

# Weed community shifts during the aging of perennial intermediate wheatgrass crops harvested for grain in arable fields

Olivier Duchene, Camille Bathellier, Benjamin Dumont, Christophe David,

Florian Celette

# ▶ To cite this version:

Olivier Duchene, Camille Bathellier, Benjamin Dumont, Christophe David, Florian Celette. Weed community shifts during the aging of perennial intermediate wheatgrass crops harvested for grain in arable fields. European Journal of Agronomy, 2023, 143, pp.126721. 10.1016/j.eja.2022.126721. hal-03892614

# HAL Id: hal-03892614 https://isara.hal.science/hal-03892614

Submitted on 12 Dec 2022

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

#### 1 Weed community shifts during the aging of perennial intermediate wheatgrass

#### 2 crops harvested for grain in arable fields

- 3 Olivier Duchene<sup>1\*</sup>, Camille Bathellier<sup>1</sup>, Benjamin Dumont<sup>2</sup>, Christophe David<sup>1</sup>, Florian Celette<sup>1</sup>
- <sup>4</sup> <sup>1</sup>ISARA, Agroecology and Environment Research Unit, 23 Rue Jean Baldassini, 69007 Lyon,
- 5 France
- <sup>2</sup> ULiege Gembloux AgroBio-Tech, Plant Sciences Axis, Crop Science lab., B- 5030
  Gembloux, Belgium
- 8 \*Corresponding author : <u>olduchene@isara.fr</u>

## 9 KEYWORDS

10 Perennial grain, intermediate wheatgrass, weed traits, weed communities, on-farm trials.

#### 11 **ABSTRACT**

12 The development of a perennial grain offers opportunities to diversify annual crop rotations, 13 with potential benefits in terms of soil protection. Perennials could also reduce weed 14 development over time through year-round soil cover and longer growing seasons. However, 15 whether weeds would actually decrease remains mainly theoretical, with field data on perennial 16 grains remaining sparse. Qualitative changes might also have an effect, because disturbance 17 and modifications to resource regimes drive shifts in weed communities. Here, we analyzed 18 weed abundance, composition, and traits in three arable fields containing perennial grain over 19 a 4-year period. Specifically, intermediate wheatgrass (IWG) perennial grain (Kernza) was 20 cultivated. IWG grain production was maximal during the first and second growing seasons 21 (899 and 854 kg.ha<sup>-1</sup> respectively), with total biomass production peaking in the second year 22 (mean: 11.9 t DM.ha<sup>-1</sup>). However, reproductive effort noticeably dropped in the third and fourth 23 years. Weed biomass also gradually reduced during the fall of all years (mean: ~0.4-~0.03 t 24 DM.ha<sup>-1</sup>), but remained constant in spring (mean: 1–2 t DM.ha<sup>-1</sup>). During spring, the community 25 composition of weeds shifted from broadleaves to grass species and, to a lesser extent, from 26 annuals to perennials, with weed species having an earlier phenology than IWG. Thus, relative 27 fitness appeared to be the strongest driver of weed community composition in aging IWG 28 stands. Weed species richness systematically declined over the years. Specific leaf area, 29 height, light, and nitrogen requirement index of weed communities provided poor descriptors 30 of community shifts; however, all weed species with high light requirements were excluded 31 from aging IWG stands. IWG capacity to compete with weeds might have been undermined 32 by its late growing cycle, absence of forage harvest during the growing season, and substantial 33 initial weed development during establishment (first year of growth). Thus, before IWG 34 establishment, initial site conditions and land use history should be considered to implement 35 the best management strategies for each field. Important weed development in perennial grain 36 fields could lead to high weeding requirement, either mechanical or chemical, in conflict with 37 the initial principle of increasing sustainability and reducing inputs.

## 38 1. INTRODUCTION

39 The perennial grain Kernza<sup>™</sup> is the result of ongoing efforts by The Land Institute (Kansas, 40 USA) to domesticate intermediate wheatgrass (IWG, Thinopyrum intermedium, (Host) 41 Barkworth & D.R. Dewey). This grain became a figurehead of new perennial grain crops that 42 could revolutionize cropping systems (Crews et al., 2016; DeHaan et al., 2020; Duchene et al., 43 2019; Ryan et al., 2018). Besides provisioning farmers with food and feed biomass in the form 44 of grain and forage over several years, the deep root system and year round soil cover of this 45 perennial crop (Sainju et al., 2017; Sakiroglu et al., 2020) could provide important additional 46 benefits, including nutrients leaching mitigation (Culman et al., 2013; Jungers et al., 2019), soil 47 erosion control, and carbon storage, (Audu et al., 2022; Kim et al., 2022; Sprunger et al., 2019). 48 IWG could also potentially outcompete weeds by increasing the timespan of light and soil

resource capture in each year (Lanker et al., 2019; Ryan et al., 2018). This expectation is
 supported by published studies, in which grasslands were identified as better competitors of

51 weeds compared to annual crops (Dominschek et al., 2021; Schuster et al., 2020). The weed suppression effect from integrating perennial forage and temporary grasslands in cropping 52 53 systems often corresponds to a shift in weed communities, driven by changes in the 54 disturbance regime and resource gradients (Fried et al., 2022; Gaba et al., 2014). Community ecology and trait-based approaches can be used to describe the general patterns of these 55 56 changes on a functional basis (Fried et al., 2012, 2008; Grime, 2006). For instance, tillage 57 increases the development of 'ruderal' species (i.e., annuals with fast growing strategies, early 58 flowering, and higher Specific Leaf Area (SLA; Dominschek et al., 2021; Fried et al., 2022). In 59 comparison, systems with reduced or no tillage (e.g., grasslands) tend to favor grass and 60 perennial weed species (Adeux et al., 2022; Meiss et al., 2010a,b). Other contributing factors 61 include the intensity of grazing and cutting events, which affect how much light penetrates the 62 canopy, filtering weed species depending on their morphology and ability to regrow (Meiss et al., 2010a; Meiss et al., 2008; Renne and Tracy, 2007; Schuster et al., 2016; Smith et al., 63 2018). Trophic soil conditions represent an orthogonal driver of the structure of weed 64 65 communities with, for example, species with greater seed mass and plant height favored in 66 richer soils compared to poor soils (Fried et al., 2022).

67 Cropping systems that have minimal yield losses due to weed competition tend to correspond 68 to systems with diversified weed communities, with higher weed evenness and lower weed 69 biomass, compared to more problematic situations with dominant and competitive weed 70 species (Adeux et al., 2019). Thus, a shift in the structure of weed communities following 71 changes to cropping systems could generate problems, depending on the dominance and 72 fitness of species under novel growing conditions.

Due to the novelty of IWG crops, associated field data about weed development remain scarce, and sometimes contradictory; yet, weed management has been identified by farmers as one of the main challenges in Kernza field trials (Duchene, 2020; Lanker et al., 2019; Law et al., 2021a). Zimbric et al. (2020) and Dick et al. (2018) reported that weed biomass in summer declined during IWG regrowth (second and third year of growth). In contrast, Law et al. (2021a)

78 recorded consistent weed biomass in the summers of successive years, with the development 79 of perennial grass communities (Poa trivialis, Phleum pratense). During IWG establishment, 80 following sowing in fall, conditions for weed growth are analogous to annual grain stands. Land 81 preparation steps, that vary depending on farming systems, are designed to favor the seed 82 germination and seedling emergence of crops. During the subsequent weeks and months, 83 crop seedlings establish their first roots, leaves, and tillers; consequently, their ability to 84 compete with weeds is initially limited, depending on the rate at which it can occupy space and 85 use resources (i.e., regulated by relative growth rate and sowing density). However, after the 86 first year, the growth and management of IWG widely differs to that of annual grain systems, 87 because regrowth in fall is enabled by perennating organs, such as the root and plant crown; 88 consequently, yearly tillage and soil preparation operation are obsolete. This regrowth ability 89 enhances the efficiency of resource capture and use over time (Culman et al., 2013; De 90 Oliveira et al., 2018; Vico and Brunsell, 2017). However, when IWG is harvested for grain, it 91 cannot be cut at regular intervals during the cropping season, as implemented when harvesting 92 grassland as forage. Only fall or early spring harvest operations are possible, before stem 93 elongation. Thus, a noticeable change in land use is required when cultivating IWG as a 94 perennial grain crop, particularly regarding the disturbance regime (no annual tillage and no 95 regular cutting events in spring) and resource availability over multiple years (because 96 resource capture and use efficiency change over time). Such changes drive shits in the 97 structure of the weed community (Dominschek et al., 2021; Fried et al., 2022), as demonstrated 98 by Law et al. (2021a) in fields containing IWG grain crops. Therefore, it is important to assess 99 the structure of weed communities over successive growing seasons to determine the 100 importance of IWG cultivation in filtering weed species initially present through habitat change 101 under field conditions.

This study explored how weed communities change under IWG cultivation in the temperate
arable fields of western Europe (France), from crop establishment to 4-years of growth.
Biomass, composition, and traits were analyzed. We hypothesized that both weed biomass

and community composition in fields would alter in response to changes in the disturbance regime and resource gradients following IWG establishment. Potentially problematic weed species were also identified that might require specific attention and management practices in future research or production fields.

109

# 2. MATERIALS & METHODS

## 110 2.1. Experimental sites description

111 This study was conducted using three on-farm trial sites (1, 2, and 3) of 0.3–0.4 ha each in the 112 south-east of France. IWG was established in the fall of 2017 (site 1 and 3) and fall of 2018 113 (site 2), and was grown until the summer of 2021. Data on IWG yields and weed development 114 were collected in each successive year to analyze the nature and intensity in the shifts of the 115 weed community. Table 1 provides information on field locations, management operations, 116 and main soil and climate characteristics. At each site, samples were taken from four subplots 117 (10\*20 m) to account for any effect of field heterogeneity. The three sites were cropped for at 118 least the last 10 years with a three-year rotation of annual crops, which are common in the 119 region (rapeseed or maize - winter wheat - winter barley or winter rye). Winter wheat preceded 120 the sowing of IWG at all sites, and maize was grown before wheat. Site 3 was managed with 121 direct sowing practices, whereas sites 1 and 2 were managed with standard tillage operations, 122 including mold-board ploughing and harrowing. All sites were managed with herbicides to 123 control weeds in annual crops and before IWG planting; however, weeds were not treated in 124 any form (mechanical or chemical) during IWG growth. Each year at grain maturity (after the 125 last sampling event in summer), direct combine harvesting was used to harvest both grain and 126 straw.

#### 127 2.2. Data collection

128

#### 2.2.1. Canopy biomass, composition, and grain yields

129 Data collection started in the fall of 2017 (sites 1 and 3) and 2018 (site 2) following crop 130 establishment, and ended in the summer of 2021, corresponding to the fourth (sites 1 and 3) 131 or third (site 2) year of IWG growth. During this period, canopy (IWG and weed) biomass and 132 composition were measured: i) each fall (at the end of November), corresponding to the end 133 of vegetative growth before winter; ii) each spring at the crop heading period (mid-May) and 134 flowering stage (mid-June); and iii) in summer at grain maturity (late-July to mid-August). The 135 two spring sampling periods were chosen to obtain a comprehensive overview of weed 136 biomass development, because the peak growth period significantly differs among species, 137 depending on their respective growth dynamics and phenology. In summer, IWG spikes were 138 collected separately from straw. The spikes were then threshed with a manual thresher 139 (NEWEEK), and weighed to estimate grain yields.

140 For all sampling events at the 3 sites, canopy biomass was sampled after weed species had 141 been identified in two 0.5 m<sup>2</sup> guadrats on each of the four subplots (1 m<sup>2</sup> sample per subplot). 142 by cutting the aboveground biomass 5 cm above the soil surface. The entire set of weed 143 species identified at each site is provided in Table 1 and 2. The soil cover of weed species was 144 estimated by visual observation, and was rated on a 10% grade scale. For each sampled 145 quadrat, IWG biomass was separated from weeds, and weed species were separated from 146 each other. IWG and weed biomass were oven-dried at 65 °C for 48 h before weighing. The 147 relative biomass of each weed species was presented as the proportion of total weed biomass 148 per quadrat. This approach allowed us to construct a relative abundance table based on 149 biomass units instead of individual plants (Wilhm, 1968). This table was used for the statistical 150 analyses (diversity indexes, RLQ analysis). Biomass is thereafter expressed in tons of dry 151 matter per hectare (t DM.ha<sup>-1</sup>). In summer, grain yields were obtained by oven-drying and 152 weighing threshed grains in a similar way to the rest of IWG biomass. Yields were calculated

and expressed on a 15% humidity basis. The harvest index were calculated as the ratiobetween grain yields and total aboveground biomass.

#### 155 2.2.2. Traits of weed species

156 Eight functional traits of weeds were selected as potentially responding to IWG growth under 157 field conditions (Table 2). These traits corresponded to the main ecological features related to 158 resource use. These traits were life history (annual, perennial), phenology, plant division 159 (monocotyledons, broadleaves), plant earliness (month corresponding to the start of the 160 flowering period), average height, specific leaf area (SLA, as a proxy of photosynthetic capacity 161 and growth rate), nitrogen, moisture and light requirements. The last three were described 162 using Ellenberg's indicator values (Julve, 1998); namely, L - light (from 1- deep shade to 9-full 163 light), F - moisture (from 1-extreme dryness to 12-submerged plant), and N - nitrogen (from 1-164 extremely infertile to 9-extremely rich). Values for all weed species identified in this study were 165 collected from online databases and the published literature (Table 2).

**Table 1:** Information about the on-farm trial sites, including location, main soil type, weather characteristics (OM = Organic Matter, GDD = Growing

167 Degree Day in base 0 °C), management timing and operations, and identified weed communities.

Site		1	2	3	
Surface (ha)		0.31	0.38	0.33	
GPS coordinates (	longitude; latitude)	5.1251; 45.4250	5.0920; 45.2746	5.1433; 45.3323	
	Texture	Loam	Sandy-Ioam	Sandy loam	
Soil characteristics (0-30cm)	рН	7.6	6.7	6.8	
	OM (%)	2.1	1.9	2.4	
IWG sowing date and rate (accumulated GDD until first frost)		20/09/2017, ~15kg/ha <i>(88</i> 2 <i>°C)</i>	18/09/2018, ~15kg/ha <i>(904°C)</i>	05/09/2017, ∼15kg/ha <i>(1 112°C)</i>	
Mean temperature during the whole growing season (°C)	2017-2018	12.2	-	10.9	
	2018-2019	12.3	11.1	11.3	
	2019-2020	13.2	11.9	12.4	
	2020-2021	12.6	11.5	11.6	
Accumulated GDD during the whole growing season	2017-2018	3775.4	-	3339.2	
	2018-2019	3808.5	3512.6	3509	
	2019-2020	4080.4	3802.5	3841.5	
	2020-2021	3854.1	3606.4	3743	
	2017-2018	676.8	-	649.6	
Accumulated rainfall during the	2018-2019	535.3	667.2	630.2	
whole growing season (mm)	2019-2020	629.5	783.4	731.4	
	2020-2021	651.2	832.6	801.4	
Tillage practices (CT = conver	ntional tillage; NT = No tillage)	CT: plowing to a depth < 25cm (10/09/2017) + power harrow (20/09/2017) + tine seeder (20cm inter-row)	CT: plowing to a depth < 25cm (14/09/2018) + disc harrow (16/09/2018) + tine seeder (22cm inter-row)	NT: direct sowing with discer seeder (25cm inter- row)	
Nitrogen application date (ar	nmonium-nitrate 50 kg N.ha <sup>-1</sup> )	15/03/2018; 24/03/2019; 01/04/2020; 26/03/2021	02/04/2019; 05/04/2020; 27/03/2021	21/03/2018; 05/04/2019; 15/04/2020; 28/03/2021	
Harves	st date	25/07/2018; 01/08/2019; 27/07/2020; 04/08/2021	11/08/2019; 07/08/2020; 16/08/2021	27/07/2018; 05/08/2019; 08/08/2020; 25/07/2021	
Weed species identified on field (code in Table 2)		ACH. CHE. BRO. CAP. PAP. FUM. SON. LAM. POA. VIO. RUM. SEN. CER. STE. VER. ALO. ARR. TAR	BRO. LAM. POA. VIO. SEN. CER. STE. VER. ARR. LOL. CAR. ANA. OXA. AGR	BRO. CHE. PAP. SON. POA. CER. STE. VER. ARR. TAR. POT. LOL. CAR. EPI. GAL. GER. ANA. AGR	

168 Table 2: Traits selected to evaluate weeds with their descriptive values (symbol † provided with each trait indicates source reference and

169 database).

Species	Code	Ellenberg index (†)				Earliness of	Average		
					Life History	Division (††)	flowering (month	canopy	Average
		Light	Moisture	Nitrogen	(††,†††)		of the year)	height (m)	SLA (†††)
							(††,†††)	(†††)	
Capsella bursa-pastoris	CAP	7	5	7	Annual	Broadleaves	3	0.22	30.02
Papaver rhoeas	PAP	7	5	6	Annual	Broadleaves	4	0.40	33.07
Fumaria officinalis	FUM	6	5	6	Annual	Broadleaves	4	0.20	28.54
Lamium purpureum	LAM	6	5	7	Annual	Broadleaves	3	0.28	38.45
Viola arvensis	VIO	8	4	6	Annual	Broadleaves	3	0.15	24.32
Senecio vulgaris	SEN	7	5	7	Annual	Broadleaves	1	0.20	29.82
Cerastium glomeratum	CER	7	5	5	Annual	Broadleaves	4	0.25	21.75
Stellaria media	STE	7	5	7	Annual	Broadleaves	3	0.23	53.68
Veronica persica	VER	6	5	7	Annual	Broadleaves	3	0.25	39.60
Cardamine hirsuta	CAR	8	5	6	Annual	Broadleaves	3	0.19	27.78
Galium aparine	GAL	6	6	8	Annual	Broadleaves	6	0.68	34.68
Geranium dissectum	GER	5	6	6	Annual	Broadleaves	5	0.35	23.20
Anagallis arvensis	ANA	7	4	5	Annual	Broadleaves	5	0.17	29.22
Achillea millefolium	ACH	8	5	4	Perennial	Broadleaves	6	0.32	19.81
Sonchus arvensis	SON	8	6	6	Perennial	Broadleaves	7	0.88	21.70
Rumex obtusifolius	RUM	7	5	9	Perennial	Broadleaves	6	0.68	29.71

Taraxacum officinale	TAR	7	5	6	Perennial	Broadleaves	4	0.20	34.77
Potentilla reptans	POT	7	5	5	Perennial	Broadleaves	6	0.13	25.09
Epilobium hirsutum	EPI	7	8	7	Perennial	Broadleaves	5	1.15	26.92
Oxalis corniculata	OXA	7	4	5	Perennial	Broadleaves	5	0.15	41.51
Bromus sterilis	BRO	7	4	7	Annual	Monocotyledons	5	0.38	32.20
Alopecurus myosuroides	ALO	6	5	6	Annual	Monocotyledons	4	0.35	27.27
Lolium perenne	LOL	7	5	7	Perenne	Monocotyledons	5	0.35	30.06
Poa trivialis	POA	7	6	6	Perennial	Monocotyledons	4	0.36	30.98
Arrhenatherum elatius	ARR	7	5	7	Perennial	Monocotyledons	5	0.60	28.25
Agrostis capillaris	AGR	6	5	4	Perennial	Monocotyledons	6	0.25	34.43

170

171 <sup>†</sup>Hill et al., 1999

172 <sup>††</sup>Julve, 1998

173 <sup>†††</sup>Kleyer et al., 2008.

#### 174 2.3. Data analysis

#### 175

#### 2.3.1. IWG and weed biomass

176 Statistical analyses were conducted in R (R Core Team, 2018). Sites corresponded to 177 replicates, while subplots corresponded to pseudo-replicates. IWG and weed biomass 178 production were analyzed as response variables with mixed models (ImerTest package) 179 (Kuznetsova et al., 2019), including three fixed effects. These effects were IWG stand age as 180 a categorical variable (1- first growing season, 2- second, 3- third, and 4- fourth), sampling 181 period (fall, mid-spring, late spring, summer), and covariate biomass (weeds or IWG, 182 depending on which was analyzed as the response or explanatory variable). As our data 183 collection included a repeated-measures structure (eight measurements taken per year in 184 twelve subplots), the site effect and nested effect of each subplot per site were treated as 185 random intercept effects, representing an uncontrolled (not chosen) effect from local conditions 186 on IWG and weed growth (i.e., weed seed bank, soil, and climate conditions). The model also 187 fits a random slope to account for the random interactions of sites with sampling period or 188 stand age factors. Maximum likelihood of model and the covariance between random slopes 189 and intercepts were checked. The correlations between the random intercept and slope were 190 low (< 0.25). IWG grain yields and harvest index were analyzed using similar models (without 191 sampling period effect). Variables were log-transformed as necessary to improve normality. 192 Least-squares means were computed and used for pairwise comparisons (post hoc analysis, 193  $\alpha$  = 0.05, *Ismeans* and *cld* functions) (Piepho, 2004) to determine the significance among mean 194 values following significant (p-value < 0.05) factor effects and interactions. When identified as 195 relevant by the model, correlations between crop and weed biomass were tested with Pearson 196 coefficients, and their associated significance (t test).

197

#### 2.3.2. Structure, diversity, and traits of the weed community

Analysis of weed communities during spring was performed using both spring sampling events
(heading and flowering time). Weed diversity was calculated using Shannon's diversity index,
based on biomass units (rather than individuals), according to the following equation:

$$H' = -\sum_{i=1}^{s} p_i \ln p_i$$

202 where p is the proportion of total weed biomass of a given weed species, and s is the number 203 of species present. Mean values were calculated for each site for each growing season, and 204 the species evenness index was obtained by dividing H' by  $\ln(S)$ , which corresponds to  $H_{max}$ . 205 Multivariate analyses were used to examine differences in the structure of the weed 206 community. Nonmetric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) ordination (Oksanen, 2005) was used 207 to visualize differences in community structure. For NMDS, Bray-Curtis dissimilarity 208 coefficients were calculated using transformed (Wisconsin double standardization) species 209 relative abundance values. A minimum stress to halt iterations was set at 0.01 with 100 210 restarts. The relationship between weed community structure and IWG stand age (duration of 211 crop presence) was tested through permutational multivariate analysis of variance using 212 distance matrices (Adonis function; Oksanen et al., 2020). Considering that the null hypothesis 213 (random dispersion of weed species) was unlikely due to the effect of repeated measures 214 within sites and subplots over the four years, blocking (sites) and nesting (subplots in sites) 215 arguments were added to produce a permutational test to compare the effect of stand age 216 within different groups (here the subplots nested in sites). Then, a three-table ordination 217 method (RLQ analysis) (Dray et al., 2014; Dray and Legendre, 2008) was used to investigate 218 the relationship between weed community traits and IWG growth using the library ade4 219 (Chessel et al., 2004). RLQ analysis enabled the joint structure of three matrices to be 220 assessed; namely, R (environmental characteristics of samples), L (species distribution across 221 samples) and Q (species traits) (Dolédec et al., 1996; Dray et al., 2014). The matrix R 222 contained three environmental variables: site code (1, 2, 3), age of IWG stands, and sampling 223 year for each sample. The matrix L contained the standardized relative abundances of weeds. 224 The matrix Q contained the eight trait values for each of the 26 weed species (Table 2). 225 Correspondence analysis was carried out on the L-matrix. For the R and Q tables, mixed 226 principal component analysis were performed (Hill and Smith, 1976), conserving row weight of the correspondence analysis of the L table. Finally, a fourth-corner statistic was computed
(Dray and Legendre, 2008), in which the link between traits and environment variables were
measured by Pearson correlation, Chi2, or Pseudo-F index (ratio of between-cluster variance),
depending on the type of variable (i.e., quantitative or qualitative). Significance was tested by
a permutation procedure, resulting in 5,000 Monte Carlo permutations of the rows of matrices
R and Q (Dolédec et al., 1996).

# 233 **3. RESULTS**

3.1. Biomass of IWG and weeds

## 235 3.1.1. Biomass and yields of IWG

The mixed model showed that sampling period, stand age, and their interaction had highly significant effects on IWG biomass (p-value < 0.001). Weed biomass had no significant effect (p-value = 0.15).



Figure 1: Total biomass of IWG and weeds (tons of dry matter per hectare) during fall (A), crop heading (B), crop flowering (C), and harvest (D), in the first, second, third, and fourth growing seasons. [Colors useful]

During the first year of growth (establishment year), IWG biomass was consistently lower compared to the subsequent years, in both fall and spring (Figure 1, Table S1). IWG biomass was very low (0.087 t DM.ha<sup>-1</sup> on average) during the first fall (Figure 1a). This low biomass corresponded to small seedlings with four to five leaves maximum. During the first spring biomass was 2.53 and 6.10 t DM.ha<sup>-1</sup> (heading and flowering stages respectively), and rose to and 6.09 t DM.ha<sup>-1</sup> in summer (harvest) (Figure 1).

On average, IWG biomass during fall increased across the four years (Figure 1). At flowering and harvest, biomass was highest during the second year of growth (12 and 13 t DM.ha<sup>-1</sup>, respectively). Biomass was similar in the third and fourth growing seasons (9.36 and 8.76 t DM.ha<sup>-1</sup> at flowering, respectively).





**Figure 2:** Grain yield (a) and harvest index (b) of IWG at harvest time during the first, second, third, and fourth growing seasons. Circles in boxplots indicate mean values. Letters indicate statistical differences between years ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ). [Colors not useful]

256 The highest IWG grain yield was obtained during the first and second years of growth, and 257 then dropped in the third and fourth years (Figure 2a). Summer and spring weed biomass did 258 not significantly affect grain yield. Grain yield was associated with mean harvest indices of 0.05 259 to 0.16 (Figure 2b). The harvest index was highest in the first year of growth, and then 260 decreased in the second year, due to higher IWG biomass not leading to higher grain yields. 261 The drop in grain yield during the third growing season caused the harvest index to decline 262 further. Biomass production at harvest was a good predictor of grain yield for the first growing 263 season ( $R^2 = 0.74$ , p-value < 0.001); however, the correlation was not significant in the second 264 year (R<sup>2</sup>= 0.06), and was much weaker in the third and fourth years (0.31 and 0.29, 265 respectively; p-value<0.01).

#### 266 *3.1.2. Weed biomass*

Sampling period and its interactions with IWG stand age and biomass significantly explained weed biomass (p-value < 0.01, < 0.05, < 0.01, respectively). In fall, weed biomass was 0.02 to 0.57 t DM.ha<sup>-1</sup>. Biomass was significantly higher during the establishment year compared to the third and fourth year of growth, in which weed biomass was very low (Figure 1). A significant negative correlation was observed between the reduction in weed biomass and increase in IWG biomass during fall over the first three years of growth (Figures 1 and 3), corresponding to a 92.3% reduction in mean weed biomass.

At crop heading and flowering, weed biomass reached a mean 1.29 and 1.72 t DM.ha<sup>-1</sup> during the first year, and remained similar in the following three years (Figure 1). At site 3, where weed biomass was initially the lowest, a significant increase occurred the third year, reaching levels similar to sites 1 and 2 (Table S1). Overall, in spring, no significant relationship was found between IWG and weed biomass (Figure 3).

At harvest, weed biomass declined in all years (mean: 0 to 0.3 t DM.ha<sup>-1</sup>, Figure 1), and was not influenced by the biomass or yield of IWG. This phenomenon reflected the delay between IWG and weed growth cycles, as almost all the weeds were senescent or had decayed when IWG was harvested.



**Figure 3:** Weed biomass as a function of intermediate wheatgrass (IWG) biomass in fall (a), crop heading (b), crop flowering (c), and harvest (d). Both parameters are expressed in tons of total dry matter per hectare. Only significant relationships are reported on panels. In the absence of significant correlations, horizontal dashed lines indicate the mean value of weed biomass. [Colors should be used]

## 3.2. Structure and traits of the weed community in spring

NMDS (stress = 0.163; Figure 4) showed that perennial IWG stands affected the structure of weed communities in the spring of all four cropping years. Spring sampling time had no effect (crop heading or flowering). The initial situation (first year) differed across the three sites. However, these differences strongly declined over the study period, with year three and four largely overlapping, while being clearly distinct from the first year. The permutational test showed that IWG stand age significantly affected the structure of the weed community (p-value) 296 < 0.001). Weed species richness declined from the establishment year to the last growing 297 season at all three sites (from 14 to 5, 12 to 4, and 18 to 6, respectively, for sites 1, 2, and 3). 298 For sites 1 and 2, Shannon diversity index declined (from 1.26 to 0.75, and 1.54 to 0.40, 299 respectively); however, species evenness remained constant at site 1 (0.48 to 0.46) but 300 dropped at site 2 (from 0.62 to 0.29). This trend at site 2 was attributed to the increasing 301 dominance of *Lolium perenne*, followed by *Poa* trivialis, whereas the other species were highly 302 variable. Site 3 had a stable species diversity index (from 0.96 to 0.90), due to a compensatory 303 effect between lower species richness and higher evenness over the four years (0.33 to 0.50). 304 The initial dominance of Galium aparine and Veronica persica was progressively balanced by 305 an increase in other species, such as Epilobium hirsutum, Bromus Sterilis, Arrhenatherum 306 elatius, and Poa trivialis.





Figure 4: Non-Metric Multidimensional Scaling (NMDS) analysis of the relative abundance of
 weed species in IWG crops during spring in the first, second, third, and fourth years of growth.
 The centroid of each species and year is given by labeled positions. [Colors useful]

310 RLQ showed how the weed community changed over time and between sites (Figure 5). In all 311 three sites, most variation occurred along the first axis (57.17%), which contained (canonical 312 absolute weight of variables > 0.5) plant life history (annual - perennial), division 313 (monocotyledons - broadleaves), and flowering earliness as the main driving traits. The 314 transition from year 1 to year 2, 3, and 4 was characterized by fewer broadleaf plants, shifting 315 towards grass-dominated communities (e.g., Lolium perenne, Alopecurus myosuroides, Poa 316 trivialis, Bromus sterilis, Arrhenatherum elatius, Agrostis capillaris; Figure 6), and more early 317 Taraxacum sp., Alopecurus myosuroides, Poa trivialis) and perennial (e.g., (e.g.,

Arrhenatherum elatius, Agrostis capillaris, Epilobium hirsutum, Lolium perenne, Poa trivialis; species (Figure 6). Fourth corner analysis only identified plant division (i.e., monocotyledons vs broadleaf) as being significantly influenced by the longevity of the IWG stand (p-value < 0.01). Minor drivers identified by RLQ included SLA and weed height, showing that as the community shifted from annuals and broadleaved species towards perennials and grasses, taller species with lower SLA became, to a certain extent, more prominent. The shift from year three to four was marginal compared to shifts in years one and two.

325 No consistent trend was observed across the three sites over the four years on the second 326 axis. This axis was mostly characterized by minor drivers, including the light requirement of 327 weed communities (canonical absolute weight of variables > 0.5), along with nitrogen 328 requirement, earliness, and plant division. Overall, site position on the second axis showed the 329 variability of the initial weed communities and its importance of understanding later community 330 assemblages at each site. On the second axis, sites 1 and 2 maintained approximately the 331 same position across years. In contrast, site 3 exhibited a noticeable shift from species with 332 high light requirement (e.g., Sonchus arvensis and Cardamina hirsute) to less light demanding 333 species (e.g., Galium aparine, Agrostis Capillaris, Arrhenatherum elatius, Bromus sterilis, Poa 334 trivialis, Lolium perenne).



Axis 1, projected inertia = 57,17%

**Figure 5:** RLQ analysis of the multiple relationships between species traits (life history, division, earliness of flowering, average canopy height, average SLA, light-moisture-nitrogen; Ellenberg index; Table 2), experimental site, and IWG growth (longevity). First and second axes summarized 57.17 and 20.41% of inertia, respectively. Trait variables with a canonical weight > 0.5 (absolute value) on RLQ axes 1 or 2 are shown. Each point in the ordination plot represents the site-year position modeled (canonical weight) according to its traits on RLQ axes 1 and 2. Squares = site 1, triangles = site 2, circles = site 3. [Colors should be used]



Figure 6: Average position and standard deviation of each species at crop flowering according to normalized site scores (x axis; RLQ analysis). Dispersion along the x-axis represents the distance between species in the context of growth (i.e., site and year conditions). Grass species are represented with red lines and squares. Perennial species are represented with dashed lines. Species codes are listed in Table 2. [Colors should be used]

## 347 **4. DISCUSSION**

## 348 4.1. Biomass and grain yields of IWG

The biomass and yield of IWG in this study were consistent with those of previous studies (Fernandez et al., 2020; Hunter et al., 2020a,b; Law et al., 2021a; Zimbric et al., 2020). Importantly, low grain yields, and variability in both grain and biomass production, likely represent a significant hurdle in adopting IWG as a novel perennial grain crop by farmers.

Low grain yields of IWG have been explored by many previous studies (Altendorf et al., 2021; Cassman and Connor, 2022; Cattani, 2017; Tautges et al., 2018), with dedicated breeding programs existing to improve them. Variability in yield might have been exacerbated in our 356 study by the relatively low rate of nitrogen fertilization applied each year (50 kg N.ha<sup>-1</sup>) 357 compared to the theoretical optimal range identified by previous studies on the role of nitrogen 358 in building grain yields (61 to 96 kg N.ha<sup>-1</sup>; Fernandez et al., 2020; Jungers et al., 2017). As 359 nitrogen content was not measured in our study, a definitive conclusion cannot be obtained 360 about the balance between nitrogen input and nitrogen use by plants. Also, the plant allocation 361 strategy in case of nitrogen deficiency is not known (translocation to roots, stems, leaves or 362 grains). At 10 tons of aboveground biomass per hectare at flowering, nitrogen content in the 363 aboveground tissue of IGW is about 1% (Fagnant et al., under revisions), representing 100 kg 364 nitrogen in plant tissue per hectare. Between flowering and harvest, grain filling would likely 365 cause overall nitrogen demand to slightly increase. Thus, more than 50 kg of the nitrogen 366 required is not provided by fertilizers, and depends nitrogen availability in the soil pool, which 367 tends to be underestimated because nitrogen in roots is not included in this calculation. 368 Besides, heterogeneity of plant emergence at establishment (not measured) and planting 369 dates likely induced heterogeneous seedling vigor initially. However, all sites were planted 370 early enough to allow sufficient GDD accumulation (~900 GDD) and tillering before winter and 371 vernalization, based on Olugbenle et al. (2021). Variation in temperature and moisture 372 conditions between growing seasons also caused heterogeneity in our study. For example, the 373 2019–2020 growing season was warmer, whereas the 2020–2021 growing season was wetter 374 (Table 1).

375 Irrespective of site or climatic year, biomass production peaked during the second growing 376 season, and likely corresponded to a peak in reproductive growth (i.e., many fertile tillers that 377 induced stems elongation; Altendorf et al., 2021; Fernandez et al., 2020; Hunter et al., 2020a). 378 However, the harvest index dropped after the first year (Figure 2b), indicating a potential trade-379 off between tiller density and tiller fertility. Previous studies also reported a decline in grain 380 yield over time, driven by a decrease in the fertility of tillers and spikes (Altendorf et al., 2021; 381 Fernandez et al., 2020; Hunter et al., 2020). Regardless of the underlying yield components 382 involved, this reduced fertility led to very low grain yields in the third and fourth years of growth

383 (Figure 2a). Tillering is a complex process in grasses, as it is under multifactorial control (e.g., 384 light quality, nutrient and water availability, defoliation regime, temperature; Assuero and 385 Tognetti, 2010). This process is especially complex in perennial species, like IWG, for which 386 the regulation of tiller emergence and differentiation in relation to environmental cues remain 387 poorly understood (Lafarge and Durand, 2011; Rouet et al., 2021). Thus, more research is 388 required to clarify tillering dynamics, which would allow appropriate management practices to 389 be designed (e.g., planting design, mowing, grazing, fertilization, residue management) that 390 maintain the production of fertile tillers over multiple growing seasons.

391 In our study, mixed models (section 3.1.1) and regression analysis (section 3.1.2, Figure 3) did 392 not indicate that high or low weed biomass depressed IWG yields. This result supported that 393 of Zimbric et al. (2020), who showed that yield did not increase in plots where weeds were 394 removed (starting from the second growing season) compared to unweeded plots. However, 395 weeds are a major cause of yield loss in grain production (Adeux et al., 2019; Barberi, 2002; 396 Oerke, 2006), largely due to competition for resources (light, nutrients, water; Zimdahl, 2007). 397 This competition is particularly deleterious for wheat yields during stem elongation and 398 flowering (Fischer, 2020 and references therein). Yet in the current study, the highest weed 399 biomass was recorded in late spring, during the elongation phase of IWG, up to anthesis 400 (Figures 1 and 3). Overall, our results (together with previous findings; Zimbric et al., 2020) 401 raise the question of why IWG biomass and grain production appear to be relatively insensitive 402 to important spring weed biomass compared to annual grains. A recent study investigating how 403 different weed communities impact winter cereals showed that weed biomass alone, especially 404 when sampled late in the season, is a poor predictor of yield loss (Adeux et al, 2019). The 405 authors showed that weed-crop interference is better captured in terms of niche competition. 406 In other words, weed traits are critical for understanding their impact, with weeds that occupy 407 the same niche as crops being the most deleterious. IWG likely displays high ecological 408 complementarity with the weed flora encountered in typical annually disturbed agrosystems, 409 such as those of this study, initially mitigating the impact of weeds on IWG yield. Further studies

410 are required to test this hypothesis, and potentially identify the weed traits that are the most411 deleterious to IWG growth and grain yield in the field.

#### 412 4.2. Does weed biomass change under IWG over time?

Our results showed that weed biomass declined during fall in all four years of IWG growth 413 414 (Figure 1 and 3). This decline might have been due to increased competition with the crop in 415 fall, as IWG biomass was significantly higher during regrowth periods compared to when it was 416 establishment in the first fall (Figure 1). Alternatively, weed emergence might have declined 417 because soil preparation and tillage operations were not implemented after sowing the crop. 418 Also, the composition of the weed community might have shifted towards grasses, which 419 remain vegetative in fall. In any case, slow IWG growth during establishment in the first fall 420 clearly made the crop prone to substantial weed development in the first months after sowing. 421 with potentially enduring effects in terms of crop growth and weed management for farmers.

422 In spring, weed biomass was already high in the first year, and remained high throughout the 423 experimental period, despite higher IWG biomass in spring during the regrowth years. These 424 weed biomass levels tended to be higher than that recorded for grain crops, such as wheat 425 and barley, under organic management, for which weed biomass rarely exceeds 0.5 t DM.ha<sup>-</sup> 426 <sup>1</sup> (Drews et al., 2009; Lundkvist et al., 2008). Such high weed abundance is not likely to be 427 tolerated by farmers in strict grain cropping systems where weed biomass cannot be valorized 428 as forage, and controlling weed seedlings is an important issue. Law et al. (2021a) reported 429 stable weed biomass in spring over three years in IWG fields, whereas Zimbric et al. (2020) 430 reported a significant decline after the establishment year. Yet in the latter study, weed 431 biomass was sampled at grain harvest in summer, when early weeds were likely to have 432 already senesced. In fact, the significant decline in weed biomass recorded from the spring to 433 harvest sampling periods in our study (Figure 1) shows that sampling weeds at IWG harvest 434 might largely underestimate weed development, as most observed species grew in spring, and 435 were already senesced at the IWG harvest stage. In addition, the initial mean weed biomass 436 recorded in the current study was double that recorded by Zimbric et al. (2020); thus, weed

pressure was less challenging in this previous study, and the diversity of weed species waslower (notably very few grass species).

439 The fact that weed biomass did not decline in spring over the four years contrasts with previous 440 studies highlighting the value of temporary grasslands in promoting weed regulation for crop 441 rotations (Bretagnolle et al., 2011; Dominschek et al., 2021; Lemaire et al., 2015; Meiss et al., 442 2010a). However, data on temporary grasslands cannot be easily transposed to IWG fields 443 because management practices notably differ. For instance, absence of mowing and grazing 444 are absent in IWG fields, but are common practices during the entire spring period in 445 grasslands (Schuster et al., 2018, 2016). Since grain production is at stake, IWG tillers cannot 446 be cut or grazed after the start of stem elongation until grain maturity in late July or early 447 August. Consequently, many weed communities are able to complete their entire life cycle and 448 produce new seeds for the following year before IWG is harvested. This phenomenon is 449 particularly an issue with narrow-row planting (as is the case in this study), where mechanical 450 weeding is technically challenging.

451 Unlike IWG grown in pure stands, grasslands generally harbor a mixture of different grass 452 and/or legume species. Through complementarity and stabilizing niche differences (Cardinale 453 et al., 2007; Duchene et al., 2017; HilleRisLambers et al., 2012), functional diversity in mixtures 454 generally allow a better use of resources, leaving less vacant space for weed species to 455 develop. As such, previous studies highlighted the benefit of IWG intercropping with legumes 456 to reduce weed biomass (Law et al., 2021b), but also to increase forage value (Favre et al., 457 2019) and stabilize grain yields over multiple years (Dimitrova Mårtensson et al., 2022; Tautges 458 et al., 2018).

# 459 4.3. Do weed communities change with ageing IWG stands?

In our study, weed communities under ageing stands of IWG had lower diversity compared to those under young stands. Furthermore, as IWG stands aged, the composition of weed communities significantly shifted from primarily annual broadleaved weeds towards grass 463 species and, to a lesser extent, perennial and earlier flowering species (Figure 5 and 6). A 464 larger number of sites is needed to confirm whether the life history and earliness of plants are 465 robust drivers. Also, weed trait values could be improved by measuring the traits of studied 466 samples rather than using trait values provided in databases at the species level. While this 467 approach is sufficiently robust for some traits (e.g., plant division or life history), it does not 468 account for the plasticity of other traits in a given environment (e.g., SLA, height). At our study 469 sites, which had a history of annual rotation, a minimum of three years was required to observe 470 shifts in the weed community under IWG. Similar changes were observed at other studies for 471 both IWG (Law et al., 2021a; Zimbric et al., 2020) and temporary grasslands (Bretagnolle et 472 al., 2011; Hiltbrunner et al., 2008; Meiss et al., 2010a), with these studies reporting the 473 selection of grass weed species in perennial stands over time (e.g., Poa trivialis, Phleum 474 pratense).

475 At our study sites, the main grass species for which abundance increased included Poa 476 trivialis, Lolium perenne, Agrostis capillaris, Arrhenatherum elatius, and Bromus sterilis. These 477 species were mostly perennials that flowered earlier than IWG (Table 2; Figure 6). At one of 478 the sites, the early annual Alopecurus myosuroides was also present; however, it was already 479 relatively abundant in the first year, and no further increase was recorded. Among the few 480 broadleaf species that were also able to grow under IWG aging stands, almost all were 481 perennials (e.g., Taraxacum officinale, Epilobium hirsutum, and Potentilla reptans), except 482 Galium aparine.

The selection of species more adapted to co-existing with IWG reflected an interplay between differences in relative fitness and stabilizing niches (HilleRisLambers et al., 2012). The important changes that occurred when switching from an annually tilled system to a perennial system without tillage modify the fitness optimum for all species growing in a given agroecosystem, acting as a filter of weed species. In the current study, this phenomenon resulted in the clustering of weed species over time around two main functional traits: grass species and perennial habit, supporting previous studies (Dominschek et al., 2021; Fried et al., 490 2022; Mainardis et al., 2020). Furthermore, functional dissimilarity, such as different growing 491 cycles, also facilitate coexistence by limiting competition between species. The later phenology 492 of IWG (about 1630 average GDD accumulation from February 1<sup>st</sup> to flowering; Duchene et 493 al., 2021) compared to earlier temperate grass (<1300 GDD accumulation from February 1st 494 to flowering; e.g. Poa pratense, Arrhenantherum elatius, Lolium perenne, Dactylis glomerata, 495 Festuca arundinacea, Alopecurus myosuroides; Cruz et al., 2010) might explain why earlier 496 grasses thrive in IWG fields. Changes to resource gradients (i.e., light, nitrogen, moisture) 497 minimally affected our trait-based analysis (Figure 6). Still, light demanding species (e.g., Viola 498 arvensis, Cardamine hirsute, Achillea millefolium, Sonchus arvensis; Table 2) were systematically hindered, and there was a clear change in the light requirement of weed 499 500 communities at site 3, likely due to species that were only found at this location (e.g., 501 Cardamine hirsute, Sonchus arvensis, Galium aparine).

502 Among broadleaf species that continued to grow under IWG aging stands were Epilobium 503 hirsutum and Galium aparine, which have a climbing morphology, contrasting to broadleaves 504 with upright stature that are generally found in temporary grasslands (Meiss et al., 2010a). As 505 mowing and grazing were not implemented at our three sites, the potential role of these two 506 species in promoting or suppressing other weed species remains unexplored. However, as the 507 value of IWG perennial grain is linked to its ability to produce both grain and forage (Favre et 508 al., 2019; Law et al., 2022; Pugliese et al., 2019), the interactions between different defoliation 509 regimes and the assemblages of weed communities requires further research.

### 510 **5. CONCLUSIONS**

This study provided new evidence on the evolution of weed abundance and community composition under ageing IWG stands (establishment to four years). Biomass and yield performance of the perennial grain crop supported previous studies, with biomass production being lower during the first year, while grain yield substantially declined after the second harvest. While weed biomass tended to decrease in the fall of each year, it remained constant 516 in each spring; however, the composition of the weed communities shifted. The species 517 richness of weeds was also consistently lower under aging IWG stands, whereas evenness 518 remained dependent on local site characteristics and initial weed communities. Grasses and 519 perennials were largely favored over annual broadleaves; thus, strong fitness differences 520 appear to drive community composition towards species with similar functional traits. In 521 contrast, dissimilarity (e.g., phenological differences) might help to stabilize niche differences 522 and favor particular species. The abundance of weed species co-existing with IWG 523 demonstrates the need to assess the legacy effect of perennial grain in crop rotations. Such 524 information could help optimize optimal management practices, including planting time and 525 design, covered seeding, mechanical weeding, intercropping or mowing.

## 526 FUNDING

527 This project was supported by a grant from the European Union through a Biodiversa funding

528 for the project NAPERDIV. This work was also supported by a grant from the endowment fund

529 TERRA ISARA. The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

## 530 **CONTRIBUTIONS**

- 531 O.D., C.D., and F.C. conceived and planned the experiments. O.D. carried out the 532 experiments, sampling, formal analysis, and figure design. O.D., C.B. and F.C contributed to 533 the interpretation of results. O.D. led the writing the manuscript. C.B. participated to the writing, 534 editing and reviewing. C.D., B.D., and F.C. participated to reviewing and provided critical
- 535 feedback.

#### 536 **REFERENCES**

- Adeux, G., Vieren, E., Carlesi, S., Bàrberi, P., Munier-Jolain, N., Cordeau, S., 2019. Mitigating crop yield
  losses through weed diversity. Nat. Sustain. 2, 1018–1026. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-0190415-y
- Adeux, G., Yvoz, S., Biju-Duval, L., Cadet, E., Farcy, P., Fried, G., Guillemin, J.-P., Meunier, D., MunierJolain, N., Petit, S., Cordeau, S., 2022. Cropping system diversification does not always beget
  weed diversity. Eur. J. Agron. 133, 126438. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2021.126438
- Altendorf, K.R., DeHaan, L.R., Heineck, G.C., Zhang, X., Anderson, J.A., 2021. Floret site utilization and
   reproductive tiller number are primary components of grain yield in intermediate wheatgrass spaced
   plants. Crop Sci. 61, 1073–1088. https://doi.org/10.1002/csc2.20385

- Assuero, S.G., Tognetti, J.A., 2010. Tillering Regulation by Endogenous and Environmental Factors and
   its Agricultural Management. Am J Plant Sci Biotechnol 4, 35–48.
- Audu, V., Rasche, F., Dimitrova Mårtensson, L.-M., Emmerling, C., 2022. Perennial cereal grain
  cultivation: Implication on soil organic matter and related soil microbial parameters. Appl. Soil Ecol.
  174, 104414. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2022.104414
- 551 Barberi, P., 2002. Weed management in organic agriculture: are we addressing the right issues? Weed 552 Res. 42, 177–193. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-3180.2002.00277.x
- Bretagnolle, V., Gauffre, B., Meiss, H., Badenhausser, I., 2011. The role of grassland areas within arable
  cropping systems for the conservation of biodiversity at the regional level., in: Lemaire, G.,
  Hodgson, J., Chabbi, A. (Eds.), Grassland Productivity and Ecosystem Services. CABI,
  Wallingford, pp. 251–260. https://doi.org/10.1079/9781845938093.0251
- 557 Cardinale, B.J., Wright, J.P., Cadotte, M.W., Carroll, I.T., Hector, A., Srivastava, D.S., Loreau, M., Weis,
  558 J.J., 2007. Impacts of plant diversity on biomass production increase through time because of
  559 species complementarity. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 104, 18123–18128.
  560 https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0709069104
- 561 Cassman, K.G., Connor, D.J., 2022. Progress Towards Perennial Grains for Prairies and Plains. Outlook
   562 Agric. 00307270211073153. https://doi.org/10.1177/00307270211073153
- 563 Cattani, D., 2017. Selection of a perennial grain for seed productivity across years: Intermediate 564 wheatgrass as a test species. Can. J. Plant Sci. 97. https://doi.org/10.1139/CJPS-2016-0280
- 565 Chessel, D., Dufour, A.B., Thioulouse, J., 2004. The ade4 package I: One-table methods 4, 6.
- 566 Crews, T.E., Blesh, J., Culman, S.W., Hayes, R.C., Jensen, E.S., Mack, M.C., Peoples, M.B.,
  567 Schipanski, M.E., 2016. Going where no grains have gone before: From early to mid-succession.
  568 Agric. Ecosyst. Environ. 223, 223–238. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2016.03.012
- 569 Cruz, P., Theau, J.P., Lecloux, E., Jouany, C., Duru, M., 2010. Typologie fonctionnelle de graminées
   570 fourragères pérennes: une classification multitraits. Fourrages 201, 11–17.
- 571 Culman, S.W., Snapp, S.S., Ollenburger, M., Basso, B., DeHaan, L.R., 2013. Soil and Water Quality
  572 Rapidly Responds to the Perennial Grain Kernza Wheatgrass. Agron. J. 105, 735.
  573 https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj2012.0273
- De Oliveira, G., Brunsell, N.A., Sutherlin, C.E., Crews, T.E., DeHaan, L.R., 2018. Energy, water and
  carbon exchange over a perennial Kernza wheatgrass crop. Agric. For. Meteorol. 249, 120–137.
  https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2017.11.022
- 577 DeHaan, L., Larson, S., López-Marqués, R.L., Wenkel, S., Gao, C., Palmgren, M., 2020. Roadmap for
   578 Accelerated Domestication of an Emerging Perennial Grain Crop. Trends Plant Sci. 25, 525–537.
   579 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2020.02.004
- 580 Dick, C., Cattani, D., Entz, M., 2018. Kernza Intermediate wheatgrass (Thinopyrum intermedium) grain
   581 production as influenced by legume intercropping and residue management. Can. J. Plant Sci. 98,
   582 1376–1379.
- 583 Dimitrova Mårtensson, L.-M., Barreiro, A., Li, S., Jensen, E.S., 2022. Agronomic performance, nitrogen
   acquisition and water-use efficiency of the perennial grain crop Thinopyrum intermedium in a
   monoculture and intercropped with alfalfa in Scandinavia. Agron. Sustain. Dev. 42, 21.
   https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-022-00752-0
- 587 Dolédec, S., Chessel, D., ter Braak, C.J.F., Champely, S., 1996. Matching species traits to
  588 environmental variables: a new three-table ordination method. Environ. Ecol. Stat. 3, 143–166.
  589 https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02427859
- Dominschek, R., Barroso, A.A.M., Lang, C.R., de Moraes, A., Sulc, R.M., Schuster, M.Z., 2021. Crop
   rotations with temporary grassland shifts weed patterns and allows herbicide-free management
   without crop yield loss. J. Clean. Prod. 306, 127140. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.127140
- 593 Dray, S., Choler, P., Dolédec, S., Peres-Neto, P.R., Thuiller, W., Pavoine, S., Braak, C.J.F. ter, 2014.
  594 Combining the fourth-corner and the RLQ methods for assessing trait responses to environmental
  595 variation. Ecology 95, 14–21. https://doi.org/10.1890/13-0196.1
- 596 Dray, S., Legendre, P., 2008. Testing the Species Traits–Environment Relationships: The Fourth-Corner 597 Problem Revisited. Ecology 89, 3400–3412. https://doi.org/10.1890/08-0349.1
- Drews, S., Neuhoff, D., Köpke, U., 2009. Weed suppression ability of three winter wheat varieties at
  different row spacing under organic farming conditions. Weed Res. 49, 526–533.
  https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3180.2009.00720.x
- Duchene, O., 2020. Caractérisation fonctionnelle et performances d'une céréale vivace (Thinopyrum intermedium): une alternative agroécologique pour les systèmes de grandes cultures d'Europe occidentale. (These de doctorat). Paris, Institut agronomique, vétérinaire et forestier de France.

- Duchene, O., Celette, F., Ryan, M.R., DeHaan, L.R., Crews, T.E., David, C., 2019. Integrating
   multipurpose perennial grains crops in Western European farming systems. Agric. Ecosyst.
   Environ. 284, 106591. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2019.106591
- 607 Duchene, O., Dumont, B., Cattani, D.J., Fagnant, L., Schlautman, B., DeHaan, L.R., Barriball, S., 608 Jungers, J.M., Picasso, V.D., David, C., Celette, F., 2021. Process-based analysis of Thinopyrum 609 intermedium phenological development highlights the importance of dual induction for reproductive 610 performance. agronomic Agric. For. Meteorol. growth and 301-302, 108341. 611 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2021.108341
- Duchene, O., Vian, J.-F., Celette, F., 2017. Intercropping with legume for agroecological cropping
   systems: Complementarity and facilitation processes and the importance of soil microorganisms.
   A review. Agric. Ecosyst. Environ. 240, 148–161. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2017.02.019
- Fagnant, L., Duchene, O., Celette, F., David, C., Bindelle, J, Dumont, B., *under revisions*. Learning
  about the growing habits and reproductive strategy of Thinopyrum intermedium through the
  establishment of its critical nitrogen dilution curve. Field Crops Res.
- Favre, J.R., Castiblanco, T.M., Combs, D.K., Wattiaux, M.A., Picasso, V.D., 2019. Forage nutritive value
  and predicted fiber digestibility of Kernza intermediate wheatgrass in monoculture and in mixture
  with red clover during the first production year. Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 258, 114298.
  https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2019.114298
- Fernandez, C.W., Ehlke, N., Sheaffer, C.C., Jungers, J.M., 2020. Effects of nitrogen fertilization and
  planting density on intermediate wheatgrass yield. Agron. J. 112, 4159–4170.
  https://doi.org/10.1002/agj2.20351
- Fischer, R.A., 2020. Breeding wheat for increased potential yield: Contrasting ideas from Donald and
   Fasoulas, and the case for early generation selection under nil competition. Field Crops Res. 252,
   107782. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2020.107782
- Fried, G., Blanchet, C., Cazenave, L., Bopp, M., Kazakou, E., Metay, A., Christen, M., Alard, D.,
  Cordeau, S., 2022. Consistent response of weeds according to Grime's CSR strategies along
  disturbance and resource gradients in Bordeaux vineyards. Weed Res. wre.12549.
  https://doi.org/10.1111/wre.12549
- Fried, G., Kazakou, E., Gaba, S., 2012. Trajectories of weed communities explained by traits associated
  with species' response to management practices. Agric. Ecosyst. Environ. 158, 147–155.
  https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2012.06.005
- Fried, G., Norton, L.R., Reboud, X., 2008. Environmental and management factors determining weed
  species composition and diversity in France. Agric. Ecosyst. Environ. 128, 68–76.
  https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2008.05.003
- Gaba, S., Fried, G., Kazakou, E., Chauvel, B., Navas, M.-L., 2014. Agroecological weed control using a
  functional approach: a review of cropping systems diversity. Agron. Sustain. Dev. 34, 103–119.
  https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-013-0166-5
- 641 Grime, J.P., 2006. Trait convergence and trait divergence in herbaceous plant communities:
   642 Mechanisms and consequences. J. Veg. Sci. 17, 255–260. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1654-</u>
   643 <u>1103.2006.tb02444.x</u>
- Hill, M.O., Mountford, J.O., Roy, D.B., Bunce, R.G.H., 1999. Technical annex—Ellenberg's indicator
   values for British plants. ECOFACT, England
- Hill, M.O., Smith, A.J.E., 1976. Principal Component Analysis of Taxonomic Data with Multi-State
   Discrete Characters. Taxon 25, 249–255. https://doi.org/10.2307/1219449
- HilleRisLambers, J., Adler, P.B., Harpole, W.S., Levine, J.M., Mayfield, M.M., 2012. Rethinking
  Community Assembly through the Lens of Coexistence Theory. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst. 43,
  227–248. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-110411-160411
- Hiltbrunner, J., Scherrer, C., Streit, B., Jeanneret, P., Zihlmann, U., Tschachtli, R., 2008. Long-term
  weed community dynamics in Swiss organic and integrated farming systems. Weed Res. 48, 360–
  369. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3180.2008.00639.x
- Hunter, M.C., Sheaffer, C.C., Culman, S.W., Jungers, J.M., 2020. Effects of defoliation and row spacing
   on intermediate wheatgrass i: Grain production. Agron. J. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/agj2.20128</u>
- Julve, Ph., 1998 ff.—Baseflor. Index botanique, écologique et chorologique de la flore de France.
   http://philippe.julve.pagesperso-orange.fr/catminat.htm
- Jungers, J.M., DeHaan, L.H., Mulla, D.J., Sheaffer, C.C., Wyse, D.L., 2019. Reduced nitrate leaching in
  a perennial grain crop compared to maize in the Upper Midwest, USA. Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.
  272, 63–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2018.11.007

- Jungers, J.M., DeHaan, L.R., Betts, K.J., Sheaffer, C.C., Wyse, D.L., 2017. Intermediate Wheatgrass
  Grain and Forage Yield Responses to Nitrogen Fertilization. Agron. J. 109, 462–472.
  https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj2016.07.0438
- Kim, K., Daly, E.J., Flesch, T.K., Coates, T.W., Hernandez-Ramirez, G., 2022. Carbon and water
  dynamics of a perennial versus an annual grain crop in temperate agroecosystems. Agric. For.
  Meteorol. 314, 108805. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2021.108805</u>
- Kleyer, M. et al., 2008. The LEDA Trait base: a database of life-history traits of Northwest European
   flora. J. Ecol. 96, 1266–1274. https://uol.de/en/landeco/research/leda/data-filest
- Kuznetsova, A., Brockhoff, P.B., Christensen, R.H.B., Jensen, S.P., 2019. ImerTest: Tests in Linear
   Mixed Effects Models.
- Lafarge, M., Durand, J.-L., 2011. Comment l'herbe pousse: développement végétatif, structures
   clonales et spatiales des graminées, Synthèses. Éd. Quae, Versailles.
- Lanker, M., Bell, M., Picasso, V.D., 2019. Farmer perspectives and experiences introducing the novel
   perennial grain Kernza intermediate wheatgrass in the US Midwest. Renew. Agric. Food Syst. 1–
   10. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742170519000310
- Law, E.P., Wayman, S., Pelzer, C.J., Culman, S.W., Gómez, M.I., DiTommaso, A., Ryan, M.R., 2022.
  Multi-Criteria Assessment of the Economic and Environmental Sustainability Characteristics of Intermediate Wheatgrass Grown as a Dual-Purpose Grain and Forage Crop. Sustainability 14, 3548. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14063548
- Law, E.P., Wayman, S., Pelzer, C.J., DiTommaso, A., Ryan, M.R., 2021a. Tradeoffs between grain and
   straw production from perennial Kernza intermediate wheatgrass and annual winter wheat in
   central New York State. Agron. J. agj2.20914. https://doi.org/10.1002/agj2.20914
- Law, E.P., Wayman, S., Pelzer, C.J., DiTommaso, A., Ryan, M.R., 2021b. Intercropping red clover with
   intermediate wheatgrass suppresses weeds without reducing grain yield. Agron. J. n/a.
   https://doi.org/10.1002/agj2.20914
- Lemaire, G., Gastal, F., Franzluebbers, A., Chabbi, A., 2015. Grassland–Cropping Rotations: An
  Avenue for Agricultural Diversification to Reconcile High Production with Environmental Quality.
  Environ. Manage. 56, 1065–1077. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-015-0561-6
- Lundkvist, A., Salomonsson, L., Karlsson, L., Gustavsson, A.-M.D., 2008. Effects of organic farming on
  weed flora composition in a long term perspective. Eur. J. Agron. 28, 570–578.
  https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2008.01.001
- Mainardis, M., Boscutti, F., Cebolla, M. del M.R., Pergher, G., 2020. Comparison between flaming,
   mowing and tillage weed control in the vineyard: Effects on plant community, diversity and
   abundance. PLOS ONE 15, e0238396. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0238396
- Meiss, H., Médiène, S., Waldhardt, R., Caneill, J., Bretagnolle, V., Reboud, X., Munier- Jolain, N., 2010.
   Perennial lucerne affects weed community trajectories in grain crop rotations. Weed Res. 50, 331–
   340. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3180.2010.00784.x
- Meiss, Helmut, Médiène, S., Waldhardt, R., Caneill, J., Munier-Jolain, N., 2010. Contrasting weed
   species composition in perennial alfalfas and six annual crops: implications for integrated weed
   management. Agron. Sustain. Dev. 30, 657–666. https://doi.org/10.1051/agro/2009043
- Meiss, H., Munier-Jolain, N., Henriot, F., Caneill, J., 2008. Effects of biomass, age and functional traits
   on regrowth of arable weeds after cutting. J. Plant Dis. Prot. Special Issue XXI, 493–499.
- 703
   Oerke,
   E.-C.,
   2006.
   Crop
   losses
   to
   pests.
   J.
   Agric.
   Sci.
   144,
   31–43.

   704
   https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021859605005708
- 705 Oksanen, J., 2005. Multivariate Analysis of Ecological Communities in R 35.
- Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F.G., Friendly, M., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., McGlinn, D., Minchin, P.R., O'Hara,
  R.B., Simpson, G.L., Solymos, P., H. Stevens, M.H., Szoecs, E., Wagner, H., 2020. Community
  Ecology Package.
- Olugbenle, O., Pinto, P., Picasso, V.D., 2021. Optimal Planting Date of Kernza Intermediate Wheatgrass
   Intercropped with Red Clover. Agronomy 11, 2227. https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy11112227
- Plepho, H.-P., 2004. An algorithm for a letter-based representation of all pairwise comparisons. J.
   Comput. Graph. Stat. 13, 456–466.
- Pugliese, J.Y., Culman, S.W., Sprunger, C.D., 2019. Harvesting forage of the perennial grain crop
   kernza (Thinopyrum intermedium) increases root biomass and soil nitrogen cycling. Plant Soil.
   https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-019-03974-6
- 716 R Core Team, 2018. R: A Language for Statistical Computing.

- 717 Renne, I.J., Tracy, B.F., 2007. Disturbance persistence in managed grasslands: shifts in aboveground 718 seed bank. Plant community structure and the weed Ecol. 190. 71-80. 719 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11258-006-9191-7
- Rouet, S., Barillot, R., Leclercq, D., Bernicot, M.-H., Combes, D., Escobar-Gutiérrez, A., Durand, J.-L.,
   2021. Interactions Between Environment and Genetic Diversity in Perennial Grass Phenology: A
   Review of Processes at Plant Scale and Modeling. Front. Plant Sci. 12.
- Ryan, M.R., Crews, T.E., Culman, S.W., DeHaan, L.R., Hayes, R.C., Jungers, J.M., Bakker, M.G., 2018.
   Managing for Multifunctionality in Perennial Grain Crops. BioScience 68, 294–304.
- Sainju, U.M., Allen, B.L., Lenssen, A.W., Ghimire, R.P., 2017. Root biomass, root/shoot ratio, and soil
   water content under perennial grasses with different nitrogen rates. Field Crops Res. 210, 183–
   191. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2017.05.029
- Sakiroglu, M., Dong, C., Hall, M.B., Jungers, J., Picasso, V., 2020. How does nitrogen and forage
   harvest affect belowground biomass and nonstructural carbohydrates in dual-use Kernza
   intermediate wheatgrass? Crop Sci. 60, 2562–2573. https://doi.org/10.1002/csc2.20239
- Schuster, M.Z., Gastal, F., Doisy, D., Charrier, X., de Moraes, A., Médiène, S., Barbu, C.M., 2020. Weed
  regulation by crop and grassland competition: critical biomass level and persistence rate. Eur. J.
  Agron. 113, 125963. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2019.125963
- Schuster, M.Z., Harrison, S.K., Moraes, A. de, Sulc, R.M., Carvalho, P.C.F., Lang, C.R., Anghinoni, I.,
  Lustosa, S.B.C., Gastal, F., 2018. Effects of crop rotation and sheep grazing management on the
  seedbank and emerged weed flora under a no-tillage integrated crop-livestock system. J. Agric.
  Sci. 156, 810–820. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021859618000813
- 738 Schuster, M.Z., Pelissari, A., de Moraes, A., Harrison, S.K., Sulc, R.M., Lustosa, S.B.C., Anghinoni, I., 739 Carvalho, P.C.F., 2016. Grazing intensities affect weed seedling emergence and the seed bank in 740 integrated crop-livestock system. Agric. Ecosyst. Environ. 232, 232–239. an 741 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2016.08.005
- Smith, A.L., Barrett, R.L., Milner, R.N.C., 2018. Annual mowing maintains plant diversity in threatened
   temperate grasslands. Appl. Veg. Sci. 21, 207–218. https://doi.org/10.1111/avsc.12365
- Sprunger, C.D., Culman, S.W., Peralta, A.L., DuPont, S.T., Lennon, J.T., Snapp, S.S., 2019. Perennial
  grain crop roots and nitrogen management shape soil food webs and soil carbon dynamics. Soil
  Biol. Biochem. 137, 107573. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2019.107573
- Tautges, N.E., Jungers, J.M., DeHaan, L.R., Wyse, D.L., Sheaffer, C.C., 2018. Maintaining grain yields
   of the perennial cereal intermediate wheatgrass in monoculture v. bi-culture with alfalfa in the Upper
   Midwestern USA. J. Agric. Sci. 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021859618000680
- Vico, G., Brunsell, N.A., 2017. Tradeoffs between water requirements and yield stability in annual vs.
   perennial crops. Adv. Water Resour. 112, 189–202.
   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2017.12.014
- 753 Wilhm, J.L., 1968. Use of Biomass Units in Shannon's Formula. Ecology 49, 153–156. 754 https://doi.org/10.2307/1933573
- Zimbric, J.W., Stoltenberg, D.E., Picasso, V.D., 2020. Effective weed suppression in dual-use
   intermediate wheatgrass systems. Agron. J. 112. https://doi.org/10.1002/agj2.20194
- 757 Zimdahl, R.L., 2007. Weed-Crop Competition: A Review. John Wiley & Sons.