SoilPHIX and field reference

Product identity and evidence review | Agrosource Group grower guide

Use the product label to establish what is being supplied, the field summaries to understand the reported observations, and the listing record to check organic-input status. This guide keeps those different documents in context so a grower can ask better questions before adopting or evaluating a program.

Identify the material precisely

Living Water describes SoilPHIX as a shelf-stable microbial powder activated within its bioreactor. The supplied label uses the name Soil Phix and identifies a microbial soil inoculant guaranteed by Applied Organic Solutions Inc., with a net weight of 1 lb (0.45 kg). Keep that exact label and package identity in the farm records.

Original source	What it contributes
Supplied Soil Phix label	Named organisms, stated quantities and application instructions. The panel uses propagules per gram, spores per gram and CFU per gram for different organisms.
Product Breakdown	Supplier descriptions of microbial groups and the functions attributed to them. This is explanatory literature, not an additional product-use label.
Monthly program page	The supplier's recurring supply model. Confirm your season, quantities and commercial terms separately.

The label names fungi and bacterial groups including Glomus, Pisolithus, Rhizopogon, Bacillus, Paenibacillus, Pseudomonas, Streptomyces and Trichoderma. The breakdown describes seven categories and 30 strains. Do not treat those descriptions as interchangeable counts or silently revise the label to reconcile them.

Intended biological roles

The supplier literature describes root-associated fungal networks as extending contact with soil moisture and nutrients. It attributes nutrient cycling and organic-matter processing to several microbial groups, and links biological activity with aggregation and pore space. Together, these are proposed routes to supporting roots and soil function. They describe intended mechanisms; neither the ingredient list nor these descriptions proves establishment or field outcomes at a particular site.

Read directions in their full context

The supplied label directs the whole package into the Living Water tank with fresh-water autofill connected. It specifies 2 gallons per acre at each irrigation cycle, continuous agitation for best results and monthly recharge. This is a description of the undated supplied label, not a newly issued Agrosource application recommendation. Confirm the current applicable label and supplier-configured program before use.

What the evidence does not establish

The supplier refers to more than 40 independent studies, but the reviewed material provides no supporting bibliography. That claim cannot establish product-specific performance, universal nutrient compatibility, guaranteed yield or a guaranteed return for this installation.

Sources and authorship: Applied Organic Solutions Inc.: supplied Soil Phix product label, undated. Living Water Agriculture: SoilPHIX; Product Breakdown; root-development article; Subscription.

Supplier articles and practical context

Four themes | Supplier perspective and Agrosource evaluation prompts

Living Water's article collection includes four pieces dated 18 February 2026. They explain the supplier's rationale for the program. They are not independent research papers or controlled field-trial reports. The prompts below are Agrosource guidance for turning each theme into a question that can be tested locally.

Repeated microbial delivery

Source: Continuous Microbial Inoculation vs. One-Time Biological Applications. The article favors recurring delivery with irrigation over a single treatment, emphasizing activation timing and repeated introduction to the root zone. It offers an operating rationale rather than a quantified head-to-head trial.

Evaluate locally: record which irrigation events actually received input and any interruptions. If comparing programs, agree on comparable blocks and measurement timing before starting. Do not assume that delivery frequency alone proves root colonization.

Labor and operating costs

Source: How Automated Microbial Bioreactors Lower Labor and Input Costs in Farming. The supplier proposes that integrating activation and delivery with irrigation can reduce handling and improve input planning. The article does not supply a farm-specific cost model for your installation.

Evaluate locally: log installation, routine care, troubleshooting, receiving and application time. Compare total seasonal equipment, input and labor costs using the same acreage and service scope. Include the work that remains after automation.

Orchard water management

Source: How Regenerative Soil Biology Reduces Irrigation Costs in Pistachio Farming. The supplier connects soil structure and rooting with water movement and irrigation economics. Its 5 to 10 percent water-reduction discussion is an illustrative scenario, not a measured Living Water trial result.

Evaluate locally: record water use, irrigation duration, weather and crop condition. An apparent reduction is hard to interpret if acreage, rainfall or the crop load also changed. Do not reduce irrigation solely from this article.

Root development and soil structure

Source: Living Water's SoilPHIX Improves Soil Structure and Root Development. The article describes roles attributed to mycorrhizal fungi, rhizosphere bacteria and actinobacteria, including nutrient processes and aggregation. These descriptions do not quantify a guaranteed response for a particular field.

Evaluate locally: agree on sampling locations, methods and repeat dates before inspecting roots or soil condition. Keep photographs, laboratory reports and management history together so changes can be interpreted in context.

Sources and authorship: Living Water Agriculture: four articles listed above, 18 February 2026. Evaluation prompts by Agrosource Group.

Nevada alfalfa comparison

March and April 2024 | Supplier prepared observational summary

The two-page supplier document compares soil-test values for an alfalfa setting in Nevada. It attributes laboratory testing to Stukenholtz Laboratory, Inc. The file is a Living Water summary rather than the laboratory's complete report; the dates describe the testing period.

Selected values as reported

Reported measure	March 2024	April 2024
pH	8.1	7.9
Salts, mmhos/cm	1.4	1.9
Organic matter, percent	1.65	2.29
Organic nitrogen, lb/acre	65	90
Phosphorus, ppm	16	50
Potassium, ppm	164	159

This selection shows increases and decreases instead of repeating only promotional percentages. A higher value is not automatically favorable; interpretation depends on crop needs, analytical method, soil conditions and the full result.

Keep two different tables separate

The lower table on the second source page lists phosphate, potash, sulfate-sulfur, copper, boron and elemental sulfur. Those fertilizer-related figures are distinct from the soil-test concentration table above. Units and the basis for interpreting them are not supplied there. Do not present changes in that lower table as measured fertilizer savings or a prescription for reducing inputs.

What this comparison can support

It is a useful starting point for discussing the reported site and requesting the underlying laboratory records. The supplied document does not show an untreated control, replicated design or statistical analysis. It does not isolate Living Water from other management or seasonal effects, and the supplier states that results are not guaranteed.

Questions to take to the adviser
Request sampling locations and depths, the laboratory method, original reports, treatment timing and any fertilizer, water or management changes between samples. Ask what the lower table represents and which units apply before using it in a budget or fertility plan.

Sources and authorship: Living Water Agriculture: Soil Biological Summary and Nutrient Soil Test Details, Alfalfa / Nevada, March to April 2024, two-page supplied PDF.

California soil biology comparison

June and November 2024 | Supplier prepared observational summary

The supplier describes a pistachio and citrus program across 800 acres and 11 injection sites in California. It attributes testing to the Earthfort Soil Life test. The source is a compact summary rather than a complete laboratory dataset.

Displayed values and their limits

Source measure	June 2024	November 2024
Beneficial fungi	331	975
Beneficial bacteria	341	448
Biological carbon	677	1330
Biological nitrogen	94	141
C/N ratio	7 : 1	10 : 1

The source does not state measurement units for the first four rows or explain how measurements across acreage and injection sites were combined. Do not add a unit, infer sample counts or treat the displayed values as a uniform response across every block.

A percentage discrepancy to keep visible
The original sheet prints a 99 percent increase for biological carbon. Its displayed values, 677 and 1330, give approximately 96.5 percent by (1330 - 677) / 677 x 100. This guide preserves those values and identifies the arithmetic discrepancy. The original PDF remains unchanged.

Separate observations from conclusions

No untreated control, full laboratory reports or statistical analysis are provided in the supplied summary. The comparison cannot establish causation, yield response or water savings. The supplier also notes that outcomes depend on soil conditions and are not guaranteed. Treat the sheet as a source of questions for a local evaluation.

The broad OMRI system claim needs qualification: the listing concerns the Soil Phix Organic input. See the next page.

Use the second page once

Page two contains the Soil Phix microbial-group literature. The standalone Product Breakdown PDF repeats that page. Keep both originals available for their intended use, but do not count them as separate studies or independent corroboration.

Ask the supplier for: individual sample results, laboratory units, sampling locations, aggregation method, application history and comparison blocks before forecasting another site's response.

Sources and authorship: Living Water Agriculture: Soil Biology Test Summary, California, June to November 2024, and Product Breakdown, supplied PDFs. Calculation and interpretation by Agrosource Group.

Check listing and source identity

Organic input status | Document review dated 13 October 2026

The supplied certificate and the live registry describe the same named product, but they represent different dates. Keep the certificate as historical documentation and verify the current listing when making a use decision.

Record	What was verified
Supplied certificate	Soil Phix Organic; Applied Organic Solutions; product code apo-20478; listed 13 June 2024; printed expiration 1 June 2026.
Official OMRI registry	Checked 13 October 2026: Soil Phix Organic, apo-20478, status Allowed under NOP, with expiration 1 June 2027.
Scope of listing	The record concerns the microbial input. Listing is not a performance endorsement, hardware certification or certification of an entire farm.

Confirm the product identity against the material actually supplied, review the current OMRI entry and consult the operation's organic certifier before use. No replacement current certificate PDF was verified for this guide. A status recorded here can change after the review date.

Choose the original for the question

Question	Original document to consult
What is in the product and how is it used?	Soil Phix product label. The supplied label has no printed issue date; confirm the current applicable version.
What functions does the supplier attribute to the microbes?	Product Breakdown. Supplier product literature, also included on page two of the California summary.
What happened in the Nevada comparison?	Alfalfa Soil Biological and Nutrient Summary, March to April 2024. Read both pages and request the underlying laboratory report.
What does the California comparison show?	Soil Biology Summary, June to November 2024. Note the missing units and carbon percentage discrepancy.
What does the supplied listing document establish?	Soil Phix OMRI Certification. Historical certificate with the printed 2026 expiration; use the current registry for current status.

Document handling
The five supplied originals remain separate supplier or certification documents. This Agrosource guide is a companion interpretation. It does not replace, revise or relabel any of them as an Agrosource label, trial or certificate.

Sources and authorship: Organic Materials Review Institute: supplied Soil Phix Organic certificate and official Applied Organic Solutions product registry, checked 13 October 2026. Supplied label and field literature as identified above.

Plan a useful farm evaluation

Agrosource worksheet | Define the decision before collecting results

A local evaluation should answer a specific decision about operational fit, field response or seasonal cost. Define the question in advance and agree the approach with the relevant agronomic adviser.

Use a simple evidence plan

Plan element	Practical record to agree
Decision and baseline	Name one primary question and capture the starting condition before treatment. Separate an operating goal from a crop-response goal.
Comparison	Identify a suitable comparison with the adviser where feasible. Record differences in crop, soil, irrigation, weather and prior management.
Sampling	Use documented locations, depths, dates and methods. Retain complete laboratory reports, units and any quality notes.
Operation	Record input identity, application events, system settings, care, downtime and relevant changes to the normal program.
Outcome	Keep water, yield, quality, nutrient and cost measures distinct. A change in one does not establish a change in the others.
Review	Set the review date and the person responsible for interpreting the results. Include adverse, unchanged and missing results.

Avoid three common interpretation errors

- **Changing the question afterward:** selecting only the largest percentage increase can hide unchanged or unfavorable measures. Keep the original evaluation question in view.
- **Comparing unlike records:** different laboratory methods, units, sampling depths or seasons can make two numbers difficult to compare. Resolve those differences first.
- **Assigning all change to one input:** fertility, irrigation, weather, crop load and other management can change alongside the biological program. Record them rather than assuming they had no effect.

Start the evaluation record

Primary decision and review date

Blocks and baseline date

Measures and comparison agreed

Adviser and record owner

Report what changed and what remains uncertain. Keep the operating record with the evaluation. The supplied field percentages are context for discussion, not promised targets.

Sources and authorship: Original Agrosource Group evaluation guidance. This worksheet sets no guaranteed performance target and does not replace crop-specific agronomic advice.