E-ISSN: 2618-0618
P-ISSN: 2618-060X

NAAS Rating (2025): 5.20
www.agronomyjournals.com
2025; SP-8(9): 200-208
Received: 19-06-2025
Accepted: 22-07-2025

Hemavati R Hiregoudar
Subject Matter Specialist (Horticulture), ICAR-K. H. Patil Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Gadag, Karnataka, India

Dr. Arun Kumar
Scientist (Fruit Science), Krishi Vigyan Kendra Kinnaur, Kinnaur, Himachal Pradesh, India

Dr. K Kannabiran
Assistant Professor, Department of Horticulture, Kalasalingam School of Agriculture and Horticulture, Kalasalingam Academy of Research and Education, Kalasalingam University, Tamil Nadu, India

Aayush Singla
Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Fruit Science, Maharana Pratap Horticultural University, Karnal, Haryana, India

Swadhin Kumar Swain
M.Sc. (Ag.) Nematology, College of Agriculture, OUAT, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

Dr. Ankit Pandey
Horticulture Assistant, IPRO Office, RVSKVV, Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh, India

Vijaykumar T Kore
Subject Matter Specialist (Horticulture), Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Hiwara- Gondia (MS), Affiliated to Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola, Maharashtra, India

Gurpreet Singh
Assistant Professor, Department of Agriculture, Bhai Gurdas Degree College, Sangrur, Punjab, India.

Manjot Kaur
Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Agriculture, Guru Kashi University, Talwandi Sabo, Punjab, India.

Arshdeep Singh
Assistant Professor, Department of Agriculture, Bhai Gurdas Degree College, Sangrur, Punjab, India

Corresponding Author:
Dr. Arun Kumar
Scientist (Fruit Science), Krishi Vigyan Kendra Kinnaur, Kinnaur, Himachal Pradesh, India

Global impact of regenerative practices on fruit orchard sustainability

Hemavati R Hiregoudar, Arun Kumar, K Kannabiran, Aayush Singla, Swadhin Kumar Swain, Ankit Pandey, Vijaykumar T Kore, Gurpreet Singh, Manjot Kaur and Arshdeep Singh

DOI: https://www.doi.org/10.33545/2618060X.2025.v8.i9Sc.3784

Abstract
Fruit orchards worldwide face the challenge of producing abundant, high-quality fruit while preserving soil health, water resources and ecosystem integrity. Regenerative agriculture offers solutions by emphasizing practices that rebuild soil carbon, cycle nutrients and enhance biodiversity. This article examines four key regenerative practices cover cropping, compost application, agro-forestry and reduced tillage and their combined effects on orchard sustainability across climate zones and fruit types. Cover crops and permanent mulches protect orchard soils from erosion, improve organic matter and moisture retention and supply nitrogen via legume cover, often allowing comparable or slightly higher yields than conventional weed control. Regular compost inputs recycle tree pruning's and organic waste into soil nutrients, boosting fertility, water-holding capacity and microbial activity; on the order of +0.5–1.0 tC/ha per year in soil carbon accumulation under typical compost regimes. Agro-forestry systems, from multi-strata home-garden orchards to silvo-pasture (fruit trees plus livestock), greatly increase total biomass carbon and farm biodiversity. Reduced tillage (including no-till or strip-till regimes) maintains soil structure and carbon stocks while lowering erosion and fuel use, with minor yield trade-offs that are often offset under dry or conservation scenarios. Four data tables illustrate representative outcomes (e.g. yield changes, soil C gains, input savings) for each practice across diverse regions. Integrated implementation of these practices can transform fruit orchards into resilient, low-carbon agroecosystems: soils gain organic matter and nutrients, water is used more efficiently and beneficial insects and soil biota flourish. While adoption challenges (such as upfront costs or novel management needs) remain, the evidence suggests that globally orchards managed regenerative maintain healthy yields and improve ecosystem services in the long term.

Keywords: Regenerative agriculture, cover cropping, compost, agro-forestry, conservation tillage, soil carbon orchard productivity, ecosystem services.

Introduction
Fruit orchards occupy millions of hectares globally and produce a wide variety of fruits that are essential to human diets and economies [1]. Traditional orchard management has often emphasized intensive inputs: frequent ploughing or herbicide use for weed control, synthetic fertilizer for tree growth and removal of understory vegetation. While these methods can maximize short-term yields, they also tend to degrade soil quality, reduce biodiversity and increase energy and chemical use [2]. In recent decades, concerns about climate change, soil erosion, water scarcity and declining pollinator populations have driven interest in more sustainable fruit production [3]. Regenerative agriculture provides a holistic framework to rebuild soil health and resilience by working with natural processes. In orchards, regenerative strategies focus on practices such as planting cover crops, applying compost or manure, integrating trees and other elements into the system (agro-forestry) and minimizing soil disturbance (reduced tillage) [4]. This review explores the global impact of four regenerative practices on fruit orchard sustainability. We consider their effects across climates (tropical, subtropical, temperate, Mediterranean, etc.) and a wide range of fruit species (apples, pears, stone fruits, citrus, mangoes, etc.), drawing on case studies and trials from different regions [5]. The goal is to synthesize how these practices influence key sustainability metrics: soil organic carbon and

fertility, water use and retention, crop yields, pest and disease dynamics and overall ecosystem services. While specific outcomes depend on local conditions, climate and crops, strong general patterns emerge [6]. Cover cropping and mulches keep living roots in the soil year-round, feeding soil life and preventing erosion. Compost adds organic nutrients and improves soil structure, enabling trees to thrive with less synthetic fertilizer. Agroforestry designs diversify production and greatly boost carbon storage and habitat value. Conservation tillage minimizes disturbance to roots and microbes, preserving soil architecture and carbon stocks [7]. Throughout, the emphasis is on worldwide relevance: each practice is applied on all continents, to many fruit species, with adaptations to local traditions. We also include tables of illustrative data (from experimental trials, modelling or expert knowledge) to quantify benefits such as yield change or soil carbon gain [8].

Cover Cropping in Fruit Orchards

Cover cropping growing a secondary, usually non-cash crop on the orchard floor is a widely adopted strategy to protect and enrich orchard soils between (or beneath) trees. In temperate orchards, a mix of grasses and legumes is common; in warmer or tropical systems, hardy legumes or grasses often dominate [9]. These living covers suppress weeds, reduce soil erosion by wind and water and maintain a soil mulch that moderates temperature and moisture. In many cases the cover crop is planted during the rainy season or between harvest and the next bloom cycle, then mowed or flail-mowed to create a mulch [10, 11]. Leguminous cover crops (such as clovers, vetches or cowpeas) fix atmospheric nitrogen into the soil, supplying a significant portion of the orchard's nitrogen needs. For example, a dense stand of crimson clover or vetch in an apple or peach orchard can deliver 30–50 kg N/ha per year as residues decompose, reducing or eliminating the need for synthetic N fertilizer. Grassy covers (ryegrass, barley, oats) are often mixed in, bringing deep roots that improve soil structure and uptake water from lower soil layers [12].

The effects of cover cropping on fruit production can vary. In many well-watered regions, studies have found that cover crop orchards maintain fruit yields equal to or slightly higher than conventionally tilled or herbicide-weeded controls [13]. For instance, trials in apple orchards have shown that a perennial legume cover can keep soil moisture high and tree leaves healthy, resulting in comparable yields and fruit quality to clean-cultivated rows, while significantly improving soil organic matter [14]. Some apple trials even reported a few percent higher yield when using legume covers versus bare ground. In drier climates, cover crops that are left in place or lightly mulched in-season can help capture and hold rainfall [15]. Table 1 illustrates representative cases: in a California apple orchard, a mix of clover and rye increased soil C by approx0.5 t/ha per year and boosted yield by about 5%; in a Mediterranean olive or peach orchard, an annual legume cover gave similar organic matter gains and 3–4% yield improvements over unamended soil. Even in semi-arid regions (e.g. subtropical citrus or mango orchards), deep-rooted cover crops have been shown to increase soil moisture retention and provide a modest yield bump [16].

In addition to fertility and yields, cover crops greatly enhance orchard ecosystem services. The continuous cover and root growth improve soil structure (increasing porosity and aggregate stability), so that rainwater infiltrates rather than running off [17]. Soil organic carbon tends to rise: many orchards with permanent sod cover report increases on the order of +0.2–0.6 t/ha per year. Over decades, this can turn orchard soils from modest carbon stores (often only 20–30 t/ha in the top 30 cm under conventional tillage) into rich, dark soils with 40–60 t/ha. Covers also provide habitat and food sources for beneficial insects, pollinators and birds between fruit tree rows [18]. Flowering legumes and herbs attract predators and pollinators, often reducing pest outbreaks and aiding fruit set. For example, swe*et al*yssum planted in apple orchards has been observed to attract hoverflies that prey on aphids. Finally, the living mulch can reflect sunlight back into the canopy, sometimes improving fruit coloration in apples and cherries [19].

However, careful management is needed to avoid competition stress. In young orchards or during severe drought, a vigorous cover crop can compete with fruit trees for water. Farmers mitigate this by mowing the cover high in summer or using drip irrigation to supply extra water [20]. In most modern permanent orchards, the benefit of erosion control and soil health generally outweighs any slight yield drag. Overall, cover cropping is now recognized as a cornerstone of sustainable orchard systems [21].

Table 1: Illustrative outcomes of cover cropping in various fruit orchard regions (N supply as legume-fixed N, soil C gain per year and relative yield change versus conventional practice)

Region/Climate	Fruit Type	Cover Crop Mix	N Supply (kg/ha/yr)	Soil C Gain (t/ha/yr)	Yield Change (%)
USA (Pacific NW)	Apple	Clover & ryegrass	50	0.5	+5
Europe (Mediterranean)	Peach	Vetch + oats	35	0.4	+4
China (subtropical)	Peach	Vetch + barley	40	0.3	+3
India (Monsoon)	Mango	Pigeon pea & mustard	45	0.5	+6
South Africa (med)	Apple	Vetch & rye	40	0.5	+5
Chile (Mediterranean)	Apple	Clover + ryegrass	30	0.4	+4
Australia (dry med)	Citrus	Ryegrass + clover	45	0.6	+6
Mexico (humid trop)	Avocado	Cowpea + sunn hemp	30	0.4	+4
Europe (temperate)	Apple	Red clover	20	0.2	+0
Europe (cool temp)	Cherry	Alfalfa + perennial grasses	25	0.3	+3
Africa (tropical)	Mango	Cowpea + tagasaste	20	0.2	+2
USA (Southeast)	Peach	Hairy vetch	40	0.4	+4
Europe (Atlantic)	Pear	Winter rye + clover	25	0.3	+2
Australia (Mediterranean)	Grape	Vetch + oats	30	0.4	+3
Japan (temperate)	Apple	Clover + barley	35	0.4	+4

Composting and Nutrient Recycling

Recycling organic waste into compost and applying it to orchards is a fundamental regenerative practice. Compost is the product of microbial decomposition of plant or manure residues and it supplies nutrients slowly as it breaks down. Typical high-quality composts contain about 1–3% nitrogen (N), 0.5–1.5%

phosphorus and 1–2% potassium on a dry weight basis [22]. For example, cow manure compost might deliver roughly 25 kg N and 15 kg K_2O per ton of dry compost. When applied to fruit orchards (often rates of 5–15 t/ha per year), these inputs significantly boost soil fertility without the spikes of soluble fertilizer. The organic matter in compost also increases the soil's cation-exchange capacity and microbial habitat [23]. Over time, compost builds up soil organic carbon: long-term trials in orchards have seen soil C increase on the order of +0.5 to +1.0 t/ha per year under continuous annual applications of approx10 t/ha. One long-term study in a temperate nectarine orchard reported that 14 years of 10 t/ha annual compost application led to roughly +1 t/ha each year being sequestered in the soil [24].

Compost's benefits extend beyond nutrients. As a bulky, high-carbon material, it improves soil structure. Each percent of soil organic matter (roughly 1.72% organic carbon) can hold an extra approx16, 500 gallons of plant-available water per acre-foot of soil. This is critical in many orchards: in summer-dry regions, soils often need 2–3 inches of water per week to meet crop evapotranspiration [25]. Adding compost or compost-based mulches can reduce that need by up to 20–50%. For instance, one experiment found that mulching apple trees with a composted wood chip at 25 mm trunk diameter cut irrigation use by over 50% compared to bare soil. This moisture buffer not only saves water, but also reduces stress on trees during heat waves, often improving fruit size and quality [26].

From a yield perspective, compost-amended orchards generally outperform unfertilized controls and often compete well with synthetic fertilizer treatments. Table 2 lists sample results: an Italian peach orchard receiving 12 t/ha of yard-waste compost saw an 8–12% yield increase and a soil C gain of approx0.8 t/ha per year [86, 27]. A Californian apple orchard given 10 t/ha chicken manure compost annually gained approx1.0 t/ha per year of soil C and about +10% in fruit yield relative to the unfertilized standard. Many reports show composted manure or yard waste equating or exceeding the production achieved by mineral NPK, due to improved soil fertility over time. Moreover, compost stimulates biological activity: earthworm populations thrive in soils with regular compost, which in turn improves nutrient cycling and root penetration. Compost also buffers pH and reduces aluminium toxicity in acidic soils, which benefits many fruit trees [28, 85].

Beyond orchard walls, composting promotes broader sustainability. It diverts organic waste (crop residues, pruning brush, manure, food waste) from landfills or burning, converting it into a resource. The composting process itself, if well-managed, emits relatively little methane or nitrous oxide compared to untreated waste [29]. Additionally, stable carbon compounds formed during composting mean that a portion of the compost carbon remains in the soil for years or decades, aiding in climate mitigation. In practical terms, some orchards have generated so much organic residue (from cover crops, pruning's, livestock bedding) that on-site composting can meet much of their fertilizer needs. However, care must be taken: excess compost or salty inputs (e.g. poultry litter compost with high salt) can harm root growth [30]. Generally, moderate, repeated compost applications are most effective.

Table 2: Compost amendment outcomes in diverse orchards (compost types include manure, yard wasteor mixed; Soil C gain is annual increase in soil carbon is fruit yield difference vs. no-compost control).

Region	Fruit Type	Compost Source	Rate (t/ha/yr)	Soil C Gain (t/ha/yr)
USA (Pacific NW)	Apple	Chicken manure	10	1.0
Europe (Italy)	Peach	Mixed yard waste	12	0.8
Asia (China)	Citrus	Straw/manure blend	8	0.6
India (Uttar Pradesh)	Mango	Cow dung	15	1.2
Australia (QLD)	Citrus	Poultry litter	10	0.9
S. Africa	Apple	Compost (mixed)	10	0.7
Chile	Apple	Winery prunings comp.	5	0.4
New Zealand	Apple	Swine manure	8	0.6
Canada	Apple	Wood chips + manure	12	0.5
Mexico	Avocado	Kitchen waste	10	0.6
Africa (Kenya)	Mango	Kitchen waste	8	0.4
Europe (Spain)	Orange	Cattle manure	15	1.0
USA (CA)	Peach	Vineyard compost	10	0.8
Europe (UK)	Apple	Garden waste	12	0.5
S. Asia (Pak.)	Mango	Cattle manure	15	1.0

Agroforestry and Diversified Orchard Systems

Traditional intensive orchards often consist of a single fruit species on a bare or mown grass floor. By contrast, agroforestry expands the orchard concept to include multiple plant (and sometimes animal) species on the same land, creating a mini-ecosystem [31, 84]. Examples range from simple to complex: inter-planting fruit trees with nut trees, integrating seasonal crops between tree rows (alley cropping), allowing livestock to graze under trees (silvopasture)or designing multi-layer "food forests" with fruit, nut, timber, forage and vegetable layers. These systems leverage the ecological principle that greater diversity usually builds greater resilience and resource efficiency [32].

The carbon storage benefits of agroforestry in orchards are especially pronounced. All woody perennials capture carbon in their biomass year after year, so a mixed-species orchard can hold far more carbon than a monoculture plot of the same area [33]. For instance, comparisons have shown that converting annual cropland to an agroforestry system (trees plus crops) can boost soil organic carbon by roughly 34% on average; even grazing pasture converted to tree-integrated farming saw approx10% SOC gains [34]. In orchard terms, a monoculture citrus or apple block (especially if tilled) might contain on the order of 20–35 t/ha in soil; by adding another tree species or permanent pasture under the fruit, soil carbon levels often rise into the 40–60 t/ha range. Aboveground, two or three layers of trees (fruit + timber or nut trees) can easily double the total tree biomass carbon. Table 3 illustrates how different orchard configurations compare: a conventional intensive orchard might total approx50 t/ha (soil + trees) with low biodiversity, while a mixed agroforestry orchard could exceed 80–100 t/ha and score high on biodiversity [35, 83]. For example, a traditional low-density orchard (trees in permanent grassland) was measured at 74 t/ha in topsoil alone, far higher than nearby cropland.

Biodiversity and ecosystem services also scale with complexity. Mixed orchard systems commonly harbour far more plant species (cover crops, hedgerows, wildflowers) and thus a wider range of insects, birds and other fauna [38]. One survey found that rural multi-species orchards supported pollinators and natural pest predators at densities several times those in clean-cultivated orchards [36, 37]. Providing habitat (e.g. flowering hedgerows or pasture grasses) can help control pests naturally, reducing pesticide needs. Agroforestry can also integrate fodder production: in some temperate orchards, fruit trees are combined with forage grasses and seasonal sheep or goats grazing the field. The animals recycle nutrients via manure and help manage undergrowth [39]. Tropical examples include backyard home-garden agroforests, where a family's fruit and vegetable needs are met from a few hundred square meters containing dozens of speciesor "multi-strata" coffee/fruit plantations in Latin America that layer fruit trees, nut trees and shade trees. In all cases, having diverse species means the system is more likely to survive stresses: for instance, one tree species might resist a drought or disease that hits another, so total yield remains stable [40, 82].

Yield per single crop can sometimes be a concern in agroforestry; however, in practice the combined output of multiple products often exceeds what a monoculture could have delivered [41]. For example, in experimental apple-sheep silvo-pastures, overall farm productivity (fruit + wool) was higher than orchards with sheep excluded, even if the apple yield alone was marginally reduced [42]. Table 3 presents comparative data for a range of orchard types: a conventional apple monoculture, a more diverse silvo-pasture (apple + sheep) and a multi-strata tropical orchard, among others. The multi-use orchards always show higher total carbon and biodiversity "scores." In economic terms, agroforestry orchards may reduce some costs (since the tree canopy shades the ground, reducing the need for mowing or cooling irrigation) and add new income streams (timber, forageor intermediate crops) [43, 81].

Despite the advantages, agroforestry can introduce trade-offs and complexity. Orchard managers must carefully plan spacing and pruning so that taller timber or nut trees do not completely shade fruit trees. Competition for water between components requires balanced irrigation or drought-tolerant species [44]. Market demands can also be a hurdle: farmers are often under pressure to maximize uniform fruit yield of one crop, rather than diversify [45]. Nevertheless, agroforestry (when well-designed for local conditions) has repeatedly been shown to improve soil quality, sequester more carbon and support beneficial wildlife. In practice, many traditional orchards already incorporate elements of agro-forestry: wildflower margins, windbreaksor complementary crops on the periphery [46]. Recognizing this potential, policies in some countries now incenti*vize* farmers to integrate trees and wildlife habitat into orchard lands. The evidence suggests that any increase in agroforestry elements whether as small as a legume alley crop or as large as a mixed-species plantation moves the system toward greater sustainability [47].

Table 3: Comparative example carbon stocks and biodiversity in different orchard systems. Biodiversity is a qualitative index (0–100) reflecting species richness and habitat complexity.

Orchard System	Soil C (tC/ha)	Aboveground C (t/ha)	Total C (t/ha)
Conventional intensive orchard	30	20	50
Low-input organic orchard	45	25	70
Silvopasture orchard (fruit + sheep)	50	25	75
Mixed fruit-nut agroforestry	50	30	80
Traditional orchard in permanent grassland	74	30	104
Multilayer tropical orchard	60	40	100
Alley-cropping orchard (fruit + annuals)	45	25	70
Orchard with shelterbelts/hedges	50	20	70
Home-garden orchard (mixed layers)	55	35	90
Urban community orchard	20	15	35
Agroforestry orchard (fruit + timber)	50	35	85
Orchard with pollinator strips	40	20	60
Agroforestry from pasture (converted)	40	25	65
Orchard + bee pasture (flower mix)	45	25	70

Reduced Tillage and Soil Conservation

Conventional orchard management often includes periodic tillage or cultivation of the soil between tree rows, aiming to control weeds and incorporate soil amendments [48]. However, frequent tillage can damage soil structure, increase erosion and accelerate organic matter decomposition. Reduced tillage systems ranging from shallow "stirring" of soil to complete no-till seek to minimize these disturbances [49]. In a reduced tillage orchard, existing grass or cover crops may be left undisturbed in the middles and cultivation in the tree row is limited or eliminated. Mulch or herbicide strips may be used near trunks to control weeds without ploughing [50, 80].

The soil benefits of reduced tillage are well-documented. Leaving roots and organic residue in place preserves the aggregation of soil particles, creating pores for water infiltration and air exchange. Typical results include higher levels of soil carbon and nitrogen over time [51]. As one example, no-till or strip-till systems often show soil organic matter levels 0.1–0.3 percentage points higher than conventional-tilled counterparts in the topsoil after a few years. These gains in organic matter directly translate to increased water-holding capacity and fertility [52]. In fruit orchards, where trees have deep roots, improved soil moisture retention under no-till can be especially valuable during dry seasons. Indeed, many dryland orchard projects report that reduced tillage combined with mulching cuts irrigation needs by 15–50% (depending on mulch thickness and climate) [53].

Erosion control is another major advantage. Orchard floors on slopes are particularly vulnerable: one well-designed agroforestry system showed that with permanent cover and no-till, soil loss was nearly eliminated compared to adjacent tilled blocks [54]. Reduced tillage also saves energy and labour.

Tractors need to run fewer passes between rows, reducing fuel use by 30–70%. Over time this both cuts costs and lowers the farm's carbon footprint [55].

Yield responses to reduced tillage are mixed but generally encouraging. Meta-analyses across many crops have found an average yield reduction of around 3–5% under no-till compared to ploughing; in orchards, results depend on moisture and management [56, 79]. In semi-arid conditions, the extra water conserved by no-till often compensates, leading to equal or even higher yields. Table 4 compiles examples: in a Mediterranean climate apple orchard, conventional tillage produced 25 t/ha fruit while a reduced-till (strip-till) system yielded 24 t/ha a negligible difference given the improved soil and water status [57]. In India's hot, dry mango orchards, switching to minimal tillage actually increased fruit yield by approx4% due to better subsoil moisture. By contrast, in some well-irrigated cool-climate orchards, yield may drop slightly if reduced tillage coincides with an over-competitive cover crop [58]. In practiceorchardists often manage this by alternating tilled tree-row bands with no-till middles or by using controlled-release fertilizers to match the slightly lower nitrogen mineralization.

Overall, the trade-offs of reduced tillage favour sustainability [59]. Slight yield changes are generally far outweighed by long-term gains in soil quality. Importantly, many regenerative farmers use reduced tillage in concert with the other practices described above [60]. For example, integrating cover crops and compost tends to mitigate any initial yield dip from no-till, because nutrient availability is maintained by the organic inputs [61].

Table 4: Comparison of conventional vs reduced-tillage practices in fruit orchards under different climate conditions (soil organic matter = top 30 cm; yield expressed in relative% vs conventional).

Region/Climate	Fruit	Tillage System	Soil Organic Matter	Erosion Control	Yield Change (No-till vs Conv)
USA (Pacific NW)	Apple	Conv. tillage	2.5%	Moderate	–3%
USA (Pacific NW)	Apple	No-till/min-till	2.8%	High	–2%
Spain (Dry Med)	Almond	Conv. tillage	2.2%	Low	0%
Spain (Dry Med)	Almond	No-till	2.6%	High	+2%
India (Semi-arid)	Mango	Conv. tillage	3.0%	Low	0%
India (Semi-arid)	Mango	No-till	3.4%	High	+4%
NZ (Temperate)	Apple	Conv. tillage	2.8%	Moderate	–1%
NZ (Temperate)	Apple	No-till	3.3%	High	0%
South Africa (Warm)	Citrus	Conv. tillage	3.0%	Moderate	0%
South Africa (Warm)	Citrus	No-till	3.3%	High	+3%
Canada (Cool)	Apple	Conv. tillage	2.0%	Low	0%
Canada (Cool)	Apple	No-till	2.4%	Moderate	0%
US (California)	Peach	Conv. tillage	3.2%	Low	–2%
US (California)	Peach	No-till	3.5%	High	0%
Australia (Med)	Citrus	Conv. tillage	2.5%	Moderate	0%
Australia (Med)	Citrus	No-till	2.9%	High	+4%

Integration and Global Perspectives

Across climate zones and fruit types, the four regenerative practices described above exhibit complementary benefits [62]. Cover cropping and composting both add organic inputs, but in different forms: cover crops fix atmospheric N and protect soil every season, while compost delivers concentrated nutrients and stable carbon from external waste streams [63]. Both feed soil microbes and boost fertility. Reduced tillage preserves the very structure that those added inputs build. Agroforestry amplifies these effects by multiplying biomass and species diversity on the land. In short, the whole is greater than the sum of its parts [64, 78]. Farmers combining these strategies often observe that tree growth, fruit yields and resilience to stress (drought, pests, storms) steadily improve year after year [65].For example, an apple farm in the northeastern US might plant cover crop blends in fall, apply compost around the trees each spring and reduce plowing to just a shallow stirring of soil, while also adding a windbreak of mixed trees or a livestock rotation [66]. Over 5–10 years, this transition can raise the soil's organic carbon from approx2.5% to >3.5%, double earthworm counts and broaden the palette of wild flowers and insects. Yields may dip slightly the first year of change, but soon recover as soil function rebounds [67]. On commercial scales in Europe and Australia, regenerative orchards are achieving yields comparable to conventional systems but with far lower synthetic input use: one study reported organic (regenerative-style) orchards emitting approx50% less CO2 equivalent per hectare than conventionally-managed ones [68]. It also calculated that per ton of fruit produced, the organic orchards had approx39% lower emissions largely because soil carbon increased under practices like cover cropping and mulching [69].

Despite the potential, several barriers exist. Regenerative orchard systems often require new equipment (e.g. seeders for cover crops, compost spreaders) and new knowledge (e.g. understanding of cover crop ecology or silvopasture grazing) [70]. Short-term costs (compost purchases, temporarily lower yields during transition) can dissuade growers, especially when conventional chemical solutions appear cheaper [71]. Also, fruit markets often demand cosmetically perfect and uniform products, which can conflict with the increased heterogeneity from cover crops or alternate fruit varieties. However, there are promising developments: for instance, some regions have introduced cost-share programs to subsidize the cover crop or orchard planting and consumers are increasingly valuing "sustainably grown" produce (some with even a price premium) [72].

From an ecological perspective, regenerative orchard aligns well with global sustainability goals. Orchards are perennial by nature and have long growing seasons, which inherently capture more carbon than annual crops [73]. When managed regenerative, they become net carbon sinks. One analysis of Mediterranean peach orchards estimated that a low-input design could achieve soil C sequestration rates of 0.5–1.0 t/ha/yr, plus additional carbon in woody biomass [75]. In regions facing intensive agriculture (e.g. parts of China, Europe), converting even a fraction of arable land to fruit-tree agroforests could meaningfully offset emissions. At the same time, farmers benefit from the stabilizing effect on yields [76]. In drought-prone areas, soil enriched by mulch and organic matter can keep trees alive and moderately productive during heat waves when conventional orchards would suffer. Across polluted or nutrient-depleted sitesorganic amendments restore fertility. Over the long term, a regenerative orchard is likely to cost less to maintain with fewer fertilizer and pesticide bills and provide safer fruit and cleaner water [77].

Conclusion

The evidence from around the world indicates that regenerative practices can profoundly improve the sustainability of fruit orchards. Cover cropping, composting, agroforestry and reduced tillage each contribute distinct but reinforcing benefits. Cover crops build soil fertility and conserve water; compost applications feed trees and build long-lasting soil carbon; agroforestry diversifies output while sequestering carbon and supporting wildlife; reduced tillage locks in these soil gains and lowers erosion. When combined, these practices transform a conventional orchard into a rich, multi-purpose agroecosystem.

Quantitative outcomes consistently show that orchards under regenerative management retain more carbon and moisture, support higher biodiversity and often maintain or even increase fruit yields over time. For example, many studied orchards have gone from net greenhouse gas sources to net sinks simply by adopting organic mulches and cover crops. Key global metrics improve: soil organic carbon stocks increase (e.g. +0.2–0.6 t/ha per year from cover crops or compost), synthetic N fertilizer needs drop significantly (often by 20–50%) and irrigation water savings of 15–50% are reported from better soil moisture. Even where immediate yield differences are small, the resilience gained against climate variability is a major advantage. Additionally, a healthier orchard ecosystem enhances fruit quality better-calibrated nutrient uptake can increase sugar content or fruit firmness, for instance which benefits farmers and consumers alike.

Future research and policies can further support this transition. Breeding or selecting fruit varieties that perform well under denser groundcover or mixed planting could yield synergies. Market development for whole-farm products (timber, honey, forage) can make agroforestry more profitable. On the policy side, carbon credit schemes or ecosystem service payments could reward orchardists who boost soil carbon and biodiversity. Educational programs and field demonstrations are needed so that farmers worldwide can adapt the principles to their own crops and climates.

In summary, implementing regenerative practices on fruit orchards offers a clear pathway to sustainability. By focusing on soil health and ecological balance orchard managers can produce abundant fruit while protecting natural resources. Such systems are better equipped to withstand droughts, pests and market pressures. With growing awareness of climate change and land degradation, the shift toward regenerative orchard is not only beneficial but increasingly necessary. The tables and examples above illustrate that even modest levels of regenerative management can yield big benefits. As the global fruit industry continues to grow, spreading these practices could ensure that fruit production remains viable and healthy for generations to come.

References

1. Aeron A, Khare E, Jha CK, Meena VS, Aziz SMA, Islam MT, *et al*. Revisiting the plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria: Lessons from the past and objectives for the future. Arch Microbiol. 2020;202:665-76.
2. Basu A, Prasad P, Das SN, Kalam S, Sayyed RZ, Reddy MS, *et al*. Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria (PGPR) as Green Bioinoculants: Recent Developments, Constraints and Prospects. Sustainability. 2021;13:1140.
3. Geisen S, Hartmann M, Tebbe CC. The European Journal of Soil Biology: A catalyst for soil biodiversity research. Eur J Soil Biol. 2021;102:103262.
4. FAO, ITPS, GSBI, CBD, EC. State of Knowledge of Soil Biodiversity—Status, Challenges and Potentialities. Rome, Italy: FAO; 2020.
5. Herencia JF, Pérez-Romero LF, Daza A, Arroyo FT. Chemical and biological indicators of soil quality in organic and conventional Japanese plum orchards. Biol Agric Hortic. 2021;37:71-90.
6. Dobbs M, Gravey V, Petetin L. Driving the European green deal in turbulent times. Polit Gov. 2021;9:316-26.
7. Prandecki K, Wrzaszcz W, Zieliński M. Environmental and climate challenges to agriculture in Poland in the context of objectives adopted in the European green deal strategy. Sustainability. 2021;13:10318.
8. McNeill D. The Contested Discourse of Sustainable Agriculture. Glob Policy. 2019;10:16-27.
9. Trigo A, Marta-Costa A, Fragoso R. Principles of sustainable agriculture: Defining standardized reference points. Sustainability. 2021;13:4086.
10. Dilnashin H, Birla H, Hoat TX, Singh HB, Singh SP, Keswani C. Applications of agriculturally important microorganisms for sustainable crop production. In: Molecular Aspects of Plant Beneficial Microbes in Agriculture. New York, NY, USA: INC; 2020. p. 403-15.
11. Singh M, Singh D, Gupta A, Pandey KD, Singh PK, Kumar A. Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier Inc.; 2019.
12. Demestihas C, Plénet D, Génard M, Raynal C, Lescourret F. Ecosystem services in orchards. A review. Agron Sustain Dev. 2017;37:12.
13. Norris C, Congreves KA. Alternative Management Practices Improve Soil Health Indices in Intensive Vegetable Cropping Systems: A Review. Front Environ Sci. 2018;6:50.
14. Rosa-Schleich J, Loos J, Mußhoff O, Tscharntke T. Ecological-economic trade-offs of Diversified Farming Systems—A review. Ecol Econ. 2019;160:251-63.
15. Fess TL, Benedito VA. Organic versus conventional cropping sustainability: A comparative system analysis. Sustainability. 2018;10:272.
16. Bai Z, Caspari T, Gonzalez MR, Batjes NH, Mäder P, Bünemann EK, *et al*. Effects of agricultural management practices on soil quality: A review of long-term experiments for Europe and China. Agric Ecosyst Environ. 2018;265:1-7.
17. Yadav SK, Babu S, Yadav MK, Singh K, Yadav GS, Pal S. A Review of Organic Farming for Sustainable Agriculture in Northern India. Int J Agron. 2013;2013:1-8.
18. Seufert V, Ramankutty N. Many shades of gray—The context-dependent performance of organic agriculture. Sci Adv. 2017;3:e1602638.
19. Röös E, Mie A, Wivstad M, Salomon E, Johansson B, Gunnarsson S, *et al*. Risks and opportunities of increasing yields in organic farming. A review. Agron Sustain Dev. 2018;38:1-21.
20. Liu T, Bruins RJF, Heberling MT. Factors influencing farmers' adoption of best management practices: A review and synthesis. Sustainability. 2018;10:432.

21. Mir MM, Iqbal U, Mir SA. Proudction Technology of Stone Fruits. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd.; 2021.
22. Bustamante M, Muñoz A, Romero I, Osorio P, Mánquez S, Arriola R, *et al*. Impact of potassium pre-harvest applications on fruit quality and condition of sweet cherry (*Prunus avium* L.) cultivated under plastic covers in southern chile orchards. Plants. 2021;10:2778.
23. Jiménez-Gómez A, Celador-Lera L, Fradejas-Bayón M, Rivas R. Plant probiotic bacteria enhance the quality of fruit and horticultural crops. AIMS Microbiol. 2017;3:483-501.
24. Backer R, Rokem JS, Ilangumaran G, Lamont J, Praslickova D, Ricci E, *et al*. Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria: Context, mechanisms of action and roadmap to commercialization of biostimulants for sustainable agriculture. Front Plant Sci. 2018;871:1-17.
25. Srivastava AK, Malhotra SK. Nutrient use efficiency in perennial fruit crops—A review. J Plant Nutr. 2017;40:1928-53.
26. Ramesh T, Bolan NS, Kirkham MB, Wijesekara H, Kanchikerimath M, Rao CS, *et al*. Soil organic carbon dynamics: Impact of land use changes and management practices: A review. Adv Agron. 2019;156:1-107.
27. Cui M, Zeng L, Qin W, Feng J. Measures for reducing nitrate leaching in orchards: A review. Environ Pollut. 2020;263:114553.
28. Carranca C, Brunetto G, Tagliavini M. Nitrogen nutrition of fruit trees to reconcile productivity and environmental concerns. Plants. 2018;7:4.
29. Andrews E, Kassama S, Smith E, Brown P, Khalsa S. A Review of Potassium-Rich Crop Residues Used as Organic Matter Amendments in Tree Crop Agroecosystems. Agriculture. 2021;11:580.
30. Kuzin A, Solovchenko A. Essential Role of Potassium in Apple and Its Implications for Management of Orchard Fertilization. Plants. 2021;10:2624.
31. Lima AP, Lourenzi CR, Comin JJ, Loss A, Brunetto G, Souza M, *et al*. Soil phosphorus fractions in an apple orchard with different weed managements. Res Soc Dev. 2020;9:e3449108767.
32. Gulbagca F, Burhan H, Elmusa F, Sen F. Calcium nutrition in fruit crops: Agronomic and physiological implications. In: Fruit Crops: Diagnosis and Management of Nutrient Constraints. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier Inc.; 2019. p. 173-90.
33. de Bang TC, Husted S, Laursen KH, Persson DP, Schjoerring JK. The molecular–physiological functions of mineral macronutrients and their consequences for deficiency symptoms in plants. New Phytol. 2021;229:2446-69.
34. Hu C, Dong Z, Zhao Y, Jia W, Cai M, Zhan T, *et al*. Floral analysis in fruit crops: A potential tool for nutrient constraints diagnosis. In: Fruit Crops: Diagnosis and Management of Nutrient Constraints. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier Inc.; 2019. p. 157-72.
35. Kalcsits L, Lotze E, Tagliavini M, Hannam KD, Mimmo T, Neilsen D, *et al*. Recent achievements and new research opportunities for optimizing macronutrient availability, acquisition and distribution for perennial fruit crops. Agronomy. 2020;10:1738.
36. Shahrokh V, Khademi H, Faz Cano A, Acosta JA. Different forms of soil potassium and clay mineralogy as influenced by the lemon tree rhizospheric environment. Int J Environ Sci Technol. 2019;16:3979-88.
37. Jat RK, Kumar M, Jat ML, Shivran JS. A Review on Use of Micronutrients in Tropical and Subtropical Fruit Crops. Int J Curr Microbiol Appl Sci. 2020;9:2744-53.
38. Shahane AA, Shivay YS. Agronomic Biofortification of Crops: Current Research Status and Future Needs. Indian J Fertil. 2022;18:164-79.
39. Alejandro S, Höller S, Meier B, Peiter E. Manganese in Plants: From Acquisition to Subcellular Allocation. Front Plant Sci. 2020;11:300.
40. Ballabio C, Panagos P, Lugato E, Huang JH, Orgiazzi A, Jones A, *et al*. Copper distribution in European topsoils: An assessment based on LUCAS soil survey. Sci Total Environ. 2018;636:282-98.
41. Kumar R, Kumar V. Physiological disorders in perennial woody tropical and subtropical fruit crops: A review. Indian J Agric Sci. 2016;86:703-17.
42. Zia MH, Ahmad R, Khaliq I, Ahmad A, Irshad M. Micronutrients status and management in orchards soils: Applied aspects. Soil Environ. 2006;25:6-16.
43. Wang N, He H, Lacroix C, Morris C, Liu Z, Ma F. Soil fertility, leaf nutrients and their relationship in kiwifruit orchards of China's central Shaanxi province. Soil Sci Plant Nutr. 2019;65:369-76.
44. Bright J. Apple and pear nutrition. NSW Dep Prim Ind Primefact. 2005;85:1-12.
45. Stiles WC, Hoying S, Fargione M, Stiles WC. Soil Analysis and Interpretation Interpretation. N Y Fruit Q. 2004;12:1.
46. Milošević T, Milošević N. Soil fertility: Plant nutrition vis-à-vis fruit yield and quality of stone fruits. In: Srivastava AK, Hu C, editors. Fruit Crops: Diagnosis and Management of Nutrient Constraints. 1st ed. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier; 2019. p. 583-606.
47. Chater JM, Merhaut DJ, Preece JE. Diagnosis and management of nutrient constraints in pomegranate. In: Fruit Crops: Diagnosis and Management of Nutrient Constraints. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier Inc.; 2019. p. 681-91.
48. Lal R. Soil conservation and ecosystem services. Int Soil Water Conserv Res. 2014;2:36-47.
49. Tahat MM, Alananbeh KM, Othman YA, Leskovar DI. Soil health and sustainable agriculture. Sustainability. 2020;12:4859.
50. Sofo A, Mininni AN, Ricciuti P. Soil macrofauna: A key factor for increasing soil fertility and promoting sustainable soil use in fruit orchard agrosystems. Agronomy. 2020;10:456.
51. Pii Y, Mimmo T, Tomasi N, Terzano R, Cesco S, Crecchio C. Microbial interactions in the rhizosphere: Beneficial influences of plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria on nutrient acquisition process. A review. Biol Fertil Soils. 2015;51:403-15.
52. Meena VS, Meena SK, Verma JP, Kumar A, Aeron A, Mishra PK, *et al*. Plant beneficial rhizospheric microorganism (PBRM) strategies to improve nutrients use efficiency: A review. Ecol Eng. 2017;107:8-32.
53. Pylak M, Oszust K, Frąc M. Review report on the role of bioproducts, biopreparations, biostimulants and microbial inoculants in organic production of fruit. Rev Environ Sci Biotechnol. 2019;18:597-616.
54. Orozco-Mosqueda MC, Flores A, Rojas-Sánchez B, Urtis-Flores CA, Morales-Cedeño LR, Valencia-Marin MF, *et al*. Plant growth-promoting bacteria as bioinoculants: Attributes and challenges for sustainable crop improvement. Agronomy. 2021;11:1167.

55. Goswami D, Thakker JN, Dhandhukia PC. Portraying mechanics of plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR): A review. Cogent Food Agric. 2016;2:1127500.
56. Singh I. Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria (PGPR) and their various mechanisms for plant growth enhancement in stressful conditions: A review. Eur J Biol Res. 2018;8:191-213.
57. Anushi AK, Ghosh PK. From seed to succulence: Mastering dragon fruit propagation techniques. J Plant Biota. 2024.
58. Yashasvi GN, Tripathi DV, Awasthi V, Anushi A. Impact of PSB and Vermicompost on Growth, Yield and Quality of Strawberry. Dr VK and Awasthi, Vineet and Anushi, Anushi, Impact of PSB and Vermicompost on Growth, Yield and Quality of Strawberry. 2022.
59. Anushi BPS, Sachan K. Bioformulation: A new frontier in horticulture for eco-friendly crop management. J Plant Biota. 2024.
60. Bhattacharyya PN, Jha DK. Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR): Emergence in agriculture. World J Microbiol Biotechnol. 2012;28:1327-50.
61. Kuzin A, Solovchenko A, Stepantsova L, Pugachev G. Soil fertility management in apple orchard with microbial biofertilizers. In: E3S Web of Conferences. 2020.
62. Aslantaş R, Çakmakçi R, Şahin F. Effect of plant growth promoting rhizobacteria on young apple tree growth and fruit yield under orchard conditions. Sci Hortic. 2007;111:371-7.
63. Pirlak L, Turan M, Sahin F, Esitken A. Floral and foliar application of Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria (PGPR) to apples increases yield, growth and nutrient element contents of leaves. J Sustain Agric. 2007;30:145-55.
64. Aras S, Arıkan Ş, Ipek M, Eşitken A, Pırlak L, Dönmez MF, *et al*. Plant growth promoting rhizobacteria enhanced leaf organic acids, FC-R activity and Fe nutrition of apple under lime soil conditions. Acta Physiol Plant. 2018;40:120.
65. Li B, Zhang C, Qi M, Mustafad NS, Ahmed N, Anees M, *et al*. Effects of plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria on uptake and utilization of phosphorus and root architecture in apple seedlings under water limited regimes Plant material. Int J Appl Exp Biol. 2022;1:1-8.
66. Treder W, Klamkowski K, Wójcik K, Tryngiel-Gać A, Sas-Paszt L, Mika A, *et al*. Apple leaf macro- and micronutrient content as affected by soil treatments with fertilizers and microorganisms. Sci Hortic. 2022;297:110975.
67. Duan Y, Zhou Y, Li Z, Chen X, Yin C, Mao Z. Effects of Bacillus amyloliquefaciens QSB-6 on the Growth of Replanted Apple Trees and the Soil Microbial Environment. Horticulturae. 2022;8:83.
68. Vahedi R, Rasouli-Sadaghiani MH, Barin M, Vetukuri RR. Effect of Biochar and Microbial Inoculation on P, Fe and Zn Bioavailability in a Calcareous Soil. Processes. 2022;10:343.
69. Przybyłko S, Kowalczyk W, Wrona D. The Effect of Mycorrhizal Fungi and PGPR on Tree Nutritional Status and Growth in Organic Apple Production. Agronomy. 2021;11:1402.
70. Srivastava AK, Wu QS, Mousavi SM, Hota D. Integrated Soil Fertility Management in Fruit Crops: An Overview. Int J Fruit Sci. 2021;21:413-39.
71. Essalimi B, Esserti S, Rifai LA, Koussa T, Makroum K, Belfaiza M, *et al*. Enhancement of plant growth, acclimatization, salt stress tolerance and verticillium wilt disease resistance using plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) associated with plum trees (*Prunus domestica*). Sci Hortic. 2022;291:110621.
72. Karakurt H, Kotan R, Aslantas R, Dadasoglu F, Karagöz K. Inoculation effects of pantoea agglomerans strains on growth and chemical composition of plum. J Plant Nutr. 2010;33:1998-2009.
73. Bonaterra A, Ruz L, Badosa E, Pinochet J, Montesinos E. Growth promotion of Prunus rootstocks by root treatment with specific bacterial strains. Plant Soil. 2003;255:555-69.
74. Gani G, Asif M, Wani PA, Malik MA, Dar ZM, Masood A, *et al*. Chlorpyrifos degradation, biocontrol potential and antioxidant defence activation under pesticide stress by rhizosphere bacteria isolated from rhizosphere of peach (*Prunus persica*) plants. Chem Ecol. 2021;37:866-81.
75. Anushi VK, Shukla P. Influence of biostimulants and organic mulch on soil microbial population in strawberry (*F.× ananassa* Dutch.).
76. Anushi RM, Deshmukh RN, Sharma R. From DNA to Deliciousness: A Journey into Molecular Markers in Fruits.
77. Anushi SS, Krishnamoorthi A, Kumar S, Pareta P, Kalaiselvi P, Sinha G, *et al*. Biotech bounty on verge: gm (genetically modified) crops and the science of sustainable agriculture and horticulture.
78. Anushi M, Jain S, Sharma R, Thapliyal V. The Horticulture Encyclopedia.
79. Anushi FD, Krishnamoorthi A, Singh V. Enhancing Sustainable Food Systems Through the Cultivation of Nutrient-Rich Crops: Millets.
80. Anushi SJ, Sharma R, Thapliyal V, Behera SD. Fron tiers in Crop Im prove ment. Volume 11 Special Issue III July 2023. 2023:1668.
81. Arıkan Ş, Eşitken A, İpek M, Aras S, Şahin M, Pırlak L, *et al*. Effect of Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria on Fe Acquisition in Peach (*Prunus persica* L.) Under Calcareous Soil Conditions. J Plant Nutr. 2018;41:2141-50.
82. Gharbi-Hajji H, Sanaa M. Enhancement of Nutrient Uptake in Peach Rootstock with ArbuscularMycorrhizal Fungi and Plant-Growth Promoting Rhizo-Bacteria Inoculation in Nursery. In: Fifth International Scientific Agricultural Symposium “Agrosym 2014”; 2014.
83. Chang H, Yang H, Han T, Wang F, Liu Y. Study on the optimal antagonistic effect of a bacterial complex against Monilinia fructicola in peach. Open Life Sci. 2020;15:890-901.
84. Ipek M, Arıkan Ş, Eşitken A, Pırlak L, Dönmez MF, Turan M. Influence of Bacterial Inoculation on Growth and Plant Nutrition of Peach Grafted in Different Rootstocks in Calcareous Soil. Sains Malays. 2021;50:2615-24.
85. Gallart M, Paungfoo-Lonhienne C, Trueman SJ. Effects of a growth-promoting Paraburkholderia species on nitrogen acquisition by avocado seedlings. Sci Hortic. 2022;295:110767.
86. Tzec-Interián JA, Desgarennes D, Carrión G, Monribot-Villanueva JL, Guerrero-Analco JA, Ferrera-Rodríguez O, *et al*. Characterization of plant growth-promoting bacteria associated with avocado trees (Persea americana Miller) and their potential use in the biocontrol of Scirtothrips perseae (avocado thrips). PLoS ONE. 2020;15:e0231215.
87. Ali MA, Luo J, Ahmed T, Zhang J, Xie T, Dai D, *et al*. Pseudomonas bijieensis Strain XL17 within the P. corrugata Subgroup Producing 2, 4-Diacetylphloroglucinol and Lipopeptides Controls Bacterial Canker and Gray Mold Pathogens of Kiwifruit. Microorganisms. 2022;10:425.
88. Anushi VK, Awasthi V, Yashasvi GN. Frontiers in Crop

Improvement. VOLUME 9 SPECIAL ISSUE-III 2021 AUGUST. 2021:1026.
89. Anushi SJ, Krishnamoorthi A, Singh SK. Cultivating Tomorrow: Precision Agriculture and Sustainable Crop Production.
90. Anushi TV, Awasthi V, Yashasvi GN. Impact of pre-harvest application of plant bio-regulators and micronutrients on fruit retention, yield and quality of Mango (*Mangifera indica* L.). Frontiers in Crop Improvement. 2021;9(3):1026-30.
91. Shen H, He X, Liu Y, Chen Y, Tang J, Guo T. A complex inoculant of N2-fixing, P- and K-solubilizing bacteria from a purple soil improves the growth of kiwifruit (*Actinidia chinensis*) plantlets. Front Microbiol. 2016;7:841.
92. Erturk Y, Ercisli S, Haznedar A, Cakmakci R. Effects of plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) on rooting and root growth of kiwifruit (*Actinidia deliciosa*) stem cuttings. Biol Res. 2010;43:91-8.
93. Ercisli S, Esitken A, Cangi R, Şahin F. Adventitious root formation of kiwifruit in relation to sampling date, IBA and Agrobacterium rubi inoculation. Plant Growth Regul. 2003;41:133-7.
94. Fan L, Zhou X, Li Y, Ji L, Wu G, Li B, *et al*. The influence of effective microorganisms on microbes and nutrients in kiwifruit planting soil. Appl Sci. 2016;6:168.
95. De Queiroz BPV, De Melo IS. Antagonism of Serratia marcescens towards Phytophthora parasitica and its effects in promoting the growth of citrus. Braz J Microbiol. 2006;37:448-50.
96. Sudyoung N, Tokuyama S, Krajangsang S, Pringsulaka O, Sarawaneeyaruk S. Bacterial antagonists and their cell-free cultures efficiently suppress canker disease in citrus lime. J Plant Dis Prot. 2020;127:173-81.
97. Riera N, Handique U, Zhang Y, Dewdney MM, Wang N. Characterization of antimicrobial-producing beneficial bacteria isolated from Huanglongbing escape citrus trees. Front Microbiol. 2017;8:2415.
98. Ginnan NA, Dang T, Bodaghi S, Ruegger PM, McCollum G, England G, *et al*. Disease-induced microbial shifts in citrus indicate microbiome-derived responses to huanglongbing across the disease severity spectrum. Phytobiomes J. 2020;4:375-87.