

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.2024.24

Integrating Cover Crops and Herbicides for Weed Control in Soybean

Annu Kumari*¹, Andrew J. Price², Audrey Gamble³, Steve Li⁴, Alana Jacobson⁵

¹Graduate Research Assistant, Department of Crop, Soil & Environmental Sciences, Auburn University, Auburn, AL, USA, 36849;

²Plant Physiologist, USDA-ARS, National Soil Dynamics Laboratory, Auburn, AL, USA, 36832;

³Associate Professor, Department of Crop, Soil & Environmental Sciences, Auburn University, Auburn, AL, USA, 36849;

⁴Associate Professor & Extension Specialist, Department of Crop, Soil & Environmental Sciences, Auburn University, Auburn, AL, USA, 36849;

⁵Associate Professor, Department of Entomology and Plant Pathology, Auburn University, Auburn, AL, USA, 36849

***Author for correspondence:** Annu Kumari, Graduate Research Assistant, Department of Crop, Soil & Environmental Sciences, Auburn University, Auburn, AL 36849 (azk0132@auburn.edu)

Nomenclature: Soybean, (*Glycine max* (L.) Merr.); oats, (*Avena strigosa* Schreb.); cereal rye, (*Secale cereale* L.); crimson clover, (*Trifolium incarnatum* L.); radish, (*Raphanus sativus*), dicamba; glyphosate; S-metolachlor

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:

In midsouthern, southeastern, and northeastern United States soybean production regions, the evolution of herbicide-resistant weeds has become a significant management challenge for growers. The rising herbicide costs for managing herbicide-resistant weeds are also a growing concern, leading to the utilization of cover crops as an integrated weed management strategy for addressing these challenges. Field experiments were conducted at two locations in Alabama in 2022 to evaluate winter cereal cover crops, including a mixture and herbicide system integration in soybean. Treatments included five cover crops: oats, cereal rye, crimson clover, radish, and a cover crop mixture. Cover crops were evaluated for their weed-suppressive characteristics compared to a winter fallow treatment. Additionally, four herbicide treatments were applied: a preemergence (PRE) herbicide, a postemergence (POST) herbicide, PRE plus POST herbicides, and a non-treated (NT) check. The PRE herbicide was *S*-metolachlor, the POST treatment contained a mixture of dicamba and glyphosate. The PRE plus POST system contained the PRE application followed by POST application. Results show that cereal rye and the cover crop mixture provided weed biomass reduction compared to all cover crop treatments across both locations. Furthermore, we observed greater soybean yield following the cereal rye cover crop than the winter fallow treatment at one location. POST and PRE+POST herbicide treatment resulted in greater weed biomass reduction and improved soybean yield than the PRE herbicide treatment alone and NT check at both locations.

Keywords: Herbicide-resistant weeds, integrated weed management system, weed biomass, soybean yield.

Introduction

Soybean is among the most important agricultural crops worldwide. It provides a palatable protein-rich seed, making it highly beneficial for both human consumption and animal feed. However, troublesome and herbicide-resistant weed species challenge soybean production. Potential soybean yield losses due to weed infestation in the United States are estimated at \$16.2 billion (Soltani et al. 2017). Weeds not only compete for limited resources like light, water, and nutrients during the crop growing season (Burnside 1973) but also adversely impact soybean production by interrupting harvesting operations (Nave and Wax 1971) and altering the protein content of soybean seed (Gibson et al. 2008). Herbicides have been the most common method for weed control in soybean production, among other methods (Landau et al. 2022). However, the management of problematic weeds is a significant challenge for growers due to the over-reliance on herbicides, which has led to the selection of herbicide-resistant weeds that are common throughout soybean production regions in the US (Beckie et al. 2006; Heap et al. 2014; Shaw et al. 2012).

The diminishing herbicide utility and rising herbicide costs for managing herbicide-resistant weeds have become a growing concern, leading to the resurgence of integrated weed management strategies to address it (Harker 2013; Menalled et al. 2016; Neve et al. 2014). Included in integrated strategies is an increased use of tillage to bury weed seeds at depth beyond successful germination and emergence which threatens adoption and retention of conservation systems (Price et al. 2011, 2016). However, the adoption of cover crops continues to gain attention for their weed suppressive attributes including disrupting establishment and growth of weeds while maintaining crop yield (Aulakh et al. 2015; Norsworthy et al. 2010, 2011; Price et al. 2011, 2016, 2021). Weed suppression after cover crop termination has primarily been shown to be due to plant residue biomass that prevents seed germination and establishment by altering light quantity at the soil surface and providing a physical barrier (Norsworthy et al. 2011; Price et al. 2006; Teasdale 2018). Furthermore, in addition to improving soil fertility (Mirsky et al. 2012) and crop productivity, cover crops provide other advantages such as complement chemical weed control method and reducing herbicide utilization by removing the requirement for either preemergence (PRE) or postemergence (POST) herbicide applications in the weed management system in soybean (Price et al. 2006; Reddy et al. 2001).

Cover crop utilization has been increasing in the United States. In 2017, farmers reported planting 15.4 million acres of cover crops, a 50-percent increase from the 10.3 million acres reported in 2012 (Wallander et al. 2021). However, the effect of cover crops on weed control has varied according to management practices and location (Schomberg et al. 2006), and regional and global meta-analyses supported this phenomenon (Nichols et al. 2020; Osipitan 2018; Osipitan et al. 2019). Numerous researchers reported increased weed suppression from high-residue cereal cover crops in strip tillage systems compared to winter fallow systems (Kumari et al. 2023a, 2023b; Norsworthy et al. 2011; Price et al. 2012; Reeves et al. 2005). Integration of cover crops, particularly cereals, contributed to early-season weed control and may reduce glyphosate selection pressure for herbicide resistance in the conservation tilled cotton (Norsworthy et al. 2017). Nichols et al. (2020) reported that grass cover crop species significantly reduce weed biomass in corn-soybean production systems in the midwestern United States. Grass cover crop species provide greater weed suppression than broadleaf cover crop species (Osipitan et al. 2019). This is likely due to a rapid increase in biomass within a relatively short period. Increased biomass leads to a dense mat of biomass on the soil surface that suppresses weed seed germination and emergence. Additionally, due to the high C:N ratio of cereal grains, their decomposition rate is slow, allowing plant residue persistence for longer time (SARE 2007). In contrast, according to Price et al. (2006), no cover crop (rye, black oat, and wheat) effectively suppressed weeds without a herbicide application in conservation-tillage soybean. Osipitan et al. (2018) suggested that in agronomic and horticultural production systems, there was little to no significant difference between single cover crop species and cover crop species mixtures in terms of early weed control considering a meta-analysis. A study by Vann et al. (2019) indicated that the variation in total biomass composition under different environmental conditions explains the importance of selecting cover crop species and optimal cover crop mixture seeding rate recommendations for each site.

Although numerous experiments have been conducted to evaluate the weed-suppressive qualities of winter annual cover crops, limited studies have been conducted in Alabama to estimate the effect of different cover crops and their mixture combined with herbicide applications to control weeds. Therefore, field research was conducted in Alabama to evaluate the influence of cover crops (cereal rye, oats, crimson clover, radish, and mixture) and the

integration of these cover crops with PRE, POST, and PRE+POST herbicide applications on weed control and soybean yield.

Materials and Methods

Experimental Sites

The field experiments were conducted from cover crop planting in fall 2021 through crop harvest in 2022 at two sites in Alabama including “E.V. Smith (EVS) Auburn University Research and Extension Center, Shorter, AL (Field Crops Unit; 32.4417°N, 85.8974°W)” and “Tennessee Valley Research and Extension Center (TVREC), Belle Mina (34°41' N 86°53' W)”. The soil characteristics at the EVS research site were sandy loam (coarse-loamy, siliceous, subactive, thermic Paleudults), pH 6.2, and 0.8% organic matter. The soil texture at TVREC was Decatur silt loam (fine, kaolinitic, thermic Rhodic Paleudults) and pH 6.0, and 2.3% organic matter.

Experimental Design and Treatments

The experimental design was a split-plot design with three replications of each treatment at each location. The plot size was 7.3 × 3.7 meters. Six cover crop treatments were considered in the main plot, while four different herbicide treatments were considered in the sub-plot of the experimental design. The six different cover crop treatments included: 1) crimson clover (*Trifolium incarnatum* L.), 2) cereal rye (*Secale cereale* L.), 3) oats (*Avena strigosa* Schreb.), 4) radish (*Raphanus sativus*), 5) a cover crop mixture, and 6) winter fallow. The cover crop mixture combined cereal rye, oat, crimson clover, and radish. The four herbicide treatments included: 1) S-metolachlor applied PRE at 1.07 kg ae ha⁻¹ (Dual II Magnum; Syngenta Crop Protection, Greensboro, NC, USA), 2) dicamba (Xtendimax; Bayer Crop Science, St. Louis, MO) applied POST at 0.559 kg ae ha⁻¹ application + glyphosate (Roundup Powermax®; Bayer Crop Science, St. Louis, MO) at 1.68 kg ae ha⁻¹, 3) PRE followed by POST, and 4) a non-treated (NT) check. In total, there were 24 different treatments of cover crops and herbicides at each site.

Crop Management

All cover crops were planted with the JD 7730 and a Great Plains[®] no-till drill (Great Plains

Salina, KS 67401) at both locations in the second week of November. Based on the Extension recommendation, the seeding rate includes: ‘Wrens Abruzzi’ cereal rye at 100 kg ha⁻¹, ‘Cosaque’ oats at 67.25 kg ha⁻¹, ‘Dixie’ crimson clover with inoculant at 22.42 kg ha⁻¹, and ‘Daikon’ radish at 9.0 kg ha⁻¹. Seeding rates in the cover crop mixture were cereal rye at 39.8 kg ha⁻¹, oat at 33.2

kg ha⁻¹, crimson clover at 11.2 kg ha⁻¹, and radish at 3.6 kg ha⁻¹. The germination percentage of cereal rye was 80%, oat 85%, crimson clover 80%, and radish 80%, respectively. To maximize biomass production, all cover crop treatments were fertilized with N as 34 kg ha⁻¹ in the form of ammonium nitrate. All cover crop plots were mechanically rolled by using a three-section straight bar roller-crimper (Ashford and Reeves 2003) to flatten the biomass residue on the soil surface in the first week of May at both sites. Just after mechanical rolling, cover crop termination was further attained with an application of glyphosate applied at 1.12 kg ae ha⁻¹. At TVREC experimental site, the soybean variety “Pioneer 45T88E” was planted during the second week of May, whereas at EVS, same soybean variety was planted in the first week of June. Soybeans were planted into a strip-tillage system across both sites. Soybean was seeded at 116,160 seed ha⁻¹ (26 seeds m⁻¹). There was no significant interaction between locations and treatments, and the average soybean stands counts achieved at three weeks after planting across both locations with a row spacing of 0.91 m ranged from 69,262 to 95,691 plants ha⁻¹.

The application of PRE herbicide *S*-metolachlor was accomplished immediately following soybean seeding while the POST dicamba + glyphosate treatment was applied approximately four weeks after soybean planting. All herbicides were applied with a CO₂ pressurized backpack sprayer equipped with TTI 11004 nozzles (TeeJet, Glendale Heights, IL) at 276 kPa calibrated to deliver 280 L ha⁻¹. At all locations, soybeans were harvested from the center two rows from each plot to determine yield with a small-plot combine.

Data Collection

Immediately prior to cover crop termination, biomass samples were collected by cutting all aboveground parts of the plants near the ground within each cover crop plot. Samples were taken from one randomly selected 0.25-m² section from each cover crop treatment. The harvested cover crop samples were then placed in a dryer set at 65 C for 72 h, after which their dry weight was measured and recorded. Subsequent summer annual weed density and weed biomass were collected based on randomly selected 0.25-m² quadrats from each subplot between rows, then dried similarly to the cover crop biomass, and the dry weight of weed biomass was recorded. Visual control ratings were recorded regularly in two-week intervals throughout the season (data not shown). Weed biomass and weed density were determined seven weeks after soybean planting.

Data Analysis

Analyses were conducted using R statistical software version 3.4.1 with the “agricolae” package. All data were subjected to analysis of variance (ANOVA) to evaluate the effect of herbicides and cover crops on weed density and biomass and soybean yield. Log transformation was used for the weed biomass as data was not normally distributed, then it was back transformed to show original means. Due to the significant interaction of locations with treatments, data was analyzed separately for each site. Means were separated using Tukey’s HSD at $\alpha = 0.05$ to check the treatment effects on weed density and biomass and soybean yield. Figures were build using Sigma Plot software (version 3.0; Systat Software, San Jose, CA).

Pearson’s correlation coefficients were used to assess the relationship among weed biomass, weed density, soybean yield, and cover crop biomass across all sites using the `corr.test` function in Rstudio. Additionally, correlation plot was built using `corrplot` library. In the graph, the size of the circle and the color intensity within the circle were used to represent the strength of the correlation, with larger circles and darker colors indicating stronger correlations. The presence of a cross or an “X” within a circle indicated no correlation between the variables. The correlation from 1 to -1, in which 1 represents positive correlation and -1 represents negative correlation, and 0 means no correlation between variables.

Results and Discussion

Cover Crop Biomass

Upon conducting an analysis of variance (ANOVA) to examine the impact of various cover crops on biomass production, we obtained a significant result with a p-value < 0.0001 . Above ground biomass production was significantly different among cover crops evaluated. At TVREC, the recorded cover crop biomass of cereal rye, mixture, and oats was found to be similar, measuring 4,150, 3,356, and 3,873 kg ha⁻¹, respectively (**Figure 1A**). Clover and radish had comparable biomass residue as 1,351 and 875 kg ha⁻¹. Additionally, radish had again the lowest biomass at this location.

At EVS, the average cover crop biomass of rye and a mixture at the time of termination was recorded similar as 6,290 kg ha⁻¹ and 6,787 kg ha⁻¹, respectively (**Figure 1B**). Additionally, clover and oat cover crops had comparable biomass residue of 4,364 and 4,441 kg ha⁻¹ respectively. Out of all the cover crops evaluated, radish exhibited the lowest residue biomass, measuring 1,986 kg ha⁻¹ at the same site.

The variations we observed in cover crop biomass between different cover crop species were expected, due to the species growth and/or development characteristics. We found the highest and sufficient amount of biomass residue in the case of cereal rye and cover crop mixture at both locations. Previous research stated that greater than 4500 kg ha⁻¹ cover crop biomass is required to predictably suppress weeds (Norsworthy et al. 2011; Price et al. 2005). The greater observed biomass residue for the cereal rye cover crop is most likely due to its characteristics as a winter hardy small grain cereal (Mirsky et al. 2009; Sattell et al. 1998).

Weed Biomass

Some cover crop species significantly reduced annual weed germination and establishment compared to winter fallow. Mainly morningglory (*Ipomoea* spp.) was the dominant weed species at EVS. Prickly sida (*Sida spinosa* L.) was the most abundant weed species at TVREC. Palmer amaranth [*Amaranthus palmeri* (S.) Watson] was present at both locations.

TVREC Site. Cover crop and herbicide treatments influenced weed biomass production at TVREC. The interaction between cover crops and herbicides was not significant (**Table 1**). We observed greater weed biomass in winter fallow treatments (518 kg ha⁻¹) than mixture (202 kg ha⁻¹), rye (202 kg ha⁻¹), and oats (247 kg ha⁻¹) (**Figure 2A**). Clover (369 kg ha⁻¹) and radish (358 kg ha⁻¹) resulted in greater weed biomass than the use of rye cover crop. Although there were no differences in terms of weed biomass reduction among clover, radish, oats, and mixture cover crops. Cereal rye was more effective in suppressing the weed species present than crimson clover, radish, and winter fallow treatments. Our results were similar to Blum et al. (1997), who reported the average density of prickly sida seedlings were 77% lower following rye residue during the growing season compared to fallow. Similarly, Palhano et al. (2018) reported that cereal rye cover crops provided greater weed suppression than fallow plots, with 83% less germination of Palmer amaranth than the winter fallow treatment. Additionally, a prior study conducted at the same location also revealed that conservation tillage systems incorporating a rye cover crop result in reduced emergence of early-season pigweed due to the presence of a dense mat of cover crop biomass (Price et al. 2007). Because greater cover crop biomass at planting was more effective at suppressing the emergence and establishment of weed seedlings, specifically during the earlier part of the crop growing season, cover crop biomass was considered the key factor associated in weed biomass reduction. NT checks (580 kg ha⁻¹) had greater weed biomass than both POST (106 kg ha⁻¹) and PRE+POST (87 kg ha⁻¹) herbicide

treatments (**Figure 2B**). There was no significant difference in terms of weed biomass reduction between NT check and the PRE alone herbicide treatment, where weed biomass measured 492 kg ha⁻¹. However, the effect of the PRE alone treatment to control weeds was seen up to three to four weeks after planting as compared to NT check (data not shown). In coarse-textured soils of the mid-Atlantic and southern Coastal Plain, S-metolachlor applied as PRE offered only 2 to 4 weeks of weed control (Clewis et al. 2006).

EVS Site. Weed biomass was influenced by the main effects of cover crop and herbicide at the EVS site. There was no significant interaction between cover crops and herbicides in relation to their effect on weed biomass (**Table 2**). The fallow treatment (1108 kg ha⁻¹) resulted in greater weed biomass than the rye (465 kg ha⁻¹) and mixture (824 kg ha⁻¹) treatments (**Figure 3A**). Clover, oats, radish, and a mixture of cover crops provided similar weed biomass reduction. We recorded the lowest weed biomass following the rye cover crop treatment at this site. Due to greater C:N ratio of cover crop cereal rye and slow decomposition (Sievers et al. 2018), it provides a longer effect on weed suppression. Cover crop mixture resulted in greater weed biomass reduction than the winter fallow treatment. Our results suggested that mixture of cover crops has the potential to increase the aboveground biomass residue production as compared to biomass produced by clover and radish when grown as a monoculture. The presence of a significant amount of cover crop mixture biomass indicated that the presence of grain cover crop in a mixture with legumes enhances the cold tolerance of legumes, compared to legumes cover crop in a monoculture system (Hayden et al. 2015). In addition, the cover crop mixture such as cereal and legumes maintains the C:N ratio and causes a slower decomposition rate than a legume monoculture. Hence, mixtures may increase persistence of residue on soil surface and release of nitrogen (Clark et al. 2007; Poffenbarger et al. 2015).

Radish had the lowest biomass in both locations, and we did not find the effect of radish on either season long weed suppression. Due to forage radish sensitivity to frost, it experiences slow growth when exposed to temperatures below -4 C for an extended period (Weil et al. 2009). Our field results also agree with the previously reported poor growth of radish when planted late in Alabama (Decker et al. 2022). Furthermore, a study previously suggested that quick decomposition of forage radish cover crops produces low residue biomass and weed-free seed bed for planting in the early spring (Lawley et al. 2012). Additionally, previous research stated that radish cover crop alone provided good early season weed suppression but is ineffective for

weed control throughout the growing season (Malik et al. 2009). Generally, it has been observed that cover crops provide early-season weed control that may allow elimination of a PRE herbicide in cropping system (Reeves et al. 2005; Teasdale 2005).

NT check (1682 kg ha⁻¹) resulted in the highest weed biomass, whereas PRE alone treatment (1277 kg ha⁻¹) resulted in greater weed biomass as compared to POST alone (360 kg ha⁻¹) and both PRE+POST treatment (270 kg ha⁻¹) (**Figure 3B**). Previous research also observed that *S*-metolachlor (PRE) controlled morningglory 64% and Palmer amaranth 68% only after three to four weeks after application (Clewis et al. 2007). It has been shown that high residue of cover crops can intercept PRE herbicide, preventing it from reaching the ground (Banks and Robinson 1982; Ghadiri et al. 1984). Crutchfield et al. (1985) reported that interception of *S*-metolachlor due to wheat straw before reaching the soil surface leads to a loss of weed control. The application of dicamba as a POST herbicide enhanced the consistency of weed control and effectively managed smooth pigweed, morningglory, and various broadleaf weed species (Johnson et al. 2010; Striegel et al. 2022).

Soybean Yield

TVREC Site. Cover crop species and herbicide program influenced soybean yield at the TVREC. The interaction between cover crop and herbicide was not significant. (**Table 2**). Among different cover crops, we found rye treatment (1,791 kg ha⁻¹) resulted in greater yield than clover (1,055 kg ha⁻¹), radish (984 kg ha⁻¹), and winter fallow treatments (1,008 kg ha⁻¹) (**Figure 4A**). Soybean yield was likely greater in cereal rye cover crop treatments because of increase biomass production and decreased weed competition. There were no significant differences for soybean yield between oats (1,476 kg ha⁻¹), mixture (1,420 kg ha⁻¹), clover (1,055 kg ha⁻¹), radish (984 kg ha⁻¹) and the winter fallow treatments (1,008 kg ha⁻¹). Both PRE+POST herbicide treatments (1,781 kg ha⁻¹) resulted in greater soybean yield than only PRE herbicide treatment (745 kg ha⁻¹) and NT check (770 kg ha⁻¹) (**Figure 4B**). The PRE+POST treatment resulted in a 131% greater yield than the NT check, while the POST alone herbicide treatment resulted in a 142% greater yield compared to the NT check. Late-season weeds began to emerge and compete with soybeans, causing yield loss. As a result, the use of only PRE herbicide application did not have a significant effect on increasing soybean yield in cover crop systems.

EVS Site. At this location, there was no significant effect of cover crops while impact of herbicide treatments was observed for soybean yield. No interaction between cover crops and herbicides were found to influence soybean yield (**Table 2**). No effect of cover crops on soybean yield was observed (**Figure 5A**). PRE+POST (2,810 kg ha⁻¹) and POST alone (2,937 kg ha⁻¹) treatments resulted in greater soybean yield than plots that were treated with PRE alone (1,973 kg ha⁻¹) and NT check (1,735 kg ha⁻¹) (**Figure 5B**). Specifically, PRE+POST treatment had 62% greater soybean yield than the NT check, while the PRE alone treatment resulted in 14% greater soybean yield than the NT check. Results suggest that the application of only POST and both PRE+POST herbicide treatments were effective on morningglory, Palmer amaranth, and prickly sida and maintained soybean yield at both sites.

Correlation

The correlation between cover crop biomass, weed biomass, weed counts, and soybean yield has been estimated and represented in a correlation graph (**Figure 6**).

A negative correlation between cover crop biomass and weed density was observed at the TVREC site, indicating that greater cover crop biomass production results in reduced weed biomass. The correlation values of cover crop biomass with weed density and weed biomass were -0.4 and -0.35, respectively (**Figure 6A**). Cover crop biomass also had a positive correlation with soybean yield of 0.39. The high cover crop biomass not only inhibits weed germination but also significantly contributes to maintaining soybean yield by effectively suppressing weed growth. MacLaren et al. (2019) demonstrated that cover crop biomass is a determining factor for weed suppression and reducing weed growth. Weed density and weed biomass has a positive correlation of 0.82 which means the greater the density of weeds substantially resulted in more weed biomass. On the other hand, weed density and weed biomass have a negative correlation with soybean yield with values of -0.75 and -0.80, respectively. As anticipated weed density and weed biomass have an inverse correlation with soybean yield. Greater weed density and biomass have been shown to impact soybean yield negatively.

There was no correlation of cover crop biomass with weed density, weed biomass, and soybean yield at EVS site (**Figure 6B**) due to greater weed density. Weed density and weed biomass were positively correlated with the value of 0.96. Both weed density and weed biomass had a negative correlation with soybean yield with values of -0.84 and -0.88 respectively.

Practical Implications

Cereal rye and cover crop mixture were the most effective in reducing weed density and weed biomass. Dicamba + glyphosate and *S*-metolachlor followed by dicamba + glyphosate treatments provided greater weed control and soybean yield than only *S*-metolachlor and NT check. Cover crops effectively suppress early-season weeds but may not provide control throughout the season. Therefore, integrating high residue cover crops such as cereal rye and cover crop mixture with dicamba + glyphosate herbicides would be an effective strategy for weed control and maintaining yield in soybean. Suggested cover crops are not only effective in weed control but also provide practical benefits such as preventing runoff losses, controlling soil erosion, increasing organic matter, and conserving soil moisture in the southeastern region, which has typically poor soils with mineralogical features despite abundant precipitation. At the same time, the potential negative impacts of cover crops included equipment limitations and an increase in the cost of production for farmers.

Acknowledgements

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency, commercial or not-for-profit sectors. We wish to thank Mr. James C. Bonnell, USDA ARS NSDL Technician, and the station personnel at the E. V. Smith and Tennessee Valley Research and Extension Centers for their technical assistance in this study. No conflicts of interest have been declared.

References

- Ashford DL, Reeves DW (2003) Use of a mechanical roller–crimper as an alternative kill method for cover crops. *Am J Altern Agric* 18:37–45
- Aulakh JS, Saini M, Price A, Faircloth WH, van Santen E, Wehtje G, Kelton J (2015) Herbicide and rye cover crop residue integration affect weed control and yield in strip-tillage peanut. *Peanut Sci* 42:30-38
- Beckie HJ (2006) Herbicide-resistant weeds: management tactics and practices. *Weed Technol* 20:793-814
- Blum U, King L, Gerig T, Lehman M, Worsham A (1997) Effects of clover and small grain cover crops and tillage techniques on seedling emergence of some dicotyledonous weed species. *Am J Altern Agric* 12:146-161
- Burnside OC (1973) Influence of weeds on soybean harvesting losses with a combine. *Weed Sci* 21:520–523
- Clark AJ, Meisinger JJ, Decker AM, Mulford FR (2007) Effect of a grass-selective herbicide in a vetch-rye cover crop system on nitrogen management. *Agron J* 99:36– 42
- Clewis S, Wilcut J, Porterfield D (2006) Weed management with *S*-metolachlor and glyphosate mixtures in glyphosate-resistant strip- and conventional-tillage cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.). *Weed Technol* 20:232-241
- Clewis SB, Everman WJ, Jordan DL, Wilcut JW (2007) Weed management in North Carolina peanuts (*Arachis hypogaea*) with *S*-metolachlor, diclosulam, flumioxazin, and sulfentrazone systems. *Weed Technol* 21:629-635
- Decker HL, Gamble AV, Balkcom KS, Johnson AM, Hull NR (2022) Cover crop monocultures and mixtures affect soil health indicators and crop yield in the southeast United States. *Soil Sci Soc Am J* 86:1312-1326
- Foote W, Edmisten K, Wells R, Jordan D, Fisher L (2014) Cotton response to nitrogen derived from leguminous cover crops and urea ammonium nitrate. *J Cotton Sci* 18:367–375.
- Gibson DJ, Millar K, DeLong M, Connolly J, Kirwan L, Wood AJ, Young BG (2008) The weed community affects yield and quality of soybean (*Glycine max* (L.) Merr.). *J Sci Food Agric* 88:371–381

- Hayden ZD, Brainard DC, Henshaw B, Ngouajio M (2012) Winter annual weed suppression in rye-vetch cover crop mixtures. *Weed Technol* 26:818– 825
- Heap I (2014) Global perspective of herbicide-resistant weeds. *Pest Manag Sci* 70:1306-1315
- Johnson B, Young B, Matthews J, Marquardt P, Slack C, Bradley K, York A, Culpepper S, Hager A, Al-Khatib K, Steckel L, Moechnig M, Loux M, Bernards M, Smeda, R (2010) Weed control in dicamba-resistant soybeans. *Crop Manag* 9:1-23
- Kumari A, Price AJ, Korres NE, Gamble A, Li S (2023a) Influence of a cereal rye cover crop on the critical period for weed control in soybean. *Weed Technol.* 37:25-33
- Kumari A, Price AJ, Korres NE, Gamble A, Li S (2023b) Effect of crimson clover on the critical period of weed control in conservation tillage corn. *Front Agron* 4:128
- Landau CA, Hager AG, Williams MM (2022) Deteriorating weed control and variable weather portends greater soybean yield losses in the future. *Sci Total Environ* 830:154764
- Lawley YE, Teasdale JR, Weil RR (2012) The mechanism for weed suppression by a forage radish cover crop. *Agron J* 104:205-214
- MacLaren C, Swanepoel P, Bennett J, Wright J, Dehnen-Schmutz K (2019) Cover crop biomass production is more important than diversity for weed suppression. *Crop Sci.* 59:733-748
- Malik MS (2009) Biology and ecology of wild radish (*Raphanus raphanistrum*). Ph.D. dissertation. Clemson University.
- Mirsky SB, Curran WS, Mortensen DA, Ryan MR, Shumway DL (2009) Control of cereal rye with a roller/crimper as influenced by cover crop phenology. *Agron J* 101:1589–1596
- Mirsky SB, Ryan MR, Curran WS, Teasdale JR, Maul J, Spargo JT, Camargo GG (2012) Conservation tillage issues: Cover crop-based organic rotational no-till grain production in the mid-Atlantic region, USA. *Renew Agri Food Syst* 27:31-40
- Nave WR, Wax LM (1971) Effect of weeds on soybean yield and harvesting efficiency. *Weed Sci.* 19:533–535
- Nichols V, Martinez-Feria R, Weisberger D, Carlson S, Basso B, Basche A (2020) Cover crops and weed suppression in the U.S. Midwest: a meta-analysis and modeling study. *Agric Environ Lett* 5:e20022
- Norsworthy JK, McClelland M, Griffith G, Bangarwa SK, Still J (2010) Evaluation of legume cover crops and weed control programs in conservation-tillage, enhanced glyphosate-resistant cotton. *Weed Technol* 24:269-274

- Norsworthy JK, McClelland M, Griffith G, Bangarwa S, Still J (2011) Evaluation of cereal and brassicaceae cover crops in conservation-tillage, enhanced, glyphosate-resistant cotton. *Weed Technol* 25:6-13
- Osipitan OA (2018) Cover crop for early season weed suppression in crops: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Agron J* 110:2211–2221
- Osipitan OA, Dille JA, Assefa Y, Radicetti E, Ayeni A, Knezevic SZ (2019) Impact of cover crop management on level of weed suppression: a meta-analysis. *Crop Sci* 59:833–842
- Parr M, Grossman JM, Reberg-Horton SC, Brinton C, Crozier C (2011) Nitrogen delivery from legume cover crops in no-till organic corn production. *Agron J* 103:1578–1590
- Price AJ, Balkcom KS, Arriaga FJ (2005) Rye biomass amount affects weed suppression levels in conservation-tillage cotton. Pages 2921–2923 in *Proceedings of the 2005 Beltwide Cotton Conferences*. New Orleans, LA
- Price A, Wayne Reeves D, Patterson M (2006) Evaluation of weed control provided by three winter cereals in conservation-tillage soybean. *Renew Agric Food Syst* 21:159–164
- Price AJ, Monks CD, Patterson MG (2007) Early Season Pigweed Control in Conservation Tillage Cotton. Pages 13–15 in No. 32–2007 *Cotton Research Report*, Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station, Agricultural Communications.
- Price AJ, Balkcom KS, Culpepper SA, Kelton JA, Nichols RL, Schomberg H (2011) Glyphosate-resistant Palmer amaranth: a threat to conservation tillage. *J Soil Water Cons* 66:265-275
- Price AJ, Balkcom KS, Duzy LM, Kelton JA (2012) Herbicide and cover crop residue integration for *Amaranthus* control in conservation agriculture cotton and implications for resistance management. *Weed Technol* 26:490–498
- Price AJ, Monks CD, Culpepper AS, Duzy LM, Kelton JA, Marshall MW, Steckel LE, Sosnoskie LM, Nichols RL (2016) High residue cover crops alone or with strategic tillage to manage glyphosate-resistant Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) in southeastern cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum*). *J Soil Water Cons.* 71:1–11
- Price AJ, Nichols RL, Morton TA, Balkcom KS, Grey TL, Li S (2021) Effect of cover-crop biomass, strip-tillage residue disturbance width, and PRE herbicide placement on cotton weed control, yield, and economics. *Weed Technol* 35:385-393

- Palhano MG, Norsworthy JK, Barber T (2018) Cover crops suppression of Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) in cotton. *Weed Technol* 32:60-65
- Poffenbarger HJ, Mirsky SB, Maul JE, Weil RR, Kramer M, Spargo JT, Cavigelli MA (2015) Biomass and nitrogen content of hairy vetch-cereal rye cover crop mixtures as influenced by species proportions. *Agron J* 107: 2069-2082
- Reddy KN (2003) Impact of rye cover crop and herbicides on weeds, yield, and net return in narrow-row transgenic and conventional soybean (*Glycine max*). *Weed Technol* 17: 28–35.
- Reeves DW, Price AJ, Patterson MG (2005) Evaluation of three winter cereals for weed control in conservation-tillage nontransgenic cotton. *Weed Technol* 19:731–736
- [SARE] Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education (2007) Managing cover crops Profitably. 3rd edition. A. Clark, ed. College Park, MD: SARE
- Sattell R, Dick R, Karow RS, Kaufman D, Hemphill DD, Luna J, McGrath DM (1998) Cereal rye (*Secale cereale* L.). Ext. Publ. EM 8704. Oregon State Univ. Ext., Corvallis.
- Schomberg HH, McDaniel RG, Mallard E, Endale DM, Fisher DS, Cabrera ML (2006) Conservation tillage and cover crop influences on cotton production on a southeastern U.S. Coastal Plain soil. *Agron J* 98:1247–1256
- Sievers T, Cook RL (2018) Aboveground and root decomposition of cereal rye and hairy vetch cover crops. *Soil Sci Soc Amer J* 82:147-155
- Shaw D, Culpepper SA, Owen M, Price AJ, Wilson R (2012) Herbicide-resistant weeds threaten soil conservation gains: finding a balance for soil and farm sustainability. Issue Paper 49. Ames, IA: CAST
- Soltani N, Dille JA, Burke IC, Everman WJ, Vangessel MJ, Davis VM, Sikkema PH (2017) Perspectives on potential soybean yield losses from weeds in North America. *Weed Technol* 31:148–154
- Striegel A, Jhala AJ (2022) Economics of reducing Palmer amaranth seed production in dicamba/glufosinate/glyphosate-resistant soybean. *Agron J* 114:2518-2540
- Teasdale JR (1996) Contribution of cover crops to weed management in sustainable agricultural systems. *J Prod Agric* 9:475–479

- Teasdale JR, Pillai P, Collins RT (2005) Synergism between cover crop residue and herbicide activity on emergence and early growth of weeds. *Weed Sci* 53:521–527
- Teasdale JR (2018) The use of rotations and cover crops to manage weeds. Pages 227–260 *in* Zimdahl, R, ed. *Integrated Weed Management for Sustainable Agriculture*. Cambridge, UK: Burleigh Dodds Science Publishing
- Vann RA, Reberg-Horton SC, Castillo MS, McGee RJ, Mirsky SB (2019) Winter pea, crimson clover, and hairy vetch planted in mixture with small grains in the southeast United States. *Agron J* 111:805-815
- Wallander S, Smith D, Bowman M, Claassen R (2021) Cover crop trends, programs, and practices in the United States. Economic Research Service, USDA. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22004/ag.econ.309562>. Assessed: December 3, 2023
- Weil R (2009) *Laboratory manual for introductory soils*. 8th ed. Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co., Dubuque, IA
- Weisberger DA, Bastos LM, Sykes VR, Basinger NT (2023) Do cover crops suppress weeds in the US Southeast? A meta-analysis. *Weed Sci* 71:244-254
- Wen L, Lee-Marzano S, Ortiz-Ribbing LM, Gruver J, Hartman GL, Eastburn DM (2017) Suppression of soilborne diseases of soybean with cover crops. *Plant Dis* 101:1918-1928

TABLE 1. Significance of tests of fixed effects and their interaction in ANOVA for weed biomass as influenced by cover crops and herbicides across both locations. ^{a,b}

Effects	P values	
	EVS	TVREC
Cover crop	0.0002*	0.0012*
Herbicide	<.0001*	<.0001*
Cover crop × herbicide	0.0733	0.0644

^aP values followed by * are significant ($\alpha = .05$).

^aAbbreviations: EVS, E.V. Smith Research Center; TVREC, Tennessee Valley Research and Extension Center

TABLE 2. Significance of tests of fixed effects and their interaction in ANOVA for soybean yield as influenced by cover crops and herbicides across both locations. ^{a,b}

Effects	P values	
	EVS	TVREC
Cover crop	0.6278	0.0132*
Herbicide	<.0001*	<.0001*
Cover crop × herbicide	0.8987	0.3081

^aP values followed by * are significant ($\alpha = .05$).

^aAbbreviations: EVS, E.V. Smith Research Center; TVREC: Tennessee Valley Research and Extension Center




Figure 1. Dry weight of cover crop residue at the time of termination at Tennessee Valley Research and Extension Center (A) and E.V. Smith Research Center (B). Means followed by the different Tukey letters showed a significant effect. In the box plot, solid line indicates the median and dotted line represents the mean.




Figure 2. Effect of cover crops (A) and herbicides (B) on weed biomass at Tennessee Valley Research and Extension Center. Means followed by the different Tukey letters showed a significant effect. In the box plot, solid line indicates the median and dotted line represents the mean. In the box plot, solid line indicates the median and dotted line represents the mean.




Figure 3. Effect of cover crops (A) and herbicides (B) on weed biomass at E.V. Smith Research Center. Means followed by the different Tukey letters showed a significant effect. In the box plot, solid line indicates the median and dotted line represents the mean.




Figure 4. Effect of cover crops (A) and herbicides (B) on soybean yield at Tennessee Valley Research and Extension Center. Means followed by the different Tukey letters showed a significant effect. In the box plot, solid line indicates the median and dotted line represents the mean.




Figure 5. Effect of cover crops (A) and herbicides (B) on soybean yield at E.V. Smith Research Center. Means followed by the different Tukey letters showed a significant effect. In the box plot, solid line indicates the median and dotted line represents the mean.




Figure 6. Pearson correlation coefficients between variables at Tennessee Valley Research and Extension Center (A) and E.V. Smith Research Center (B). Color intensity indicates the strength of correlation, with blue representing a strong positive correlation and red representing a strong negative correlation.