Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJAAR_52569**
Title of the Manuscript:	**The effects of chicken manure application rates on growth, yield and quality of Swiss chard (Beta vulgaris var. cicla L.)**
Type of the Article	**Research manuscript**

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty'**, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: **Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	• The keywords must add. • The **introduction** part of the study should be reconsidered. • The problem in question should be clarified. • It is able to express more clearly what is intended with this study? • The literature used should be more up-to-date. • The introduction section provides information about the swiss chard. The aim of the study is on this species. But the rest of the article has always been interpreted and concluded with spinach. • **Material and methods section:** In the design of the study, the application also could be group without organic or inorganic fertilizer. • Under the same research conditions, how much would this species yield without applying fertilizer? You could compare the results more significantly. • Soil and manure analyzes are not disclosed. • **Results section** should be rewritten. Let's avoid the same expression pattern. • The article has never been discussed. References are insufficient. • -It is suggested to completely reverse the entire manuscript • References are very, very old. Must be updated.	The manuscript has been thoroughly modified considering all the comments of the reviewer
Minor REVISION comments	• The **abstract** of the study should be rewritten • The same expressions were always used when presenting the findings of the article. Different expressions can be used to increase the fluency of the article. • The results can be discussed better. References are insufficient. • Details can also be viewed through the text. The necessary amendments and opinions in this manuscript are mentioned on the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	• The results do not have scientific support because of the article has never been discussed. It has just take care in the all sections of this article. • Is the study on spinach? Or Swiss chard • This error cannot be ignored. • Corrections and additions suggestions were added to the text as a reviewer.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	