Effectiveness of *Desmanthus virgatus* Leaf Ethyl Acetate Extract and Antiviral Drugs as Antirabies Based on In Silico Study

Syahrul Lerry Hendrawan*, Cindy Ambarwati, Tukiran Tukiran

Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Science, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia ^{*}e-mail: <u>syahrul.21059@mhs.unesa.ac.id</u>

Received: May 11, 2025. Accepted: June 1, 2025. Published: June 27, 2025

Abstract: Rabies is a deadly viral disease that has no effective therapy after clinical symptoms appear. This study aims to evaluate the antirabies potential of the dominant compounds in the ethyl acetate extract of *Desmanthus virgatus* leaves, as well as several antiviral drugs, through an in silico approach. The extract was obtained through maceration and partitioning methods using ethyl acetate solvent, then analyzed using LC-MS, which identified 182 secondary metabolite compounds, and ten dominant compounds were selected for further analysis. These compounds, along with seven antiviral drugs, were docked against the rabies virus glycoprotein (PDB ID: 6LGX) using AutoDockTools 4.2.6 software. The docking results were analyzed based on the values of binding affinity, inhibition constant (Ki), and interaction with active amino acid residues. Quercitrin and quercimeritrin were the dominant flavonoid glycosides in the ethyl acetate extract of *D. virgatus* leaves that showed binding affinity values of -9.17 kcal/mol and -9.05 kcal/mol, respectively. Four compounds indicated potential as antirabies drugs. Pharmacokinetic feasibility tests using Lipinski parameters showed that most of the dominant compounds violated one or more parameters, especially the number of hydrogen bond donors/acceptors and molecular weight. However, such violations were also found in some antiviral drugs that have been used, such as remdesivir and darunavir. These results suggest that D. virgatus leaf extracts contain compounds with promising potential antirabies activity and deserve further investigation through in vito and in vivo tests.

Keywords: Antiviral Drugs; Desmanthus virgatus; Flavonoid Glycosides; Molecular DockingRabies Virus.

Introduction

Rabies is a disease most feared by humans because its death rate is almost uniform after symptoms appear [1]. This virus belongs to a species of the Lyssavirus genus that causes fatal inflammation of the brain and spinal cord (encephalitis) [2]. The rabies virus genome encodes five proteins such as phosphoproteins, glycoproteins, matrix proteins, nucleoproteins, and viral RNA polymerase. Glycoprotein is a major component of the rabies virus that plays an important role in inducing neutralizing antibodies. The virus has a high affinity for the nervous system and is able to replicate within nerve cells. The infection process begins with the attachment of the virus to cell receptors, such as p75 neurotrophin receptor, acetylcholine receptor and neural cell adhesion molecule, which allows the virus to enter the target cell [3]. Rabies is most commonly transmitted through unvaccinated dogs and carnivorous animals. The virus is transmitted from the animal's saliva and enters through bite wounds on the body [4].

Rabies virus infection should be quickly prevented. However, when treatment or vaccines are not available, the virus inoculated into the bite wound can ascend into the neurons of the brain, resulting in inflammation [5]. The treatment of rabies encephalitis has been a major challenge throughout history. In traditional medicine, methods used include poultices, the use of dog hair applied to wounds, and herbal concoctions. Some practitioners also make use of animal horns to neutralize the venom from animal bites [6]. In Roman times, some patients infected with the rabies virus were forced into pools of water to overcome the hydrophobia caused by the viral infection [7]. Without intensive treatment, patients with unvaccinated malignant rabies encephalitis will generally die within days. In contrast, patients with paralytic rabies may survive for several weeks even without optimal treatment [8]. However, no therapy has consistently demonstrated efficacy in treating rabies infection after symptoms develop.

Research on the therapy and effectiveness of drugs as antirabies continues to be developed to reduce the number of deaths due to viral infections [9]. The search for medicinal plants continues because they have fewer toxic effects than synthetic drugs [10]. One of the wild plants as a drug candidate is Desmanthus virgatus. D. virgatus leaf extract contains various secondary metabolites such as alkaloids, flavonoids, tannins, and steroids [11]. Flavonoid compounds are known to have antiviral activity more effectively than other compounds [12]. In addition, various synthetic antiviral drugs are thought to inhibit rabies virus replication [13]. In silico studies were conducted to determine the mechanism of interaction between ligands and rabies virus proteins. The study results of these interactions are expected to predict compounds as drug candidates in the treatment of rabies virus infection [14].

Based on this, this study aims to analyze the content of secondary metabolite compounds in the ethyl acetate extract of D. virgatus leaves using a liquid chromatographymass spectrometry instrument. The dominant compounds in

How to Cite:

S. Hendrawan, C. Ambarwati, and T. Tukiran, "Effectiveness of Desmanthus virgatus Leaf Ethyl Acetate Extract and Antiviral Drugs as Antirabies Based on In Silico Study", J. Pijar.MIPA, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 616–625, Jun. 2025. https://doi.org/10.29303/jpm.v20i4.9024

the ethyl acetate extract of *D. virgatus* leaves and antiviral drugs were further analyzed through the in silico method against rabies virus glycoproteins. Simultaneously, the binding affinity values of the dominant compounds in D. *virgatus* leaf extract were compared with the antiviral drugs. In addition, this study also evaluated the molecular interactions between the dominant compounds of *D. virgatus* extract and antiviral drugs against the active site of rabies virus glycoprotein. The pharmacological properties of the dominant compounds of *D. virgatus* leaves and antiviral drugs were analyzed for their evaluation as drug candidates for further drug development. This analysis can help in creating drug candidate compounds and formulations for curing patients infected with the rabies virus.

Research Methods

D. virgatus leaf samples were collected from Kedungrungkem Village, Benjeng Subdistrict, Gersik District, East Java, located between latitude -7.2918593° and longitude 112.4490716° East, Indonesia, in March 2024. Plant samples were identified at Genbinesia, Gersik, East Java, Indonesia, with Service Order ID: BT-02/035/24. A total of 6.8 Kg of *D. virgatus* leaves were pulverized into powder form and macerated using ethanol solvent in a ratio of 1:3 for three days. The filtrate from maceration was then evaporated so that a concentrated ethanol extract of *D. virgatus* leaves was obtained as much as 478 g. The ethanol extract was then partitioned with ethyl acetate solvent three times in a ratio of 1:1, so that an ethyl acetate filtrate was obtained, which was then evaporated and yielded an ethyl acetate extract of *D. virgatus* leaves of 1.5 grams.

Identification of chemical compounds can be done using an LC system (Shimadzu LCMS-8040 LC/MS). A total of 1 μ L of extract was injected into the LC instrument equipped with a Shim Pack FC-ODS column (2 mm × 150 mm, 3 μ m particle size) and a column temperature of 35 °C. Separation was performed by isocratic elution with methanol as the mobile phase at a flow rate of 0.5 mL/min. Parameter analysis was performed in negative ion mode as follows: 100°C source temperature, 23 eV cone sampling voltage, 3.0 kV capillary voltage, 350°C desolvation temperature, and 60 mL/h desolvation gas flow. Mass spectra were detected in ESI negative ion mode between m/z 10-1000 with a scan duration of 0.6 s/scan) and a run time of 80 min.

The dominant compounds in the extract (with more than 1% content) and antiviral drugs (bictegravir, darunavir, favipiravir, hydroxychloroquine, remdesivir, ribavirin, and tegobuvir) were pretreated through AutodockTools 4.2.6 software. and added polar hydrogen and Gasteiger charge. Rabies virus protein (PDB ID: 6LGX) was pretreated by removing residual water and adding Kollman Charges. Prepared proteins and ligands were subjected to molecular docking tests with Grid Settings set with a grid spacing of 0.375 Å with x, y, and z dimensions of $126 \times 126 \times 126$ Å and grid centers x, y, and z with values of 42,563, 23,235, and 14,859. The Lamarck Genetic Algorithm method was used to find the smallest binding affinity value by applying minimization to the genetic algorithm by adjusting the gene population. Other parameters were set as follows: Number of GA Runs: 100; Population Size: 150; Maximum Number of Evaluations: medium (2500000); Maximum Number of Generations: 27000; Gene Mutation Rate: 0.02; and

Crossover Rate: 0.8. The results of molecular docking then analyzed the pharmacological properties of drug candidate compounds based on Lipinski's five rules including the value of hydrogen donors and acceptors, molecular weight, log P value, and molar refraction of a compound.

Results and Discussion

The results showed that the ethyl acetate extract of *D. virgatus* leaves had various secondary metabolite compounds in LC-MS analysis. In addition, the dominant compounds of *D. virgatus* leaf ethyl acetate extract and antiviral drugs have various active sites by binding through amino acid residues in inhibiting rabies virus glycoproteins.

LC-MS Analysis

The results of LC-MS analysis of ethyl acetate extract of *D. virgatus* leaves obtained 182 secondary metabolite compounds identified using the principle of determining the ratio of mass to charge and mass spectrum fragmentation patterns. The results showed that secondary metabolite compounds were identified through molecular weight, compound abundance, and the presence of peak fragments at certain retention times.



Figure 1. LC-MS Chromatogram of Ethyl Acetate Extract of *D. virgatus* Leaf

Table 1. Dominant Compound of Ethyl Acetate Extract of

 D. virgatus Leaf

Compound Nama	RT	Composition	
Compound Name	(minute)	(%)	
Trifolin	22.178	1.367	
Kaempferol-5-glucoside	22.185	1.469	
Astragalin	22.623	1.838	
Cynaroside	22.628	1.471	
Quercitrin	23.194	1.542	
Quercimeritrin	23.311	1.544	
Procyanidin B3	33,499	1.385	
Kaempferol-3-O- neohesperidoside	33.625	1.408	
Kaempferol-7-rhamnoside- 4'-glucoside	34.003	1.890	
Kaempferol-3- feruloylapioside	34.016	1.743	

A total of 182 compounds were detected in the ethyl acetate extract of *D. virgatus* leaves, and 10 dominant compounds were selected based on the highest composition obtained from the LC-MS analysis results (Table 1). The dominant compounds in the extract have the potential to affect living organisms, either positively or negatively

depending on the type of compound, dosage, and bioavailability. The abundant content of these compounds increases the chances of involvement in biological processes and the effectiveness of their biological activities [15].

The dominant compound contained in the ethyl acetate extract of *D. virgatus* leaves is a flavonoid glycoside group compound. Flavonoid glycosides are known to have a variety of biological activities, including as antiinflammatory, antibacterial, antiviral, antiallergic, cytotoxic, antitumor, and vasodilator agents [16]. Flavonoid glycosides are able to modulate the behavior of cell systems and have a positive effect on the body [17]. Flavonoid glycoside class compounds can affect enzyme activity through inhibition of lipid peroxidation processes as well as cyclooxygenase and lipoxygenase enzyme activities that contribute to suppressing NADH oxidase activity and maintaining reactive oxygen balance, platelet aggregation, and stabilizing capillary permeability [18].

Molecular Docking Analysis

The analysis was then continued by conducting molecular docking between the dominant compounds and antiviral drugs against rabies virus glycoproteins. In this study, one target protein was used, namely the rabies virus glycoprotein (PDB ID: 6LGX), which is a crystal structure in a prefusion form under alkaline pH conditions with a resolution of 3.10 Å. The glycoprotein was chosen because it plays a crucial role in the early stages of viral infection of host cells. The structure of the rabies virus glycoprotein is considered biologically most relevant as it represents the active conformation prior to membrane fusion. Additionally, the use of a single target protein was employed in the early stages of the in silico study to ensure analytical focus, particularly when the target structure is experimentally available with sufficient quality. Validation of docking results was not performed because the structure of the rabies virus glycoprotein (PDB ID: 6LGX) does not contain a bound ligand in its crystal data and is categorized as an apo protein, i.e., a ligand-free state [19]. The native ligand of the protein is generally used as a positive control because it is supported by experimental data such as IC_{50} or EC_{50} , which can be found on protein database websites. In molecular docking, the native ligand serves as a benchmark or standard for evaluating the effectiveness of the test ligand. However, since the rabies virus glycoprotein structure lacks an inherent ligand, a positive control is not directly available, and conventional docking validation cannot be performed [20], [21].

The results of molecular docking were analyzed based on binding affinity values, inhibition constants, and molecular interactions between ligands and target proteins. The binding affinity value shows how strongly the ligand of the drug candidate compound binds to the receptor. The smaller the binding affinity value of the drug candidate compound to the receptor, the stronger the bond that occurs, which causes the bond of the drug candidate compound to the receptor to be stable [22]. The inhibition constant plays a role in determining the amount of concentration of drug candidate compounds needed to inhibit rabies virus receptors. The smaller the Ki value, the stronger the binding affinity and the less concentration of the drug candidate compound needed to inhibit the receptor activity [23]. The results of the binding affinity and inhibition constant values produce molecular interactions in the form of non-covalent bonds such as hydrogen bonds, ionic bonds, Van Der Waals bonds, and hydrophobic interactions between the ligand and the target protein [24]. Data from the binding affinity, Ki, and molecular interaction values between the ligand and the target protein can be seen in Tables 2 and 3.

 Table 2. Bioactivity of Dominant Compounds of D. virgatus Leaf Extract

Compound Name	Binding Affinity (kcal/mol)	Inhibition Constant	Molecular Interactions	Amino Acid Residue
Dominant Compound of	f Ethyl Acetate Extract	t of <i>D. virgatus</i> Leaf		
	-6.47		Uridao aon hond	ASN57, TRP14, HIS352,
			Trydrogen bond	GLU10, PRO353, HIS354
Trifolin		18.00 μM	Carbon-hydrogen bond	PRO13, SER15, PRO16
			Pi-alkyl	LEU11
			Hydrogen bond	TYR50, ASN57, TRP14,
Kaampfaral 5			Trydrogen bond	GLY49, ASP326
glucoside	-6.58	15.11 μM	Pi-cation	LYS55
glucoside			Pi-alkyl	PRO13
			Carbon hydrogen	SER15
	-7.12	6.05 μM	Hydrogen bond	SER151, VAL139, ASP141,
			nydrogen bond	PRO137
Astragalin			Pi-cation	HIS21
			Pi-anion	ASP18
			Pi-alkyl	PRO16
Cynaroside	-7.68	2.33 μM	Hydrogen bond	ARG280, SER302,
			nydrogen bond	GLU282, ARG299
			Pi-cation	LYS299
			Pi-sigma	LEU307
			Pi-Pi stacked	HIS303
Quercitrin	° 45 642 0		Hydrogen bond	HIS150, ASP141, ASP18
Querennin	-0.45	042.03 1111	Pi-Cation	HIS21

			Pi-lone pair	VAL139
			Pi-alkyl	VAL153
			Pi-anion	ASP18
			Pi-Pi T-shaped	VAL139
			Uridao oon hond	LYS294, LYS320, LUE322,
			Hydrogen bond	PRO16, VAL139, ASP18
Quercimeritrin	-8.10	1.16 μM	Carbon-hydrogen	SER138
			bond D: -111	Ц Е 10
			Р1-акуг	ILEI9
			Hydrogen bond	GLY343, HIS352, ASN172
Procyanidin B3	-6 89	8 83 uM	Pi-donor	SER341
1100 juliulii D5	0.09	0.05 µ.11	hydrogen bond	
			Pi-alkyl	LEU365, CYS351
			Pi-cation	HIS354
				CYS24, ASN26, PHE311,
Kaempferol-3-O-	-6.50	17.09 иM	Hydrogen bond	LYS306, LEU304, LYS313,
neohesperidoside	0.00	17109 μπτ		HIS21
			Pi-sigma	PRO25
Kaempferol-7-			Hydrogen bond	LEU365, ASN319, LYS320,
rhamnoside-4'-	-6.00	40.04 µM		VAL296
glucoside	0.00	ioto i pitti	Pi-sigma	VAL358
5			Pi-alkyl	ILE364, ILE317
				PHE154, ASN172,
			Hydrogen bond	GLY156, HIS20, ARG152,
Kaempferol-3-				CYS351, LEU284
ferulovlanioside	-7.41	3.69 µM	Pi-cation	ARG350
Terutoytapioside			Pi-sulfur	MET291
			Alkyl	LYS342
			Pi-alkyl	LEU287
	(; ; 1D			
Table 3. Bioactivity of A	ntiviral Drugs Dinding Affinity		Malagular	
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol)	Inhibition Constant	Molecular	Amino Acid Residue
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol)	Inhibition Constant	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine)	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol)	Inhibition Constant	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine) Carbon-hydrogen	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol)	Inhibition Constant	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine) Carbon-hydrogen bond	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218 ASP237
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol)	Inhibition Constant	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine) Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-donor hydrogen	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218 ASP237
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name Bictegravir	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol) -9.17	Inhibition Constant 191.36 nM	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine) Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-donor hydrogen bond	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218 ASP237 LEU28, PRO309
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name Bictegravir	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol) -9.17	Inhibition Constant 191.36 nM	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine) Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-donor hydrogen bond	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218 ASP237 LEU28, PRO309 VAL308, VAL29, VAL30,
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name Bictegravir	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol) -9.17	Inhibition Constant 191.36 nM	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine) Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-donor hydrogen bond Pi-alkyl	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218 ASP237 LEU28, PRO309 VAL308, VAL29, VAL30, LEU235
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name Bictegravir	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol) -9.17	Inhibition Constant 191.36 nM	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine) Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-donor hydrogen bond Pi-alkyl Pi-sigma	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218 ASP237 LEU28, PRO309 VAL308, VAL29, VAL30, LEU235 LEU215
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name Bictegravir	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol) -9.17	Inhibition Constant 191.36 nM	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine) Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-donor hydrogen bond Pi-alkyl Pi-sigma	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218 ASP237 LEU28, PRO309 VAL308, VAL29, VAL30, LEU235 LEU215 ARG280, ASN26, CYS24,
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name Bictegravir	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol) -9.17	Inhibition Constant 191.36 nM	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine) Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-donor hydrogen bond Pi-alkyl Pi-sigma Hydrogen bond	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218 ASP237 LEU28, PRO309 VAL308, VAL29, VAL30, LEU235 LEU215 ARG280, ASN26, CYS24, SER52
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name Bictegravir Darunavir	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol) -9.17	Inhibition Constant 191.36 nM 25.02 μM	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine) Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-donor hydrogen bond Pi-alkyl Pi-sigma Hydrogen bond Carbon-hydrogen	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218 ASP237 LEU28, PRO309 VAL308, VAL29, VAL30, LEU235 LEU215 ARG280, ASN26, CYS24, SER52
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name Bictegravir Darunavir	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol) -9.17 -6.28	Inhibition Constant 191.36 nM 25.02 μM	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine) Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-donor hydrogen bond Pi-alkyl Pi-sigma Hydrogen bond Carbon-hydrogen bond	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218 ASP237 LEU28, PRO309 VAL308, VAL29, VAL30, LEU235 LEU215 ARG280, ASN26, CYS24, SER52 GLY312
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name Bictegravir Darunavir	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol) -9.17 -6.28	Inhibition Constant 191.36 nM 25.02 µM	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine) Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-donor hydrogen bond Pi-alkyl Pi-sigma Hydrogen bond Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-Pi T-shaped	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218 ASP237 LEU28, PRO309 VAL308, VAL29, VAL30, LEU235 LEU215 ARG280, ASN26, CYS24, SER52 GLY312 PHE311
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name Bictegravir Darunavir	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol) -9.17 -6.28	Inhibition Constant 191.36 nM 25.02 μM	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine) Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-donor hydrogen bond Pi-alkyl Pi-sigma Hydrogen bond Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-Pi T-shaped	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218 ASP237 LEU28, PRO309 VAL308, VAL29, VAL30, LEU235 LEU215 ARG280, ASN26, CYS24, SER52 GLY312 PHE311 LEU28, LYS306, PRO309,
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name Bictegravir Darunavir Favipiravir	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol) -9.17 -6.28 -6.09	Inhibition Constant 191.36 nM 25.02 μM 34.46 μM	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine) Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-donor hydrogen bond Pi-alkyl Pi-sigma Hydrogen bond Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-Pi T-shaped	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218 ASP237 LEU28, PRO309 VAL308, VAL29, VAL30, LEU235 LEU215 ARG280, ASN26, CYS24, SER52 GLY312 PHE311 LEU28, LYS306, PRO309, PHE311, ASP237
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name Bictegravir Darunavir Favipiravir	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol) -9.17 -6.28 -6.09	Inhibition Constant 191.36 nM 25.02 μM 34.46 μM	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine) Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-donor hydrogen bond Pi-alkyl Pi-sigma Hydrogen bond Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-Pi T-shaped Hydrogen bond	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218 ASP237 LEU28, PRO309 VAL308, VAL29, VAL30, LEU235 LEU215 ARG280, ASN26, CYS24, SER52 GLY312 PHE311 LEU28, LYS306, PRO309, PHE311, ASP237 TYR216
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name Bictegravir Darunavir Favipiravir	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol) -9.17 -6.28 -6.09	Inhibition Constant 191.36 nM 25.02 μM 34.46 μM	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine) Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-donor hydrogen bond Pi-alkyl Pi-sigma Hydrogen bond Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-Pi T-shaped Hydrogen bond Halogen (fluorine)	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218 ASP237 LEU28, PRO309 VAL308, VAL29, VAL30, LEU235 LEU215 ARG280, ASN26, CYS24, SER52 GLY312 PHE311 LEU28, LYS306, PRO309, PHE311, ASP237 TYR216 ILE17, LYS320, VAL139
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name Bictegravir Darunavir Favipiravir Hydroxychloroquine	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol) -9.17 -6.28 -6.28 -6.09 -5.29	Inhibition Constant 191.36 nM 25.02 μM 34.46 μM 57.22 μM	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine) Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-donor hydrogen bond Pi-alkyl Pi-sigma Hydrogen bond Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-Pi T-shaped Hydrogen bond Halogen (fluorine) Hydrogen bond	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218 ASP237 LEU28, PRO309 VAL308, VAL29, VAL30, LEU235 LEU215 ARG280, ASN26, CYS24, SER52 GLY312 PHE311 LEU28, LYS306, PRO309, PHE311, ASP237 TYR216 ILE17, LYS320, VAL139 ASP18
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name Bictegravir Darunavir Favipiravir Hydroxychloroquine	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol) -9.17 -6.28 -6.28 -6.09 -5.29	Inhibition Constant 191.36 nM 25.02 μM 34.46 μM 57.22 μM	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine) Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-donor hydrogen bond Pi-alkyl Pi-sigma Hydrogen bond Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-Pi T-shaped Hydrogen bond Halogen (fluorine) Hydrogen bond Salt bridge Alkvl	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218 ASP237 LEU28, PRO309 VAL308, VAL29, VAL30, LEU235 LEU215 ARG280, ASN26, CYS24, SER52 GLY312 PHE311 LEU28, LYS306, PRO309, PHE311, ASP237 TYR216 ILE17, LYS320, VAL139 ASP18 PRO16, VAL296, ILE19
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name Bictegravir Darunavir Favipiravir Hydroxychloroquine	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol) -9.17 -6.28 -6.28 -6.09 -5.29	Inhibition Constant 191.36 nM 25.02 μM 34.46 μM 57.22 μM	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine) Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-donor hydrogen bond Pi-alkyl Pi-alkyl Pi-sigma Hydrogen bond Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-Pi T-shaped Hydrogen bond Halogen (fluorine) Hydrogen bond Salt bridge Alkyl	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218 ASP237 LEU28, PRO309 VAL308, VAL29, VAL30, LEU235 LEU215 ARG280, ASN26, CYS24, SER52 GLY312 PHE311 LEU28, LYS306, PRO309, PHE311, ASP237 TYR216 ILE17, LYS320, VAL139 ASP18 PRO16, VAL296, ILE19 TRP14, LEU11, VAL48.
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name Bictegravir Darunavir Favipiravir Hydroxychloroquine	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol) -9.17 -6.28 -6.28 -6.09 -5.29	Inhibition Constant 191.36 nM 25.02 μM 34.46 μM 57.22 μM	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine) Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-donor hydrogen bond Pi-alkyl Pi-alkyl Pi-sigma Hydrogen bond Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-Pi T-shaped Hydrogen bond Halogen (fluorine) Hydrogen bond Salt bridge Alkyl	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218 ASP237 LEU28, PRO309 VAL308, VAL29, VAL30, LEU235 LEU215 ARG280, ASN26, CYS24, SER52 GLY312 PHE311 LEU28, LYS306, PRO309, PHE311, ASP237 TYR216 ILE17, LYS320, VAL139 ASP18 PRO16, VAL296, ILE19 TRP14, LEU11, VAL48, GLU288
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name Bictegravir Darunavir Favipiravir Hydroxychloroquine Remdesivir	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol) -9.17 -6.28 -6.28 -6.09 -5.29 -6.79	Inhibition Constant 191.36 nM 25.02 μM 34.46 μM 57.22 μM 10.61 μM	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine) Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-donor hydrogen bond Pi-alkyl Pi-alkyl Pi-sigma Hydrogen bond Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-Pi T-shaped Hydrogen bond Halogen (fluorine) Hydrogen bond Salt bridge Alkyl	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218 ASP237 LEU28, PRO309 VAL308, VAL29, VAL30, LEU235 LEU215 ARG280, ASN26, CYS24, SER52 GLY312 PHE311 LEU28, LYS306, PRO309, PHE311, ASP237 TYR216 ILE17, LYS320, VAL139 ASP18 PRO16, VAL296, ILE19 TRP14, LEU11, VAL48, GLU288 MET323, PHE318
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name Bictegravir Darunavir Favipiravir Hydroxychloroquine Remdesivir	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol) -9.17 -6.28 -6.28 -6.09 -5.29 -6.79	Inhibition Constant 191.36 nM 25.02 μM 34.46 μM 57.22 μM 10.61 μM	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine) Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-donor hydrogen bond Pi-alkyl Pi-sigma Hydrogen bond Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-Pi T-shaped Hydrogen bond Halogen (fluorine) Hydrogen bond Salt bridge Alkyl Hydrogen bond	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218 ASP237 LEU28, PRO309 VAL308, VAL29, VAL30, LEU235 LEU215 ARG280, ASN26, CYS24, SER52 GLY312 PHE311 LEU28, LYS306, PRO309, PHE311, ASP237 TYR216 ILE17, LYS320, VAL139 ASP18 PRO16, VAL296, ILE19 TRP14, LEU11, VAL48, GLU288 MET323, PHE318 VAL355, PRO13
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name Bictegravir Darunavir Favipiravir Hydroxychloroquine Remdesivir	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol) -9.17 -6.28 -6.28 -6.09 -5.29 -6.79	Inhibition Constant 191.36 nM 25.02 μM 34.46 μM 57.22 μM 10.61 μM	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine) Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-donor hydrogen bond Pi-alkyl Pi-sigma Hydrogen bond Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-Pi T-shaped Hydrogen bond Halogen (fluorine) Hydrogen bond Salt bridge Alkyl Hydrogen bond	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218 ASP237 LEU28, PRO309 VAL308, VAL29, VAL30, LEU235 LEU215 ARG280, ASN26, CYS24, SER52 GLY312 PHE311 LEU28, LYS306, PRO309, PHE311, ASP237 TYR216 ILE17, LYS320, VAL139 ASP18 PRO16, VAL296, ILE19 TRP14, LEU11, VAL48, GLU288 MET323, PHE318 VAL355, PRO13 ASP141, SER15 PRO16
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name Bictegravir Darunavir Favipiravir Hydroxychloroquine Remdesivir Bibavirin	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol) -9.17 -6.28 -6.28 -6.09 -5.29 -6.79 -5.84	Inhibition Constant 191.36 nM 25.02 μM 34.46 μM 57.22 μM 10.61 μM	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine) Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-donor hydrogen bond Pi-alkyl Pi-alkyl Pi-sigma Mydrogen bond Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-Pi T-shaped Hydrogen bond Halogen (fluorine) Hydrogen bond Salt bridge Alkyl Hydrogen bond	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218 ASP237 LEU28, PRO309 VAL308, VAL29, VAL30, LEU235 LEU215 ARG280, ASN26, CYS24, SER52 GLY312 PHE311 LEU28, LYS306, PRO309, PHE311, ASP237 TYR216 ILE17, LYS320, VAL139 ASP18 PRO16, VAL296, ILE19 TRP14, LEU11, VAL48, GLU288 MET323, PHE318 VAL355, PRO13 ASP141, SER15, PRO16, PRO137 ASP18
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name Bictegravir Darunavir Favipiravir Hydroxychloroquine Remdesivir Ribavirin	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol) -9.17 -6.28 -6.28 -6.09 -5.29 -6.79 -5.84	Inhibition Constant 191.36 nM 25.02 μM 34.46 μM 57.22 μM 10.61 μM	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine) Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-donor hydrogen bond Pi-alkyl Pi-sigma Mydrogen bond Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-Pi T-shaped Mydrogen bond Halogen (fluorine) Hydrogen bond Salt bridge Alkyl Hydrogen bond Salt bridge	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218 ASP237 LEU28, PRO309 VAL308, VAL29, VAL30, LEU235 LEU215 ARG280, ASN26, CYS24, SER52 GLY312 PHE311 LEU28, LYS306, PRO309, PHE311, ASP237 TYR216 ILE17, LYS320, VAL139 ASP18 PRO16, VAL296, ILE19 TRP14, LEU11, VAL48, GLU288 MET323, PHE318 VAL355, PRO13 ASP141, SER15, PRO16, PRO137, ASP18 VAL139 HIS21 LYS55
Table 3. Bioactivity of A Compound Name Bictegravir Darunavir Favipiravir Hydroxychloroquine Remdesivir Ribavirin Tegobuvir	ntiviral Drugs Binding Affinity (kcal/mol) -9.17 -6.28 -6.28 -6.09 -5.29 -6.79 -5.84 -9.05	Inhibition Constant 191.36 nM 25.02 μM 34.46 μM 57.22 μM 10.61 μM 52.27 μM	Molecular Interactions Halogen (fluorine) Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-donor hydrogen bond Pi-alkyl Pi-sigma Hydrogen bond Carbon-hydrogen bond Pi-Pi T-shaped Hydrogen bond Halogen (fluorine) Hydrogen bond Salt bridge Alkyl Hydrogen bond Salt bridge Alkyl Hydrogen bond Salt bridge Hydrogen bond	Amino Acid Residue LYS220, SER218 ASP237 LEU28, PRO309 VAL308, VAL29, VAL30, LEU235 LEU215 ARG280, ASN26, CYS24, SER52 GLY312 PHE311 LEU28, LYS306, PRO309, PHE311, ASP237 TYR216 ILE17, LYS320, VAL139 ASP18 PRO16, VAL296, ILE19 TRP14, LEU11, VAL48, GLU288 MET323, PHE318 VAL355, PRO13 ASP141, SER15, PRO16, PRO137, ASP18 VAL139, HIS21, LYS55 LYS279, ASN27 PRO25

Halogen (fluorine)	ASN26
Pi-sigma	LEU307
Pi-Pi stacked	HIS303
Pi-alkyl	ARG280, CYS283

The results of molecular docking analysis show that quercitrin, quercimitrin, bictegravir, and tegobuvir have the most negative binding energy compared to other compounds. Quercitrin and quercimeritrin showed more negative binding affinity values than the dominant compounds in the ethyl acetate extract of *D. virgatus* leaves. Quercitrin, with a binding affinity value of -8.45 kcal/mol, interacts with rabies virus glycoproteins through hydrogen bonding with amino acid residues HIS150, ASP141, and ASP18. Ring A on quercitrin forms a pi-cation interaction with residue HIS21, while ring C forms a pi-anion bond with residue ASP18. In addition, residue VAL139 interacts with ring C through a pilone pair bond, while ring B binds to VAL153 through a pialkyl interaction. A pi-pi T-shaped interaction was also formed between ring C and residue VAL139. Quercimeritrin shows a binding affinity value of -8.10 kcal/mol and interacts with rabies virus glycoproteins through hydrogen bonds with amino acid residues LYS294, LYS320, LEU322, PRO16, VAL139, and ASP18. The B ring of quercimeritrin forms a pi-alkyl interaction with residue ILE19, while the oxygen atom on the glycoside group forms a carbon-hydrogen bond with residue SER138.



Figure 2. Visualization of the Interaction between Quercitrin and Quercimitrin Compounds and Rabies Virus Glycoprotein

Some antiviral drugs have very negative binding affinity values, such as tegobuvir (-9.05 kcal/mol) and bictegravir (-9.17 kcal/mol), which indicates the stability of the bond formed between the ligand and the receptor. Tegobuvir is an antiviral drug with a clinical trial phase for the treatment of chronic hepatitis C [25]. The tegobuvir compound interacts with rabies virus glycoproteins through hydrogen bonds with amino acid residues LYS279, ASN27, and PRO25. The imidazole ring on tegobuvir forms pi-sigma interactions with residue LEU307, pi-pi stacking with residue HIS303, and pi-alkyl with residues ARG280 and CYS283. In addition, the fluorine group on tegobuvir forms a halogen bond with residue ASN26. Bictegravir is an antiretroviral drug that is used to treat HIV infection by targeting the viral integrase [26]. The molecular docking results of bictegravir with rabies virus glycoprotein showed a halogen bond between the fluorine group and amino acid residues LYS220 and SER218. A carbon-hydrogen interaction was formed between the alkyl group on the benzene ring and residue ASP237. A pi-donor hydrogen bond occurs between the dihydropyridine ring and residues LEU28 and PRO309, and a pi-sigma bond with residue LEU215. In addition, the rings of bictegravir interact via pi-alkyl bonds with residues VAL308, VAL29, VAL30, and LEU235.



Figure 3. Visualization of the Interaction between Tegobuvir and Bictegravir Compounds and Rabies Virus Glycoprotein

The antiviral drugs tegobuvir and bictegravir have more negative binding affinities than quercitrin and quercimetrin. This is due to the presence of fluorine halogen bonds in both antiviral molecules, which can strengthen the interaction between the ligand and the rabies virus glycoprotein receptor. Halogen bonds exhibit highly directed, specific interactions that act analogously to hydrogen bonds. These interactions form between covalently bonded halogen atoms (e.g., C-X, where X = Cl, Br, or I, as the XB donor) and a nucleophile or Lewis base acting as the acceptor. Due to the anisotropy in the distribution of charge on halogen atoms, an electropositive region known as a σhole is formed on the extension of the C-X bond. This region allows for electrostatic attraction with nucleophiles [27]. Meanwhile, quercitrin and quercimetrin compounds have slightly higher binding affinities than tegobuvir and bictegravir, influenced by the number of hydrogen bonds in their glycoside groups. The hydrogen bonds formed play a role in the stability of the complex structure. The more hydrogen bonds formed, the more complex the structure becomes [28]. In addition to hydrogen bonds, electrostatic interactions, and hydrophobic interactions in antiviral drugs and the dominant compounds of D. virgatus also influence the stability of the ligand toward the receptor [29]. These interactions can significantly impact the biological activity, physicochemical properties, and pharmacokinetics of drugs, making hydrogen bonds crucial in drug discovery [30].

Although tegobuvir and bictegravir exhibit more negative binding affinity compared to quercitrin and quercimitrin compounds, the effectiveness of a compound as an antirabies drug candidate is not only determined by the strength of the interaction between the ligand and the receptor, but also depends on target selectivity, potential toxicity, and pharmacodynamic relevance. Tegobuvir and bictegravir exhibit highly negative binding affinity toward rabies virus glycoprotein. However, these two drugs were primarily developed for the target viruses HCV and HIV. Despite their high binding affinity, their potential selectivity toward rabies virus glycoprotein may be lower, leading to non-specific interactions that could trigger off-target toxicity. Meanwhile, quercitrin and quercimeritrin interact with the rabies virus glycoprotein through ASP18, HIS150, and VAL139. The diverse binding patterns formed with the rabies target indicate higher selectivity potential. This means the compounds are more likely to act specifically against the rabies virus with lower side effects [31].

In addition to quercitrin, quercimeritrin, tegobuvir, and bictegravir, which showed more negative binding affinity values to rabies virus glycoproteins, there were several other dominant compounds and antiviral drugs that had less negative binding affinity values. This reflects that the strength of the interaction between these ligands and glycoproteins is relatively weak, so it is likely that their effectiveness in inhibiting rabies virus glycoprotein function is also lower. The interactions formed are generally limited to hydrophobic bonds or hydrogen bonds, which are less stable than the complex bonds exhibited by high-affinity compounds. Therefore, although these compounds were detected as dominant components or are known antivirals, their therapeutic potential against the rabies virus through the mechanism of glycoprotein inhibition is still low and requires structural optimisation or compound combination approaches to increase their effectiveness.

Bioavailability Test

Determination of the bioavailability of a drug candidate compound is an important parameter to determine

the amount and speed at which the drug is absorbed in the body [32]. Drug bioavailability is influenced by several factors, including the physicochemical properties of the drug, dose of administration, excretion, and hepatic metabolism [33]. In determining the bioavailability test of a drug candidate compound, Lipinski's Rule of Five parameters are used to evaluate the feasibility of the compound as a drug candidate. Lipinski's rule of five parameters includes molecular weight (\leq 500 Da), molar refractivity (40-130), log P (\leq 5), hydrogen acceptor (\leq 10), and hydrogen donor (\leq 5) [34]. The results of Lipinski's rule of five analysis of the dominant compounds of ethyl acetate extract of *D. virgatus* leaves and antiviral drugs can be seen in Tables 4 and 5.

Table 3. ADME Analysis of Dominant Compounds of D. virgatus Leaf Ethyl Acetate Extra	act
--	-----

_	ADME Properties				
Compound	Molecular	Hydrogen Donor	Hydrogen	Log D	Molar
	Weight	Trydrogen Donor	Acceptor	Log I	Refractivity
Trifolin	448	7	11	-0.43	104.60
Kaempferol-5-	118	7	11	0.22	105 11
glucoside	440	1	11	-0.22	105.11
Astragalin	448	7	11	-0.43	104.60
Cynaroside	448	7	11	-0.40	105.20
Quercitrin	448	7	11	0.29	104.86
Quercimeritrin	464	8	12	-0.51	106.78
Procyanidin B3	578	10	12	2.99	143.38
Kaempferol-3-O-	504	0	15	1.59	125.92
neohesperidoside	594	9	15	-1.38	155.65
Kaempferol-7-					
rhamnoside-4'-	594	9	15	-1.72	136.43
glucoside					
Kaempferol-3-	504	6	12	2 19	146 10
feruloylapioside	594	0	15	2.18	140.19

Table 3. ADME Analysis of Antiviral Drugs

			ADME Properties		
Compound	Molecular	Hydrogen Donor	Hydrogen	Log D	Molar
	Weight	Trydrogen Donor	Acceptor	Log I	Refractivity
Bictegravir	449	2	8	1.37	100.75
Darunavir	547	4	10	3.45	141.63
Favipiravir	157	3	5	-1.18	33.96
Hydroxychloroquine	335	2	4	3.78	98.27
Remdesivir	602	5	13	2.31	149.83
Ribavirin	244	5	8	-3.01	51.54
Tegobuvir	517	0	4	6.59	118.83

Hydrogen bonding is an important interaction in the design of a drug because this bond can affect structural stability, partitioning, drug permeability, and enzyme catalysis [35]. All dominant compounds of the ethyl acetate extract of *D. virgatus* leaves have hydrogen bond donors and acceptors exceeding Lipinski's rule parameters. While the category of antiviral drugs, remdesivir, has a hydrogen bond acceptor value exceeding the parameters of Lipinski's rule. The functional groups of the dominant compounds of *D. virgatus* leaf extract and antiviral drugs that are able to form hydrogen bonds can affect important interactions with their receptor targets, so they have strong selectivity and binding. However, too many hydrogen bond donors and acceptors

have low effectiveness on drug partitioning and permeability, thus decreasing the binding affinity to hydrophobic membrane regions [36].

Molecular weight represents the molecular size of a compound. The larger the molecular size of a compound, the greater the absorption through biological membranes [37]. The dominant compounds of *D. virgatus* extract that do not pass this criterion are kaempferol-3-O-neohesperidoside, kaempferol-7-rhamnoside-4'-glucoside, and kaempferol-3-feruloylapioside. While in the category of antiviral drugs, darunavir, tegobuvir, and remdesivir also do not meet the criteria of Lipinski's rule. Molecular weights exceeding 500

Da have low promiscuity, thus reducing interactions with receptor targets [38].

The log P value is the partition coefficient of solute between water and octanol, in almost infinite dilutions. LogP is widely used in drug discovery and development as an indicator of a compound's potential as a drug, with one of the criteria being that the LogP value is in the range of 0 to 5 [39]. The results of the log P value of antiviral drugs show that favipiravir has a negative log P value, and tegobuvir has a log P value exceeding the parameter limit. While in the dominant compounds of D. virgatus extract, only quercitrin, procyanidin B3, and kaempferol-3-feruloylapioside meet the log P value criteria. A negative log P value indicates that a compound prefers to dissolve in water rather than fat, which results in the compound not being able to enter the cell membrane. While the log P value that exceeds 5 in a compound indicates that the compound has hydrophobic and less hydrophilic properties, which can have a toxic effect because the compound will be retained longer in the lipid bilayer [40].

Molar refraction is associated with refractive index and polarizability, assessed according to how much it varies and contributes to the biological activity of compounds, especially in predictive modelling using topological indices to assess drug effectiveness [41]. The compounds procyanidin B3 and kaempferol-3-feruloylapioside in *D. virgatus* leaf extract have molar refraction values exceeding 140 cm³/mol. In addition, darunavir and remdesivir compounds also did not meet the molar refraction criteria. An acceptable molar refraction value, combined with the number of hydrogen bonds, indicates that a compound has adequate intestinal absorption and oral bioavailability [42].

Although some of the dominant compounds in the ethyl acetate extract of D. virgatus leaves and antiviral drugs violate one or more Lipinski parameters, this does not hinder their potential for development as drug candidates. Compounds that violate Lipinski parameters can still be reformulated using a lipid-based drug delivery approach. Lipid-based delivery systems are formulated using plant and animal oils that exhibit higher biocompatibility and lower toxicity. All lipid-based systems can enhance the half-life and bioavailability of the loaded drug and prolong therapeutic efficacy due to controlled drug release [43]. Additionally, both hydrophilic and hydrophobic compounds can be formulated using encapsulation methods. Drug encapsulation is a crucial strategy for compounds that are poorly soluble, fragile, or aggressive, enabling stronger therapeutic effects with minimized toxic effects [44]. Therefore, advanced formulation approaches such as lipidbased delivery systems and encapsulation play a crucial role in overcoming bioavailability limitations caused by violations of Lipinski's rules.

Conclusion

Phytochemical screening of dominant compounds of ethyl acetate extract of *D. virgatus* leaves and antiviruys drugs as antirabies based on in silico studies allows as drug candidates based on their binding affinity. Based on the results of molecular docking, the dominant compounds in *D. virgatus* leaf extract have antirabies properties, namely quercitrin and quercimeritrin. In addition, antiviral drugs suspected as antirabies drug candidates are bictegravir and tegobuvir. The bioactivity of a drug candidate compound is influenced by the interaction of functional groups bound between receptors through amino acid residues in each ring of the drug candidate compound, so that it has more stable binding activity and can be further investigated as an antirabies drug candidate. Therefore, validation through in vitro and in vivo studies is needed to confirm the anti-rabies activity and evaluate the pharmacokinetic and toxicity aspects of the compound, so that it can support its development as a viable anti-rabies therapy candidate.

Author's Contribution

Syahrul Lerry Hendrawan: contributed to drafting the research concept, developing the research methodology, collecting data, analyzing data, and writing the manuscript. Cindy Ambarwati: contributed to the drafting of the research concept, data collection, and data analysis. Tukiran Tukiran: contributed to drafting the research concept and evaluating the authors in writing the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank all participants who have contributed to this study, both directly and indirectly, for their support, involvement, and cooperation throughout the study implementation process.

References

- A. R. Fooks *et al.*, "Rabies," *Nat Rev Dis Primers*, vol. 3, no. 1, p. 17091, Nov. 2017, doi: 10.1038/nrdp.2017.91.
- [2] C. H. Calisher and J. A. Ellison, "The other rabies viruses: The emergence and importance of lyssaviruses from bats and other vertebrates," *Travel Med Infect Dis*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 69–79, Mar. 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.tmaid.2012.01.003.
- [3] S. Zhu and C. Guo, "Rabies Control and Treatment: From Prophylaxis to Strategies with Curative Potential," *Viruses*, vol. 8, no. 11, p. 279, Oct. 2016, doi: 10.3390/v8110279.
- [4] M. Y. Jane Ling *et al.*, "Rabies in Southeast Asia: a systematic review of its incidence, risk factors and mortality," *BMJ Open*, vol. 13, no. 5, p. e066587, May 2023, doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2022-066587.
- [5] M. J. Schnell, J. P. McGettigan, C. Wirblich, and A. Papaneri, "The cell biology of rabies virus: using stealth to reach the brain," *Nat Rev Microbiol*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 51–61, Jan. 2010, doi: 10.1038/nrmicro2260.
- [6] D. Kurup, C. E. Rupprecht, S. J. Scholand, C. Yankowki, and M. Schnell, "Glimpses into the past: New World contributions towards understanding the basic etiology, pathobiology and treatment of rabies," in History of Rabies in the Americas: From the Pre-Columbian to the Present, Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2023, pp. 15–41.
- [7] A. Tarantola, "Four Thousand Years of Concepts Relating to Rabies in Animals and Humans, Its Prevention and Its Cure," *Trop Med Infect Dis*, vol. 2, no. 2, p. 5, Mar. 2017, doi: 10.3390/tropicalmed2020005.
- [8] M. J. Warrell and D. A. Warrell, "Rabies: the clinical features, management and prevention of the classic

zoonosis," *Clinical Medicine*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 78–81, Feb. 2015, doi: 10.7861/clinmedicine.14-6-78.

- [9] V. Du Pont, R. K. Plemper, and M. J. Schnell, "Status of antiviral therapeutics against rabies virus and related emerging lyssaviruses," *Curr Opin Virol*, vol. 35, pp. 1–13, Apr. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.coviro.2018.12.009.
- [10] A. Balkrishna, N. Sharma, D. Srivastava, A. Kukreti, S. Srivastava, and V. Arya, "Exploring the Safety, Efficacy, and Bioactivity of Herbal Medicines: Bridging Traditional Wisdom and Modern Science in Healthcare," Future Integrative Medicine, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 35–49, Mar. 2024, doi: 10.14218/FIM.2023.00086.
- [11] G. Mesa and J. Enrique, "Evaluación química y nutricional de plantas consumidas por pequeños rumiantes en ecosistemas secos del alto magdalena," Ibagué Universidad del Tolima, 2011.
- [12] S. L. Badshah, S. Faisal, A. Muhammad, B. G. Poulson, A. H. Emwas, and M. Jaremko, "Antiviral activities of flavonoids," *Biomedicine & Pharmacotherapy*, vol. 140, p. 111596, Aug. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.biopha.2021.111596.
- [13] A. C. Jackson, "Current and future approaches to the therapy of human rabies," *Antiviral Res*, vol. 99, no. 1, pp. 61–67, Jul. 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.antiviral.2013.01.003.
- [14] A. Subbaiyan et al., "In silico Molecular Docking Analysis Targeting SARS-CoV-2 Spike Protein and Selected Herbal Constituents," *J Pure Appl Microbiol*, vol. 14, no. suppl 1, pp. 989–998, May 2020, doi: 10.22207/JPAM.14.SPL1.37.
- [15] N. Mahfoudhi, R. Ksouri, and S. Hamdi, "Nanoemulsions as potential delivery systems for bioactive compounds in food systems: preparation, characterization, and applications in food industry," in Emulsions, Elsevier, 2016, pp. 365–403. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-804306-6.00011-8.
- [16] J. B. Harborne and C. A. Williams, "Advances in flavonoid research since 1992," *Phytochemistry*, vol. 55, no. 6, pp. 481–504, Nov. 2000, doi: 10.1016/S0031-9422(00)00235-1.
- [17] A. Gomes, E. Fernandes, J. Lima, L. Mira, and M. Corvo, "Molecular Mechanisms of Anti-Inflammatory Activity Mediated by Flavonoids," *Curr Med Chem*, vol. 15, no. 16, pp. 1586–1605, Jul. 2008, doi: 10.2174/092986708784911579.
- [18] W. F. Hodnick, E. B. MllosavljeviĆ, J. H. Nelson, and R. S. Pardini, "Electrochemistry of flavonoids," *Biochem Pharmacol*, vol. 37, no. 13, pp. 2607–2611, Jul. 1988, doi: 10.1016/0006-2952(88)90253-5.
- [19] J. H. Zothantluanga and D. Chetia, "A Beginner's Guide to Molecular Docking," *Sci Phytochem*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 90–93, Dec. 2022, doi: 10.58920/sciphy01020037.
- [20] L. Patowary, M. Sarma, J. H. Zothantluanga, and D. Chetia, "Repurposing of FDA Approved Drugs Having Structural Similarity to Artemisinin Against PfDHFR-TS Through Molecular Docking and Molecular Dynamics Simulation Studies," *Curr Trends in Pharm Res*, vol. 8, no. 2, 2022, [Online]. Available: www.dibru.ac.in/ctpr

- [21] J. H. Zothantluanga, S. K. Aswin, M. Rudrapal, and D. Cheita, "Antimalarial flavonoid-glycoside from acacia pennata with inhibitory potential against PfDHFR-TS: An in-silico study," *Biointerface Res Appl Chem*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 4871–4887, Aug. 2022, doi: 10.33263/BRIAC124.48714887.
- [22] P. L. Kastritis and A. M. J. J. Bonvin, "On the binding affinity of macromolecular interactions: daring to ask why proteins interact," *J R Soc Interface*, vol. 10, no. 79, Feb. 2013, doi: 10.1098/rsif.2012.0835.
- [23] A. K. Pandey and S. Verma, "An in-silico evaluation of dietary components for structural inhibition of SARS-Cov-2 main protease," *J Biomol Struct Dyn*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 136–142, Jan. 2022, doi: 10.1080/07391102.2020.1809522.
- [24] V. A. Adhav and K. Saikrishnan, "The Realm of Unconventional Noncovalent Interactions in Proteins: Their Significance in Structure and Function," ACS Omega, vol. 8, no. 25, pp. 22268– 22284, Jun. 2023, doi: 10.1021/acsomega.3c00205.
- [25] M. A. H. Ismail, D. A. Abou El Ella, K. A. M. Abouzid, and A. H. Mahmoud, "Integrated structurebased activity prediction model of benzothiadiazines on various genotypes of HCV NS5b polymerase (1a, 1b and 4) and its application in the discovery of new derivatives," *Bioorg Med Chem*, vol. 20, no. 7, pp. 2455–2478, Apr. 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.bmc.2012.01.031.
- [26] J. M. Molina *et al.*, "Switching to fixed-dose bictegravir, emtricitabine, and tenofovir alafenamide from dolutegravir plus abacavir and lamivudine in virologically suppressed adults with HIV-1: 48 week results of a randomised, double-blind, multicentre, active-controlled, phase 3, non-inferiority trial," *Lancet HIV*, vol. 5, no. 7, pp. e357–e365, Jul. 2018, doi: 10.1016/S2352-3018(18)30092-4.
- [27] Z. Xu, Z. Yang, Y. Liu, Y. Lu, K. Chen, and W. Zhu, "Halogen Bond: Its Role beyond Drug–Target Binding Affinity for Drug Discovery and Development," *J Chem Inf Model*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 69–78, Jan. 2014, doi: 10.1021/ci400539q.
- [28] A. Madushanka, R. T. Moura, N. Verma, and E. Kraka, "Quantum Mechanical Assessment of Protein–Ligand Hydrogen Bond Strength Patterns: Insights from Semiempirical Tight-Binding and Local Vibrational Mode Theory," *Int J Mol Sci*, vol. 24, no. 7, p. 6311, Mar. 2023, doi: 10.3390/ijms24076311.
- [29] L. Lins and R. Brasseur, "The hydrophobic effect in protein folding," *FASEB J*, vol. 9, no. 7, pp. 535–540, Apr. 1995, doi: 10.1096/fasebj.9.7.7737462.
- [30] G. M. Ghiandoni and E. Caldeweyher, "Fast calculation of hydrogen-bond strengths and free energy of hydration of small molecules," *Sci Rep*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 4143, Mar. 2023, doi: 10.1038/s41598-023-30089-x.
- [31] S. K. Bardal, J. E. Waechter, and D. S. Martin, "Basic Principles and Pharmacodynamics," in Applied Pharmacology, *Elsevier*, 2011, pp. 3–16. doi: 10.1016/B978-1-4377-0310-8.00001-4.
- [32] C. Herkenne et al., "In Vivo Methods for the Assessment of Topical Drug Bioavailability," *Pharm*

Res, vol. 25, no. 1, p. 87, Jan. 2008, doi: 10.1007/s11095-007-9429-7.

- [33] M. N. Martinez and G. L. Amidon, "A Mechanistic Approach to Understanding the Factors Affecting Drug Absorption: A Review of Fundamentals," The *Journal of Clinical Pharmacology*, vol. 42, no. 6, pp. 620–643, Jun. 2002, doi: 10.1177/00970002042006005.
- [34] O. Pillai, A. B. Dhanikula, and R. Panchagnula, "Drug delivery: an odyssey of 100 years," *Curr Opin Chem Biol*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 439–446, Aug. 2001, doi: 10.1016/S1367-5931(00)00226-X.
- [35] T. Rezai, J. E. Bock, M. V. Zhou, C. Kalyanaraman, R. S. Lokey, and M. P. Jacobson, "Conformational Flexibility, Internal Hydrogen Bonding, and Passive Membrane Permeability: Successful in Silico Prediction of the Relative Permeabilities of Cyclic Peptides," J Am Chem Soc, vol. 128, no. 43, pp. 14073–14080, Nov. 2006, doi: 10.1021/ja063076p.
- [36] A. Alex, D. S. Millan, M. Perez, F. Wakenhut, and G. A. Whitlock, "Intramolecular hydrogen bonding to improve membrane permeability and absorption in beyond rule of five chemical space," *Medchemcomm*, vol. 2, no. 7, p. 669, 2011, doi: 10.1039/c1md00093d.
- [37] G. Sampat, S. S. Suryawanshi, M. S. Palled, A. S. Patil, P. Khanal, and A. S. Salokhe, "Drug Likeness Screening and Evaluation of Physicochemical Properties of Selected Medicinal Agents by Computer Aided Drug Design Tools," *Advances in Pharmacology and Pharmacy*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 234–246, Oct. 2022, doi: 10.13189/app.2022.100402.
- [38] M. Navia and P. Chaturvedi, "Design principles for orally bioavailable drugs," *Drug Discov Today*, vol. 1, no. 5, pp. 179–189, May 1996, doi: 10.1016/1359-6446(96)10020-9.
- [39] T. A. Berger, B. K. Berger, and K. Kogelman, "Chromatographic Separations and Analysis: Supercritical Fluid Chromatography for Chiral Analysis and Semi-Preparative Purification," in Comprehensive Chirality, *Elsevier*, 2024, pp. 355– 393. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-32-390644-9.00013-5.
- [40] H. Herawati, R. N. A. Jabbar, dan Y. Oktanella, "Analisis pemberian serbuk jahe merah, kunyit, dan temulawak dengan metode in silico dan in vivo pada ayam broiler," *Jurnal Sain Veteriner*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 98–111, Apr. 2023, doi: 10.22146/jsv.76111.
- [41] N. Idrees, E. Noor, S. Rashid, and F. T. Agama, "Role of topological indices in predictive modeling and ranking of drugs treating eye disorders," *Sci Rep*, vol. 15, no. 1, p. 1271, Jan. 2025, doi: 10.1038/s41598-024-81482-z.
- Z. Y. Ibrahim, A. Uzairu, G. A. Shallangwa, and S. [42] E. Abechi, "Pharmacokinetic predictions and docking studies of substituted aryl amine-based inhibitors triazolopyrimidine designed of Plasmodium falciparum dihvdroorotate dehydrogenase (PfDHODH)," Futur J Pharm Sci, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 133, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1186/s43094-021-00288-2.
- [43] D. Rana, S. Salave, D. Khunt, and D. Benival, "Blood brain barrier and its significance in drug delivery to brain in Alzheimer disease," *in Alzheimer's Disease* and Advanced Drug Delivery Strategies, Elsevier,

2024, pp. 47–60. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-443-13205-6.00018-2.

[44] I. Klojdová, T. Milota, J. Smetanová, and C. Stathopoulos, "Encapsulation: A Strategy to Deliver Therapeutics and Bioactive Compounds?," Pharmaceuticals, vol. 16, no. 3, p. 362, Feb. 2023, doi: 10.3390/ph16030362.