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| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | Yes, overall, the manuscript is scientifically correct, but a few technical and structural improvements can strengthen it further: -   * The objective is clearly defined and relevant to sustainable agriculture. * The experimental methodology—use of five treatment combinations with replicates—is appropriate for this type of germination study. * Parameters like germination percentage, germination speed, seedling vigor, and root/shoot growth are standard and correctly used. * The discussion is supported by citations and logically interprets the results. | We sincerely thank the reviewer for the constructive and positive evaluation of our manuscript. |
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