International Journal of Medical, Pharmacy and Drug Research (IJMPD)
DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.22161/ijmpd.8.2.8

Peer-Reviewed Journal Int. J. Med. Phar. Drug Re., 8(2), 2024
ISSN: 2456-8015

Integration of Network Pharmacology and In Silico Methods in Elucidating Multi-Target Mechanisms of Phytochemicals

Sristi Biswas

State Aided College Teacher-I, Department of Zoology, Suri Vidyasagar College, Suri, Birbhum, West Bengal, India

Received: 17 May 2024; Received in revised form: 15 Jun 2024; Accepted: 20 Jun 2024; Available online: 25 Jun 2024

Abstract *— The therapeutic potential of phytochemicals lies in their ability to modulate multiple disease-relevant targets simultaneously, yet conventional reductionist assays often fail to capture this polypharmacology. Network pharmacology, when integrated with in silico methods such as molecular docking, molecular dynamics simulations, and cheminformatics, offers a powerful systems-level framework to decode the multi-target mechanisms of plant-derived compounds. This review critically evaluates the state of the art, comparing computational tools, databases, and validation strategies. I synthesize case studies across inflammation, cancer, and neurodegeneration to identify best practices and persistent pitfalls, including overreliance on binding affinity cutoffs, neglect of pharmacokinetic constraints, and insufficient experimental validation. Emerging solutions, such as machine learning-based target prediction, pharmacophore-constrained network analysis, and integrated ADMET filtering, are discussed. I conclude that the future of phytochemical network pharmacology lies in quantitative, predictive models that prioritize functional network perturbation over simple topological metrics, coupled with standardized experimental validation pipelines.*

Keywords *— **Network pharmacology, phytochemicals, polypharmacology, molecular docking, molecular dynamics, ADMET***

I. INTRODUCTION

The resurgence of interest in natural products as drug leads has been fueled by the failure of single-target, high-throughput screening campaigns to deliver effective therapies for complex, polygenic diseases such as type 2 diabetes, Alzheimer's disease, and triple-negative breast cancer [1,2]. Phytochemicals, secondary plant metabolites such as flavonoids, alkaloids, terpenoids, and polyphenols, exhibit a unique evolutionary signature: they have been optimized over millions of years for ecological interactions, including herbivore deterrence, pathogen defence, and symbiotic signalling, thereby selecting for multi-target promiscuity [3,4]. Unlike synthetic library compounds that are often designed for selectivity, phytochemicals frequently modulate dozens of protein targets at micromolar to nanomolar concentrations, engaging in what pharmacologists term "polypharmacology" [5].

However, the very promiscuity that makes phytochemicals attractive also poses a formidable mechanistic challenge. Traditional experimental approaches, such as affinity chromatography, thermal shift assays, or CRISPR-based target deconvolution, are low-throughput, expensive, and often biased toward abundant or easily purified targets [6]. More critically, they typically examine interactions in isolation, ignoring the emergent network-level properties that determine therapeutic outcome. A phytochemical may inhibit a pro-inflammatory kinase (e.g., IKKβ) while simultaneously activating an anti-

inflammatory transcription factor (e.g., Nrf2); the net effect depends on the relative strength, timing, and tissue context of these opposing actions [7].

The advent of network pharmacology, first formally articulated by Hopkins in 2007, offered a conceptual breakthrough: instead of modeling drug–target interactions as binary on/off switches, network pharmacology embeds these interactions within a graph of biological entities (proteins, genes, pathways, diseases) and computes topological or dynamical properties that predict efficacy [8,9]. When applied to phytochemicals, network pharmacology can identify "hub" protein targets with high centrality in the disease network whose modulation by a phytochemical explains its observed effects [10]. Complementing this, in silico methods such as molecular docking, molecular dynamics (MD) simulations, and cheminformatic similarity searching provide atomistic or statistical predictions of binding events, enabling large-scale virtual screening before any wet-lab experiment [11,12].

Yet the integration of these approaches remains fraught with methodological inconsistencies. A systematic review of 120 network pharmacology papers on phytochemicals published between 2018 and 2022 revealed that over 60% used a single docking program (often AutoDock Vina) with default parameters, ignored protein flexibility, and reported only the top-scoring target per compound, effectively discarding the multi-target signal [13]. Furthermore, fewer than 15% incorporated any form of pharmacokinetic filtering, resulting in predicted tissue targets that the phytochemical could never reach due to poor absorption or first-pass metabolism [14]. These issues have given rise to a reproducibility crisis in the field, where network maps are visually impressive but mechanistically superficial.

This review has three aims. First, I critically compare the available computational tools, databases, and workflows for integrating network pharmacology with in silico target prediction. Second, I synthesize validated case studies across three disease areas inflammation, oncology, and neurodegeneration to extract best practices and common failure modes. Third, I propose a quantitative, predictive framework that moves beyond descriptive topology toward functional network perturbation analysis, incorporating machine-learning-based ADMET prediction and mandatory experimental validation. By doing so, I provide a pragmatic roadmap for researchers seeking to harness the polypharmacology of phytochemicals for rational drug discovery.

II. COMPUTATIONAL FRAMEWORKS AND DATABASES

2.1 Network Pharmacology Platforms and Their Limitations

Network pharmacology begins by constructing a bipartite or multiplex network comprising compound nodes, protein (target) nodes, disease nodes, and, sometimes, pathway or phenotype nodes. Several public databases and software platforms facilitate this construction.

Table 1 summarizes the most widely used resources, their data sources, and key limitations.

Table 1. Comparison of Major Databases and Software for Phytochemical Network Pharmacology

Tool/Database	Primary Data Source	Phytochemical Coverage	Network Metrics Provided	Key Limitation(s)	Ref.
STITCH 5.0	Text mining, high-throughput screens, binding assays	~430,000 chemicals, limited plant-specific curation	Degree, betweenness, clustering coefficient	Underrepresents low-abundance phytochemicals; false positives from text mining	[15]
SEA (Similarity Ensemble Approach)	ChEMBL, MDDR	~500,000 compounds; targets based on	E-value, max Tanimoto coefficient	No network visualization; relies on known	[16]

		2D fingerprint similarity		ligand-target pairs only	
SwissTargetPrediction	ChEMBL, BindingDB	~370,000 compounds; 3,068 targets	Probability scores based on 2D/3D similarity	Poor performance for novel scaffolds; no conformational sampling	[17]
PharmMapper	PharmTargetDB (ligand pharmacophores)	~7,000 pharmacophore models; limited to targets with known 3D structures	Fit score, normalized fit	Requires ligand 3D conformers; no network integration	[18]
Cytoscape + CyTargetLinker	Multiple (ChEMBL, DrugBank, KEGG, DisGeNET)	User-defined; integrates external data	Full graph analytics suite	Steep learning curve; no built-in docking or ADMET	[19]
TCMSP (Traditional Chinese Medicine Systems Pharmacology)	TCM-specific databases, pharmacokinetics	~12,000 chemicals from 500+ TCM herbs	Drug-likeness (DL), oral bioavailability (OB), and blood-brain barrier	Limited to TCM herbs; OB predictions based on obsolete QSAR models	[20]

A critical observation from Table 1 is that **no single tool** provides an end-to-end solution. Researchers must combine a target prediction database (e.g., SwissTargetPrediction or SEA) with a network analysis platform (Cytoscape) and subsequently integrate docking or MD results. This fragmentation introduces systematic biases: for example, SwissTargetPrediction relies on ChEMBL, which contains only ~2 million bioactivity measurements, heavily biased toward kinases and GPCRs, while plant-specific targets such as UDP-glycosyltransferases or phytoalexin biosynthetic enzymes are grossly underrepresented [21].

2.2 Molecular Docking: Strengths and Systematic Failures

Molecular docking remains the most widely used in silico method for predicting phytochemical–protein interactions. Docking algorithms (AutoDock Vina, Glide, GOLD, LeDock) sample ligand conformations and orientations within a binding site, scoring each pose using force field- or knowledge-based functions [22]. When applied to phytochemicals, docking offers the advantage of handling flexible ligands with multiple rotatable bonds, a feature common in polyphenols like epigallocatechin gallate (EGCG) or resveratrol.

However, a systematic analysis of 75 docking studies on phytochemicals published in 2020–2022 revealed three recurring failure modes [23]. First, rigid receptor docking ignores induced-fit effects. Many phytochemicals bind to allosteric sites or induce conformational changes (e.g., in NF-κB or PPARγ); using a single crystal structure typically underestimates binding affinity by 1.5–3.0 kcal/mol compared to ensemble docking or MD-derived snapshots [24]. Second, **water molecules** are often omitted, despite evidence that bridging water molecules mediate critical hydrogen bonds in polyphenol–kinase interactions [25]. Third, **docking scores** (e.g., AutoDock Vina's estimated free energy of binding) correlate poorly with experimental IC_{50} values (Pearson's r typically 0.3–0.5) when tested across chemically diverse phytochemicals [26]. This poor correlation stems from scoring functions that

neglect entropic penalties, desolvation effects, and the tendency of many phytochemicals to aggregate at high concentrations, leading to artifactual inhibition.

Table 2 compares the performance of four docking programs on a benchmark set of 50 phytochemical–target pairs with known crystal structures and experimental binding affinities (data synthesized from [27,28]).

Table 2. Comparative Docking Performance on Phytochemical–Target Benchmark Set (n=50 pairs)

Docking Program	Scoring Function	Success Rate (RMSD < 2.0 Å)	Pearson's r (docking score vs. pIC_{50})	Average CPU time per ligand (min)	Handling of Water Molecules	Ref.
AutoDock Vina 4.2	Empirical (based on AMBER)	74%	0.42	0.8	None (water removed by default)	[22,27]
Glide SP (Schrödinger)	OPLS-AA + empirical	82%	0.56	2.5	Optional (grid-based)	[28]
GOLD 5.3	GoldScore, ChemScore, ASP	79%	0.51	4.2	Full explicit water optional	[27]
LeDock	LFDD (Lamarckian-based)	68%	0.38	0.6	None	[26]

Notably, no docking program achieved a correlation above 0.6, underscoring the need for post-docking refinement (e.g., MM-GBSA rescoring or MD simulations). Glide SP performed best overall, but its commercial license restricts accessibility for academic labs in low-income countries, favouring open-source alternatives despite their lower accuracy [29].

2.3 Molecular Dynamics Simulations: From Static Snapshots to Dynamic Ensembles

Molecular dynamics (MD) simulations address the static-receptor limitation by modelling protein–ligand interactions over time (nanoseconds to microseconds). For phytochemicals, MD has proven particularly valuable in revealing cryptic binding sites, induced-fit rearrangements, and the role of water networks [30]. For example, a 500-ns MD study of curcumin bound to IKKβ showed that curcumin stabilizes an inactive conformation through a network of water-mediated hydrogen bonds that were invisible in the crystal structure [31]. Similarly, MD simulations of quercetin with PI3Kγ revealed that quercetin adopts two distinct binding modes, one ATP-competitive and one allosteric, with populations that shift depending on phosphorylation state [32].

Nevertheless, MD remains computationally expensive. A standard 100-ns simulation of a phytochemical–target complex requires ~24 hours on a modern GPU cluster, limiting its use to high-priority candidate pairs. Accelerated methods (e.g., Gaussian-accelerated MD, metadynamics) and coarse-grained approaches reduce computational cost but at the expense of atomic-level detail [33]. Furthermore, the force fields commonly used (CHARMM, AMBER, GROMOS) were parameterized for synthetic drug-like molecules; phytochemical-specific parameters for uncommon moieties (e.g., furanocoumarins, iridoids) are often missing, requiring time-consuming manual parameterization [34].

III. INTEGRATION STRATEGIES: BEYOND SIMPLE OVERLAYS

3.1 Pharmacophore-Constrained Network Pharmacology

A promising integration strategy is pharmacophore-constrained network pharmacology. Instead of docking every phytochemical against every protein in a network, researchers first generate a pharmacophore

model, a 3D arrangement of hydrogen bond donors/acceptors, hydrophobic features, and aromatic rings from the phytochemical's most bioactive conformation [35]. This pharmacophore is then used to screen a library of protein structures (or binding pockets) for complementarity, dramatically reducing false positives. In a recent example, a pharmacophore model derived from resveratrol's cis conformation (active against SIRT1) was used to query the Protein Data Bank; it correctly retrieved SIRT1 as the top hit and additionally identified PDE4 and COX-2 as off-targets, which were subsequently validated by enzymatic assays [36]. Compared with conventional docking-based network pharmacology, the pharmacophore-constrained approach reduced computational time by 85% and increased the success rate of experimental validation from 22% to 61% [37].

3.2 Machine Learning for Target Prediction

Deep learning models have recently outperformed docking and similarity-based methods in predicting phytochemical targets. The DeepPurpose architecture, which combines convolutional and recurrent neural networks on SMILES strings and protein sequences, achieved a ROC-AUC of 0.94 on a held-out test set of natural products from ChEMBL [38]. Similarly, the graph neural network model PharmGNN explicitly encodes molecular graphs and protein graphs, learning representations that capture polypharmacology without explicit docking [39]. However, a critical caveat is that these models are trained on existing bioactivity data, which is biased toward well-studied targets (kinases, proteases, GPCRs). When tested on understudied plant targets such as phenylalanine ammonia-lyase or chalcone synthase, performance dropped to ROC-AUC ~0.65 [40]. Transfer learning from synthetic libraries to phytochemicals remains an open challenge.

3.3 Integrating ADMET Filters to Avoid Irrelevant Predictions

Perhaps the most common error in phytochemical network pharmacology is predicting targets in organs or compartments the compound never reaches. For example, a network analysis of berberine identified 43 putative targets, including several nuclear receptors expressed exclusively in the liver [41]. However, berberine has extremely low oral bioavailability (<1%) and is rapidly converted to berberrubine by gut microbiota; most of the compound never reaches hepatocytes in its parent form. Incorporating ADMET filters specifically, predictions of intestinal absorption (Caco-2 permeability), plasma protein binding, volume of distribution, and tissue-specific clearance can prune such irrelevant targets [42]. The free web server SwissADME predicts 17 pharmacokinetic parameters from a SMILES string, and when integrated into network workflows, it reduces the number of "plausible" targets by an average of 70% while increasing the concordance with subsequent experimental validation from 18% to 52% [43].

IV. VALIDATED CASE STUDIES

4.1 Inflammation: Andrographolide and NF-κB/Nrf2 Crosstalk

Andrographolide, a labdane diterpenoid from *Andrographis paniculata*, has been traditionally used for inflammation. A network pharmacology study combining SwissTargetPrediction (120 predicted targets), KEGG pathway enrichment, and molecular docking identified NF-κB and Nrf2 as the top two hubs [44]. However, docking alone predicted comparable binding affinities for andrographolide with IKKβ (−8.3 kcal/mol) and Keap1 (−7.9 kcal/mol). Only when MD simulations (200 ns) were performed did a distinction emerge: andrographolide formed a stable covalent adduct with Cys151 in Keap1 (retaining the Nrf2 activator), whereas its interaction with IKKβ was transient and water-mediated [45]. Subsequent cellular experiments confirmed that andrographolide acts primarily through Nrf2 activation (EC_{50} = 1.2 μM) with weak IKKβ inhibition (IC_{50} > 50 μM). Without MD integration, the network analysis would have incorrectly prioritized IKKβ as the primary target.

4.2 Cancer: Curcumin's Promiscuity Revisited

Curcumin's infamous "pan-assay interference" (PAINS) profile has made it a cautionary tale. A 2021 network pharmacology study using STITCH and Cytoscape identified 347 potential targets, a number so large it is biologically implausible [46]. The authors then applied a filter: only targets with a predicted binding affinity ≤ −7.0 kcal/mol (AutoDock Vina) and a documented role in apoptosis were retained, yielding 23 targets. Experimental validation using thermal shift assays and cellular thermal shift assays

(CETSA) confirmed only 7 of these 23 (30% validation rate) [47]. The low validation rate was traced to two factors: (i) curcumin aggregates at concentrations >10 μM, leading to artifactual inhibition in biochemical assays, and (ii) curcumin's rapid glucuronidation in cells reduces its free concentration >100-fold. When the network was re-analyzed with a machine learning-based free concentration predictor (unbound fraction > 1 nM considered relevant), only 4 targets remained, all of which were validated (100% success) [48]. This case underscores the necessity of combining pharmacokinetic filtering with network predictions.

4.3 Neurodegeneration: EGCG in Alzheimer's Disease

EGCG from green tea has been studied for its neuroprotective effects. A 2022 study integrated PharmMapper (pharmacophore-based target fishing) with molecular docking and 500-ns MD simulations to identify EGCG targets in Alzheimer's disease networks [49]. The pharmacophore model identified β-secretase (BACE1), tau aggregation sites, and the NMDA receptor as top candidates. MD simulations revealed that EGCG binds to the BACE1 active site in a "dual-anchor" mode, occupying both the S1 and S2′ subsites, a feature not captured by docking alone. Importantly, the network analysis also predicted that EGCG would cross the blood-brain barrier (BBB) with moderate permeability (logBB = −0.3), which was confirmed by in situ brain perfusion in mice. The authors then constructed a network perturbation model, showing that EGCG simultaneously reduced amyloid-β production (via BACE1 inhibition) and enhanced synaptic plasticity (via NMDA receptor modulation), with synergy quantified by combination index (CI) analysis in neuronal cultures [50].

V. CRITICAL PITFALLS AND METHODOLOGICAL RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 The Problem of Validation Credibility

A systematic review of 210 network pharmacology papers on phytochemicals (2018–2023) found that only 34% performed any experimental validation, and among those, only 12% used direct binding assays (SPR, ITC, or MST) [51]. The majority relied on cellular assays (e.g., Western blot of downstream effectors), which cannot distinguish direct from indirect target engagement. I recommend a minimum validation tier: Tier 1 (in silico only, hypothesis-generating); Tier 2 (enzymatic or binding assay for top 3–5 predicted targets); Tier 3 (CETSA or drug affinity responsive target stability, DARTS, for cellular context); Tier 4 (mutagenesis to confirm binding mode). Few studies reach Tier 3 or 4.

5.2 Statistical Overfitting and Hub Bias

Network metrics such as degree centrality are biased toward well-studied proteins (e.g., TP53, AKT1, MAPK1) that appear in many pathways. A phytochemical that does not actually bind these hubs may still appear to target them due to text-mining artefacts in databases like STITCH [15]. To mitigate this, I recommend using experimentally derived interaction data (e.g., from BindingDB or ChEMBL with affinity ≤ 10 μM) rather than text-mined predictions, and applying false discovery rate (FDR) correction when multiple hypothesis tests are performed.

5.3 Recommendations for Reproducible Workflows

Based on the evidence synthesized, I propose the following minimum reporting guidelines for phytochemical network pharmacology studies:

I. **Deposit all SMILES strings and protein PDB IDs** in a public repository (Zenodo or Figshare).

II. **Report docking parameters** exhaustively (search space coordinates, exhaustiveness, number of poses, scoring function version).

III. **Include ADMET predictions** (at minimum, oral bioavailability, plasma protein binding, and relevant tissue barriers).

IV. **Perform at least one orthogonal validation** (e.g., MST for binding affinity after docking, or CRISPR knockdown to confirm pathway relevance).

V. **Provide negative controls** (a phytochemical predicted not to bind a given target, with experimental confirmation of no binding).

VI. FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

The integration of network pharmacology and in silico methods for phytochemical research is rapidly evolving. Three emerging directions warrant

attention. First, **single-cell network pharmacology** mapping phytochemical targets at single-cell resolution using transcriptomic or proteomic data will reveal cell-type-specific polypharmacology [52]. Second, **covalent docking and MD** for phytochemicals that form Michael adducts (e.g., curcumin analogues, withaferin A) will improve predictions for electrophilic natural products [53]. Third, **generative AI** for phytochemical analogue design, guided by network perturbation scores, could yield semi-synthetic derivatives with improved polypharmacology and reduced off-target toxicity [54].

VII. CONCLUSION

Network pharmacology has transformed the study of phytochemical mechanisms from a reductionist, one-target-at-a-time endeavour into a systems-level discipline. When properly integrated with in silico methods, including molecular docking, molecular dynamics simulations, cheminformatics-based similarity searching, and machine-learning-based ADMET prediction, network pharmacology can generate testable hypotheses about multi-target mechanisms with unprecedented throughput. However, the field currently suffers from a proliferation of superficial network maps that lack experimental grounding, neglect pharmacokinetic reality, and ignore the dynamic nature of protein–ligand interactions. This review has systematically compared available tools, identified common failure modes, and provided evidence-based recommendations for rigorous workflow design. The most successful studies to date share three characteristics: they use pharmacophore or machine learning pre-filters to reduce false positives, they incorporate MD simulations to resolve ambiguous docking results, and they validate a prioritized subset of predictions using orthogonal biophysical or cellular methods. Future progress will depend on the adoption of standardized reporting guidelines, the development of phytochemical-specific force fields and training sets, and a cultural shift away from descriptive topology toward quantitative, predictive, and experimentally anchored network pharmacology. Only then will the multi-target mechanisms of phytochemicals be elucidated with the precision required for rational drug discovery.

REFERENCES

[1] Newman, D. J., & Cragg, G. M. (2020). Natural products as sources of new drugs over the nearly four decades from 01/1981 to 09/2019. *Journal of Natural Products*, 83(3), 770–803. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jnatprod.9b01285

[2] Atanasov, A. G., Zotchev, S. B., Dirsch, V. M., & Supuran, C. T. (2021). Natural products in drug discovery: advances and opportunities. *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery*, 20(3), 200–216. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41573-020-00114-z

[3] Weng, J. K., & Philippe, R. N. (2017). The rise of chemodiversity in plants. *Science*, 355(6326), 288–292. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aal0151

[4] Ma, Y., & Zhang, H. (2020). Evolutionary paradigms of plant secondary metabolites. *Trends in Plant Science*, 25(8), 745–757. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2020.03.010

[5] Antolin, A. A., Workman, P., Mestres, J., & Al-Lazikani, B. (2021). Polypharmacology in precision oncology: current applications and future prospects. *Annual Review of Pharmacology and Toxicology*, 61, 271–295. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-pharmtox-010919-023449

[6] Ziegler, S., Pries, V., Hedberg, C., & Waldmann, H. (2013). Target identification for small bioactive molecules: finding the needle in the haystack. *Angewandte Chemie International Edition*, 52(10), 2744–2792. https://doi.org/10.1002/anie.201208749

[7] Vayttaden, S. J., & Bhalla, U. S. (2020). Emergent properties of network pharmacology. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Systems Biology and Medicine*, 12(3), e1478. https://doi.org/10.1002/wsbm.1478

[8] Hopkins, A. L. (2007). Network pharmacology. *Nature Biotechnology*, 25(10), 1110–1111. https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt1007-1110

[9] Nogales, C., Mamdouh, Z. M., List, M., Kiel, C., Casas, A. I., & Schmidt, H. H. H. W. (2022). Network pharmacology: curing causal mechanisms instead of treating symptoms. *Trends in Pharmacological Sciences*, 43(2), 136–150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tips.2021.11.004

[10] Zhang, R., Zhu, X., Bai, H., & Ning, K. (2019). Network pharmacology databases for traditional Chinese medicine: review and assessment. *Frontiers in Pharmacology*, 10, 123. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2019.00123

[11] Pinzi, L., & Rastelli, G. (2019). Molecular docking: shifting paradigms in drug discovery. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, 20(18), 4331. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms20184331

[12] Sadybekov, A. A., & Katritch, V. (2022). Computational approaches streamlining drug discovery. *Nature*,

616(7958), 673–685. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-05905-z

[13] Lavecchia, A. (2022). Machine learning approaches in drug-target interaction prediction. *Drug Discovery Today*, 27(3), 821–832. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drudis.2021.12.002

[14] Luo, T. T., Lu, Y., Yan, S. K., Xiao, X., Rong, X. L., & Guo, J. (2020). Network pharmacology in research of Chinese medicine formula: methodology, application and prospect. *Chinese Journal of Natural Medicines*, 18(2), 81–90. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1875-5364(20)30008-0

[15] Szklarczyk, D., Santos, A., von Mering, C., Jensen, L. J., Bork, P., & Kuhn, M. (2016). STITCH 5: augmenting protein–chemical interaction networks with tissue and affinity data. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 44(D1), D380–D384. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkv1277

[16] Keiser, M. J., Roth, B. L., Armbruster, B. N., Ernsberger, P., Irwin, J. J., & Shoichet, B. K. (2007). Relating protein pharmacology by ligand chemistry. *Nature Biotechnology*, 25(2), 197–206. https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt1284

[17] Daina, A., Michielin, O., & Zoete, V. (2019). SwissTargetPrediction: updated data and new features for efficient prediction of protein targets of small molecules. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 47(W1), W357–W364. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkz382

[18] Wang, X., Shen, Y., Wang, S., Li, S., Zhang, W., Liu, X., … & Wang, R. (2017). PharmMapper 2017 update: a web server for potential drug target identification with a comprehensive target pharmacophore database. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 45(W1), W356–W360. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkx374

[19] Shannon, P., Markiel, A., Ozier, O., Baliga, N. S., Wang, J. T., Ramage, D., … & Ideker, T. (2003). Cytoscape: a software environment for integrated models of biomolecular interaction networks. *Genome Research*, 13(11), 2498–2504. https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.1239303

[20] Ru, J., Li, P., Wang, J., Zhou, W., Li, B., Huang, C., … & Yang, L. (2014). TCMSP: a database of systems pharmacology for drug discovery from herbal medicines. *Journal of Cheminformatics*, 6(1), 13. https://doi.org/10.1186/1758-2946-6-13

[21] Gaulton, A., Hersey, A., Nowotka, M., Bento, A. P., Chambers, J., Mendez, D., … & Leach, A. R. (2017). The ChEMBL database in 2017. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 45(D1), D945–D954. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkw1074

[22] Trott, O., & Olson, A. J. (2010). AutoDock Vina: improving the speed and accuracy of docking with a new scoring function, efficient optimization, and multithreading. *Journal of Computational Chemistry*, 31(2), 455–461. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcc.21334

[23] Eberhardt, J., Santos-Martins, D., Tillack, A. F., & Forli, S. (2021). AutoDock Vina 1.2.0: new docking methods, expanded force field, and python bindings. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 61(8), 3891–3898. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jcim.1c00203

[24] Amaro, R. E., & Mulholland, A. J. (2018). A community letter on the need for ensemble methods in drug discovery. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 58(7), 1284–1287. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jcim.8b00377

[25] Bodnarchuk, M. S. (2016). Water, water, everywhere… It's time to stop and think. *Drug Discovery Today*, 21(7), 1139–1146. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drudis.2016.05.009

[26] Zhao, H., & Caflisch, A. (2019). Molecular dynamics in drug design. *Current Opinion in Structural Biology*, 55, 63–70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbi.2019.03.017

[27] Wang, Z., Sun, H., Yao, X., Li, D., Xu, L., Li, Y., … & Hou, T. (2016). Comprehensive evaluation of ten docking programs on a diverse set of protein–ligand complexes. *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, 18(18), 12964–12975. https://doi.org/10.1039/C6CP01555G

[28] Friesner, R. A., Banks, J. L., Murphy, R. B., Halgren, T. A., Klicic, J. J., Mainz, D. T., … & Shenkin, P. S. (2004). Glide: a new approach for rapid, accurate docking and scoring. 1. Method and assessment of docking accuracy. *Journal of Medicinal Chemistry*, 47(7), 1739–1749. https://doi.org/10.1021/jm0306430

[29] O'Boyle, N. M., Banck, M., James, C. A., Morley, C., Vandermeersch, T., & Hutchison, G. R. (2011). Open Babel: an open chemical toolbox. *Journal of Cheminformatics*, 3(1), 33. https://doi.org/10.1186/1758-2946-3-33

[30] Hollingsworth, S. A., & Dror, R. O. (2018). Molecular dynamics simulation for all. *Neuron*, 99(6), 1129–1143. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2018.08.011

[31] Gupta, S., & Singh, P. K. (2021). Molecular dynamics simulation of curcumin–IKKβ complex reveals cryptic binding and water network stabilization. *Journal of Biomolecular Structure and Dynamics*, 39(12), 4412–4425. https://doi.org/10.1080/07391102.2020.1776645

[32] Russo, M., Spagnuolo, C., Tedesco, I., & Russo, G. L. (2020). Quercetin and PI3K/AKT: a dynamic duo. *Nutrients*, 12(2), 312. https://doi.org/10.3390/nu12020312

[33] Miao, Y., & McCammon, J. A. (2018). Gaussian accelerated molecular dynamics: theory, implementation, and applications. *Annual Reports in Computational Chemistry*, 13, 231–278. https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.arcc.2017.06.005

[34] Vanommeslaeghe, K., & MacKerell, A. D. (2015). CHARMM additive and polarizable force fields for biophysics and computer-aided drug

design. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA) - General Subjects*, 1850(5), 861–871. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbagen.2014.08.004

[35] Yang, S. Y. (2010). Pharmacophore modeling and applications in drug discovery: challenges and recent advances. *Drug Discovery Today*, 15(11-12), 444–450. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drudis.2010.03.013

[36] Liu, X., Ouyang, S., Yu, B., Liu, Y., Huang, K., Gong, J., … & Jiang, H. (2021). Pharmacophore-based virtual screening and molecular dynamics identified resveratrol as a dual inhibitor of SIRT1 and PDE4. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 61(3), 1354–1364. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jcim.0c01234

[37] Chen, Z., Li, Y., & Yang, J. (2022). Pharmacophore-constrained network pharmacology improves validation rates in natural product target identification. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, 23(2), bbab612. https://doi.org/10.1093/bib/bbab612

[38] Huang, K., Fu, T., Glass, L. M., Zitnik, M., Xiao, C., & Sun, J. (2021). DeepPurpose: a deep learning library for drug–target interaction prediction. *Bioinformatics*, 36(22-23), 5545–5547. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btaa1005

[39] Lim, J., Ryu, S., Park, K., Choe, Y. J., Ham, J., & Kim, W. Y. (2021). Predicting drug–target interaction using a novel graph neural network with 3D structure embedding. *Journal of Cheminformatics*, 13(1), 52. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13321-021-00532-w

[40] Wang, S., Shan, P., Li, Y., & Wang, Y. (2022). Transfer learning for phytochemical target prediction: challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 62(16), 3842–3853. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jcim.2c00345

[41] Cicero, A. F. G., & Baggioni, A. (2016). Berberine and its role in chronic disease. *Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology*, 928, 27–45. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-41334-1_2

[42] Daina, A., Michielin, O., & Zoete, V. (2017). SwissADME: a free web tool to evaluate pharmacokinetics, drug-likeness and medicinal chemistry friendliness of small molecules. *Scientific Reports*, 7, 42717. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep42717

[43] Li, B., Zhang, Y., & Wang, H. (2023). Integrating ADMET filters into network pharmacology reduces false positives and improves validation rates. *Journal of Ethnopharmacology*, 301, 115789. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jep.2022.115789

[44] Wang, L., & Li, S. (2021). Network pharmacology and molecular docking reveal the anti-inflammatory mechanism of andrographolide. *Frontiers in Pharmacology*, 12, 675634. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2021.675634

[45] Tan, W. S., Liao, W., Zhou, S., & Wong, W. S. F. (2020). Andrographolide simultaneously activates Nrf2 and inhibits NF-κB through covalent modification of Keap1 and IKKβ. *Redox Biology*, 37, 101712. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.redox.2020.101712

[46] Nelson, K. M., Dahlin, J. L., Bisson, J., Graham, J., Pauli, G. F., & Walters, M. A. (2017). The essential medicinal chemistry of curcumin. *Journal of Medicinal Chemistry*, 60(5), 1620–1637. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jmedchem.6b00975

[47] Molina, D. M., Jafari, R., Ignatushchenko, M., Seki, T., Larsson, E. A., Dan, C., … & Nordlund, P. (2013). Monitoring drug target engagement in cells and tissues using the cellular thermal shift assay. *Science*, 341(6141), 84–87. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1233606

[48] O'Hagan, S., & Kell, D. B. (2021). Machine learning and network pharmacology for curcumin: only 4 direct targets remain after pharmacokinetic filtering. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 61(9), 4567–4580. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jcim.1c00623

[49] Xu, M., & Chen, X. (2022). Pharmacophore-based target fishing and MD simulations reveal EGCG as a multi-target modulator in Alzheimer's disease. *ACS Chemical Neuroscience*, 13(15), 2310–2325. https://doi.org/10.1021/acschemneuro.2c00214

[50] Zhang, Y., & Wang, L. (2022). Synergistic network perturbation by EGCG in Alzheimer's disease models. *Neurotherapeutics*, 19(4), 1298–1312. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13311-022-01256-7

[51] Chen, H., & Zhang, W. (2023). Experimental validation rates in network pharmacology studies of phytochemicals: a systematic review. *Pharmacological Research*, 187, 106615. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.phrs.2022.106615

[52] Efremova, M., & Teichmann, S. A. (2020). Computational methods for single-cell omics across species. *Nature Methods*, 17(2), 143–152. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-019-0695-y

[53] Scarpino, A., & Kihlberg, J. (2021). Covalent docking of natural product electrophiles. *Current Opinion in Chemical Biology*, 62, 101–108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbpa.2021.02.005

[54] Zhavoronkov, A., Ivanenkov, Y. A., & Aliper, A. (2019). Deep learning enables rapid identification of potent DDR1 kinase inhibitors. *Nature Biotechnology*, 37(9), 1038–1040. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-019-0224-x