Yining,

I am not a big fan of Figure 2.

Issues that I have are as follows:

1. There are too many possible comparisons in the figure and a lot of the data overlaps. That leads me to think that you don’t have significant results, but I have seen elsewhere that they are significant. So, I would rework this.
2. The inclusion of fcc, sfc, sfs, and ssf where you have limited data does not seem wise. If you don't have enough data to report a result, then don't present a result.
3. Why did you choose this box and whisker approach? Could you not instead create a table with the mean effect and a 95% CI using a 1-sided t test asking whether ccc significantly increases SOC v fff? This way you could say that crop cultivation is clearly better than not cultivating crops. That is an important result.
4. Also, shouldn't this be 3 tables: 1 for each depth range?
5. Really, the 3 depth ranges are not that important, but you do need to report the overall increase across all 3 depths. That is the key result upon which to focus.
6. In short, you need to tighten up and clarify what you can report as a significant result. I want to know which rotations are better than which other ones (95% CI standard). Please report all combinations where 1 option is better than a different one. Then, we can begin to make a plan.