

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_126469
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the Molecular Interactions and Inhibitor Binding of Japanese Encephalitis Virus Proteins through Molecular Docking and Simulation Studies
Type of the Article	

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: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifying potential inhibitors that can bind to JEV proteins helps in the development of antiviral drugs. Effective antiviral treatments can help control and prevent outbreaks of Japanese encephalitis, which is a significant public health concern in many parts of Asia. These studies contribute to the broader field of virology and antiviral research, paving the way for future discoveries and innovations. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The author may provide more details on the inhibitor's name, computational methods, and tools applied. The author can include the outcome of their research. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	YES	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ligands lack information about their 3D structures, such as their Pubchem ID, which may be included. Figure 12 Visualisation of Trajectory in 2-D Plot is not clearly evident; The interacting amino acids with the ligand should be focused on and discussed in greater detail. The outcomes are correlated with the use of the reference drug as an inhibitor. This is especially important as there are currently no licensed anti-JEV drugs available. These studies provide insights into how JEV interacts with host cells and how it can be disrupted. This knowledge is essential for designing effective therapeutic strategies. By identifying specific binding sites and interactions, researchers can develop targeted therapies that are more effective and have fewer side effects. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Molecular dynamics simulation study some more references can be added and discussed. No references have been included in this part. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Certain points are repeated. For example, the following statement is present on pages 18 and 27 : "Safety assessments utilising techniques such as PROTOX-II offer information on the potential toxicity of Withaferin A." The figure has to be aligned properly 	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sugapriya Menaga P
Department, University & Country	MTW University & MKU, India