Excellent — that’s a smart approach. Below is your **cleaned, publication-ready version** of the *Results* section (Sections 3.1–3.3) rewritten to:

* ✅ Use **only mean ± 95% CI** (no medians or percentiles).
* ✅ Correct **units** (GDD → °C·days, P → mg kg⁻¹, BD → g cm⁻³).
* ✅ Fix **typos, acronyms, and inconsistencies** (use **RFPs** consistently).
* ✅ Retain placeholders [insert values] where you can later insert numbers that were previously medians/IQRs.
* ✅ Improve clarity, flow, and readability while keeping your structure and content intact.

**3.1. Analysis of the entire data set across regenerative farming practices, crops, and environmental variables**

In this section, all crop types were pooled to examine the overall impact of regenerative farming practices (RFPs) on yield across different environmental variables. Across the entire dataset, RFPs resulted in a modest overall yield increase of **0.7% (95% CI: [insert])** (Fig. 2). However, responses varied substantially among practices and crop groups.

Agroforestry (AF) and cover cropping (CC) significantly enhanced yields by **12% (95% CI: [insert])** and **7.5% (95% CI: [insert])**, respectively. In contrast, no-till (NT) and organic farming (OF) were associated with slight yield reductions of **–0.7% (95% CI: [insert])** and **–2.0% (95% CI: [insert])**, respectively. Among crops (considering all RFPs), significant yield gains were observed only in maize and cash crops, with increases of **1.7% (95% CI: [insert])** and **0.7% (95% CI: [insert])**, respectively.

Yield effects also varied across climate zones and temperature regimes. Arid regions exhibited the greatest yield increase of **3.8% (95% CI: [insert])**, followed by temperate regions with **1.8% (95% CI: [insert])** (Fig. 2). This pattern aligned with the aridity index, where mean yield increases of **9% (95% CI: [insert])** and **2.7% (95% CI: [insert])** were observed in arid (0.05–0.20) and semi-arid (0.20–0.50) zones, respectively. In contrast, continental regions showed yield declines, while tropical regions showed no significant changes.

Yield responses across growing degree days (GDD, °C·days) varied by crop. Maize showed notable increases at 2700–4000 °C·days (**1.9% (95% CI: [insert])**) and 4000–6000 °C·days (**5.7% (95% CI: [insert])**). Rice exhibited strong gains below 800 °C·days (**11.6% (95% CI: [insert])**) and between 4000–6000 °C·days (**2.8% (95% CI: [insert])**) and 6000–10000 °C·days (**2.7% (95% CI: [insert])**). Soybean yields increased most within 2700–4000 °C·days (**1.9% (95% CI: [insert])**) and 4000–6000 °C·days (**5.7% (95% CI: [insert])**), while wheat showed its largest gains at 800–2700 °C·days (**1.8% (95% CI: [insert])**) and 6000–10000 °C·days (**3.8% (95% CI: [insert])**).

Across soil properties, the largest yield increases occurred in crops grown on soils with low soil organic carbon (SOC) (**10% (95% CI: [insert])**), coarse texture (**1.8% (95% CI: [insert])**), and either alkaline (**1.4% (95% CI: [insert])**) or acidic conditions (**1.2% (95% CI: [insert])**). Substantial gains were also observed in soils with phosphorus (P) < 10.9 mg kg⁻¹ (**1.3% (95% CI: [insert])**) and 10.9–21.4 mg kg⁻¹ (**0.5% (95% CI: [insert])**), as well as in soils with low (< 1.20 g cm⁻³, **1.05% (95% CI: [insert])**) or medium (1.20–1.47 g cm⁻³, **1.3% (95% CI: [insert])**) bulk density. Conversely, crops on neutral soils experienced yield declines.

By soil classification, the greatest mean yield increases occurred in Lixisols (**18.3% (95% CI: [insert])**), Arenosols (**14.6% (95% CI: [insert])**), Calcisols (**12.7% (95% CI: [insert])**), Regosols (**4.6% (95% CI: [insert])**), Acrisols (**3.7% (95% CI: [insert])**), Luvisols (**2.3% (95% CI: [insert])**), and Kastanozems (**2.9% (95% CI: [insert])**). Yield reductions were recorded in Alisols (**–17.5% (95% CI: [insert])**), Gleysols (**–11.3% (95% CI: [insert])**), and Phaeozems (**–4.3% (95% CI: [insert])**).

Significant yield increases were observed at elevations > 250 m (250–1000 m: **1.0% (95% CI: [insert])**; > 1000 m: **4.9% (95% CI: [insert])**). Positive yield responses were most pronounced on gentle slopes (1–5%, **3.4% (95% CI: [insert])**) and strong slopes (15–30%, **11% (95% CI: [insert])**). Yield effects were generally positive across landforms, except in high plains (**–2.9% (95% CI: [insert])**), valley slopes (**–2.6% (95% CI: [insert])**), and moderate hills (**–2.1% (95% CI: [insert])**). The highest mean yield increases occurred in high-elevation landforms, from mountain valley slopes (**3.8% (95% CI: [insert])**) to mountain summits (**8.0% (95% CI: [insert])**).

**Figure 2.** Distribution of the percentage change in yield (effect size) between regenerative farming practices, crop groups, soil properties, topography, and climatic variables. Dots with error bars represent mean effect size ± 95% CI. Categories whose 95% CI do not include zero (vertical red line) differ significantly between RFPs and controls.

**3.2. Effect size distribution across crops and environmental variables for different soil conservation practices**

This section disaggregates yield impacts of RFPs across practices, crops, climates, soils, and topography to identify where particular RFPs are most effective.

Cropwise, most crops exhibited positive mean yield gains under CC, while responses were mixed for other practices. Significant increases were recorded mainly for maize under AF, CC, and OF, and for cash crops under CC and NT.

In arid (aridity index = 0.05–0.20) and semi-arid (0.20–0.50) regions, significant yield increases occurred under AF and NT. Notably, many positive yield gains under OF were also concentrated in semi-arid regions. AF recorded its highest yield increase in temperate regions (**36% (95% CI: [insert])**). In more humid zones (aridity > 0.50), higher yield gains were again observed for AF and CC.

Yield responses across GDD confirmed that high temperature regimes (> 4000 °C·days) resulted in larger yield increases for maize under AF and CC. Significant increases at low GDD (< 800 °C·days) were observed for maize under OF and for rice under NT and OF. For rice and soybean, yields increased above 4000 °C·days under CC. At moderate GDD (800–2700 °C·days), wheat showed significant yield increases under CC and OF, while above 6000 °C·days, the positive trend persisted mainly for CC.

Across soil properties (Fig. 4), yield increased with decreasing bulk density, particularly under AF, CC, and OF. Increasing phosphorus (P) generally increased yield, except at high P (> 21.4 mg kg⁻¹, **mean 38% (95% CI: [insert])**), which resulted in yield declines under CC, NT, and OF. All RFPs showed high yield increases in soils with low SOC (< 5 g kg⁻¹), except OF. For high SOC (> 5 g kg⁻¹), AF and CC still produced positive but smaller yield increases. Coarse-textured soils showed positive mean yield changes across all RFPs except OF, though significance occurred mainly with CC (**9% (95% CI: [insert])**) and NT (**3% (95% CI: [insert])**).

Considering elevation (Fig. 5), significant yield increases occurred above 250 m for AF and CC. This pattern was supported by positive mean effects across landforms ranging from mountain summits to moderate hills. OF showed similar positive trends in areas characterized by large highland slopes (moderate). Additionally, CC and NT recorded significant yield increases in low-elevation landforms such as dissected terraces/fans/plateaus and valley slopes. For slope, the largest yield increases were observed under AF on level to gently sloping areas (< 15%) and under CC on gentle (1–5%) and strong slopes.

By soil type, AF produced significant mean yield increases in Acrisols and reductions in Kastanozems. The strongest positive yield responses occurred under CC in Cambisols, Luvisols, and Vertisols, and under NT in Alisols, Fluvisols, and Phaeozems. NT produced negative effects in Calcisols, Gypsisols, Histosols, and Luvisols. OF showed yield increases in Ferralsols and Phaeozems (non-significant for the latter).

**Figure 3.** Distribution of mean effect size across crop groups and climate variables for different RFPs. Dots with error bars represent mean ± 95% CI. Categories whose 95% CI exclude zero differ significantly from controls.

**Figure 4.** Distribution of mean effect size across soil properties for different RFPs. Dots with error bars represent mean ± 95% CI. P: phosphorus (mg kg⁻¹); SOC: soil organic carbon (g kg⁻¹); BD: bulk density (g cm⁻³).

**Figure 5.** Distribution of mean effect size across topographic variables for different RFPs. Dots with error bars represent mean ± 95% CI. Mtn\_sumt: mountain summit; Mtn\_vs: mountain valley slope; Mod\_hills: moderate hills; Val\_sl: valley slope; Hi\_plain: high plain; Tfphi\_dis/surf: terrace/fan/plateau (high, dissected/surface); Tfplw\_dis/surf: terrace/fan/plateau (low, dissected/surface).

**3.3. Effect size distribution across different no-tillage management practices**

The effect of no-till (NT) on yield was assessed across climatic regions and management combinations to identify conditions producing positive or negative responses (Fig. 6).

Overall, NT led to significant yield increases of **14.7% (95% CI: [insert])** in arid regions and **9.8% (95% CI: [insert])** in temperate regions, while yields declined in continental (**–0.1% (95% CI: [insert])**) and tropical (**–8.7% (95% CI: [insert])**) regions. The greatest positive impacts occurred in arid zones under management regimes combining nitrogen input, soil cover, and weed control—with or without crop rotation—yielding up to **39% (95% CI: [insert])**. Other effective combinations included nitrogen input with soil cover and weed control (**20% (95% CI: [insert])**), nitrogen input with soil cover alone (**1.2% (95% CI: [insert])**), and nitrogen input with weed control (**4.8% (95% CI: [insert])**).

In temperate regions, positive yield gains were noted with nitrogen input plus soil cover, weed control, and rotation (**2.6% (95% CI: [insert])**), as well as soil cover with weed control (**2.5% (95% CI: [insert])**). The largest increases occurred under nitrogen input with soil cover and weed control (**20% (95% CI: [insert])**) and under nitrogen input plus soil cover (**8.3% (95% CI: [insert])**).

In continental regions, NT produced small positive yield responses under some combinations, including nitrogen input + soil cover + weed control (**0.09% (95% CI: [insert])**) and soil cover + weed control (**6.1% (95% CI: [insert])**). The greatest gain, **20% (95% CI: [insert])**, occurred with soil cover, weed control, and rotation. Conversely, in tropical regions, most NT management strategies led to yield declines, except for the combination of nitrogen input, soil cover, and weed control, which produced a small positive effect (**1.1% (95% CI: [insert])**).