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.2025.13

Short title: Rice tolerance to fluridone

Rice cultivar tolerance to preemergence- and postemergence-applied fluridone

Maria C.C.R. Souza[1], Jason K. Norsworthy[2], Pâmela Carvalho-Moore[3], Amar Godar[4], Samuel B. Fernandes[5], and Thomas R. Butts[6]

[1]Graduate Research Assistant (ORCID 0000-0002-9378-9586), Department of Crop, Soil, and Environmental Sciences, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR, USA; [2]Distinguished Professor (ORCID 0000-0002-7379-6201), Department of Crop, Soil, and Environmental Sciences, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR, USA; [3]Graduate Research Assistant (ORCID 0000-0002-4832-9062), Department of Crop, Soil, and Environmental Sciences, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR, USA; [4]Post Doctoral Fellow (ORCID 0000-0001-9980-6562), Department of Crop, Soil, and Environmental Sciences, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR, USA; [5]Assistant Professor (0000-0001-8269-535X), Department of Crop, Soil, and Environmental Sciences, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR, USA; and [6]Clinical Assistant Professor, Extension Weed Scientist (ORCID 0000-0001-8310-0493), Department of Botany and Plant Pathology, West Lafayette, IN, USA.

Author for correspondence:

Maria C.C.R. Souza; Email: mcsouza@uark.edu

Abstract

Fluridone was registered for use in rice in 2023, offering a new herbicide site of action for growers. However, little information is available on rice tolerance to this herbicide. Field experiments conducted in 2022 and replicated in 2023 near Colt, AR, evaluated the tolerance of twelve rice cultivars to fluridone, applied preemergence or at the 3-leaf growth stage, in separate experiments. Each experiment consisted of one cultivar. Fluridone rates were 0, 168 (1× label rate), and 336 (2× label rate) g ai ha^{-1} in all experiments. Visible injury varied between years in all experiments, likely due to different environmental conditions. In 2022, injury following preemergence applications of fluridone was below 25% across cultivars. In contrast, in 2023, injury ≥ 30% occurred to five cultivars, with a maximum of 58% observed for the cultivar 'DG263L'. Across both years, only three cultivars achieved injury ≥ 20% following fluridone applications at the 3-leaf rice. Fluridone negatively affected shoot density, groundcover, chlorophyll content, and days to 50% heading in most cultivars when applied preemergence. When fluridone was applied to 3-leaf rice, at least one of the variables evaluated was negatively affected in two and nine cultivars in 2022 and 2023, respectively. Grain yield reductions of at least 18% were observed in eight cultivars in 2022, and a grain yield decrease from 9% to 49% in eight cultivars occurred in 2023 in the preemergence experiments. Fluridone applied at the 3-leaf rice did not cause a yield penalty to any cultivar in 2022, whereas in 2023, eight cultivars had a yield loss. Yield loss in 'DG263L' occurred at the 1× rate in both experiments, indicating this cultivar appears sensitive to fluridone, regardless of the application timing. Based on these findings, fluridone tolerance is cultivar-dependent. Furthermore, preemergence applications of fluridone in rice should be avoided.

Nomenclature: fluridone; rice, *Oryza sativa* L.

Keywords: crop tolerance, phytoene-desaturase, rice injury

Introduction

Rice production in the United States (USA) is primarily led by Arkansas, which accounts for nearly half of the country's total rice output, totaling almost five million metric tons in 2023 (USDA-NASS 2024). Within the state, long- and medium-grain cultivars comprised 86% and 14% of the total rice production in 2023, respectively. In 2022, 54% of the total rice acreage was planted with the long-grain hybrid cultivars RT 7521 FP, RT XP753, RT 7321 FP, and RT 7421 FP, while 8% was allocated to the long-grain pureline cultivar DG263L (Hardke 2023). Additionally, 4% of the acreage was planted with the long-grain pureline cultivar CLL16 and 10% with the medium-grain pureline cultivars Jupiter and Titan.

Weed competition stands as one of the main factors limiting rice production, often resulting in more than 50% yield reductions, depending on variables such as weed density, species present, and time of emergence (King et al. 2024; Maun and Barrett 1986; Ziska et al. 2015). For instance, a single Palmer amaranth [*Amaranthus palmeri* (S.) Watson] plant that emerges one week before rice can reduce rice yield by 5% to 50% within 1.4 m to 0.4 m from the weed, respectively (King et al. 2024). Besides decreasing yield, weeds can cause economic losses by reducing land value, primarily due to the additional costs associated with weed management and reduction in grain quality (Oerke 2006). Thus, effective weed control programs are essential for successful rice cultivation (Riar and Norsworthy 2011). Not surprisingly, herbicides are the most used pesticides in rice production in the USA, applied to 96% of the rice acreage (USDA-NASS 2022).

Varying degrees of herbicide tolerance have been documented among cultivars within the same crop (Beesinger et al. 2022; Bond and Walker 2011, 2012; Griffin and Baker 1990; Hardcastle 1979; Montgomery et al. 2014; Wright et al. 2021). For instance, hybrid and inbred, medium-grain rice cultivars were injured more than inbred, long-grain cultivars following a postemergence application of saflufenacil or carfentrazone (Montgomery et al. 2014). Wright et al. (2021) observed that long and medium-grain pureline cultivars exhibited greater tolerance to florpyrauxifen-benzyl compared to a long-grain hybrid, which suffered a yield penalty when sequential applications of the herbicide were used. Additionally, rice tolerance to herbicides depends on the crop growth stage at the time of application (Bond and Walker 2011, 2012; Wright et al. 2021). Therefore, it is crucial to assess crop tolerance to new herbicides across

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cultivars at multiple application timings to identify risks associated with potential crop injury and yield loss.

Fluridone is an inhibitor of phytoene desaturase, a crucial enzyme in the biosynthesis of carotenoids (Bartels and Watson 1978; Sandmann and Böger 1997; Sandmann et al. 1991). Recently registered for use starting at the 3-leaf rice stage, fluridone offers a novel site of action in rice production, providing residual control for annual grass and broadleaf weeds (US EPA 2023). Also registered for use in cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.) and peanut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.), fluridone has shown excellent control of Palmer amaranth (Grichar et al. 2020; Hill et al. 2016). With the increased adoption of furrow-irrigated rice in Arkansas (Hardke 2023), Palmer amaranth emerged as a problematic weed in rice fields due to the favorable environmental conditions created by the non-flooded system (Bagavathiannan et al. 2011; Butts et al. 2022). The intensified interference from Palmer amaranth in rice fields, coupled with limited chemical options for its control due to herbicide resistance, makes this weed particularly difficult to manage. Therefore, fluridone emerges as a fundamental tool for farmers to manage this troublesome weed.

Despite its promising results in controlling Palmer amaranth, few studies have been conducted to investigate rice tolerance to fluridone. Martin et al. (2018) observed 25% injury to rice seven weeks after treatment following a preemergence application of fluridone at 224 g ai ha^{-1} on silt loam soil in a paddy system. Similarly, fluridone applied at 170 g ai ha^{-1} on clay soil following precision-leveling in a furrow-irrigation system caused more than 25% rice injury between eight and twelve weeks after treatment when applied at the 3-leaf growth stage (Butts et al. 2024). In both studies, fluridone injury increased following irrigation initiation, likely due to greater herbicide availability.

Due to the limited effective options available, fluridone may become a significant herbicide in battling Palmer amaranth in rice systems, provided crop tolerance is acceptable. Little information is available regarding rice response to this herbicide. Further investigations are necessary to evaluate its safety across a range of rice cultivars at different application timings. Therefore, this study assessed the tolerance of twelve rice cultivars commonly grown in Arkansas to fluridone applied preemergence and at the 3-leaf growth stage in a paddy production system.

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Materials and Methods

Experiment setup

To determine the tolerance of rice to fluridone within each cultivar, preemergence and postemergence experiments were conducted by cultivar, totaling 24 experiments in 2022 and 22 in 2023. The goal was not to compare cultivars but rather to understand the response of each cultivar to fluridone. Cultivars were planted in independent strips and treatments were randomized within each cultivar. The experiments were organized as a randomized complete block design with four replications. All experiments were located at the Pine Tree Research Station, near Colt, AR (35.1242°N, 90.9306°W), on a Calhoun silt loam soil with 1.4% organic matter and pH of 8 and 8.1 in 2022 and 2023, respectively. Twelve rice cultivars were drill-seeded at 36, 52, and 72 seeds m^{-1} of row for hybrids, a pureline quizalofop-resistant cultivar, and all other pureline cultivars, respectively (Table 1). The cultivar 'Lynx' was planted only in 2022 due to seed availability. Rice in the experiments was planted with a nine-row, small-plot drill at a 1.3-cm depth with 19 cm between rows on May 12, 2022, and April 11, 2023. The plots were 1.8 wide and 5.2 m long. The seedbed was prepared using conventional tillage in both years.

The preemergence experiments aimed to evaluate the tolerance of each rice cultivar to fluridone when applied preemergence, and the postemergence experiments focused on rice tolerance to fluridone applied at the 3-leaf growth stage. Applications were made across all cultivars on the same date. In the preemergence experiments, the herbicide was applied to the soil surface on the day of planting. In the postemergence experiments, fluridone was sprayed on June 6, 2022, and May 16, 2023. Treatments consisted of fluridone (Brake®, SePRO Corporation, Carmel, IN, USA, 46032) applied at 168 g ai ha^{-1} and at 336 g ai ha^{-1}, which corresponds to the 1× and 2× label rate for the soil texture in which the experiments were conducted (US EPA 2023). A 'no fluridone' treatment was included for comparison, and all experiments were conducted under weed-free conditions to avoid interference from factors other than the treatments.

Weed control management was the same for all experiments each year. Quinclorac (Facet®L, BASF, Research Triangle Park, NC, USA, 27709) was applied preemergence in both years. Postemergence applications were made at 2-leaf rice in 2022 using halosulfuron-methyl +

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

prosulfuron (Gambit®, Gowan Company, Yuma, AR, USA 85366), while in 2023, propanil + thiobencarb (Ricebeaux®, UPL Limited, King of Prussia, PA 19406) and halosulfuron-methyl (Permit®, Gowan Company, Yuma, AR 85366) were used. The experiments were managed following the University of Arkansas System Division of Agriculture recommendations for direct-seeded, delayed-flood rice production (Henry et al. 2021; Roberts et al. 2016). Flood establishment occurred 30 days after emergence, on June 18, 2022, and June 2, 2023, for all experiments. The herbicides were applied using a CO_2-pressurized backpack sprayer equipped with four AIXR 110015 nozzles (TeeJet Technologies, Spraying Systems Co., Glendale Heights, IL, USA), calibrated to deliver 140 L ha^{-1} at a speed of 4.8 kph. Air temperature and rainfall data were monitored via a nearby weather station.

Visible crop injury was evaluated at 2, 4, and 6 weeks after emergence (WAE) in the preemergence experiments and at 2, 4, and 6 weeks after treatment (WAT) in the postemergence experiments using a scale of 0 to 100, with 0 representing no injury and 100 representing plant death (Frans et al. 1986). Rice shoot counts were taken in two 1-m sections of row 2 WAE in the preemergence experiments only, whereas all other subsequent variables were collected in both preemergence and postemergence experiments. Chlorophyll content was estimated using a soil plant analysis development (SPAD) chlorophyll meter (SPAD-502 plus Chlorophyll meter, Konica Minolta, Tokyo, Japan) at the rice panicle initiation growth stage, with readings of the uppermost fully expanded leaf of five plants per plot. A small unmanned aerial system [DJI Mavic Air 2S (DJI Technology Co., LTD., Nanshan, Shenzhen, China)] was used to capture aerial images from a height of approximately 60 m in 2022, with each image covering twelve plots in width and four plots in length. In 2023, images were captured at approximately 30 m, covering nine plots in width and four plots in length. Images were taken at 8 WAE in both years. Overhead images were analyzed using Field Analyzer (Green Research Services, LLC., Fayetteville, AR, USA) to determine the groundcover percentage for each plot by measuring green pixel counts. Days to 50% heading were recorded for each plot and reported relative to each control. Rough rice grain yield was harvested from the center four rows of each plot using a small-plot combine, and grain moisture was adjusted to 12% when reporting yield.

Data analysis

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

All data were analyzed in R statistical software version 4.2.2 (R Core Team 2022). All data were fitted to a generalized linear mixed-effect model (GLMM) (Stroup 2015) using the 'glmmTMB' function (glmmTMB package, Brooks et al. 2017). Year was included in the model as a fixed effect, and block was treated as a random effect for the analysis of all variables. The interaction of year and fluridone rate was significant for most variables across cultivars ($P > 0.05$). Therefore, data were analyzed by year. Rice shoot density, chlorophyll content, groundcover, relative heading date, and yield were analyzed using a Gaussian or normal distribution. Percent visible rice injury was analyzed using a beta distribution. For injury analysis, evaluation timing (WAE or WAT) was considered a repeated-measure variable that allowed comparisons across evaluations taken on the same plot over the same interval (Gbur et al. 2012). An autoregressive first-order covariance structure (AR1) was applied to account for the temporal correlation between repeated measurements taken at different evaluation timings on the same plot (Hamilton 1994; Kiss et al. 2021). In the GLMM models for injury, fluridone rate and evaluation timing were considered fixed effects, and block was treated as a random effect. For models for the other variables, only fluridone rate was considered a fixed effect, and block was considered a random effect. Q-Q plots were used to check the fitness of the model, and final models were selected based on Akaike information criterion (AIC) values.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed using Type III Wald chi-square tests with the 'car' package (Fox and Weisberg 2019). Following the ANOVA, treatment-estimated marginal means (Searle et al. 1980) were calculated using the 'emmeans' package (Lenth 2022). The 'multcomp' package (Hothorn et al. 2008) generated a compact letter display to distinguish significant differences among treatments. Estimated marginal means included post hoc Tukey HSD (α=0.05) adjustments, and the compact letter display was generated via the multcomp:cld function.

Results and Discussion

Preemergence experiments

Visible injury to rice never exceeded 24% in 2022 from fluridone applied preemergence (Tables 2, 3, and 4). In 2023, most cultivars displayed lower injury levels at 2 and 4 WAE compared to 6 WAE (Table 4). The cultivars 'CLL15', 'CLL16', 'Diamond', 'Jupiter', 'RTv7231 MA', and 'Titan' displayed less than 10% injury regardless of fluridone rate at the first two

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

evaluation timings in 2023. At 6 WAE in 2023, injury levels of at least 30%, averaged over rates, were observed on the cultivars ‘CLL15’, ‘DG263L’, ‘PVL02’, and ‘RT7321FP’, with ‘DG263L’ displaying 58% injury. These results lead to the suggestion of increased herbicide availability with the establishment of the flood, which occurred seven weeks after planting (4 WAE), resulting in increased injury for most of the cultivars, especially in 2023. Similar results were observed by Martin et al. (2018), where rice injury increased after flood establishment following a preemergence application of fluridone at 224 g ai ha^{-1} on Dewitt and Calhoun silt loam soils.

The lack of an increase in visible injury after the establishment of the flood in 2022 may have been influenced by environmental conditions, such as higher temperatures, which may have enhanced herbicide detoxification (Figure 1). Similarly, results found by Bond and Walker (2011) suggest that imazamox metabolism in treated rice plants was reduced by cooler temperatures, higher rainfall, and lower solar radiation, leading to a yield penalty. Furthermore, rice emergence occurred 7 and 20 days after plating in 2022 and 2023, respectively (Figure 1). The delayed emergence in 2023 may be attributed to lower temperatures after planting (Figure 1; Mertz et al. 2009); however, the cool, wet conditions that existed did not increase injury prior to flood establishment that year in most cultivars. These results are different from those seen in other research with herbicides such as clomazone (Jordan et al. 1998; O’Barr et al. 2007).

Carotenoids are essential in the photosynthetic process, with one function being the protection of chlorophyll from photooxidation (Anderson and Robertson 1960; Sandman et al. 1991). When carotenoid biosynthesis is interrupted, chlorophyll undergoes photooxidative destruction. Therefore, if injury occurs following a pigment-inhibiting herbicide application like fluridone, a decrease in chlorophyll content is likely to happen, leading to a reduction in the photosynthetic rate (Buttery and Buzzell 1977). The injury caused by fluridone treatments in 2022 did not cause a decrease in the chlorophyll content for any cultivar (Table 5). Conversely, except for ‘RTv7231 MA’, chlorophyll content decreased in all cultivars in 2023, mostly due to the 2× label rate.

Although most cultivars displayed injury levels below 20% in 2022 (Tables 2, 3, and 4), there was a shoot density decrease for ‘CLL15’, ‘CLL16’, ‘Lynx’, ‘RT7321 FP’, ‘RT7521 FP’, and ‘XP753’, primarily caused by the 2× rate (Table 5). The decrease in shoot density among these cultivars was reflected in the groundcover data only for the cultivar ‘Lynx’ at 8 WAE.

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

However, ‘Diamond’, ‘Jupiter’, and ‘Titan’ experienced a reduction in groundcover, even though no reduction in shoot density was detected (Table 5). In 2023, shoot density was reduced due to fluridone treatments only in the cultivars ‘DG263L’, ‘Jupiter’, ‘PVL02’, and ‘RT7521 FP’. As in 2022, cultivars that displayed a reduction in groundcover did not necessarily experience a decrease in shoot density. Groundcover reduction occurred in the cultivars ‘CLL15’, ‘DG263L’, ‘PVL02’, ‘RT7321 FP’, and ‘XP753’. Groundcover is a good predictor of crop yield (Donald 1998); consequently, a significant reduction in groundcover would likely result in reduced rice yield. Butts et al. (2024) observed that fluridone applications to 3-leaf rice on a precision-leveled field resulted in approximately a 45 percentage points decrease in groundcover ten weeks after application at 340 g ai ha^{-1}. The study also showed that although the rice recovered and achieved a similar canopy to the nontreated by 13 weeks after application, yield was still negatively affected.

The delay in reaching 50% heading was no more than 5 days relative to each control in both years (Table 5). Regarding yield, eight cultivars showed a decrease of at least 18% due to the 2× label rate treatment compared to the respective control in 2022. Fluridone treatments did not impact yield in the cultivars ‘CLL16’, ‘Diamond’, ‘PVL02’, and ‘RTv7231 MA’. In 2023, ‘CLL16’, ‘Diamond’, and ‘Titan’ rough rice yields were not affected by fluridone treatment. In contrast, there was a yield reduction ranging from 9% to 49% in all other eight cultivars compared to each control. Among the cultivars that experienced yield loss in 2023, ‘CLL15’ had a yield penalty exclusively from the 1× label rate, ‘DG263L’ and ‘RTv7231MA’ had yield decreases at both rates, and the other cultivars experienced a yield reduction only due to the 2× label rate treatment. Similar to the other variables analyzed, the differences in yield reduction between years were likely due to varying environmental conditions, as yield reductions at the 1× label rate occurred only in 2023.

The cultivars ‘CLL15’, ‘DG263L’, ‘Jupiter’, ‘RT7321 FP’, ‘RT7521 FP’, and ‘XP753’ suffered yield penalty in both years. Conversely, ‘CLL16’ and ‘Diamond’ did not experience a yield penalty at either rate in both years, suggesting that these two cultivars are highly tolerant to fluridone when applied preemergence. Besides the cultivar ‘PVL02’ in 2022, all other cultivars in both years showed a negative impact caused by fluridone on at least one of the variables tested (visible injury, shoot density, groundcover, chlorophyll content, or delayed heading). Among the

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cultivars that suffered a yield penalty, no single factor consistently contributed to the yield reduction. Therefore, none of the evaluated variables can be used individually to predict the likelihood of yield loss.

A preemergence application of fluridone leads to translocation of the herbicide to the leaves, resulting in bleaching and chlorosis in susceptible plants (Sandmann et al. 1991; Waldrep and Taylor 1976). In non-sensitive species, fluridone tolerance is conferred by limited herbicide translocation from the roots to the shoots, as is the case with cotton (Berard et al. 1978). In a study exposing transplanted plants in a solution containing ^{14}C-labeled fluridone, the herbicide translocated more rapidly to rice shoots than to those of corn (*Zea mays* L.), cotton, and soybean [*Glycine max* (L.) Merr.], indicating that rice is more susceptible than these species (Berard et al. 1978). Additionally, Waldrep and Taylor (1976) reported that fluridone is more effective when applied preemergence than when applied to the foliage, and higher injury levels would be expected to occur at this application timing. Therefore, the cultivars evaluated in this study that did not exhibit yield penalty following a preemergence application of fluridone are likely tolerant to this herbicide.

Postemergence experiments

Fluridone applied at the 3-leaf rice growth stage caused no more than 11% injury to any cultivar in 2022 (Tables 6, 7, and 8). In 2023, all cultivars experienced greater injury at 4 and 6 WAT, averaged over fluridone rate, compared to the first evaluation (Table 8). At 2 WAT, injury never exceeded 6%. However, by 6 WAT, injury levels ≥ 20% occurred in the cultivars 'DG263L', 'PVL02', and 'RTv7231 MA', with 39%, 32%, and 20% injury averaged over fluridone rates, respectively. The other cultivars had no more than 15% injury on the last evaluation. As reported in the preemergence experiment, the increase in rice injury in some cultivars in 2023 may be attributed to the flood establishment, which likely enhanced herbicide availability and consequently increased rice injury. In a similar study, a 19-percentage point increase in rice injury was observed at 4 WAT compared to 1 WAT following fluridone application at 340 g ai ha^{-1} at the 3-leaf rice growth stage on a Sharkey-Steele clay soil, likely due to the initiation of irrigation (Butts et al. 2024). In the same study, rice was injured 65% at 8 WAT.

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Given the minimal injury in 2022, out of the twelve cultivars tested, only ‘Diamond’ had a reduction in the chlorophyll content (Table 9). In contrast, the only cultivar that did not have a decrease in chlorophyll content in 2023 was ‘CLL15’. A reduction in groundcover at 8 WAE occurred to the cultivar ‘DG263L’ in both years, while ‘PVL02’ had a decrease in groundcover only in 2023 (Table 9). No other cultivar experienced a negative impact on groundcover. Furthermore, no more than 4 days delay in reaching 50% heading compared to the control was observed.

Given that fluridone applications at the 3-leaf rice stage are labeled at the 1× label rate tested in this study (EPA 2023), no yield penalty should be expected from herbicide treatment at that rate. Minimal injury levels and few reductions in groundcover, chlorophyll content, and little or no delay in heading caused by fluridone treatment were observed in 2022 (Table 6). Consequently, no yield penalty was observed as well. In 2023, eight cultivars experienced a yield penalty, primarily due to the 2× label rate of fluridone. However, only ‘DG263L’ and ‘RT7521 FP’ suffered a yield reduction following the 1× label rate treatment, and language concerning the sensitivity and risk of yield loss of these cultivars should be applied to the existing label. Similarly, a yield reduction following fluridone application of 340 g ai ha^{-1} at the 3-leaf stage on a precision-leveled field has been reported, with the cultivar ‘RT7521 FP’ showing a 21% yield penalty (Butts et al. 2024).

Considering the high injury level displayed by ‘DG263L’ (up to 32%) coupled with the reduction in groundcover and chlorophyll content at the 1× label rate, the yield loss experienced by this cultivar was expected. However, little injury occurred to ‘RT7521 FP’ and there was no negative effect in any other variable evaluated at the 1× label rate. Therefore, further research is needed to better understand the tolerance of ‘RT7521 FP’ to fluridone. Yield for the cultivars ‘CLL16’, ‘Diamond’, and ‘XP753’ was not affected in either rate in both years by fluridone treatment, indicating that these cultivars are tolerant to 1× and 2× of the currently labeled fluridone rates applied at the 3-leaf growth stage.

Practical Implications

The labeling of fluridone in rice offers a new site of action for growers to control annual broadleaf and grass weeds, especially Palmer amaranth. Applications at the labeled rate can be safely made at the 3-leaf rice stage for most cultivars. However, yield loss occurred to ‘DG263L’

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and 'RT7521 FP' when treated with the labeled rate of fluridone. Therefore, growers must be careful with cultivar selection if fluridone is going to be a part of the weed management program. Fluridone applications should be avoided in rice fields planted with 'DG263L' and later flooded, and further research is needed to evaluate the tolerance of the cultivar 'RT7521 FP' as it did not display high injury levels (≤ 11%) but suffered yield penalty at the labeled rate in one of the years.

Fluridone is highly effective when applied preemergence (Waldrep and Taylor 1976) and is expected to cause more injury to rice when applied at this time. Previous research has suggested that the growth stage at application affects rice cultivar tolerance to herbicides (Bond and Walker 2011, 2012; Wright et al. 2021). Although direct comparisons are not statistically allowed, based on the findings presented here, rice appears more tolerant to fluridone when applied at the 3-leaf growth stage than preemergence. Thus, preemergence applications of fluridone in rice should be avoided. Additionally, although the label specifies a zero-day plant-back interval (EPA 2023), rice should not be replanted in fields treated with fluridone immediately after application. Additional research is needed to determine the most appropriate rice plant-back interval following fluridone application for label clarification. Moreover, the lack of a labeled preemergence application and tolerance of the crop to fluridone applied preemergence complicates Palmer amaranth management because residual control is provided by fluridone, meaning an alternative option would be needed for weeds that have emerged by the 3-leaf stage of rice.

Furthermore, environmental conditions likely substantially impact the degree of crop response from fluridone based on the visible injury, shoot density, chlorophyll content, and yield assessments reported here. Cool, wet conditions, more extreme than those tested here, may further increase the extent of injury to rice from postemergence application; however, delaying fluridone until the 3-leaf stage of rice should result in warmer conditions than those experienced during crop germination and emergence earlier in the growing season. Additionally, further research is needed to determine the influence of water availability on rice tolerance to fluridone under different water management techniques, such as furrow irrigation, which lacks flooding in most of the field, and alternating wetting and drying where flooding occurs intermittently.

Acknowledgments

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This research was conducted in collaboration with SePRO Corporation. The University of Arkansas System Division of Agriculture provided infrastructure and equipment.

Funding

Partial support for this research was provided by SePRO Corporation and the Arkansas Rice Research and Promotion Board.

Competing Interests

The authors declare none.

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

References

Anderson IC, Robertson DS (1960) Role of carotenoids in protecting chlorophyll from photodestruction. Plant Physiol 35:531-534

Bagavathiannan MV, Norsworthy JK, Scott RC (2011) Comparison of weed management programs for furrow-irrigated and flooded hybrid rice production in Arkansas. Weed Technol 25:556-562

Bartels PG, Watson CW (1978) Inhibition of carotenoid synthesis by fluridone and norflurazon. Weed Sci 26:198-203

Beesinger JW, Norsworthy JK, Butts T, Roberts T (2022) Rice tolerance to multiple applications of florpyrauxifen-benzyl alone and followed by benzobicyclon. Crop Forage Turfgrass Manag 8:e20162

Berard DF, Rainey DP, Lin CC (1978) Absorption, translocation, and metabolism of fluridone in selected crop species. Weed Sci 26:252-254

Bond JA, Walker TW (2012) Effect of postflood quinclorac applications on commercial rice cultivars. Weed Technol 26:183-188

Bond JA, Walker TW (2011) Differential tolerance of Clearfield rice cultivars to imazamox. Weed Technol 25:192-197

Brooks ME, Kristensen K, van Benthem KJ, Magnusson A, Berg CW, Nielsen A, Skaug HJ, Mächler M, Bolker BM (2017) glmmTMB balances speed and flexibility among packages for zero-inflated generalized linear mixed modeling. R J 9:378–400

Buttery BR, Buzzell RI (1977) The relationship between chlorophyll content and rate of photosynthesis in soybeans. Can J Plant Sci 5:1-5

Butts TR, Souza MCCR, Norsworthy JK, Barber LT, Hardke JT (2024) Rice response to fluridone following topsoil removal on a precision-leveled field. Agrosystems Geoscis Environ 7:e20541

Butts TR, Kouame KB, Norsworthy JK, Barber LT (2022) Arkansas rice: herbicide resistance concerns, production practices, and weed management costs. Front Agron 4:881667

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Donald WW (1998) Estimated soybean (*Glycine max*) yield loss from herbicide damage using ground cover or rated stunting. Weed Sci 4:454-458

Fox J, Weisberg S (2019) Nonlinear regression, nonlinear least squares, and nonlinear mixed models in R. An R companion to applied regression. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA. 608 p

Gbur EE, Stroup WW, McCarter KS, Durham S, Young LJ, Christman W, West M, Kramer M (2012) Analysis of generalized linear mixed models in the agricultural and natural resources of sciences. 1st ed. Madison WI, USA: American Society of Agronomy, Soil Science Society of America, and Crop Science of America. Pp 109-184

Grichar WJ, Dotray P, McGinty J (2020) Using fluridone herbicide systems for weed control in Texas cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.). J Adv Agric 11:1-14

Griffin JL, Baker JB (1990) Tolerance of rice (*Oryza sativa*) cultivars to fenoxaprop, sethoxydim, and haloxyfop. Weed Sci 38:528-531

Hamilton JD ed (1994) Time series analysis. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Pp 53-71

Hardcastle WS (1979) Soybean (*Glycine max*) cultivar response to metribuzin in solution culture. Weed Sci 27:278-279

Hardke JT (2023) Trends in Arkansas rice production, 2023. B.R. Wells Arkansas Rice Research Studies 2023: Overview and verification. University of Arkansas System Division of Agriculture, Cooperative Extension Service

Henry C, Daniels M, Hamilton M, Hardke JT (2021) Water management. Pages 103–123 *in* Rice Production Handbook. Little Rock: University of Arkansas System Division of Agriculture Research and Extension

Hill ZT, Norsworthy JK, Barber LT, Gbur E (2016) Residual weed control in cotton with fluridone. J Cotton Sci 20:76-85

Hothorn T, Bretz F, Westfall P (2008) multcomp: Simultaneous inference in general parametric models. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=multcomp. Accessed: September 20, 2024

Jordan DL, Bollich PK, Burns AB, Walker DM (1998) Rice (*Oryza sativa*) response to clomazone. Weed Sci 46:374-380

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

King TA, JK Norsworthy, Butts TR, Fernandes SB, Drescher GL, Avent TH (2024) Effect of Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) time of emergence on furrow-irrigated rice yields and weed seed production. Weed Sci (under review)

Kiss R, Deák B, Tóthmérész B, Miglécz T, Tóth K, Török P, Lukács K, Godó L, Körmöczi Z, Radócz S, Borza S (2021) Zoochory on and off: A field experiment for trait-based analysis of establishment success of grassland species. J Veg Sci 32:e13051

Lenth RV (2022) *emmeans*: Estimated marginal means, aka least-squares means. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=emmeans. Accessed: September 21, 2024

Martin SM, Norsworthy JK, Scott RC, Hardke J, Lorenz GM (2018) Effect of thiamethoxam on injurious herbicides in rice. Adv Crop Sci Tech 6:1000351

Maun MA, Barrett SC (1986) The biology of Canadian weeds. 77. *Echinochloa crus-galli* (L.) Beauv. Can J Plant Sci 66:739-759

Mertz LM, Henning FA, Soares RC, Baldiga RF, Peske FB, Moraes DM (2009) Physiological changes in rice seeds exposed to cold during the germination stage. Rev Bras Sementes 31:262-270

Montgomery GB, Bond JA, Golden BR, Gore J, Edwards HM, Eubank TW, Walker TW (2014) Response of commercial rice cultivars to postemergence applications of saflufenacil. Weed Technol 28:679-684

O'Barr JH, McCauley GN, Bovey RW, Senseman SA, Chandler JM (2007) Rice response to clomazone as influenced by application rate, soil type, and planting date. Weed Technol 21:199-205

Oerke EC (2006) Crop losses to pests. J Agri Sci 144:31-43

Riar DS, Norsworthy JK (2011) Use of imazosulfuron in herbicide programs for drill-seeded rice (*Oryza sativa*) in the mid-South United States. Weed Technol 25:548-555

Roberts TL, Slaton N, Wilson C, Norman R (2016) Soil fertility. Pages 69–102 *in* Rice Production Handbook. Little Rock: University of Arkansas System Division of Agriculture Research and Extension

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Sandmann G, Böger P (1997) Phytoene desaturase as a target for bleaching herbicides. Pages 1-10 *in* Roe RM, Burton JD, Kuhr R. J eds. Herbicide Activity: Toxicology, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology. Amsterdam, NL: IOS Press

Sandmann G, Schmidt A, Linden H, Böger P (1991) Phytoene desaturase, the essential target for bleaching herbicides. Weed Sci 39:474-479

Searle SR, Speed FM, Milliken GA (1980) Population marginal means in the linear model: An alternative to least squares means. Am Stat 34:216–221

Stroup WW (2015) Rethinking the analysis of non-normal data in plant and soil science. Agron J 107:811-827

[USDA - NASS] United States Department of Agriculture – National Agricultural Statistics Survey (2024) Rice Yearbook: U.S. rice acreage, production, and yield. https://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/rice-yearbook/. Accessed: August 21, 2024

[USDA - NASS] United States Department of Agriculture – National Agricultural Statistics Survey (2022) 2021 Agricultural chemical use survey. https://www.nass.usda.gov/Surveys/Guide_to_NASS_Surveys/Chemical_Use/2021_Field_Crops/chemhighlights-rice.pdf. Accessed: August 27, 2024

[US EPA] United States Environmental Protection Agency (2023) Brake® herbicide product label. Carmel, IN, US: SePRO Corporation. https://www3.epa.gov/pesticides/chem_search/ppls/067690-00078-20230124.pdf. Accessed: August 24, 2024

Waldrep TW, Taylor HM (1976) 1-Methyl-3-phenyl-5-[3-(trifluoromethyl) phenyl]-4 (1H)-pyridinone, a new herbicide. J Agric Food Chem 24:1250-1251

Wright HE, Norsworthy JK, Roberts TL, Scott R, Hardke J, Gbur EE (2021) Characterization of rice cultivar response to florpyrauxifen-benzyl. Weed Technol 35:82-92

Ziska LH, Gealy DR, Burgos N, Caicedo AL, Gressel J, Lawton-Rauh AL, Avila LA, Theisen G, Norsworthy JK, Ferrero A, Vidotto F, Johnson DE, Ferreira FG, Marchesan E, Menezes V, Cohn MA, Linscombe S, Carmona L, Tang R, Merotto A (2015) Weedy (red) rice: an emerging constraint to global rice production. Adv Agron 129:181–228

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1. List of rice cultivars, technology, seeding rate, description, and producer. [a]

Cultivar	Technology	Seeding rate	Description	Producer
		seeds m^{-1} of row		
CLL15	Clearfield	72	long-grain, pureline	Horizon Ag, LLC., Memphis, TN
CLL16	Clearfield	72	long-grain, pureline	Horizon Ag, LLC., Memphis, TN
DG263L	Conventional	72	long-grain, pureline	Nutrien Ag Solutions, Inc. Saskatoon, SK, Canada
Diamond	Conventional	72	long-grain, pureline	UADA, Stuttgart, AR
Jupiter	Conventional	72	medium-grain, pureline	UADA, Stuttgart, AR
Lynx	Conventional	72	medium-grain, pureline	UADA, Stuttgart, AR
Titan	Conventional	72	medium-grain, pureline	UADA, Stuttgart, AR
PVL02	Provisia	72	long-grain, pureline	Horizon Ag, LLC., Memphis, TN
RTv 7231 MA	MaxAce	52	long-grain, pureline	RiceTec, Inc., Alvin, TX
RT 7321 FP	FullPage	36	long-grain, hybrid	RiceTec, Inc., Alvin, TX
RT 7521 FP	FullPage	36	long-grain, hybrid	RiceTec, Inc., Alvin, TX
XP 753	Conventional	36	long-grain, hybrid	RiceTec, Inc., Alvin, TX

[a] Abbreviations: UADA, University of Arkansas System Division of Agriculture.

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 2. Rice cultivar injury as influenced by rate and evaluation timing interaction by year following preemergence applications of fluridone. [a,b,c,d]

Cultivar	Rate	2022			2023		
		2WAE	4WAE	6WAE	2WAE	4WAE	6WAE
		-------------------------------------%			--------------------------		
	g ai ha^{-1}			-------------			
CLL15	168	10	7	4	4	3	47
	336	14	10	9	5	2	36
	P-value		0.2816			0.1791	
CLL16	168	11	11	2	1	3	11
	336	17	16	4	2	2	9
	P-value		0.6363			0.6508	
DG263L	168	6 b	6 b	3 c	14	15	50
	336	10 b	16 a	20 a	19	25	65
	P-value		**<0.0001**			0.7609	
Diamond	168	5	4	3	1	1	3
	336	11	12	9	6	2	13
	P-value		0.3283			0.2885	
Jupiter	168	9 b	8 b	4 c	3	3	2
	336	19 a	17 a	15 a	8	4	4
	P-value		**0.0109**			0.7410	
Lynx	168	11 b	12 b	4 c	-	-	-
	336	19 ab	16 b	22 a	-	-	-
	P-value		**<0.0001**				
PVL02	168	9 abc	6 bc	0 d	9	7	26
	336	15 a	11 ab	5 c	23	23	53
	P-value		**0.0007**			0.8038	
RT7321 FP	168	13 ab	11 b	5 c	37	42	42
	336	24 a	19 ab	18 ab	40	35	30
	P-value		**0.0033**			0.0925	
RT7521 FP	168	10 bc	8 c	1 d	23 a	11 b	4 c

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

	336	20 a	19 a	18 ab	37 a	31 a	24 a
	P-value		**<0.0001**			**0.0037**	
RTv7231 MA	168	5 bc	3 cd	1 d	3 b	3 b	3 b
	336	12 a	10 ab	9 ab	6 b	8 b	33 a
	P-value		**0.0209**			**<0.0001**	
Titan	168	5 ab	6 ab	3 b	0	1	1
	336	14 a	11 a	12 a	6	3	6
	P-value		**0.0309**			0.1972	
XP753	168	8 bc	2 cd	1 d	15 c	7 d	1 e
	336	20 a	16 ab	15 ab	30 b	27 b	49 a
	P-value		**0.0082**			**<0.0001**	

[a] Abbreviations: WAE, weeks after emergence.

[b] Bolded values indicate significance at α = 0.05.

[c] Means within a cultivar by year for the fluridone rate by evaluation timing interaction followed by the same letter are not different according to Tukey HSD (α = 0.05).

[d] Flood establishment occurred 4 weeks after emergence in both years.

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 3. Rice cultivar injury as influenced by the main effect rate by year following preemergence applications of fluridone. [a,b]

Cultivar	Rate	2022	2023
		---------------------%----------------------	
CLL15	168	7	18
	336	11	14
	P-value	0.2378	0.7402
CLL16	168	8*	5
	336	12	4
	P-value	**0.0043**	0.4872
DG263L	168	5	26
	336	15	36
	P-value	**0.0308**	0.1342
Diamond	168	4*	2*
	336	11	7
	P-value	**0.0001**	**<0.0001**
Jupiter	168	7	3
	336	17	5
	P-value	**<0.0001**	0.1411
Lynx	168	9	-
	336	19	-
	P-value	**0.0056**	-
PVL02	168	5	14*
	336	10	33
	P-value	**0.0384**	**0.0215**
RT7321 FP	168	10	40
	336	20	35
	P-value	**0.0142**	0.5864
RT7521 FP	168	6	13

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

	336	19	31
	P-value	**0.0016**	**0.0193**
RTv7231	168	5	3
MA	336	10	16
	P-value	**0.0009**	0.2989
Titan	168	5	1*
	336	12	5
	P-value	**0.0045**	**<0.0001**
XP753	168	4	8
	336	17	35
	P-value	**0.0008**	**<0.0001**

[a] Bolded values indicate significance at α = 0.05 based on pairwise comparisons.

[b] Asterisks indicate a difference between fluridone rates averaged over WAE within the same column for each cultivar by year when interaction is not present.

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 4. Rice cultivar injury as influenced by the main effect application timing by year following preemergence applications of fluridone. [a,b,c,d,e]

Cultivar	Application timing					
	2022			2023		
	2WAE	4WAE	6WAE	2WAE	4WAE	6WAE
	-------------------------------------%---------------------------------------					
CLL15	12 a	9 ab	7 b	5 b	3 b	42 a
P-value		**0.0057**			<**0.0001**	
CLL16	14 a	14 a	3 b	2 b	3 b	10 a
P-value		<**0.0001**			**0.0006**	
DG263L	8	11	12	17 b	20 b	58 a
P-value		<**0.0001**			<**0.0001**	
Diamond	8	8	6	4 b	2 b	8 a
P-value		0.05467			**0.0022**	
Jupiter	14	13	10	6	4	3
P-value		<**0.0001**			0.9810	
Lynx	15	14	13	-	-	-
P-value		<**0.0001**				
PVL02	12	9	3	16 b	15 b	40 a
P-value		<**0.0001**			<**0.0001**	
RT7321 FP	19	15	12	39	39	36
P-value		<**0.0001**			0.5545	
RT7521 FP	15	14	10	30	21	14
P-value		<**0.0001**			<**0.0001**	
RTv7231 MA	9	7	5	5	6	18
P-value		**0.0006**			0.9137	
Titan	10	9	8	3	2	4

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

P-value		**0.0170**			0.7269	
XP753	14	9	8	23	17	25
P-value		**0.0003**			**<0.0001**	

[a] Abbreviations: WAE, weeks after emergence.

[b] Bolded values indicate significance at α = 0.05.

[c] Means within the same row for each cultivar by year followed by the same letter are not different according to Tukey HSD (α = 0.05).

[d] When interaction is present, means for the main effect evaluation timing is not separated by letters.

[e] Flood establishment occurred 4 weeks after emergence in both years.

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 5. Rice shoot density, groundcover, chlorophyll content, heading date, and rough rice yield as influenced by the main effect rate by year following preemergence applications of fluridone. [a,b,c,d]

Cultivar	Rate	2022					2023				
		Shoot density	Groundcover	Chlorophyll content	Heading date	Yield	Shoot density	Groundcover	Chlorophyll content	Heading date	Yield
	g ai ha^{-1}	plants m^{-1}	%	SPAD	days delayed	kg ha^{-1}	plants m^{-1}	%	SPAD	days delayed	kg ha^{-1}
CLL15	0	56 a	100	35	- -	8,920 a	34	100 a	43 a	- -	8,010 a
	168	49 ab	100	35	3	9,560 a	36	92 b	11 b	2	4,100 b
	336	46 b	100	34	5	7,300 b	33	93 b	19 b	3	6,890 ab
	P-value	**0.0004**	0.5943	0.8457	0.1614	**<0.0001**	0.6480	**0.0306**	**<0.0001**	0.0833	**0.0045**
CLL16	0	55 a	100	33	- -	10,270	32	99	37 a	- -	8,030
	168	50 ab	100	33	-1 b	10,050	34	99	28 b	2	7,930
	336	46 b	100	33	3 a	9,750	34	98	26 b	2	7,210
	P-value	**<0.0001**	0.2385	0.8609	**0.0015**	0.3801	0.8127	0.0557	**<0.0001**	0.2207	0.6062
DG263L	0	53	99	34	- -	11,470 a	24 a	95 a	29 a	- -	9,900 a
	168	52	99	33	0 b	11,060 a	23 a	94 a	20 ab	3 b	6,850 b

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

	336	51	98	33	2 a	5,360 b	19 b	86 b	14 b	5 a	7,590 b
	P-value	0.8043	0.4126	0.1428	**0.0023**	**<0.0001**	**<0.0001**	**0.0008**	**<0.0001**	**<0.0001**	**<0.0001**
Diamond	0	47	95 a	38	- -	10,160	31	97	40 a	- -	9,950
	168	47	92 a	37	-2	11,000	28	98	40 a	0	9,880
	336	47	85 b	36	1	9,670	27	96	26 b	0	9,110
	P-value	0.9960	**0.0317**	0.0515	0.1456	0.1614	0.2283	0.3211	**<0.0001**	0.1930	0.5270
Jupiter	0	55	99 a	35	- -	9,920 a	18 a	92	44 a	- -	7,450 a
	168	48	98 a	35	0 b	9,370 a	18 a	92	44 a	0 b	6,680 a
	336	45	84 b	36	2 a	6,970 b	15 b	87	32 b	2 a	3,940 b
	P-value	0.2474	**<0.0001**	0.5459	**<0.0001**	**0.0398**	**0.0050**	0.4462	**<0.0001**	**<0.0001**	**0.0049**
Lynx	0	43 a	97 a	34	- -	11,070 a					
	168	39 ab	96 a	36	3	10,800 a	-	-	-	-	-
	336	34 b	85 b	36	1	6,070 b					
	P-value	**0.0076**	**<0.0001**	0.5258	0.3239	**<0.0001**					
PVL02	0	51	98	33	- -	9,520	36 a	97 a	35 a	- -	8,230 a
	168	52	100	32	1	8,890	35 ab	94 ab	40 a	0	6,100 ab
	336	49	97	32	2	9,320	28 b	91 b	24 b	1	5,170 b
	P-value	0.8482	0.4131	0.2616	0.3458	0.3111	**0.0052**	**0.0098**	**<0.0001**	0.3672	**0.0023**

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 5. (Cont.)

		2022					2023				
Cultivar	Rate	Shoot density	Groundcover	Chlorophyll content	Heading date	Yield	Shoot density	Groundcover	Chlorophyll content	Heading date	Yield
	g ai ha^{-1}	plants m^{-1}	%	SPAD	days delayed	kg ha^{-1}	plants m^{-1}	%	SPAD	days delayed	kg ha^{-1}
RT7321	0					16,01					11,31
FP		32 a	100	34	- -	0 a	19	98 a	39 a	- -	0 a
	168					14,69					10,94
		27 b	100	36	0	0 ab	17	87 b	14 b	1	0 ab
	336					11,85					10,25
		27 b	100	34	0	0 b	17	98 a	21 b	0	0 b
	P-value	**0.0013**	0.9520	0.1653	0.0963	**0.0006**	0.0565	**0.0096**	**<0.0001**	0.1134	**0.0009**
RT7521	0					14,01					14,70
FP		38 a	100	36	- -	0 a	24 a	99	38 a	- -	0 a
	168					13,35					13,27
		36 b	100	38	0 b	0 ab	20 b	99	36 a	1	0 ab
	336					10,42					11,97
		35 b	100	35	4 a	0 b	20 b	98	24 b	3	0 b
	P-value	**<0.0001**	0.1939	0.2048	**<0.0001**	**0.0017**	**0.0002**	0.3848	**<0.0001**	0.1244	**0.0099**
RTv7231	0	40	100	36	- -	12,04	29	99	36	- -	12,37 a

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

MA						0					0
	168					12,14					
		43	100	36	0	0	29	99	32	0	9,490 b
	336					10,25					
		40	100	36	1	0	30	98	27	0	9,040 b
	P-value	0.0751	0.1023	0.6175	0.1573	0.1044	0.7737	0.4863	0.0882	0.9888	**<0.0001**
Titan	0					10,03					
		60	99 a	38 ab	- -	0 a	32	98	43 a	- -	7,540
	168					10,01					
		60	100 a	37 b	-3	0 a	30	99	41 a	0	8,200
	336	60	94 b	39 a	-1	7,030 b	30	99	27 b	0	7,390
	P-value	0.9423	**0.0001**	0.0680	0.2963	**0.0005**	0.2936	0.4268	**<0.0001**	0.7184	0.1710
XP753	0					15,66					14,59
		42 a	100	35	- -	0 a	22	99 a	40 a	- -	0 a
	168					15,78					14,56
		38 ab	100	35	0	0 a	19	98 a	38 a	0 b	0 a
	336					12,83					12,52
		36 b	99	34	2	0 b	19	95 b	25 b	3 a	0 b
	P-value	**0.0003**	0.0785	0.7842	0.1944	**<0.0001**	0.0525	**<0.0001**	**<0.0001**	**<0.0001**	**0.0243**

[a] SPAD: soil plant analysis development value, an indirect estimate of chlorophyll content

[b] Bolded values indicate statistical significance at α = 0.05

[c] Means within a column followed by the same letter are not different according to Tukey HSD (α = 0.05).

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[d] Hyphens (-) represent a delay in heading of zero for the control.

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 6. Rice cultivar injury as influenced by rate and evaluation timing interaction by year following fluridone applications at the 3-leaf rice. [a,b,c,d]

Cultivar	Rate	2022				2023		
		2WAT	4WAT	6WAE		2WAT	4WAT	6WAT
		-------------------------------------%---------------------------						
	g ai ha^{-1}			------------				
CLL15	168	1	1	0		0	2	3
	336	1	1	1		2	13	12
	P-value		0.7039				0.5987	
CLL16	168	1	0	0		0	4	2
	336	1	0	1		2	12	11
	P-value		0.5331				0.2933	
DG263L	168	1	1	1		0	22	32
	336	3	2	10		1	38	45
	P-value		0.3237				0.8293	
Diamond	168	2 bc	1 cd	0 d		1	8	5
	336	3 b	4 ab	8 a		2	18	18
	P-value		**<0.0001**				0.2283	
Jupiter	168	2	1	3		0	11	4
	336	3	5	9		2	24	15
	P-value		0.2486				0.2479	
Lynx	168	1	3	5	3	-	-	-
	336	2	5	11	6			
	P-value		0.9084					
PVL02	168	1	1	1		1	15	20
	336	1	1	4		6	36	44
	P-value		0.3546				0.5179	
RT7321 FP	168	1	1	1		0	7	4
	336	1	1	1		2	20	16

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

	P-value		0.6770			0.4774	
RT7521 FP	168	1	0	0	1	11	7
	336	1	2	3	1	19	13
	P-value		0.2089			0.9275	
RTv7231 MA	168	0	1	0	1	10	9
	336	1	1	2	4	28	30
	P-value		0.0638			0.9721	
Titan	168	1	1	1	1	8	5
	336	2	5	8	2	19	18
	P-value		0.2987			0.4141	
XP753	168	2	1	1	0	12	9
	336	3	4	2	1	26	21
	P-value		0.5032			0.5468	

[a] Abbreviations: WAT, weeks after treatment.

[b] Bolded values indicate statistical significance at α = 0.05.

[c] Means within a cultivar by year for the fluridone rate by evaluation timing interaction followed by the same letter are not different according to Tukey HSD (α = 0.05).

[d] Flood establishment occurred 4 weeks after emergence in both years.

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 7. Rice cultivar injury as influenced by the main effect rate by year following fluridone applications at the 3-leaf rice. [a,b]

Cultivar	Rate	2022	2023
		---------------------%---------------------	
CLL15	168	1	2
	336	1	9
	P-value	0.5399	0.1460
CLL16	168	0	2*
	336	1	8
	P-value	0.4909	**0.0010**
DG263L	168	1*	18
	336	5	28
	P-value	**0.0203**	0.4419
Diamond	168	1	7*
	336	5	19
	P-value	**0.0296**	**0.0223**
Jupiter	168	2*	5*
	336	6	14
	P-value	**0.0194**	**0.0055**
Lynx	168	3	-
	336	6	-
	P-value	0.5077	-
PVL02	168	1	12*
	336	2	29
	P-value	0.6488	**0.0005**
RT7321 FP	168	1	4*
	336	1	13
	P-value	0.5978	**0.0011**
RT7521 FP	168	0	6
	336	2	11
	P-value	0.3436	0.5443

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

RTv7231	168	0	7*
MA	336	1	21
	P-value	0.4789	**0.0409**
Titan	168	1	5*
	336	5	13
	P-value	0.1040	**0.0184**
XP753	168	1	7*
	336	3	16
	P-value	0.5173	**0.0141**

[a] Bolded values indicate significance at $\alpha = 0.05$ based on pairwise comparisons.

[b] Asterisks indicate a difference between fluridone rates averaged over WAE within the same column for each cultivar by year when interaction is not present.

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 8. Rice cultivar injury as influenced by the main effect application timing by year following fluridone applications at the 3-leaf rice. [a,b,c,d,e]

	Application timing					
	2022			2023		
Cultivar	2WAT	4WAT	6WAT	2WAT	4WAT	6WAT
	------------------------------------%---------------------------------------					
CLL15	1	1	1	1 b	8 a	8 a
P-value		0.4983			**0.0369**	
CLL16	1	1	1	1 b	8 a	7 a
P-value		0.0875			<**0.0001**	
DG263L	2	2	6	1 b	30 a	39 a
P-value		0.8035			<**0.0001**	
Diamond	3	3	4	2 b	13 a	12 a
P-value		**0.0008**			<**0.0001**	
Jupiter	3 b	3 b	6 a	1 c	18 a	10 b
P-value		**0.0033**			<**0.0001**	
Lynx	2	4	8	-	-	-
P-value		0.0784				
PVL02	1	1	3	4 b	26 a	32 a
P-value		0.2713			<**0.0001**	
RT7321 FP	1	1	1	1 c	14 a	10 b
P-value		0.9685			<**0.0001**	
RT7521 FP	1	1	2	1 b	15 a	10 a
P-value		0.5612			<**0.0001**	
RTv7231 MA	0	1	1	3 b	19 a	20 a
P-value		0.3310			**0.0002**	
Titan	2	3	5	2 b	14 a	12 a

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

P-value		0.6645			**<0.0001**	
XP753	3	3	2	1 c	19 a	15 b
P-value		0.3222			**<0.0001**	

[a] Abbreviations: WAT, weeks after treatment.

[b] Bolded values indicate significance at α = 0.05.

[c] Means within the same row for each cultivar by year followed by the same letter are not different according to Tukey HSD (α = 0.05).

[d] When interaction is present, means for the main effect evaluation timing is not separated by letters.

[e] Flood establishment occurred 4 weeks after emergence in both years.

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 9. Groundcover, chlorophyll content, heading date, and rough rice yield as influenced by the main effect rate by year following fluridone applications at the 3-leaf rice stage. [a,b,c,d]

		2022				2023			
Cultivar	Rate	Groundcover	Chlorophyll content	Heading date	Yield	Groundcover	Chlorophyll content	Heading date	Yield
	g ai ha^{-1}	%	SPAD	days delayed	kg ha^{-1}	%	SPAD	days delayed	kg ha^{-1}
CLL15	0	99	34	- -	9,060	99	41	- -	7,920 a
	168	100	35	2	8,630	99	44	1	8,280 a
	336	100	34	2	9,590	99	36	1	5,880 b
	P-value	0.1400	0.1724	0.8690	0.2927	0.1010	0.0994	0.9752	**<0.0001**
CLL16	0	100	32	- -	10,370	100	41 a	- -	8,170
	168	100	33	-1	9,340	99	42 a	0	7,670
	336	100	34	0	10,330	100	36 b	-1	7,730
	P-value	0.2921	0.2677	0.5201	0.1550	0.1138	**0.0283**	0.2059	0.6629
DG263L	0	100 a	30	- -	10,800	97 a	35 a	- -	12,440 a
	168	100 a	30	0 b	11,010	93 ab	18 b	1	9,700 b

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

	336	99 b	31	1 a	9,720	84 c	17 b	3	7,000 c
	P-value	**<0.0001**	0.4086	**0.0005**	0.0911	**0.0004**	**<0.0001**	0.0909	**<0.0001**
Diamond	0	97	37 a	- -	9,520	95	43 a	-	10,660
	168	96	35 b	-1	10,020	95	36 b	0	9,560
	336	94	34 b	1	9,190	96	28 c	2	9,410
	P-value	0.4211	**<0.0001**	0.4049	0.4518	0.6070	**<0.0001**	0.5360	0.0656
Jupiter	0	99	36	- -	10,320	92	45 a	-	8,220 a
	168	99	36	0	9,600	92	32 b	1	6,690 ab
	336	99	34	0	9,580	88	24 c	1	5,380 b
	P-value	0.4836	0.5075	0.6834	0.8706	0.4462	**<0.0001**	0.8174	**0.0127**
Lynx	0	100	35	- -	10,090				
	168	100	36	0	10,070	-	-	-	-
	336	100	35	0	10,040				
	P-value	0.1847	0.4288	0.6985	0.9946				
PVL02	0	99	31	- -	11,170	98 a	40 a	- -	8,310 a

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

168				10,84				
	100	30	0	0	96 a	33 b	2	6,650 a
336				11,16				
	100	30	0	0	85 b	22 c	4	4,690 b
P-value	0.4137	0.3109	0.9901	0.1723	**<0.0001**	**<0.0001**	0.4328	**<0.0001**

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 9. (Cont.)

		2022				2023			
Cultivar	Rate	Groundcover	Chlorophyll content	Heading date	Yield	Groundcover	Chlorophyll content	Heading date	Yield
	g ai ha^{-1}	%	SPAD	days delayed	kg ha^{-1}	%	SPAD	days delayed	kg ha^{-1}
RT7321 FP	0	100	32	- -	12,640	100	39 a	- -	10,420 a
	168	100	33	0	12,220	99	37 a	0	9,410 ab
	336	100	32	0	12,770	100	20 b	0	8,080 b
	P-value	0.3890	0.1779	0.5465	0.6454	0.3014	**<0.0001**	0.7353	**0.0022**
RT7521 FP	0	100	35	- -	14,710	100	39 a	- -	14,580 a
	168	100	37	1	15,580	99	35 a	1	11,280 b
	336	99	35	0	14,130	99	21 b	1	11,190 b
	P-value	0.2073	0.0597	0.4347	0.1105	0.1671	**<0.0001**	0.2475	**0.0002**
RTv7231	0	100	34	- -	11,75	99	40 a	- -	12,30 a

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

MA					0				0
	168				11,62				10,50
		100	35	0	0	99	38 a	0	0 a
	336				11,06				
		100	33	1	0	99	26 b	0	7,080 b
	P-value	0.2331	0.3499	0.2207	0.4852	0.8727	**0.0001**	0.6038	<**0.0001**
Titan	0	100	37	- -	8,495	99	43 a	- -	8,690 a
	168	100	37	0	8,970	99	29 b	2	8,650 a
	336	100	37	0	8,480	99	20 c	0	5,810 b
	P-value	0.7027	0.9656	0.1696	0.2469	0.0598	<**0.0001**	0.3059	<**0.0001**
XP753	0				16,13				14,13
		100	34	- -	0	99	40 a	- -	0
	168				14,73				13,01
		100	35	0	0	99	27 b	0	0
	336				13,84				12,59
		100	34	0	0	99	19 c	2	0
	P-value	0.3493	0.7996	0.8174	0.3458	0.1959	<**0.0001**	0.0961	0.2526

[a] SPAD: soil plant analysis development value, an indirect estimate of chlorophyll content

[b] Bolded values indicate statistical significance at α = 0.05

[c] Means within a column followed by the same letter are not different according to Tukey HSD (α = 0.05).

[d] Hyphens (-) represent a delay in heading of zero for the control.

https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2025.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press



Figure 1. Daily results of observed accumulated rainfall (mm) and air temperature (C) over a 24-hour period, from the planting until the last day of rice injury evaluation in Colt, AR, from 2022 and 2023.