Review of: "Synthesis of 1, 2-Disubstituted Benzimidazoles at Ambient Temperature Catalyzed by 1-Methylimidazolium Tetraflouroborate ([Hmim] BF_4) and Investigating Their Anti-ovarian Cancer Properties Through Molecular Docking Studies and Calculations"

Dr. Belay Sibuh

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I appreciate the efforts put forth by the authors to conduct the experiment and write the manuscript. However, I have some concerns that need the authors' attention.

Abstract and Introduction

A. Your abstract is too general. You should mention your major results, such as the compounds that are better in most of the criteria you used.
B. What is the aim of your study? Is it to evaluate the already existing methods of synthesis and find an optimum condition, or are you trying to suggest a new method?
C. If your aim is to determine optimal methods, what is the relevance of including the Molecular Docking or Anti-Ovarian Cancer Activity section with your study?

Experimental

1. In your experimental section, you have completely ignored the molecular docking section (which is half of your study).
2. What are the methods and tools you used? What is your target? Why did you choose this target? What is the difference between ADME-T and molecular docking prediction? These points should be clearly addressed.

Results and Discussion

a. The Results and Discussion section lacks coherence.
b. Similarly, in the molecular docking subsection, there is a mix between ADME-T prediction and molecular docking.
c. You've written a lot about *pharmacokinetics* (ADME-T) properties of the compound, yet you didn't mention the tools you have used.
d. I don't think the name "Lee Pinsky's laws" is correct; it should be***Lipinski's*** rules.

Novelty

There is previous work on a similar compound**: DOI** 10.1039/d3ra07156a. So what is new in your work?