



# Regenerative Soil Diagnostics: Tools for Restoring Soil Health

Dr. Lucas P. Moreau\*

Dept. of Regenerative Agriculture, Nouvelle Terre University, France

\*Corresponding author: Dr. Lucas P. Moreau, Dept. of Regenerative Agriculture, Nouvelle Terre University, France, Email: l.moreau@ntu.fr

**Citation:** Lucas PM (2025) Regenerative Soil Diagnostics: Tools for Restoring Soil Health. J Soil Sci Plant Health 7: 257

**Received:** 01-Dec-2025, Manuscript No. JSPH-25-183650; **Editor assigned:** 4-Dec-2025, Pre-QC No. JSPH-25-183650 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 18-Dec-2025, QC No. JSPH-25-183650; **Revised:** 25-Dec-2025, Manuscript No. JSPH-25-183650 (R); **Published:** 31-Dec-2025, DOI: 10.4172/jsph.1000257

## Introduction

Soil degradation threatens agricultural productivity, ecosystem services, and climate stability worldwide. Conventional soil testing has traditionally focused on chemical indicators such as nutrient concentrations and pH, often overlooking the biological and physical dimensions of soil health. As regenerative agriculture gains momentum, there is a growing need for diagnostic approaches that capture the full complexity of soil systems. Regenerative soil diagnostics represent an integrated framework for assessing soil health by evaluating biological activity, physical structure, and chemical balance to guide restoration-focused land management [1,2].

## Discussion

Regenerative soil diagnostics go beyond standard soil tests by emphasizing indicators that reflect soil function rather than only nutrient supply. Biological indicators play a central role in this approach. Measurements such as microbial biomass, soil respiration, enzyme activity, and fungal-to-bacterial ratios provide insight into nutrient cycling efficiency and soil resilience. Healthy, biologically active soils are better able to support plant growth, suppress pathogens, and recover from stress [3,4].

Physical indicators are equally important in regenerative diagnostics. Soil aggregation, bulk density, infiltration rate, and water-holding capacity reveal how well soil structure supports root development and water movement. Poor physical structure often limits crop productivity, even when nutrients are sufficient. By diagnosing compaction or poor aggregation, regenerative soil assessments help

identify management practices such as reduced tillage, cover cropping, or organic amendments that restore soil structure [5].

Chemical indicators remain a key component but are interpreted within a broader functional context. Instead of focusing solely on maximizing nutrient levels, regenerative diagnostics assess nutrient balance, organic carbon content, and cation exchange capacity. These indicators help determine whether soils can store and supply nutrients efficiently over time. Soil organic carbon is particularly important, as it links biological activity, nutrient retention, and climate mitigation through carbon sequestration.

Modern regenerative soil diagnostics increasingly incorporate advanced technologies. Spectroscopy, remote sensing, and digital soil mapping allow for rapid, large-scale assessments of soil health. In addition, on-farm monitoring tools and decision-support systems enable farmers to track soil improvements over time and adapt management strategies accordingly. However, challenges remain in standardizing indicators and interpreting results across diverse soil types and climates.

## Conclusion

Regenerative soil diagnostics provide a holistic approach to understanding and restoring soil health. By integrating biological, physical, and chemical indicators, these diagnostics offer actionable insights that support sustainable land management. As agriculture shifts toward regenerative practices, soil diagnostics will play a crucial role in guiding restoration efforts, improving productivity, and enhancing ecosystem resilience. Continued refinement and adoption of these tools will be essential for achieving long-term soil sustainability.

## References

1. Breman JG, Henderson DA (2002) Diagnosis and management of smallpox. *N Engl J Med* 346:1300-1308.
2. Damon IK (2011) Status of human monkeypox: clinical disease, epidemiology and research. *Vaccine* 29: D54-D59.
3. Ladnyj ID, Ziegler P, Kima E (2017) A human infection caused by monkeypox virus in Basankusu Territory, Democratic Republic of the Congo. *Bull World Health Organ* 46: 593.
4. Olson VA, Laue T, Laker MT, Babkin IV, Drosten C, et al. (2019) Real-time PCR system for detection of orthopoxviruses and simultaneous identification of smallpox virus. *J Clin Microbiol* 42: 1940-1946.
5. MacNeil A, Reynolds MG, Braden Z, Carroll DS, Bostik V, et al (2009) Transmission of atypical varicella-zoster virus infections involving palm and sole manifestations in an area with monkeypox endemicity. *Clin Infect Dis* 48: 6-8.