

1 **The effects of chicken manure application rates on growth, yield and quality of Swiss chard**2 *(Beta vulgaris var. cicla L.)*

3

4

4 **ABSTRACT**

5 Swiss chard (*Beta vulgaris* var. *cicla*) is a leafy vegetable that belongs to the *Chenopodiaceae*
 6 family. Only the fresh young leaves can be used raw in salads as the mature leaves are bitter.
 7 Over the years, Swazis have adopted the use of inorganic fertilisers as they are easy to apply and
 8 come with recommended application rates. However, their main drawback is that they are
 9 environmentally unfriendly especially when washed to river streams and other water bodies. For
 10 this cause, the use of animal manures has been promoted. The experiment was conducted at the
 11 Horticulture Department Farm, Faculty of Agriculture and Consumer Sciences, Luyengo
 12 Campus of the University of Swaziland to determine the effects of chicken manure application
 13 rates on growth, yield and quality of Swiss chard. Four chicken manure application rates (10, 20,
 14 40 and 80 t/ha) and a recommended 900kg/ha, inorganic basal fertiliser with a 125kg/ha LAN
 15 top dressing fertiliser was used as a control. A Randomised Complete Block Design (RCBD)
 16 with four replicates was used. The study showed that the application of 80 t/ha of chicken
 17 manure improved the growth and yield of spinach. It is recommended that farmers may use 80
 18 t/ha of chicken manure because it gave the best results compared to the other treatments.

Comment [F1]: L.

Comment [F2]: You don't need that much detail in this section. More specifically, the problem should be written and the purpose of the study should be stated immediately after.

Comment [F3]: More details for this abstract section.

Comment [F4]: The season or year of study can be added.

Comment [F5]: Isn't there an application group where both chicken manure and inorganic fertiliser are not applied?!

Comment [F6]: plant material, cultivar?

Comment [F7]: Spinach ??

Swiss chard???

Comment [F8]:

19

20

21

22

Comment [F9]: Where are the keywords?

23 1.0. INTRODUCTION

Comment [F10]: 1.0, 2.0 is very interesting to enumerate, is not it?

24 Swiss chard is leafy vegetable that belongs to the *Chenopodiaceae* family and is scientifically
25 known as *Beta vulgaris var. cicla*L. It belongs to the same family as beetroot and mangel-wurzel.

Comment [F11]:

26 Unlike beetroot and mangel-wurzel, Swiss chard lacks the large bulbous tape root. It is one of the
27 most nutritious vegetable crops in the world. Swiss chard may be grown in Swaziland all year
28 round, in all the ecological zones.

29 Swiss chard forms part of the several leafy green vegetables that are known as 'greens.' It is a
30 biennial plant with large dark leaves. The leaves are large, glossy and crispy and can grow to 37
31 cm long and 25 cm wide (Pierce, 1987). Stalks of Swiss chard come in a variety of colours
32 depending on the cultivar, they are usually white, yellow, orange or red (Hadfield, 1960). The
33 first records of cultivation place the origin of Swiss chard in the Mediterranean region
34 particularly Italy and was first written about by the Greek philosopher Aristotle in 4 B.C (Pierce,
35 1987).

36 Swiss chard is a short day (SD) plant with critical day length of 12 hours. It grows best at
37 temperatures ranging from 7 to 24 °C. Swiss chard can withstand light frosts but an extended
38 exposure to temperatures less than 5°C induces bolting. In hot weather, the leaves remain small
39 and are of inferior quality (Gilbert and Hadfield, 1996).

40 Leaves of Swiss chard are harvested usually within eight weeks from sowing and once they are
41 in good size (Hadfield, 1960). Harvesting is done continuously so that the leaves do not stay long
42 and lose their colour or become tough.

43 The use of inorganic fertilisers has resulted in residual toxicities and degradation of the soil
44 structure. These inorganic fertilisers become an environmental threat to aqua life when washed to

45 river streams and other water bodies. They are expensive such that not all farmers afford them.

46 As a result farmers produce Swiss chard below the expected optimum level.

47 The main objective of this research is to improve the production of Swiss chard and to contribute

48 towards food security and income generation in Swaziland. The specific objective was to

49 determine the optimum level of chicken manure application on growth, yield and quality of

50 Swiss chard.

51

52

53 2.0 MATERIAL AND METHODS

54 2.1 Experimental site

55 The experiment was conducted at the Horticulture Department Farm, Faculty of Agriculture and

56 Consumer Sciences, Luyengo Campus of the University of Swaziland. The farm is located at

57 Luyengo, Manzini region, in the Middleveld agro-ecological zone. Luyengo is located at latitude

58 26°4' S and longitude 31°4' E. The average altitude of this area is 750 m above sea level. The

59 mean annual precipitation is 980 mm with most of rain falling between October and April.

60 Drought hazard is about 40%. The average summer temperature is 27°C and winter temperature

61 is about 15°C. The soils of Luyengo are classified under Malkerns series. They are ferrasolic or

62 merely a ferralitic soil integrated to fersialitic soils or typical ultisols. The soil in the

63 experimental area was a sandy loam (Murdoch, 1970).

64 2.2 Plant Materials

65 Four weeks old Swiss chard seedlings were obtained from Greenhouse Seedlings, Ezulwini.

66 They were transplanted on the 4th of February, 2016 in 1.5 x 1.5 m plots with an inter and intra

Comment [F12]: The amount of inorganic fertilizer commonly used for this species should be indicated. As mentioned, what kind of damages and residues of this inorganic fertilizer used should be indicated by using previous studies.

Comment [F13]: These statements must be supported by the literature.

Comment [F14]: 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.

Comment [F15]: There is no connection with the fluency and expression.

Comment [F16]: Year of study??

Comment [F17]: Add to new reference

Comment [F18]: It should be stated how many leaves the seedlings are in this period. What is the approximate seedling length? Is there any name of the plant material used? cultivar

67 row spacing of 45 cm respectively and they were irrigated twice a day during the first week and
 68 every second day from the second week until the end of the experiment.

Comment [F19]: What is the content of inorganic fertilizer used for control?

69 2.3 Experimental Design

70 Four chicken manure application rates (10, 20, 40 and 80 t/ha) and a recommended 900kg/ha,
 71 inorganic basal fertiliser with a 125kg/ha LAN top dressing fertiliser was used as a control
 72 (Table 1). A Randomised Complete Block Design (RCBD) with four replicates was used. Each
 73 plot had four rows and there were four plants in each row which gave a total of 320 plants used
 74 for the experiment.

75 Table 1: Treatment descriptions.

Treatment code	Treatment
1	80 t/ha
2	40 t/ha
3	20 t/ha
4	10 t/ha
5	900 kg of 2:3:2 (22) and 125 kg of LAN (28)

Comment [F20]: In the design of the study, the an 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.

Comment [F21]: It may be better if you make treatmen codes T₁, T₂ T₃...

76

77 2.4. Soil analysis

78 Soil chemical properties were analysed at the Soil Chemistry laboratory of the University of
 79 Swaziland, Luyengo Campus.

Comment [F22]: Which ones?

Which methods??

80 2.5. Manure analysis

Comment [F23]: ?

81 Soil chemical properties were analysed at the soil Chemistry laboratory of the University of
 82 Swaziland, Luyengo Campus.

83 2.6. Data collection

84 Data was collected weekly, from the second week after transplanting. Five plants were randomly
85 selected in each plot for data recording. Data was collected on the following growth parameters:
86 plant height, number of leaves and leaf area while leaf area index was calculated. The fresh mass
87 and dry mass of the Swiss chard were measured after harvesting.

Comment [F24]: You can add to reference

88 2.7. Growth parameters

89 2.7.1. Plant height

90 Five plants were randomly selected per plot and plant height was measured from the base of the
91 plant to the leaf apex (tip).

Comment [F25]: Unit?
Cm? or mm?

92 2.7.2. Number of leaves

93 The number of leaves per plant was determined by physically counting all the leaves on each
94 selected plant. Five plants were selected per plot and it was done on a weekly basis, which was at
95 week 3, 4, and 5 after transplanting.

96 2.7.3. Leaf area

97 The leaf area of the Swiss chard was determined by multiplying the leaf width and leaf length
98 and then multiplying the product by 0.75 (correction factor), it was expressed in cm^2 .

99 2.7.4. Leaf area index

100 The leaf area index was determined by dividing the leaf area in cm^2 by the area occupied by a
101 single plant in cm^2 .

102 2.7.5. Fresh and dry mass

103 This was determined at the end of the cropping season by weighing the harvested leaves per plot.
104 Five plants per plot were used to determine the fresh and dry mass in this experiment. The plants

105 were randomly selected per plot and their shoot fresh mass was measured using a digital scale
 106 balance. They were then oven dried at a temperature of 72°C for 72 hours to determine their
 107 shoot dry mass.

108 2.8. Data analysis

109 The data collected was subjected to analysis of variance (ANOVA) using MSTAT-C statistical
 110 package, Version 1.4 (Nissen, 1989). Where significant differences were detected mean
 111 separation were performed using Duncan's New Multiple Range Test (DNMRT) at 5 %
 112 probability level (Gomez and Gomez, 1984).

113 3.0 RESULTS

114 3.1. Soil analysis

115 Soil chemical properties were analysed at the Chemistry Laboratory of the University of
 116 Swaziland, Luyengo Campus. The results of the soil chemical properties are shown in Table 2.

Comment [F26]: Needless to say, here.

117 Table 2: Soil analysis

Soil parameter	Value
Soil pH	5.8
Phosphorus (mgP/kg)	39.56
Potassium (cmolc/kg)	1.54

Comment [F27]: mg kg⁻¹

118

119 3.2. Manure analysis

120 Chemical properties of the chicken manure were analysed at the Chemistry Laboratory of the
 121 University of Swaziland, Luyengo Campus. The results of chemical properties of chicken
 122 manure are shown in Table 3.

Comment [F28]: Not necessary

123 Table 3: Chicken manure analysis

Manure parameter	Value
pH	7.2
Phosphorus	17 mg/kg
Potassium	1 895 mg/kg
Magnesium	-


Comment [F29]: It wasn't in it?
Not analyzed ??

No need to give blank lines

124 **3.3. Plant height**

125 Plant height of spinach was significantly ($P < 0.05$) different among the different treatments. The
 126 highest plant height (34.6 cm) was obtained in spinach treated with 80 t/ha of chicken manure
 127 while the lowest plant height (26.0 cm) was obtained in spinach plants treated with 10 t/ha of
 128 chicken manure (Figure 1). The plant height of spinach plants treated with inorganic fertilizers
 129 was higher (28.1 cm) but not significantly ($P > 0.05$) different from those treated with 10 t/ha of
 130 chicken manure (26.0 cm) (Figure 1).

Comment [F30]: Spanichh??



131

132 Figure 1: Effects of chicken manure on **spinach** plant height. Vertical bars are standard error (se)

133 below and above the mean.

134 3.4. Number of leaves

135 The number of leaves per plant were not significantly ($P > 0.05$) different among the spinach

136 plants. The highest number of leaves (7.6) was obtained in plants treated with 80 t/ha of chicken

137 manure while the lowest number of leaves (6.4) was obtained in plants treated with 40 t/ha of


138 chicken manure (Figure 2).

Comment [F31]: Is the study on spinach? Or Swiss chard

This error cannot be ignored.

Comment [F32]: Why?

contradictory, meaningless



139

140 Figure 2: Effects of chicken manure on number of leaves of spinach. Vertical bars are
 141 standard error (se) below and above the mean.


142

143 3.5. Leaf area

144 The leaf area was not significantly ($P>0.05$) different among the spinach plants. The highest leaf
 145 area (291.9 cm^2) was obtained in plants treated with 80 t/ha of chicken manure while the lowest
 146 leaf area (169.8 cm^2) was obtained in plants treated with 10 t/ha of chicken manure at 5 WAT

Comment [F33]:

147 (Figure 3). The leaf area of spinach increased with increasing application rates of chicken
 148 manure.




149
 150 Figure 3: Effects of chicken manure on the leaf area per plant of spinach. Vertical bars are
 151 standard error (se) below and above the mean.

152 3.6. Leaf area index

153 The leaf area index was not significantly ($P>0.05$) different among the spinach plants. The
 154 highest leaf area index (1.1) was obtained in plants treated with 80 t/ha of chicken manure while
 155 the lowest leaf area index (0.5) was obtained in plants treated with 10 t/ha of chicken manure at 5

156 WAT (Figure 4). The leaf area of spinach increased with increasing application rates of chicken
 157 manure.



158
 159 Figure 4: Effects of chicken manure on the leaf area per plant of spinach. Vertical bars are
 160 standard error (se) below and above the mean.


161 162 3.7. Fresh mass and dry mass

163 There was a significant ($P < 0.05$) difference in the fresh shoot mass of spinach plants (Figure 5).
 164 The highest fresh shoot mass (237.5 g) was obtained in plants treated with 80 t/ha of chicken
 165 manure while the lowest fresh shoot mass (100.0 g) was obtained in plants fertilised with
 166 inorganic fertilisers.

Comment [F34]: ?

167 There was a significant ($P < 0.05$) difference in the dry shoot mass of spinach plants in the
 168 different fertilisers (Figure 5). The highest dry shoot mass (20.4 g) was achieved at 80 t/ha of
 169 chicken manure while the lowest dry shoot mass (10.1 g) was obtained in spinach plants treated
 170 with inorganic fertilisers.

Comment [F35]: ?



171

172 Figure 5: Effects of chicken manures on fresh and dry shoot mass of spinach at week 5 after
 173 transplanting. Bars followed by the same alphabet were not significantly different from
 174 one another at $P = 0.05$. Mean separation by Duncan's New Multiple Range Test.

Comment [F36]: <

175

176 4.0. DISCUSSION

177 Different application rates of chicken manure had varying effects on growth, yield and quality of
 178 spinach. Plants treated with 80 t/ha of chicken manure performed better in terms of growth in
 179 comparison with the other treatments. These spinach plants had the highest plant height, number
 180 of leaves, fresh shoot mass, dry shoot mass, leaf area and leaf area index compared to spinach
 181 treated with 10, 20, 40 t/ha of goat manure and application of inorganic fertilisers recommended
 182 for spinach production. Spinach plants treated with 10 t/ha had the lowest plant height, leaf area
 183 and leaf area index. Spinach plants treated with 80 t/ha had the highest plant height, number of
 184 leaves, leaf area, leaf area index, fresh and dry shoot mass. The highest number of leaves of
 185 spinach plants from the highest application rate of chicken manure must have been as a result of
 186 relatively high amounts of nitrogen (Lungu and Chirwa, 1993).

Comment [F37]: New reference

187 It was also noted that plant height, number of leaves, leaf area, leaf area index, fresh and dry
 188 shoot mass increased with increasing levels of chicken manure. These results are in agreement
 189 with those of Lungu and Chirwa (1993) who studied the effects of an organic fertilizer (cattle
 190 manure) on *Zea mays*. As chicken manure application rate was increased, the availability of plant
 191 nutrients in the soil also increased. This resulted in the increase of growth and yield.

192 Chicken manure at 80 t/ha performed better in comparison with inorganic fertilizers. These
 193 findings do not deviate much from those obtained by Owen (2008) who reported that synthetic
 194 fertilisers do not have good characteristics in aggregating soil particles. The plants treated with
 195 inorganic fertilisers gave a lower yield than those treated with 80 t/ha of chicken manure. Animal
 196 manures have beneficial effects on physical and chemical properties and therefore have the
 197 ability to retain water, supply macro- and trace elements absent in inorganic fertilisers. Increased
 198 vegetable yield with the use of manure have been previously reported for okra (Ogunlela *et al.*,
 199 2005).

Comment [F38]: I did not understand that the discussion of the present study was so insufficient.

There are many previous studies on other organic fertilizers and chicken manure. In the same way, organic fertilizers are compared with inorganic fertilizers.

Comment [F39]: Spanish...

200 **5.0. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

201

202 The study showed that the application of 80 t/ha of chicken manure improved the growth and
203 yield of **spinach**. From these findings, it can therefore be concluded that 80 t/ha was best for
204 spinach under the conditions of this study.

205 It is recommended that farmers may use 80 t/ha of chicken manure because it gave the best
206 results compared to the other treatments.

207

208 **REFERENCES**

209 Allemann, L. and Young, B. W. (2008). Vegetable production in a nutshell. Kwa-Zulu-Natal
210 Department of Agriculture, Durban, South Africa.

211 De-Lannoy, G. and Romain, H. R. (2001). *Crop production in tropical Africa*. McGraw
212 Hill Publishers. New York, New York, USA.

213 Edje, O.T. and Ossom, E.M. (2009). Blue Moon Publishers. Manzini, Swaziland.

214 Elliot, R. (1988). *The complete vegetarian cuisine*. William Collins Sons & Co. Ltd.
215 New York, New York, USA.

216 Elliot, R. (2010). *New Complete Vegetarian*. Harper Collins Publishers. London,
217 United Kingdom.

218 Finck, A. (1982). *Fertilizers and fertilization*. Verlag Chemie International. New York,
219 New York, USA.

- 220 George, R. A. T. (1995). *Vegetable seed production*. CABI Publishing. London, United
221 Kingdom.
- 222 Gilbert, Z. and Hadfield, J. (1996). *Fruit and vegetable gardening in South Africa*. Struik
223 Publishers. Cape Town, South Africa.
- 224 Gomez, K. A. and Gomez, A. A. (1984). *Statistical procedures for Agricultural research*.
225 John Wiley and Sons 2nd Edition. Singapore.
- 226 Handreck, K. and Black, N. (2010). *Growing media for ornamental plants and turf*.
227 University of New South Wales 4th Edition. Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.
- 228 Hadfield, J. (1960). *Vegetable gardening in Central Africa*. Purnell and Sons. Johannesburg,
229 South Africa.
- 230 Hemy, C. (2004). *Growing Vegetables in South Africa*. MacMillan South Africa. Johannesburg,
231 South Africa.
- 232
233 Lungu, O. I. and Chirwa, B. (1993). Effect of lime and farmyard manure on soil acidity from
234 and maize growth on alfisols from Zambia. *Tropical Agriculture (Trinidad)* 70;
235 309-315.
- 236 Maynard, A. A. (1991). *Intensive vegetable production using composted manure*. Bulletin of
237 Connecticut Agric. Experiment Station No. 892., Hartford, Connecticut, USA.
- 238 Murdoch, G., (1970). *Soils and land capacity in Swaziland*. Swaziland Ministry of
239 Agriculture. Mbabane, Swaziland.
- 240 Nissen, O. (1989). *MSTAT-C. A micro computer programme design for management
241 and analysis of agronomic research experiments*. Michigan State University. East
242 Lansing, Michigan, USA.

243 Ogunlela, V.B., Masarirambi, M.T and Makuza, S.M. (2005). Effects of cattle
244 manure application on pod yield and yield indices of Okra (*Abelmoschus esculentus*
245 *L. Moench*) semi-arid and subtropical environment. *Journal of Food, Agriculture and*
246 *Environment*. 3 (1):125-129

247 Owen, P. (2008). Origin and distribution of lettuce.

248 <http://www.calettuceresearchboard.org/Origin.html>. 10/04/2016

249 Pierce, L. C. (1987). *Vegetables: Characteristics, production, and Marketing*. John Wiley
250 and Sons. New York, New York, USA.

251 Wien, H. C. (1997). *The physiology of vegetable crops*. CABI Publishing. New York,
252 New York, USA.

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262