**Editor’s Comment:**

**I have gone to the revised file. The authors have carried out the corrections suggested by the reviewer and also given justifications for the same. Hence, the manuscript can be accepted for publication after carrying out the following suggestions and it does not require further review.**

**Suggestion for authors**

**1. There are some grammatical, alignments and typographical errors noted in the manuscript and it should be thoroughly checked and corrected throughout the manuscript. For example, the words “Present” may be as “The present”; “basis for development” as “the basis for the development”; “amino acids residue” as “amino acid residues”; “potential to” as “the potential to”; “as drug” as “as drugs”; “the tropical” as “tropical”; “the southeast” as “southeast”; “therapeutics applications” as “therapeutic applications”; “extract derived” as “extract-derived”; “to confer” as “confer”; “beside Mangiferin, there exist variety” as “besides Mangiferin, there exists a variety”; “remain obscure due to differential” as “remains obscure due to the differential”; “those passed” as “that passed”; “UNIPROT” as “UniProt”; “and potential” as “potential”; “study we” as “study, we”; “that revealed” as “which revealed”; “Total 241” as “A total of 241”; “through on” as “through”; “a low-energy orientations” as “a low-energy orientation”; “a very low-energy orientations” as “a very low-energy orientation”; “signify a” as “signifies a”; “best fit” as “best-fit”; “strong the binding” as “strong binding”; “Schrodinger” as “the Schrodinger”; “offers a” as “offer a”; “OH and carboxylic group” as “OH and carboxylic groups”; “hydrogen bonds” as “hydrogen bond”; “of with” as “with”; “SAR502250 interact” as “SAR502250 interacted”; “with binding” as “with a binding”; “potent” as “a potent”; “negative” as “a negative”; “non crucial” as “non-crucial”; “acid demonstrate” as “acid demonstrates”; “other enzyme/protein” as “other enzymes/proteins”; “results we” as “results, we”; “function of” as “the function of”; “vivo.. .” as “vivo.”; “RMSF value” as “RMSF values”; “total” as “a total”; “qualified these” as “qualified for these”; “web-services” as “web services”; “molecular” as “a molecular”; “bioavailability” as “a bioavailability”; “the Lipinski's” as “Lipinski's”; “fails to qualifies” as “fail to qualify”; “early” as “the early”; “to be a” as “being”; “Present” as “The present”; “as inhibitor” as “as an inhibitor”; “bioinformatics- based” as “bioinformatics-based”; “that,” as “that”; “of drug” as “of the drug”; “treatment various” as “the treatment of various”; “high” as “a high”; “of present” as “of the present”.**

**2. The full form of the species should be given when the first time appears in both the abstract and in the remaining part of the manuscript and it should be followed by only the first letter of the genus (For example, Mangifera indica when the first time appear and followed by M. indica).**

**3. The conclusion seems in general. All conclusions must be convincing statements on what was found to be novel impact based on the strong support of the data/results/discussion. Moreover, the authors may also include the limitation of the present findings for a better understanding of the manuscript.**
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