

**A peer-reviewed version of this preprint was published in PeerJ on 26 February 2018.**

[View the peer-reviewed version](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.4428) (peerj.com/articles/4428), which is the preferred citable publication unless you specifically need to cite this preprint.

LaCanne CE, Lundgren JG. 2018. Regenerative agriculture: merging farming and natural resource conservation profitably. PeerJ 6:e4428 <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.4428>

# Regenerative agriculture: merging farming and natural resource conservation profitably

Claire E LaCanne<sup>1</sup>, Jonathan G Lundgren<sup>Corresp. 2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Natural Resource Management Department, South Dakota State University, Brookings, SD, USA

<sup>2</sup> Ecdysis Foundation, Estelline, SD, USA

Corresponding Author: Jonathan G Lundgren  
Email address: jgl.entomology@gmail.com

Most cropland in the U.S. is characterized by large monocultures, whose productivity is maintained through a strong reliance on costly tillage, external fertilizers, and pesticides ( Schipanski et al., 2016 ). Despite this, farmers have developed a regenerative model of farm production that promotes soil health and biodiversity, while producing nutrient-dense farm products profitably. Little work has focused on the relative costs and benefits of novel regenerative farming operations, which necessitates studying *in situ*, farmer-defined best management practices. Here, we evaluate the relative effects of regenerative and conventional corn production systems on pest management services, soil conservation, and farmer profitability and productivity throughout the Northern Plains of the United States. Regenerative farming systems provided greater ecosystem services and profitability for farmers than an input-intensive model of corn production. Pests were 10-fold more abundant in insecticide-treated corn fields than on insecticide-free regenerative farms, indicating that farmers who proactively design pest-resilient food systems outperform farmers that react to pests chemically. Regenerative fields had 29% lower grain production but 78% higher profits over traditional corn production systems. Profit was positively correlated with the particulate organic matter of the soil, not yield. These results provide the basis for dialogue on ecologically based farming systems that could be used to simultaneously produce food while conserving our natural resource base: two factors that are pitted against one another in simplified food production systems. To attain this requires a systems-level shift on the farm; simply applying individual regenerative practices within the current production model will not likely produce the documented results.

1 A submission for PeerJ

2 Word count: 2177

3 **Regenerative agriculture: merging farming and natural resource conservation profitably.**

4 Claire E. LaCanne<sup>1,2,3</sup> and Jonathan G. Lundgren<sup>2,\*</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup>Natural Resource Management Department, South Dakota State University, Brookings, SD, USA, 57007

6 <sup>2</sup>Ecdysis Foundation, Estelline, SD, USA, 57234

7 <sup>3</sup>*Current address.* Rice County Extension Office, University of Minnesota, 1900 Fairground Drive #17,  
8 Faribault, MN, 55021

9 \*Address correspondence to

10 Dr. Jonathan Lundgren  
11 Ecdysis Foundation  
12 46958 188<sup>th</sup> Street  
13 Estelline, SD, 57234, USA  
14 Phone: 605-695-9878  
15 E-mail: [jgl.entomology@gmail.com](mailto:jgl.entomology@gmail.com)  
16 Web: [www.ecdysis.bio](http://www.ecdysis.bio)

**Abstract.** Most cropland in the U.S. is characterized by large monocultures, whose productivity is maintained through a strong reliance on costly tillage, external fertilizers, and pesticides (Schipanski et al., 2016). Despite this, farmers have developed a regenerative model of farm production that promotes soil health and biodiversity, while producing nutrient-dense farm products profitably. Little work has focused on the relative costs and benefits of novel regenerative farming operations, which necessitates studying *in situ*, farmer-defined best management practices. Here, we evaluate the relative effects of regenerative and conventional corn production systems on pest management services, soil conservation, and farmer profitability and productivity throughout the Northern Plains of the United States. Regenerative farming systems provided greater ecosystem services and profitability for farmers than an input-intensive model of corn production. Pests were 10-fold more abundant in insecticide-treated corn fields than on insecticide-free regenerative farms, indicating that farmers who proactively design pest-resilient food systems outperform farmers that react to pests chemically. Regenerative fields had 29% lower grain production but 78% higher profits over traditional corn production systems. Profit was positively correlated with the particulate organic matter of the soil, not yield. These results provide the basis for dialogue on ecologically based farming systems that could be used to simultaneously produce food while conserving our natural resource base: two factors that are pitted against one another in simplified food production systems. To attain this requires a systems-level shift on the farm; simply applying individual regenerative practices within the current production model will not likely produce the documented results.

**Key words:** agroecology, biodiversity, conservation agriculture, corn, pest management, profit, soil organic matter, yield.

**Introduction.** Development of synthetic fertilizers, hybrid crops, genetically modified crops, and policies that decouple farmer decisions from market demands all helped create a modern food production system which reduces the diversity of foods that are produced (Fausti and Lundgren, 2015; Pretty, 1995). This simplification of our food system contributes to climate change (Carlsson-Kanyama and Gonzalez, 2009), rising pollution (Beman et al., 2011; Morrissey et al., 2015), biodiversity loss (Butler et al., 2007; Landis et al., 2008), and damaging land use changes (Johnston, 2014; Wright and Wimberly, 2013) that affect the sustainability, profitability and resilience of farms (Schipanski et al., 2016). Farmers experience the highest suicide rate of any profession in the United States, a rate nearly five-fold higher than the general public (McIntosh et al., 2016); the driving depression rates are related to conventional production practices (Beard et al., 2014). Yet the scale of our food production system provides opportunities for solving some of these planetary scale problems (Lal, 2004; Teague et al., 2016), but requires a systems-level shift in the values and goals of our food production system that de-prioritizes solely generating high yields toward one that produces higher quality food while conserving our natural resource base.

The goal of regenerative farming systems (Rodale, 1983) is to increase soil quality and biodiversity in farmland while producing nourishing farm products profitably. Unifying principles consistent across regenerative farming systems include 1) abandoning tillage (or actively rebuilding soil communities following a tillage event), 2) eliminating spatio-temporal events of bare soil, 3) fostering plant diversity on the farm, and 4) integrating livestock and cropping operations on the land. Further characterization of a regenerative system is problematic because of the myriad combinations of farming practices that comprise a system targeting the regenerative goal. Other comparisons of conventional agriculture with alternative agriculture schemes do not compare *in situ* best management practices developed by farmers, and frequently ignore a key driver to decision making on farming operations: the examined systems' relative net profit to the farmer (De Ponti et al., 2012).

**Materials and Methods.** Corn (*Zea mays* L.) was selected for our study due to its pre-eminence as a food crop in North America and globally. Corn is planted on 39.9% of all crop acres (NASS, 2017), or 4.8% (37.1 million ha) of the terrestrial land surface of the contiguous 48 states. In 2012, it generated 30.3% (\$64,319 billion) of all gross crop value in the U.S. (NASS, 2017). Nearly 100% of cornfields are treated annually with insecticides (NASS, 2017). We used a matrix of specific production practices (Table S1) to define each farm into one of two systems (regenerative or conventional). The most regenerative systems used mixed multispecies cover crops (ranging from 2-40 plant species), were never-till, used no insecticides, and grazed livestock on their cropland. The most conventional farms practiced tillage at least annually, applied insecticides (as GM insect-resistant varieties and neonicotinoid seed treatments), and left their soil bare aside from the cash crop.

Soil organic matter, insect pest populations, and corn yield and profit were assessed for each field. Soil cores (8.5 cm deep, 5 cm in diameter; 30 g of soil each; n = 4 samples per field that were made a composite sample; only one field was sampled per farm and two farms were omitted) were collected at least 10 m from one another during anthesis. Samples were cleaned of plant residue, ground, and dried to constant weight at 105° C. Particulate soil organic matter (POM) was determined by screening each sample (soaked in 5 g L<sup>-1</sup> aqueous hexametaphosphate) through 500 um (course POM) and 53 um (fine POM) sieves and then applying the loss on ignition (LOI) technique (Davies, 1974). Insect pests were enumerated through dissections of all aboveground plant tissues (25 plants per field). Major pests of corn (rootworm adults, caterpillar pests, and aphids) are all present in cornfields at this crop developmental stage (Lundgren et al., 2015). Yields were gathered from three 3.5 m sections of row from each field. Gross revenue for each field were considered as yield and return on grain, and additional revenue streams (e.g., livestock grazing). Total direct costs for each field were calculated based on the costs of corn seed, cover crop seed, drying/cleaning grain, crop insurance, tillage, planting, fertilizers, pesticides, and irrigation.

**Results and Discussion.** Insect pest populations were more than 10 fold higher on the insecticide-

treated farms than on the insecticide-free regenerative farms (ANOVA;  $F_{1,77} = 13.52$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ; Figure 1).

Pest problems in agriculture are often the product of low biodiversity and simple community structure on

numerous spatial scales (Tscharntke et al., 2012). Hundreds of invertebrate species have been inventoried

from cornfields of the Northern Plains of the U.S. (Lundgren et al., 2015; Welch and Lundgren, 2016), but

these communities represent only 25% of the insect species that lived in ancestral habitats (e.g., prairie)

that cornfields replaced in this region (Schmid et al., 2015). Pest abundance is lower in cornfields that

have greater insect diversity, enhanced biological network strength and greater community evenness

(Lundgren and Fausti, 2015). Suggested mechanisms to explain how invertebrate diversity and network

interactions reduce pests include predation (Letourneau et al., 2009), competition (Barbosa et al., 2009),

and other processes that may not be easily predicted. What practices foster diversity in agroecosystems?

In our studies, farmers that replaced insecticide use with agronomic forms of plant diversity invariably

had fewer pest problems than those with strict monocultures. Reducing insect diversity and relying solely

on insecticide use establishes a scenario whereby pests persist and resurge through adaptation, as was

observed by our forebears (Perkins, 1982; Stern et al., 1959). Applying winter cover crops (Lundgren and

Fergen, 2011), lengthening crop rotations (Bullock, 1992), diversifying field margins using conservation

mixes (Haaland et al., 2011), and allowing or promoting non-crop plants between crop rows (Khan et al.,

2006) are other agronomically sound practices that regenerative farmers successfully apply to improve

the resilience of their system to pest proliferation.

Despite having lower grain yields, the regenerative system was nearly twice as profitable as the

conventional corn farms (ANOVA;  $F_{1,70} = 14.35$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ; Figure 2). Regenerative farms produced 29%

less corn grain than conventional operations ( $8481 \pm 684$  kg/ha vs.  $11,884 \pm 648$  kg/ha; ANOVA;

$F_{1,70} = 8.39$ ,  $P = 0.01$ ). Yield reductions are commonly reported in more ecologically based food

production systems relative to conventional systems (De Ponti et al., 2012). However, only 4% of calories

produced as corn grain is eaten directly by humans, and almost none is consumed as grain. 36% of grain

is fed to livestock (NASS, 2017), and corn-fed beef contains only 13% of the total calories produced by corn grain. Two ways that regenerative systems could increase the human food produced per ha in cornfields would be to increase the diversity of livestock on the field, or increasing the duration of grazing current stock. The relative profitability in the two systems was driven by the high seed and fertilizer costs that conventional farms incurred (32% of the gross income went into these inputs on conventional fields, versus only 12% in regenerative fields), and the higher revenue generated from grain and other products produced on the regenerative corn fields (Figure 2). The high seed costs on conventional farms are largely attributable to premiums paid by farmers for prophylactic insecticide traits, whose value is questionable due to pest resistance and persistent low abundance for some targeted pests in the Northern Plains (Hutchison et al., 2007; Krupke et al., 2017). Regenerative farmers reduced their fertilizer costs by including legume-based cover crops on their fields during the fallow period (Ebelhar et al., 1984), adopting no-till practices (Lal et al., 2007), and grazing the crop field with livestock (Russelle et al., 2010). They also received higher value for their crop by receiving an organic premium, by selling their grain directly to consumers as seed or feed, and by extracting more than just corn revenue from their field (e.g., by grazing cover mixes with livestock).

The profitability of a corn field was not related to grain yields ( $F_{1,70} < 0.001$ ;  $P = 0.98$ ;  $r^2 < 0.01$ ;  $\text{profit} = -0.0006[\text{yield}] + 1274$ ), but was positively correlated with the level of POM in the soil, and inversely related to the bulk density of the soil (Figure 3). Organic matter is considered by some as the basis for productivity in the soil (Karlen et al., 1997; Tiessen et al., 1994), and soils with high SOM typically have lower bulk density. SOM increases water infiltration rates, and supports greater microbial and animal abundance and diversity (Lehman et al., 2015). The components of POM are the labile portion of this SOM, and are frequently used to study the effects of management-based differences in SOM (Cambardella and Elliott, 1992). The only way to generate SOM in cropland is through fostering biology, which inherently is driven by plant communities through sequestration of  $\text{CO}_2$  from the atmosphere. Eliminating tillage (Pikul et al., 2007; Six et al., 1999), implementing cover crops (Ding et al.,

2006; Kuo et al., 1997), and cycling plant residue through livestock (Tracy and Zhang, 2008) all enhance this process, and all are important practices used in regenerative food systems that raise POM in the soil.

**Conclusions.** The farmers themselves have devised an ecologically based production system comprised of multiple practices that are woven into a profitable farm that promotes ecosystem services. Regenerative farms fundamentally challenge the current food production paradigm that maximizes gross profits at the expense of net gains for the farmer. Key elements of this successful approach to farming include

- 1) By promoting soil biology and organic matter and biodiversity on their farms, regenerative farmers required fewer costly inputs like insecticides and fertilizers, and managed their pest populations more effectively.
- 2) Soil organic matter was a more important driver of proximate farm profitability than yields were, in part because the regenerative farms marketed their products differently or had a diversified income stream from a single field.

## Acknowledgements

We thank our 20 farmers throughout the Northern Plains for providing us with study sites and management information. E. Adee, M. Bredeson, J. Fergen, D. Grosz, K. Januschka, N. Koens, R. LaCanne, M. La Vallie, A. Leiferman, J. Lundgren, A. Martens, C. Mogren, K. Nemec, A. Nikolas, J. Pecenka, G. Schen, C. Snyder, & K. Weathers assisted field work. R. Conser, M. Entz, C. Morrissey, & R. Teague provided comments on earlier drafts. M. Longfellow and L. Hesler identified invertebrates. Mention of trade names or commercial products in this publication does not imply recommendation or endorsement by South Dakota State University or Ecdysis Foundation. The project was supported by USDA PMAP Award # 2013-34381-21245 and donations of farmers and beekeepers to Ecdysis Foundation.

## References

- Barbosa P, Hines J, Kaplan I, Martinson H, Szczepaniec A, Szendrei Z. Associational resistance and susceptibility: having right or wrong neighbors. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution & Systematics* 2009; 40: 1-20.
- Beard JD, Umbach DM, Hoppin JA, Richards M, Alavanja MCR, Blair A, et al. Pesticide exposure and depression among male private pesticide applicators in the agricultural health study. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 2014; 122: 984-991.
- Beman JM, Chow C-E, King AL, Feng Y, Fuhrman JA, Andersson A, et al. Global declines in oceanic nitrification rates as a consequence of ocean acidification. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the U.S.A.* 2011; 108: 208-213.
- Bullock DG. Crop rotation. *Critical Reviews in Plant Sciences* 1992; 11: 309-326.
- Butler SJ, Vickery JA, Norris K. Farmland biodiversity and the footprint of agriculture. *Science* 2007; 315: 381-384.
- Cambardella CA, Elliott ET. Particulate soil organic-matter changes across a grassland cultivation sequence. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 1992; 56: 777-783.
- Carlsson-Kanyama A, Gonzalez AD. Potential contributions of food consumption patterns to climate change. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 2009; 89: 1704S-1709S.
- Davies BE. Loss-on-ignition as an estimate of soil organic matter. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 1974; 38: 150-151.
- De Ponti T, Rijk B, Van Ittersum MK. The crop yield gap between organic and conventional agriculture. . *Agricultural Systems* 2012; 108: 1-9.
- Ding G, Liu X, Herbert S, Novak J, Amarasingiwardena D, Xing B. Effect of cover crop management on soil organic matter. *Geoderma* 2006; 130: 229-239.
- Ebelhar SA, Frye WW, Blevins RL. Nitrogen from legume cover crops for no-tillage corn. *Agronomy Journal* 1984; 76: 51-55.
- Fausti SW, Lundgren JG. The causes and unintended consequences of a paradigm shift in corn production practices. *Environmental Science & Policy* 2015; 52: 41-50.
- Haaland C, Naisbit RE, Bersier L-F. Sown wildflower strips for insect conservation: a review. *Insect Conservation and Diversity* 2011; 4: 60-80.
- Hutchison WD, Burkness E, Moon R, Leslie T, Fleischer S, Abrahamson M, et al. Evidence for regional suppression of European corn borer populations in Bt maize in the midwestern U.S.: Analysis of long-term time series' from three states. XVI International Plant Protection Congress. , Glasgow, Scotland, 2007, pp. 512-513.
- Johnston CA. Agricultural expansion: land use shell game in the U.S. Northern Plains. *Landscape Ecology* 2014; 29: 81-95.
- Karlen DL, Mausbach MJ, Doran JW, Cline RG, Harris RF, Schuman GE. Soil quality: a concept, definition, and framework for evaluation. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 1997; 61: 4-10.
- Khan ZR, Pickett JA, Wadhams LJ, Hassanali A, Midega CAO. Combined control of *Striga hermonthica* and stemborers by maize-*Desmodium* spp. intercrops. *Crop Protection* 2006; 25: 989-995.
- Krupke CH, Holland JD, Long EY, Eitzer BD. Planting of neonicotinoid-treated maize poses risks for honey bees and other non-target organisms over a wide area without consistent crop yield benefit. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 2017; in press.
- Kuo S, Sainju UM, Jellum EJ. Winter cover crop effects on soil organic carbon and carbohydrate in soil. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 1997; 61: 145-152.
- Lal R. Soil carbon sequestration impacts on global climate change and food security. *Science* 2004; 304: 1623.
- Lal R, Reicosky DC, Hanson JD. Evolution of the plow over 10,000 years and the rationale for no-till farming. *Soil & Tillage Research* 2007; 93: 1-12.
- Landis DA, Gardiner MM, van der Werf W, Swinton SM. Increasing corn for biofuel production reduces biocontrol services in agricultural landscapes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2008; 105: 20552-20557.

- 210 Lehman RM, Cambardella CA, Stott DE, Acosta-Martinez V, Manter DK, Buyer JS, et al. Understanding and  
211 enhancing soil biological health: The solution for reversing soil degradation. *Sustainability* 2015;  
212 7: 988-1027.
- 213 Letourneau DK, Jedlicka JA, Bothwell SG, Moreno CR. Effects of Natural Enemy Biodiversity on the  
214 Suppression of Arthropod Herbivores in Terrestrial Ecosystems. *Annual Review of Ecology,*  
215 *Evolution, and Systematics* 2009; 40: 573-592.
- 216 Lundgren JG, Fausti SW. Trading biodiversity for pest problems. *Science Advances* 2015; 1: e1500558.
- 217 Lundgren JG, Fergen JK. Enhancing predation of a subterranean insect pest: A conservation benefit of  
218 winter vegetation in agroecosystems. *Applied Soil Ecology* 2011; 51: 9-16.
- 219 Lundgren JG, McDonald TM, Rand TA, Fausti SW. Spatial and numerical relationships of arthropod  
220 communities associated with key pests of maize. *Journal of Applied Entomology* 2015; 136: 446-  
221 456.
- 222 McIntosh WLW, Spies E, Stone DM, Lokey CN, Trudeau A-R, Bartholow B. Suicide rates by occupational  
223 group- 17 states, 2012. *MMWR Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 2016 2016; 65: 641-645.
- 224 Morrissey CA, Mineau P, Devries JH, Sanchez-Bayo F, Liess M, Cavallaro MC, et al. Neonicotinoid  
225 contamination of global surface waters and associated risk to aquatic invertebrates: A review.  
226 *Environment International* 2015; 74: 291-303.
- 227 NASS. National Agriculture Statistics Service. USDA, 2017.
- 228 Perkins JH. *Insects, Experts, and the Insecticide Crisis*. New York: Plenum Press, 1982.
- 229 Pikul JL, Jr., Osborne SE, Ellsbury MM, Riedell WE. Particulate organic matter and water-stable  
230 aggregation of soil under contrasting management. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 2007;  
231 71: 766-776.
- 232 Pretty JN. *Regenerating Agriculture: Policies and practice for sustainability and self-reliance*. Washington,  
233 D.C.: Joseph Henry Press, 1995.
- 234 Rodale R. Breaking new ground: the search for a sustainable agriculture. *The Futurist* 1983; 17: 15-20.
- 235 Russelle MP, Entz MH, Franzluebbers AJ. Reconsidering integrated crop-livestock systems in North  
236 America. *Agronomy Journal* 2010; 99: 325-334.
- 237 Schipanski ME, MacDonald GK, Rosenzweig S, Chappell MJ, Bennett EM, Kerr RB, et al. Realizing resilient  
238 food systems. *Bioscience* 2016; 66: 600-610.
- 239 Schmid RB, Lehman RM, Brözel VS, Lundgren JG. Gut bacterial symbiont diversity within beneficial insects  
240 linked to reductions in local biodiversity. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America* 2015;  
241 108: 993-999.
- 242 Six J, Elliott ET, Paustian K. Aggregate and soil organic matter dynamics under conventional and no-tillage  
243 systems. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 63, 1350-1358. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 1999; 63:  
244 1350-1358.
- 245 Stern VM, Smith RF, van den Bosch R, Hagen KS. The integrated control concept. *Hilgardia* 1959; 29: 81-  
246 101.
- 247 Teague WR, Apfelbaum S, Lal R, Kreuter UP, Rowntree J, Davies CA, et al. The role of ruminants in  
248 reducing agriculture's carbon footprint in North America. . *Journal of Soil and Water*  
249 *Conservation* 2016; 71: 156-164.
- 250 Tiessen H, Cuevas E, Chacon P. The role of soil organic matter in sustaining soil fertility. *Nature* 1994; 371:  
251 783-785.
- 252 Tracy BF, Zhang Y. Soil compaction, corn yield response, and soil nutrient pool dynamics within an  
253 integrated crop-livestock system in Illinois. *Crop Science* 2008; 48: 1211-1218.
- 254 Tscharrntke T, Clough Y, Wanger TC, Jackson L, Motzke I, Perfecto I, et al. Global food security, biodiversity  
255 conservation and the future of agricultural intensification. *Biological Conservation* 2012; 151: 53-  
256 59.
- 257 Welch KD, Lundgren JG. An exposure-based, ecology-driven framework for selection of indicator species  
258 for insecticide risk assessment. *Food Webs* 2016; 9: 46-54.

259 Wright CK, Wimberly MC. Recent land use change in the Western Corn Belt threatens grasslands and  
260 wetlands. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the U.S.A. 2013; 110: 4134-4319.

261 **Figure 1. Insecticide-treated cornfields had higher pest abundance than untreated, regenerative**  
 262 **cornfields.** Values presented are mean  $\pm$  SEM total pests (corn rootworm adults, European corn borers,  
 263 Western bean cutworm, other caterpillars, and aphids) per m<sup>2</sup>, and were assessed during corn anthesis.  
 264 The systems were regarded as best-management practices for the sampled region by the farmers  
 265 themselves. All conventional farms planted neonicotinoid-treated, Bt corn seed to prophylactically  
 266 reduce pests, and some cornfields were also sprayed with insecticides. Regenerative farms included >3 of  
 267 the following practices: use of a multispecies cover crop, abandonment of insecticide, abandonment of  
 268 tillage, and the cropland was grazed, etc. Pest abundance was significantly different in the two systems  
 269 ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ;  $n = 39$  regenerative cornfields and 40 conventional cornfields).

270 **Figure 2. Regenerative corn fields generate nearly twice the profit of conventionally managed corn**  
 271 **fields.** Profit was calculated using direct costs and revenues for each field and excludes any overhead and  
 272 indirect expenses. Regenerative cornfields implemented three or more practices such as planting a  
 273 multispecies cover mix, eliminating pesticide use, abandoning tillage, and integrating livestock onto the  
 274 crop ground. Conventional cornfields used fewer than two of these practices. The regenerative systems  
 275 had 70% higher profit than conventional cornfields ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ;  $n = 36$  fields in each system).

276 **Figure 3. Corn fields with high particulate organic matter and low bulk density in the soil have greater**  
 277 **profits.** Corn fields were managed under either conventional or regenerative systems, and profit was  
 278 calculated using direct costs and revenues for each field and excludes any overhead and indirect  
 279 expenses. (general linear regression model;  $F_{1,16} = 7.84$ ;  $P = 0.01$ ;  $r^2 = 0.34$ ; profit =  $29.68[\text{POM}] - 66.94$ ;  
 280 bulk density;  $F_{1,19} = 5.23$ ;  $P = 0.03$ ;  $r^2 = 0.24$ ; profit =  $-975 [\text{POM}] + 1593$ )




281 **Table S2. Soil organic matter on regenerative and conventional corn farms.**

Reference town	Farm locations (latitude, longitude)	SOM (g/kg)
Bladen, NE	40.31971, -98.57358	6.23
Bladen, NE	40.33703, -98.56301	4.52
York, NE	40.63054, -97.66534	6.21
York, NE	40.97390, -97.49031	5.55
Bismarck, ND	46.85280, -100.60131	4.19
Bismarck, ND	46.85280, -100.35145	N/A
Bismarck, ND	46.81734, -100.51257	5.82
Bismarck, ND	47.14250, -100.19720	3.85
White, SD	44.42572, -96.58806	N/A
White, SD	44.41155, -96.60008	5.52
Pipestone, MN	44.11446, -96.32468	N/A
Pipestone, MN	44.12416, -96.36422	4.75
Toronto, SD	44.59248, -96.57923	7.60
Toronto, SD	44.57960, -96.58367	6.38
Gary, SD	44.80565, -96.34708	7.53
Gary, SD	44.80689, -96.35465	7.36
Arlington, SD	44.41566, -97.18795	8.17
Arlington, SD	44.42644, -97.25077	8.18
Lake Norden, SD	44.58976, -97.08649	4.56
Lake Norden, SD	44.55.6839, -97.243820	6.26

# Figure 1

Figure 1. Insecticide-treated cornfields had higher pest abundance than untreated, regenerative cornfields.


Values presented are mean $\pm$ SEM total pests (corn rootworm adults, European corn borers, Western bean cutworm, other caterpillars, and aphids) per m<sup>2</sup>, and were assessed during corn anthesis. The systems were regarded as best-management practices for the sampled region by the farmers themselves. All conventional farms planted neonicotinoid-treated, Bt corn seed to prophylactically reduce pests, and some cornfields were also sprayed with insecticides. Regenerative farms included >3 of the following practices: use of a multispecies cover crop, abandonment of insecticide, abandonment of tillage, and the cropland was grazed, etc. Pest abundance was significantly different in the two systems ( $\alpha=0.05$ ; n = 39 regenerative cornfields and 40 conventional cornfields).



## Figure 2

Figure 2. Regenerative corn fields generate nearly twice the profit of conventionally managed corn fields.

Profit was calculated using direct costs and revenues for each field and excludes any overhead and indirect expenses. Regenerative cornfields implemented three or more practices such as planting a multispecies cover mix, eliminating pesticide use, abandoning tillage, and integrating livestock onto the crop ground. Conventional cornfields used fewer than two of these practices. The regenerative systems had 70% higher profit than conventional cornfields ( $\alpha=0.05$ ;  $n = 36$  fields in each system).



## Figure 3

Figure 3. Corn fields with high particulate organic matter and low bulk density in the soil have greater profits.

Corn fields were managed under either conventional or regenerative systems, and profit was calculated using direct costs and revenues for each field and excludes any overhead and indirect expenses. (general linear regression model;  $F_{1,16}=7.84$ ;  $P=0.01$ ;  $r^2=0.34$ ; profit= $29.68[\text{POM}] - 66.94$ ; bulk density;  $F_{1,19}=5.23$ ;  $P=0.03$ ;  $r^2=0.24$ ; profit= $-975 [\text{POM}] + 1593$ )

