wk after planting.

Table 4. The influence of peanut cultivar and trifludimoxazin rate on peanut density, leaf necrosis, stunting, and yield, cultivar experiment one, Ty Ty, Georgia 2019-2021.

					Peanut Injury											
	Peanut Density[a]				2019				2020-2021				Yield			
Cultivar or Rate	2019		2020-2021		Necrosis[b]		Stunting[c]		Necrosis		Stunting		2019		2020-2021	
	------Plants/1-row m-----				-----%-----				-----%-----				-----kg ha^{-1}-----			
Cultivar[d]																
GA-06G	15	a[e]	15	b	5	a	3	a	1	a	2	ab	7662	ab	6754	ab
GA-16HO	14	a	17	a	6	a	6	a	1	a	0	b	7152	b	6581	ab
GA-18RU	16	a	13	c	4	a	1	a	1	a	1	ab	7773	a	6943	a
Rate[f]																
0	15	a	16	a	0	a	0	b	0	a	0	a	7655	a	6653	a
25	15	a	15	a	0	a	1	b	1	a	0	a	7644	a	6778	a
38	15	a	15	a	3	a	4	ab	1	a	2	ab	7595	a	6773	a
75	15	a	15	a	18	b	10	a	4	b	3	b	7222	b	6835	a

[a] Peanut density data collected 27-34 days after planting.

[b] Peanut necrosis = Visible estimates, 2 weeks after application, foliar necrosis based on scale of 0 = no necrosis and 100 = complete necrotic tissue.

[c] Peanut stunting = Visible estimates, 8 weeks after application, of peanut stunting based on scale of 0 = no stunting and 100 = complete crop death.

[d] Averaged over trifludimoxazin rate.

[e] Means in the same column of either cultivar or rate with the same letter are not significantly different according to the Tukey-Kramer method (P<0.10).

[f] Rate = g ai ha^{-1} trifludimoxazin averaged over cultivar.

Table 5. The influence of peanut cultivar and trifludimoxazin rate on peanut density, injury (leaf necrosis, stunting), canopy height/width, and yield, cultivar experiment two, Ty Ty, Georgia 2021-2022.

			----Peanut Injury[b]----				----Peanut Canopy[c]----					
-Cultivar or Rate-	-Peanut Density[a]-		Necrosis		Stunting		Height		Width		-Yield-	
	Plants/1-row m		------------%-----------				------------cm-----------				kg ha^{-1}	
Cultivar[d]												
AU-NPL 17	17	ab[e]	1	a	2	ab	23	b	86	a	6484	a
FloRun 331	16	b	1	a	1	b	25	a	85	a	5900	b
GA-20VHO	19	a	1	a	4	a	20	c	83	a	5433	b
TifNV High O/L	17	ab	1	a	1	b	26	a	86	a	5789	b
Rate[f]												
0	17	a	0	a	0	a	24	a	85	a	5913	a
38	17	a	0	a	2	a	24	a	86	a	5765	a
75	17	a	4	b	5	b	23	a	83	b	6026	a

[a] Peanut density data collected 21 days after planting.

[b] Peanut Injury = Visible estimates of peanut injury based on scale of 0 = no injury and 100 = complete crop death combined over 2 site-years. Necrosis = 3 weeks after application and stunting = 8 weeks after application.

[c] Peanut canopy data collected 9 weeks after application, 5 plants $plot^{-1}$

[d] Averaged over trifludimoxazin rate.

[e] Means in the same column of either cultivar or rate with the same letter are not significantly different according to the Tukey-Kramer method ($P<0.10$).

[f] Rate = g ai ha^{-1} trifludimoxazin averaged over cultivar.

Table 6. Peanut injury, weed control, and yield in trifludimoxazin weed control study in Ty Ty, Georgia 2020-2022.

---------Herbicide---------		-----Rate-----		Peanut Injury Stunting[a]	Necrosis[a]	AMAPA[bc]	RAPRA[b]	AGRASS[b]	AMAPA	RAPRA	AGRASS	AMAPA	AGRASS	Yield
PRE[d]	POST[e]	PRE	POST[e]	2 WAA[f]	3WAA	-----------------3 WAA-------------			--------------5 WAA-------------			---------13 WAA----		
		-----g ai ha^{-1}----		---%---										kg ha^{-1}
pendimethalin + flumioxazin + diclosulam	imazapic + *S*-metolachlor + 2,4-DB	1066 + 91 + 13	71 + 1069 + 281	20 ab[f]	3 b	99 a	99 a	96 ab	99 a	99 a	97 ab	99 a	99 a	6056 ab
pendimethalin + trifludimoxazin	imazapic + *S*-metolachlor + 2,4-DB	1066 + 25	71 + 1069 + 281	6 d	3 b	97 a	79 d	88 b	97 ab	96 b	96 ab	91 b	97 a	6397 ab
pendimethalin + trifludimoxazin	imazapic + *S*-metolachlor + 2,4-DB	1066 + 38	71 + 1069 + 281	7 d	5 b	93 b	87 cd	92 ab	96 b	97 ab	98 ab	91 b	99 a	6461 ab
pendimethalin + trifludimoxazin	imazapic + *S*-metolachlor + 2,4-DB	1066 + 75	71 + 1069 + 281	13 bcd	1b b	98 a	93 abc	92 ab	99 a	98 ab	96 ab	98 a	99 a	6600 a
pendimethalin + trifludimoxazin	imazapic + *S*-metolachlor + 2,4-DB	1066 + 150	71 + 1069 + 281	24 a	27 a	99 a	99 a	99 a	99 a	99 a	99 a	99 a	99 a	5890 b
pendimethalin + trifludimoxaz	imazapic + *S*-metolachlor	1066 + 25+	71 + 1069 +281	9 cd	3 b	99 a	99 a	94 ab	98 ab	99 a	96 ab	97 ab	98 a	6379 ab

in + diclosulam	+ 2,4-DB	13																							
pendimethalin + trifludimoxazin + diclosulam	imazapic + *S*-metolachlor + 2,4-DB	1069 + 38 +13	71 + 1069 + 281	9	cd	3	b	98	a	99	a	96	ab	99	a	99	a	97	ab	97	ab	98	a	6487	ab
pendimethalin + trifludimoxazin + diclosulam	imazapic + *S*-metolachlor + 2,4-DB	1069 + 75 +13	71 + 1069 + 281	14	bc	10	b	99	a	99	a	92	ab	99	a	99	a	97	ab	99	a	99	a	6658	a
S-metolachlor + trifludimoxazin + diclosulam	imazapic + *S*-metolachlor + 2,4-DB	1069 + 38 +13	71 + 1069 + 281	7	d	3	b	99	a	90	a-d	92	ab	99	a	99	a	97	ab	99	a	99	a	6166	ab
dimethenamid-*P* + trifludimoxazin + diclosulam	imazapic + dimethenamid-*P* + 2,4-DB	552 + 38 + 13	71 + 552 + 281	7	d	3	b	98	a	88	bcd	90	b	98	ab	98	ab	94	b	99	a	99	a	6306	ab

---

[a] Ratings are visible estimates of peanut injury based on percent of non-treated control (0= no crop injury, 100= complete crop death) and averaged over 3 site-years.

[b] AMAPA= Palmer amaranth; RAPRA= Wild radish; AGRASS= Annual grasses (non-uniform mixture of Texas millet, crabgrass spp., goosegrass, crowfootgrass).

[c] Ratings are visible estimates of weed control based on the percent of non-treated control (0=no weed control, 100= complete weed control) and averaged over 3 site-years.

[d] PRE = preemergence; POST = postemergence.

[e] POST = applied ~4 wk after planting.

[f] WAA= weeks after PRE application.

[g] Means in the same column with the same letters are not significantly different according to the Tukey-Kramer method (P<0.10). The untreated control was not included in the statistical analysis.