

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.2024.28

Pink Purslane (*Portulaca pilosa*) Control with Postemergence Herbicides

Nicholas J. Shay¹ and Eric P. Prostko²

¹Graduate Research Assistant (ORCHID 0000-0002-6638-580X), Department Crop and Soil Sciences, The University of Georgia, Tifton, GA;

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

Author for Correspondence: Nicholas J. Shay, Graduate Research Assistant, Department Crop and Soil Sciences, The University of Georgia, 2360 Rainwater Road, Tifton, GA 31794. Email: nicholas.shay@uga.edu

Short Title: Pink Purslane Control

Nomenclature: acifluorfen; atrazine; bentazon; carfentrazone; chlorimuron; dicamba; diclosulam; diuron; fomesafen; glyphosate; glufosinate; imazapic; lactofen; mesotrione; paraquat; tembotrione; tolypyralate; topramezone; 2,4-D choline; 2,4-DB; pink purslane, *Portulaca pilosa* L. PORPI.

This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives licence (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is unaltered and is properly cited. The written permission of Cambridge University Press must be obtained for commercial re-use or in order to create a derivative work.

Abstract

Pink purslane is often ranked as one of the most troublesome weeds in vegetable production systems in Georgia. Pink purslane encroachment along the field edges and in-field of agronomic crops has recently increased. Postemergence (POST) herbicides are an effective component of agronomic crop weed management. However, little research has addressed pink purslane control in agronomic crops. Therefore, greenhouse and field studies were conducted from 2022 to 2023 in Tifton, Georgia, to evaluate the response of pink purslane to POST herbicides commonly used in agronomic crops. Greenhouse screening provided preliminary evidence whereby 13 of the 21 POST herbicides evaluated provided $\geq 80\%$ above-ground biomass reductions. These 13 herbicides were then used for field studies. Results from the field studies, pooled across two locations, indicated only 3 of the 13 herbicides provided above-ground biomass reductions $\geq 70\%$ compared to the non-treated control. These herbicides included atrazine at $1682 \text{ g ai ha}^{-1}$, glufosinate at 656 g ai ha^{-1} , and lactofen at 219 g ai ha^{-1} with 79%, 70%, and 83% biomass reduction, respectively ($P < 0.05$). This research suggests that many of the POST herbicides used in agronomic crops will not effectively control pink purslane. Thus, when trying to manage pink purslane with POST herbicides in agronomic crops, growers should plant crops/cultivars tolerant of either atrazine, glufosinate, and/or lactofen.

Keywords: Herbicides, weed control.

Introduction

Pink purslane is rarely mentioned in university weed control handbooks or herbicide labels as a resident pest in agronomic crops in the Southeastern United States. With a competitive index that is much less than other invasive weed species such as Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri* S. Watson), nutsedge (*Cyperus* spp.), common cocklebur (*Xanthium strumarium* L.), and annual morningglory (*Ipomoea* spp.), purslane fecundity is likely reduced by weeds with superior vigor (Finney and Creamer 2008; Singh et al. 2005). As a result, its abundance and distribution in agronomic fields have been suppressed by interspecific competition, as well as the influence of common production practices, including pre-emergence herbicides, tillage, and harvest timing (Singh et al. 2005). This is likely why investigation of methods for controlling pink purslane with common postemergence (POST) herbicides in agronomic systems has remained limited. However, pink purslane recently has garnered the attention of growers in Georgia as sightings along field edges have increased.

Pink purslane is a summer annual and is one of seven subspecies of the genus *Portulaca* (Portulacaceae) found in the Southeastern U.S. (Matthews and Levin 1985). The earliest identified populations are based on detailed descriptions and illustrations published by Commelin (1697) with origins native to South America and the Caribbean Islands (Matthews and Levin 1985; Matthews et al. 1992). Introduction into the U.S. is attributed to one of two routes including Florida and the Southwest corridor via Mexico. Although timing is uncertain, pink purslane has been included in the southeastern flora since the late 1890s (Matthews and Levin 1985). Populations have been spotted on much of the eastern seaboard beginning in North Carolina to the southern tip of Florida, and across the Gulf Coast into the Southwestern part of the United States. Evidence suggests that movement northward into regions of Oklahoma, Missouri, and Arkansas was the result of the expansion of the American railroad (Matthews and Levin 1985). Pink purslane's intracontinental movement highlights its persistence to tolerate a wide range of growing conditions from arid regions of Australia to the subtropics of the southeastern U.S. (Bair et al. 2006; Kim and Carr 1990; Zimmerman 1976). The aesthetic appeal of purslane's bright flower color and succulent leaves makes it a popular ornamental for home gardens which could lead to escapes and further regional dispersal (Boas 2011; Hodkinson and Thompson 1997).

Many of the *Portulaca* species are nearly indistinguishable, sharing the similar linear-lanceolate fleshy leaf structure. What separates pink purslane from its close relatives, however, are its densely populated soft white hairs at the leaf axil and bright pink ephemeral inflorescence (Bair et al. 2006; Ekblad 2020; Matthews and Levin 1985). With an extensively branched prostrate growth pattern reaching 30 cm in length, pink purslane's rapid development of vegetative and reproductive stages occurs simultaneously (Bair et al. 2006; Ekblad 2020). Pink purslane is most often found on marginal lands in gravelly or sandy well-drained soils (Zimmerman 1976). Tolerating a wide range of environmental conditions, moist sunny habitats are most advantageous, and plants can produce upwards of 212,000 to 292,000 non-dormant seeds per plant with nearly 100% germination within 10 days (Adachi et al. 1979; Bair et al. 2006; Zimmerman 1976). As a result, favorable conditions can amass multiple flushes of progeny from successive life cycles, nearly every two months, within one growing season thus increasing management difficulties (Matthews and Levin 1985).

Pink purslane is also considered a late-emerging weed as it prefers high soil temperatures (30-35° C) for optimum germination, presenting potential challenges for season-long control (Hopen 1972). Typically, cultivation is a broad tactic utilized in agronomic production for early- and mid-season weed management, however, purslane's fleshy material can resist desiccation when overturned (Finney and Creamer 2008). In fact, vegetative structures can regrow root segments and re-establish resulting in increased dispersal (Connard and Zimmerman 1931). Even if cultivation was effective at controlling early flushes of pink purslane, this does not safeguard against late-season emergence. By the time the last pass of mechanical cultivation has commenced, crop canopy overlap is thought of as an effective tool for reducing light exposure to the soil surface and minimizing most weed competition. However, field observations have highlighted the persistence of pink purslane beneath orchard canopies, thus revealing its adaptability to tolerate shady environments, potentially including crop canopies (Buckelew 2009).

Previous research on controlling pink purslane in agronomic production systems has been minimal, however, the weed has consistently ranked as one of the most troublesome weeds in multiple vegetable systems throughout the state of Georgia (Singh et al. 2005; Van Wychen 2022). Common management strategies in vegetable crops such as watermelon [*Citrullus*

lanatus (Thunb.) Matsum. & Nakai] and bell pepper (*Capsicum annuum*) during early development include cultivation and the use of preemergence (PRE) and POST herbicides including thifensulfuron-methyl (1.6 g ai ha⁻¹), S-metolachlor (1.6 kg ai ha⁻¹), imazosulfuron (0.2 kg ai ha⁻¹), fomesafen (0.28 kg ai ha⁻¹), dimethenamid-*P* (0.74 kg ai ha⁻¹), and clomazone (0.24 kg ai ha⁻¹), with control ranging from 88% to 100% (Buckelew 2009; Finney and Creamer 2008; Peachey et al. 2012; Pekarek et al. 2008). However, research also indicates that pink purslane's densely populated trichomes have the potential to negatively influence chemical deposition from POST applications (Matthews and Levin 1985).

Many of the herbicides previously mentioned are commonly used in both vegetable and agronomic systems, although, herbicide rates and formulation can vary based on their intended use (UGA Pest Management Handbook 2024). A recent assessment of agronomic herbicide labels indicated that pink purslane was not well represented unlike its close relative, common purslane [*Portulaca oleracea* (L.)] (UGA Pest Management Handbook 2024). Generally, it is assumed that pink purslane will display similar responses to common purslane, but there is potential for intraspecific variation regarding herbicide tolerance between species of the same genus (Hergert et al. 2015). There is currently a paucity of research about the response of pink purslane to POST herbicides used in agronomic crops which makes it difficult to provide science-based control recommendations. Therefore, a thorough investigation into strategies for controlling pink purslane is needed to develop a comprehensive weed management plan for various agronomic production systems in Georgia. Thus, the objective of this experiment was to evaluate the response of pink purslane to various POST herbicides commonly used in Georgia's major agronomic production systems including field corn (*Zea mays* L.), soybean (*Glycine max* (L.) Merr.), and peanut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) in the greenhouse and field.

Materials and Methods

Description of Research Site.

This research was conducted at both the University of Georgia (UGA) Ponder Research Farm near TyTy, GA, (31°51' N, 83°66' W, 105 m elevation) and the UGA Crop and Soil Sciences, Weed Science greenhouse in Tifton, GA (31°48' N, 83°53' W). Seed collection sites were located in pre-existing natural populations of pink purslane in both vegetable production fields and pecan (*Carya illinoensis*) orchards at the UGA Ponder Research Farm. The

collection was conducted on June 14, 2022, during peak bloom season. Extraction methods included hand-picking vegetative structures with visible mature seed capsules (brittle/tan colored capsules) and brushing capsules across a prime-line gray aluminum screen repair patch (Ace Hardware Store) wrapped over the opening of a 30 ml test tube. Seeds were then stored one of two ways, room temperature (20 C) and refrigerated (4 C), for two weeks prior to conducting a germination test to further understand potential germination requirements. The initial germination test indicated that refrigeration was not necessary. Seeds were stored at room temperature for the remainder of the study. The field research site is primarily composed of Fuquay loamy sand with 96% sand, 2% silt, 2% clay, and 1.2% organic matter with an average soil pH of 6.0 (Web Soil Survey 2023).

Experimental Design and Treatments.

Greenhouse Experiments

Greenhouse trials were conducted twice during the winter of 2022. On the day of study initiation, potting media was placed in planting pot trays (5.7 cm x 7.62 cm x 5.1 cm tapered cells) and seeds were hand scattered over each flat followed by lightly hand-disturbing the soil surface for good seed-to-soil contact. Trays were then irrigated over the top with a common garden shower nozzle by hand delivering 150 ml per cell every other day. Immediately following irrigation, trays were placed under overhead lights (Philips 1000w Agrolite XT, Atlanta GA 30346; 1621 $\mu\text{mol/s}$, 130,000 lumens) set to run 16 hours daily, with greenhouse temperatures at 28 C throughout the entire study. A 10:10:10 (N:P₂O₅:K₂O) fertilizer was applied at planting followed by successive applications every 10 days. Flats were checked daily for emergence. Once averaging 8 to 10 cm in height, two individual plants were randomly selected, and the remaining were removed per cell by cutting the stem at the soil surface.

POST treatments were applied when pink purslane plants were 5 to 10 cm tall approximately 33 days after planting. Treatments included 21 POST herbicides plus a non-treated control and were arranged in a randomized complete block design with 6 replications (Table 1). The POST treatments at the 1X labeled use rates were applied using standard application methods in a spray chamber utilizing a TeeJet TP8004EVS nozzle (TeeJet Technologies Inc., Glendale Heights, IL). A non-ionic surfactant (Induce®, 0.25% v/v, Helena Chemical Company, 225 Schilling Boulevard, Suite 300 Collierville, TN 38017) or crop oil

concentrate (Agri-Dex, 1% v/v, Helena Chemical Company, 225 Schilling Boulevard, Suite 300 Collierville, TN 38017) was included as required. Visual estimates of pink purslane control were obtained 14 days after treatment (DAT) using a scale of 0-100% where 0 = no control and 100% = complete plant death. Above-ground fresh-weight biomass reduction data was also obtained at 14 DAT by hand-harvesting (clipping with scissors) all plant tissue per cell at the soil line. Herbicide treatments that indicated a satisfactory level of pink purslane control ($\geq 80\%$ reduction in above-ground biomass) during the greenhouse study were then selected for further evaluation in field experimentations at the UGA Ponder Research Farm near TyTy, GA.

Field Experiments

The experiment was arranged in a randomized complete block design with 14 treatments and 4 replications. Treatments included 13 POST herbicides plus a non-treated control, totaling 56 experimental units (Table 1). Field experiments were conducted twice (May; August) during the 2023 growing season. Prior to transplanting, the plot areas were prepared with a ripper/bedder and roto-tilled and maintained weed-free using glyphosate (Roundup PowerMax3®; 1133 g ai ha⁻¹, Bayer CropScience LP 800 N. Lindbergh Blvd. St. Louis, MO 63167), mechanical cultivation, and hand-weeding.

Transplant establishment in the UGA Weed Science greenhouse followed the protocol previously outlined, however, seeds were planted in 20.32 cm x 40.64 cm Styrofoam tobacco (*Nicotiana tabacum*) transplant trays with 5.08 cm x 5.08 cm x 5.08 cm tapered cells. Prior to transplanting, plants were removed from greenhouse and hardened under shade at Ponder Farm for a period of 7 to 10 days. Pink purslane was then transplanted 30 days after planting (DAP) into 2 m x 7.62 m field plots at 10 plants plot⁻¹ within each replicate. Overhead irrigation was applied at 1.27 cm immediately following transplanting and as needed for the remainder of the study. Rainfall data for this location is presented in Table 2. Weed germination and interference with the study indicated the need for POST weed control prior to treatment application. Based on preliminary data from the greenhouse, tolerance to tembotrione (Laudis®, 92 g ai ha⁻¹, Bayer CropScience LP 800 N. Lindbergh Blvd. St. Louis, MO 63167) permitted its use to control unwanted weeds. The POST treatments were applied between 15 and 20 days after transplanting (DAP) using a CO₂-pressurized backpack sprayer and TeeJet AIXR11002 nozzles (TeeJet Technologies Inc., Glendale Heights, IL) calibrated to deliver 140 L ha⁻¹. At the time of

application, pink purslane plants were 6.4 cm tall and 15.8 cm in diameter. Visual estimates of pink purslane control and above-ground biomass data followed similar methodology as the greenhouse experiments.

Statistical analyses

Data were subjected to PROC GLIMMIX in SAS 9.4 (Littell et al. 2006). Conditional residuals for control were used for checking assumptions of normality, independence of errors, homogeneity, and multiple covariance structures. Greenhouse and field experiments were analyzed separately. Fixed effects included POST herbicide treatments. Location, trials, and replicates represented random effects. Means were compared using the LSMEANS procedure with a Fisher's protected LSD test, with differences considered significant at $P \leq 0.05$.

Results and Discussion

Greenhouse Screening Study

Visual estimates of control (14 DAT) indicated no differences between experimental runs; therefore data were pooled. When combined over the experimental run, all herbicide treatments provided higher control of pink purslane compared to the non-treated control (NTC) except for diclosulam, mesotrione, tembotrione, and topramezone (Table 3). All other treatments provided > 70% control of pink purslane except for 2,4-DB (43%), carfentrazone (41%), chlorimuron (62%), dicamba (67%), and paraquat + acifluorfen + bentazon (59%). Treatments that exceeded 95% control of pink purslane included acifluorfen (97%), atrazine (98%), diuron (96%), glufosinate (98%), lactofen (99%), and paraquat (97%).

Similar results were observed with pink purslane above-ground biomass reductions. All herbicide treatments improved control compared to the NTC except for tembotrione. Among the treatments, 5 herbicides provided < 55% biomass reduction including carfentrazone (54%), diclosulam (32%), mesotrione (25%), topramezone (24%), and 2,4-DB (23%) (Table 3). All remaining herbicide treatments reduced pink purslane biomass by at least 75%. Interestingly, tolpyralate caused greater biomass reductions (76%) on pink purslane than the other hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase (HPPD) inhibitors (Group 27) in these trials. Similar trends were also observed in previous work where annual grass and broadleaf weed responses

varied significantly between Group 27 HPPD herbicides applied POST (Metzger et al. 2018; Tonks et al. 2015).

Currently, research is limited pertaining to the response of pink purslane to various herbicides in a greenhouse setting. The wide array of treatments in the greenhouse study was designed to capture as many options for the weed management toolbox as possible. Treatments included many different sites of action including EPSP synthase inhibitors (glyphosate), photosystem I electron diverter (paraquat), glutamine synthetase inhibitor (glufosinate), photosystem II inhibitor(s) (diuron, atrazine, bentazon), acetolactate synthase (ALS) inhibitor(s) (chlorimuron, imazapic), protoporphyrinogen oxidase (PPO) inhibitor(s) (fomesafen, acifluorfen, lactofen), and HPPD inhibitors (mesotrione, tembotrione, tolypyralate, topramezone). In summary, the greenhouse results provide preliminary evidence and identify several different sites of action for potential management options of pink purslane in agronomic systems. As a result, herbicide treatments that exhibited $\geq 80\%$ above-ground biomass reduction were selected for in-field trials.

In-field Study

There was no location-by-herbicide treatment interaction; therefore, data were pooled across locations. With all herbicide treatments, pink purslane control differed from the NTC ($P < 0.05$) (Table 4). Atrazine (88%), lactofen (86%), and imazapic (71%) were the only herbicides that provided satisfactory control of purslane. Control with all remaining treatments was less than 64%. Lactofen provided the greatest level of biomass reduction (83%) but was not statistically different when compared to atrazine (79%) and glufosinate (70%) (Table 4). Biomass reductions for remaining treatments were $< 61\%$. Interestingly, overall biomass reductions declined for all herbicide treatments in the field when compared to the greenhouse. Similar trends were observed in previous research where differences in testing conditions (field vs. greenhouse) influenced herbicide response (Fletcher et al. 1990). It is common knowledge that greenhouse conditions provide favorable and highly controllable environments for conducting research. However, field environmental factors such as the inability to manage temperature, light, and precipitation can influence plant growth, herbicide deposition, as well as reduced efficacy for herbicides with enhanced sensitivity to environmental degradation, and therefore increasing the variable responses to chemical treatment (Fletcher et al. 1990).

Final assessment of all herbicide treatments indicated that lactofen, glufosinate, and atrazine provided > 70% biomass reductions of pink purslane under field conditions. Leaf surface characteristics can significantly influence herbicide deposition, foliar uptake, and permeability (Hess and Falk 1990; Schonherr and Baur 1994; Stagnari 2007). Although the specific features of pink purslane's leaf surface are unknown, purslane is hypothesized to have a similarly thick waxy epicuticular layer as other succulent species, and may contribute to limited herbicide effectiveness (Evans 1932; Hess and Falk 1990). Studies have indicated that the use of surfactants can have a marked influence on herbicide distribution across the leaf surface and penetration through the cuticle layer (Hess and Falk 1990). Adjuvants were used according to label recommendations to maximize herbicide effectiveness. However, many of the herbicide treatments that failed to provide satisfactory control included either a non-ionic surfactant or a crop oil concentrate. This suggests that although adjuvants may increase herbicide efficacy, there are additional factors that influence varied responses across treatments, including within the same herbicide classification.

The PPO inhibiting and PS II inhibiting modes of action were represented by multiple herbicide treatments in the experiment, including lactofen (PPO) and atrazine (PS II). Results indicated that lactofen was the most effective herbicide treatment with 83% biomass reduction, while acifluorfen, fomesafen, and acifluorfen + bentazon had significantly lower biomass reductions (44%, 43%, and 35%, respectively) among the remaining PPO inhibitors. Conversely, Higgins et al. (1988) found that absorption of acifluorfen in pitted morningglory (*Ipomoea lacunosa* L.) was significantly greater than lactofen. However, studies have shown that weed maturity and temperature, especially colder temperatures (16 C at application) can significantly influence acifluorfen efficacy whereby temperature was not a significant factor for lactofen (Ritter and Coble 1981, 1984; Wichert et al. 1992). Since plant species is a major contributing factor to varied responses of acifluorfen and lactofen, pink purslane's differing responses to similar herbicides, even within the same family, suggests that minute differences in chemical composition can have a significant influence on absorption, translocation, and metabolic activity (Higgins et al. 1988; Stagnari 2007; Svyantek et al. 2016; Wichert et al. 1992). Furthermore, the reduced efficacy of acifluorfen + bentazon (35% biomass reduction), supports previous work suggesting that this tank-mixture can be antagonistic, especially when tank-mixed with paraquat (Colby 1967; Wehtje et al. 1992).

In contrast to these results, pink purslane has been controlled with POST applications of glyphosate at 3092 g ha⁻¹ and paraquat at 1549 g ha⁻¹ in vegetable production systems (preplant and row middles) but these application rates are much higher than rates used in agronomic crops (UGA Pest Management Handbook 2024). Renton et al. (2011) highlight that herbicide rate can be a limiting factor in providing adequate control of targeted weeds. Therefore, future pink purslane control research in agronomic crops should investigate higher application rates, however, many of the herbicides used in these studies were applied at the maximum labeled rates for agronomic production systems.

In conclusion, pink purslane is likely not a significant threat to agronomic production when compared to other highly competitive weed species. This research suggests that many of the POST herbicides used in agronomic crops will not effectively control pink purslane. Current assessments indicate that cultural and mechanical agronomic practices are likely limiting the abundance and distribution of pink purslane within the field. Thus, a systems approach is the most effective way to achieve satisfactory control. Growers can now have confidence in their integrated weed management plan with the addition of proven and effective POST herbicides when pink purslane becomes problematic in agronomic production systems.

Practical Implications

Currently, observations of pink purslane have been limited to field edges and occasional in-field treatable populations in agronomic production systems. Growers of agronomic crops who need to use POST herbicides for pink purslane control should plant crops/cultivars that are tolerant of atrazine, lactofen, or glufosinate. Fortunately, growers have many PRE herbicide options that can provide effective control of pink purslane including *S*-metolachlor (Dual Magnum®; Syngenta, Greensboro, NC), flumioxazin (Valor®; Valent, Walnut Creek, CA), dimethenamid-*P* (Outlook®; BASF, Research Triangle Park, NC), and pendimethalin (Prowl H₂O®; BASF, Research Triangle Park, NC) (UGA Pest Management Handbook 2024). Thus, utilizing a fully integrated weed management plan, including cultural practices and both PRE and POST herbicides for controlling pink purslane, is paramount.

Acknowledgments

This research could not have been conducted without the technical support of Dewayne Dales, Charlie Hilton, and Tim Richards.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Competing Interests

No conflict of interest has been declared.

References

- Adachi T, Kushima H, Nakazono K, Nagatomo T (1979) Some features on genetic diversity of seed dormancy and germination in the genus *Portulaca*. Bulletin of the Faculty of Agriculture Miyazaki University
- Bair A, Howe M, Roth D, Taylor R, Ayers T, Kiger RW (2006) Portulacaceae Purslane Family. *Canotia* 2:1-22
- Boas S (2011) Pink purslane is a weed but a pretty one with many benefits. Orlando Sentinel. <https://www.orlandosentinel.com/2011/07/25/pink-purslane-is-a-weed-but-a-pretty-one-with-many-benefits/>. Accessed February 14, 2024
- Buckelew JK (2009) Orchard floor management in young peach [*Prunus persica* (L.) Batsch.]: Effects of irrigation, vegetation-free width, and certain PRE herbicides. Ph.D dissertation. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State University. 30-31 p
- Colby SR (1967) Calculating synergistic and antagonistic responses of herbicide combinations. *Weeds-U* 15:20-22
- Commelin C (1697) Hort Med Amstelodam. 9 p
- Connard MH, Zimmerman PW (1931) Origin of adventitious roots of *Portulaca oleracea* L. Contribution. Boyce Thompson Inst. 3:337-346

- Ekblad M (2020) *Portulaca pilosa* var. *mandala*: Drought resistant succulent thrives in the rockiest of gardens. <https://conservancy.umn.edu/bitstream/handle/11299/225168/Portulaca%20pilosa%20var.%20mundala%20by%20Marena%20Ekblad.pdf?sequence=1> Accessed: November 28, 2023
- Evans BH (1932) The physiology of succulent plants. *Biological Reviews* 7:181-211
- Finney DM, Creamer N (2008) Weed management on organic farms. <https://content.ces.ncsu.edu/weed-management-on-organic-farms>. Accessed: August 20, 2023
- Fletcher JS, Johnson FL, McFarlane JC (1990) Influence of greenhouse versus field testing and taxonomic differences on plant sensitivity to chemical treatment. *Environ Toxicol Chem* 9:769-779
- Hergert HJ, Meador BA, Kniss AR (2015) Inter- and intraspecific variation in native restoration plants for herbicide tolerance. *Ecol Restoration* 33:74-81
- Hess FD, Falk RH (1990) Herbicide deposition on leaf surfaces. *Weed Sci* 38:280-288
- Higgins JM, Whitwell T, Corbin FT, Carter Jr. GE, Hill Jr. HS (1988) Absorption, translocation, and metabolism of acifluorfen and lactofen in pitted morningglory (*Ipomoea lacunosa*) and ivyleaf morningglory (*Ipomoea hederacea*). *Weed Sci* 36:141-145
- Hodkinson DJ, Thompson K (1997) Plant dispersal: the role of man. *J Applied Ecol* 1484-1496
- Hopen HJ (1972) Growth of common purslane as influencing control and importance as a weed. *Weed Sci* 20:20-23
- Kim I, Carr GD (1990) Reproductive biology and uniform culture of *Portulaca* in Hawaii. *Pac Sci* 44:123-129
- Littell R, Milliken G, Stroup W, Wolfinger R, Schabenberger O (2006) *SAS for mixed models*, Second Edition, SAS Institute Inc.
- Matthews JF, Ketron DW, Zane SF (1992) The reevaluation of *Portulaca pilosa* and *P. mundula* (Portulacaceae). *SIDA, Contributions to Botany* 15:71-89

- Matthews JF, Levins PA (1985) The genus *Portulaca* in the southeastern United States. *Castanea* 50:96-104
- Metzger BA, Soltani N, Raeder AJ, Hooker DC, Robinson DE, Sikkema PH (2018) Tolpyralate Efficacy: Part 2. Comparison of three Group 27 herbicides applied POST for annual grass and broadleaf weed control in corn. *Weed Technol* 32:707-713
- Peachey E, Doohan D, Koch T (2012) Selectivity of fomesafen based systems for preemergence weed control in cucurbit crops. *Crop Prot* 40:91-97
- Pekarek RA, Monks DW, Hoyt GD, Creamer NG, Jennings KM (2009) Evaluation of a 'Caliente' Mustard Cover Crop, S-Metolachlor, Imazosulfuron, and Thifensulfuron-Methyl for Weed Control in Bell Pepper. M.S. Thesis. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State University
- Renton M, Diggle A, Manalil S, Powles S (2011) Does cutting herbicide rates threaten the sustainability of weed management in cropping systems? *Theoretical Biology* 283:14-27
- Ritter RL, Coble HD (1981) Influence of temperature and relative humidity on the activity of acifluorfen. *Weed Sci* 29:480-485
- Ritter RL, Coble HD (1984) Influence of crop canopy, weed maturity, and rainfall on acifluorfen activity. *Weed Sci* 32:185-190
- Schonherr J, Baur P (1994) Modelling penetration of plant cuticles by crop protection agents and effects of adjuvants on their rates of penetration. *Pesticide Sci* 42:185-208
- Singh BP, Granberry DM, Kelley WT, Boyhan G, Sainju UM, Phatak SC, Sumner PE, Bader MJ, Webster TM, Culpepper AS, Riley DG, Langston DB, Fonsah GE (2005) Sustainable vegetable production. *J Food Agric Environ* 3:1-38
- Stagnari F (2007) A review of the factors influencing the absorption and efficacy of lipophilic and highly water-soluble post-emergence herbicides. *Eur J Plant Sci and Biotechnol* 1:22-35

- Svyantek AW, Aldahir P, Chen S, Flessner ML, McCullough PE, Sidhu SS, McElroy JS (2016) Target and nontarget resistance mechanisms induce annual bluegrass (*Poa annua*) resistance to atrazine, amicarbazone, and diuron. *Weed Technol* 30:773-782
- Tonks D, Grove M, Kikugawa H, Parks M, Nagayama S, Tsukamoto M (2015) Tolpyralate: an overview of performance for weed control in US corn. Abstract 276 in *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Weed Science Society of America*. Lexington, KY: Weed Science Society of America
- UGA Pest Management Handbook (2024) Georgia Pest Management Handbook. <https://ipm.uga.edu/georgia-pest-management-handbook/>. Accessed: February 19, 2024
- Van Wychen L (2022) Survey of the most common and troublesome weeds in broadleaf crops, fruits & vegetables in the United States and Canada. Weed Science Society of America National Weed Survey Dataset. <https://wssa.net/wp-content/uploads/2022-Weed-Survey-Broadleaf-crops.xlsx> Accessed February 14, 2024
- Web Soil Survey (2023) Natural Resources Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture. <http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/>. Accessed: November 27, 2023
- Wehtje G, Wilcut JW, McGuire JA (1992) Influence of bentazon on the phytotoxicity of paraquat to peanuts (*Arachis hypogaea*) and associated weeds. *Weed Sci* 40:90-95
- Wichert RA, Bozsa R, Talbert RE, Oliver LR (1992) Temperature and relative humidity effects on diphenylether herbicides. *Weed Technol* 6:19-24
- Zimmerman CA (1976) Growth characteristics of weediness in *Portulaca oleracea* L. *Ecology* 57:964-974

Table 1. Greenhouse and in-field postemergence herbicide treatments for controlling pink purslane near Tifton, GA, 2022.^{abcd}

| Herbicide | Rate | Trade name(s) |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | g ai ha ⁻¹ | |
| Non-treated control ^d | --- | |
| 2,4-D choline | 1065 | Enlist One® 3.8SL |
| 2,4-DB | 280 ^b | Butyrac® 2SL |
| Acifluorfen ^d | 421 ^a | Ultra Blazer® 2SL |
| Acifluorfen + bentazon ^d | 280 + 561 ^b | Storm® 4SL |
| Atrazine ^d | 1682 ^b | Aatrex® 4L |
| Carfentrazone | 18 ^b | Aim® 2EC |
| Chlorimuron ^d | 9 ^a | Classic® 25DG |
| Dicamba | 561 | Engenia® 5SL |
| Diclosulam | 18 ^a | Strongarm® 84WG |
| Diuron ^d | 841 ^b | Diuron® 4L |
| Fomesafen ^d | 421 ^a | Reflex®2SL |
| Glufosinate ^d | 656 | Liberty® 2.34SL |
| Glyphosate ^d | 1133 | Roundup PowerMax3® 5.88SL |
| Imazapic ^d | 70 ^b | Cadre® 2AS |
| Lactofen ^d | 219 ^b | Cobra® 2EC |
| Mesotrione | 105 ^b | Callisto® 4SC |
| Paraquat ^d | 561 ^a | Gramoxone® 2SL |
| Paraquat + Acifluorfen + Bentazon ^d | 210 + 186 + 374 ^a | Gramoxone® 2SL + Storm® 4SL |
| Tembotrione | 92 ^b | Laudis® 3.5SC |
| Tolpyralate ^d | 29 ^b | Shieldex® 3.33SC |
| Topramezone | 31 ^b | Impact® 2.8SC |

^a Treatment included non-ionic surfactant at 0.25% v/v (Induce®, Helena Chemical Company).

^b Treatment included crop oil concentrate at 1% v/v (Agri-Dex®, Helena Chemical Company).

^c Rates for 2,4-D choline and dicamba are in g ae ha⁻¹.

^d Greenhouse treatments selected for in-field studies.

Table 2. Monthly rainfall from January to December for 2023 at the University of Georgia Ponder Farm in TyTy, GA.^a

| Month | Rainfall | |
|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| | 2023 | 100-year average |
| | ----- mm ----- | |
| January | 149 | 108 |
| February | 108 | 107 |
| March | 73 | 122 |
| April | 88 | 99 |
| May | 77 | 82 |
| June | 184 | 117 |
| July | 134 | 138 |
| August | 160 | 124 |
| September | 77 | 97 |
| October | 35 | 58 |
| November | 25 | 64 |
| December | 152 | 92 |
| Total | 1262 | 1208 |

^a 100-year historical average (1923 – 2016) and data collected from Georgia Weather Network. (<http://www.georgiaweather.net>).

Table 3. Visible estimates of pink purslane control and above-ground fresh weight biomass reduction 14 d after treatment (DAT) following POST herbicide treatments in the greenhouse, Tifton, GA, 2022.^{abcde}

| Herbicide | Rate g ai ha ⁻¹ | Control | | Biomass Reduction | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|----|-------------------|-----|
| | | 14 DAT | % | 14 DAT | % |
| Non-treated control | ---- | 0 | F | 0 | h |
| 2,4-D choline | 1065 | 72 | Bc | 78 | e |
| 2,4-DB | 280 ^c | 43 | E | 23 | g |
| Acifluorfen | 421 ^b | 97 | A | 100 | a |
| Acifluorfen + bentazon | 280 + 561 ^c | 79 | B | 92 | abc |
| Atrazine | 1682 ^c | 98 | A | 100 | a |
| Carfentrazone | 18 ^c | 41 | E | 54 | f |
| Chlorimuron | 9 ^{ab} | 62 | D | 82 | cde |
| Dicamba | 561 | 67 | Cd | 75 | e |
| Diclosulam | 18 ^b | 8 | f | 32 | g |
| Diuron | 841 ^c | 96 | a | 99 | ab |
| Fomesafen | 421 ^c | 79 | b | 92 | abc |
| Glufosinate | 656 | 98 | a | 100 | a |
| Glyphosate | 1133 | 79 | b | 93 | ab |
| Imazapic | 70 ^c | 77 | b | 92 | abc |
| Lactofen | 219 ^c | 99 | a | 100 | a |
| Mesotrione | 105 ^c | 12 | f | 25 | g |
| Paraquat | 561 ^b | 97 | a | 99 | ab |
| Paraquat + Acifluorfen + Bentazon | 210 + 186 + 374 ^b | 59 | d | 80 | de |
| Tembotrione | 92 ^c | 0 | f | 5 | h |
| Tolpyralate | 29 ^c | 76 | b | 89 | bcd |
| Topramezone | 31 ^c | 6 | f | 24 | g |

^a Means within columns followed by the same letter are not significantly different according to Fisher's protected LSD test at $P \leq 0.05$. Means were averaged over 2 experimental runs with 6 replications/treatment.

^b Treatment included non-ionic surfactant at 0.25% (Induce®, Helena Chemical Company).

^c Treatment included crop oil concentrate at 1% v/v (Agri-Dex®, Helena Chemical Company).

^d Rates for 2,4-D choline and dicamba are in g ae ha⁻¹.

^e Pink purslane plants were 5 - 10 cm tall at the time of application.

Table 4. Visible estimates of pink purslane control and above-ground fresh weight biomass reduction 14 d after treatments (DAT) following POST herbicide treatments in field experiments, TyTy, GA, 2023.^{abcd}

| Herbicide | Rate | Control | | Biomass Reduction | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------|-----|-------------------|-----|
| | | 14 DAT | | 14 DAT | |
| | g ai ha ⁻¹ | ----- % ----- | | | |
| Non-treated control | ---- | 0 | g | 0 | g |
| Acifluorfen | 421 ^b | 54 | cde | 44 | def |
| Acifluorfen + bentazon | 280 + 561 ^c | 49 | def | 35 | ef |
| Atrazine | 1682 ^c | 88 | a | 79 | ab |
| Chlorimuron | 9 ^b | 55 | cde | 49 | de |
| Diuron | 841 ^c | 63 | bcd | 61 | bcd |
| Fomesafen | 421 ^b | 44 | ef | 43 | def |
| Glufosinate | 656 | 64 | bc | 70 | abc |
| Glyphosate | 1133 | 56 | cde | 43 | def |
| Imazapic | 70 ^c | 71 | b | 53 | cde |
| Lactofen | 219 ^c | 86 | a | 83 | a |
| Paraquat | 561 ^b | 63 | bcd | 54 | cde |
| Paraquat + acifluorfen + bentazon | 210 + 186 + 374 ^b | 36 | f | 25 | f |
| Tolpyralate | 39 ^c | 54 | cde | 53 | cde |

^a Means within columns followed by the same letter are not significantly different according to Fisher's protected LSD test at $P \leq 0.05$. Means were averaged over 2 experimental runs and 4 replications/treatment.

^b Treatment included non-ionic surfactant at 0.25% (Induce®, Helena Chemical Company).

^c Treatment included crop oil concentrate at 1% v/v (Agri-Dex®, Helena Chemical Company).

^d Pink purslane plants were 6.35 cm tall and 15.75 cm in diameter at the time of application.