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| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | * This study highlights the significant role of integrated nutrient management (INM) in enhancing the growth and seed yield of cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* L.) variety *Pusa Komal* under the agro-climatic conditions of Balaghat, Madhya Pradesh.
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