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| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The title is generally appropriate; but, it could be refined for better clarity and precision. Suggested Alterative: **"Optimizing Garlic (Allium sativum L.) Growth, Yield, and Quality through Integrated Nutrient Management: A Comparative Study of Organic and Inorganic Fertilizers"** |  |
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