

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_130272
Title of the Manuscript:	Rauwolfia serpentina Phytochemicals as Orexin Receptor-2 Agonists for Narcolepsy Management
Type of the Article	Original Research

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal’s peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of ‘**lack of Novelty**’, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	<div>1. This manuscript provides a significant contribution to the scientific community by utilizing advanced in silico methodologies to identify potential Orexin Receptor-2 (OX2R) agonists from <i>Rauwolfia serpentina</i> phytochemicals for narcolepsy management.</div> <div>2. The integration of multiple bioinformatics tools, including protein–ligand interaction analysis, molecular docking, and ADMET profiling, offers a comprehensive approach to drug discovery, highlighting tetraphylline and yohimbine as promising candidates for further development.</div> <div>3. This research not only paves the way for novel therapeutic strategies targeting orexin signaling but also emphasizes the potential of natural products in addressing complex neurological disorders like narcolepsy.</div> <div>4. While the study is based on computational predictions, it lays the groundwork for future experimental validation and may inspire new directions in the development of safer and more effective treatments for hypersomnia and related sleep disorders.</div>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Computational Screening of <i>Rauwolfia serpentina</i> Phytochemicals as Orexin Receptor-2 Agonists for the Management of Narcolepsy	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<div>1. These findings highlight the potential of natural compounds as novel therapeutic agents for neurological disorders, especially those related to sleep regulation.</div> <div>2. Exploring <i>Rauwolfia serpentina</i> phytochemicals could lead to safer, plant-based alternatives to conventional narcolepsy treatments.</div> <div>3. If validated experimentally, these compounds could provide effective, less invasive treatments for narcolepsy and other sleep disorders.</div> <div>4. This study underscores the value of in silico screening in drug discovery, particularly in identifying promising compounds from natural sources for further investigation.</div>	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct, utilizing appropriate in silico methods to identify potential OX2R agonists from <i>Rauwolfia serpentina</i> . However, experimental validation through in vitro and in vivo studies is needed to confirm the findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript are sufficient, relevant, and up-to-date, adequately supporting the study's key concepts. No additional references are needed.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is suitable for scholarly communication, with clear and professional wording.	
Optional/General comments	NO	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mularam Suthar
Department, University & Country	Maganbhai Adenwala Mahagujarat University, India