EVALUATION OF ANTIOXIDANT POTENTIAL AND QUANTITATIVE ESTIMATION OF PHENOLIC AND FLAVONOID CONTENT IN SOME SELECTED NEPALESE MEDICINAL PLANTS
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INTRODUCTION

Due to its greatly varied geographical and climatic conditions of Nepal, there is huge biodiversity of plants with medicinal and aromatic values. Nepal, being located at the portion of Central Himalayas, has contributed about 10% medicinal plants of expected 7000 species of flowering plants [1]. Kavre district of Nepal is rich in biodiversity due to climatic variation and possesses varied medicinal plants. In developing countries, medicinal plants are potent sources of medicine to treat various diseases. The people (approximately 80%) living in rural areas of underdeveloped countries still depend on medicinal plants for their basic health care [1]. Synthetic drugs are effective to cure various diseases, but in the long run, they show harmful side effects. However, the drug development from the natural product is promising as plants show different bioactivity to cure ailments due to the presence of bioactive compounds.

Oxidative stress needs electron pairing for their stability and thus pair with biological macromolecules such as protein, DNA, lipids and even with healthy human cells, thereby gives rise to different diseases [2]. To scavenge these free radicals, synthetic antioxidants such as butylated hydroxytoluene, butylated hydroxyanisole, and tertiary butylated hydroquinone are being used. However, these commercially available antioxidants have side effects and are toxic in vivo. Hence, there is an increased in interest for safer antioxidants from natural sources to cure different diseases [3,4]. Glutathione is master antioxidant in human body have ability to neutralise and eliminate the free radical generated by oxidative stress [5].

Natural antioxidants, derived from plants, are secondary metabolites which scavenge the free radicals generated from the oxidation process in different cells and check different oxidative stress-related maladies. Natural antioxidants are less expensive having lower toxicity and side effects. In general, phenolic acids and flavonoids have been considered to show the bioactivity for scavenging free radicals. However, there might be other secondary metabolites which act as antioxidants. Natural antioxidants are less expensive having lower toxicity and side effects [6].

Nepal is enrich with several climatic conditions, geographical variations, and immense variety of plants with potential anti diabetic activities, but no effort has been made to seek more safe and efficient antioxidant and α-amylase inhibitors from the natural sources so far. People of Nepal have been using medicinal plants for many years for treatment and cure of different diseases. Therefore, it is urgent to identify, explore and preserve the antioxidant with a quantitative estimation of flavonoid and phenolic content natural resources of Nepal. Hence, the present study mainly focused to evaluate the antioxidant potential of methanol extract of nine selected medicinal plants from Kavre district of Nepal, to examine for the antioxidant potential and to determine the total phenolic and flavonoid content in the plant extracts quantitatively.

METHODS

Collection and identification of plant samples

Different parts of nine medicinal plants were collected from the farmland of Panchkhal Municipality, Kavre, Nepal; the plants were
collected in the summer of May/June 2017. The plants were identified by Prof. Dr. Mohan Sivakoti and Prof. Dr. Sangeeta Rajbhandari, Central Department of Botany, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal.

Extract preparation
Cleansed parts of plants were dried under shade at room temperature. Dried samples were chopped into pieces and then powdered using a mechanical grinder. Dried powder (100 g) was mixed separately in 400 mL methanol. The flasks were sealed tightly, and extraction was done for 72 h with occasional shaking. The obtained extracts were filtered and concentrated in a rotary evaporator. The yield of each fraction was determined and all the extracts were stored at 4°C in a refrigerator until analyses.

Preliminary phytochemical analysis
The method employed for phytochemical screening was based on the standard protocol of Harborne et al. with some modifications [7].

2.2-diphenyl-1-picrylhydrazyl radical scavenging assay
Antioxidant capacity was measured by the use of free radical 2,2-diphenyl-1-picrylhydrazyl (DPPH). The ability of different plant extracts to scavenge DPPH free radical was performed by the standard protocol adopted by Jamuna et al. [8]. Ascorbic acid of the same concentration as that of plant extract prepared was used as standard, and its absorbance was measured at 517 nm. Distilled water was used as a blank correction. The percentage of the DPPH free radical scavenging activity was calculated using the following equation:

\[
\text{radical scavenging(%) = \left( \frac{A_b - A_t}{A_b} \right) \times 100}
\]

where,

- \( A_b \) = Absorbance of the control (DPPH solution + methanol)
- \( A_t \) = Absorbance of test sample

The 50% inhibitory concentration ([IC\(_{50}\)] \text{value}) was indicated as an effective concentration of the sample that required to scavenge 50% of the DPPH free radicals. [IC\(_{50}\)] \text{values} were calculated using the inhibition curve by plotting extract concentration versus the corresponding scavenging effect.

Total phenolic content (TPC)
The TPC of all selected plant extracts was estimated using Folin–Ciocalteu reagent using gallic acid as standard based on the oxidation-reduction reaction. The total phenol content determination was performed with the help of the standard procedure given by Kim et al. (2007) with few modifications [6,9]. TPC content was expressed in milligram of gallic acid equivalent per gram of dry weight (mg GAE/g) of extract using the formula: \( C = \frac{V}{M} \) where, \( C \) = TPC compounds in mg/g, gallic acid equivalent (GAE), \( V \) = concentration of gallic acid established from the calibration curve in mg/mL, \( V \) = Volume of extract in mL, \( M \) = Weight of plant extract. The linear correlation coefficient (\( R^2 \)) value and regression equation were obtained from the TPC curves.

2.2-diphenyl-1-picrylhydrazyl radical scavenging activity
In vitro antioxidant study of an extract of different plants was performed using methanolic extracts. Fig. 1 showed the concentration-dependent free radical scavenging activity of plant extracts. All the plant extracts showed the concentration-dependent increasing in radical scavenging capacity. Among nine medicinal plant extracts, three plants extracts, namely, Ageratina adenophora, Urtica dioica, and Achyranthes aspera were found least antioxidant and thus are the poor sources of natural antioxidants. The greatest DPPH radical scavenging potency of with a minimum inhibitory concentration ([IC\(_{50}\)] \text{value}) was recorded for S. pinnata (17.51 ± 1.27 µg/mL), followed by Bauhinia variegata (26.55 ± 2.61 µg/mL), Melia azedarach (26.04 ± 1.55 µg/mL), P. guajava (70.91 ± 2.61 µg/mL), Curcuma longa (83.50 ± 6.42 µg/mL), and Elaeocarpus angustifolius Blume (104.23 ± 5.8 µg/mL). This assay is a simple and widely used and most acceptable technique to evaluate the antioxidant potency of plant extracts. The antioxidants are the chemical compounds of the plant which are capable of enacting the visibly noticeable quenching of the stable purple-colored DPPH radical to the yellow-purple-colored DPPH radical to the yellow.
colored DPPH. The antioxidant potential of S. pinnata methanol extract was investigated in the search for new bioactive compounds from natural resources. Phytochemical analysis showed that the polyphenols were found in plant extract and act as reducing agents and antioxidants by the hydrogen donating property of their hydroxyl groups. These polyphenols are responsible for the observed antioxidant activity in this study.

The IC_{50} values of some plants which showed antioxidant property were calculated and tabulated in Table 2. IC_{50} value is the concentration of ascorbic acid or plant extracts to scavenge 50% of DPPH free radicals.

The percent scavenging and IC_{50} of S. pinnata showed that the extract is the potent source of the natural antioxidant compound. Hence, it was further fractioned to examine the antioxidant property of different fractions in different solvents based on the polarity and individual fractions were subjected for an antioxidant activity where results are presented in the line graph given in Fig. 2.

Ascorbic acid was used as standard and its IC_{50} value was 20.13±0.89 µg/mL. In this study, S. pinnata and Bauhinia variegate showed significant antioxidant property with IC_{50} 17.51±1.27 µg/mL and 26.55±2.61 µg/mL respectively. The ethyl acetate fraction of S. pinnata showed the maximum scavenging (85.92±1.37) with IC_{50} value 46.95±1.17 µg/mL. Table 3 showed the DCM and hexane fraction of S. pinnata has moderate inhibitory effect. The DCM and hexane fraction of S. Pinnata showed a moderate inhibitory effect. Similarly, the different fractions of S. pinnata showed the moderate antioxidant properties as well. S. pinnata and B. variegate showed the significant antioxidant property which is supported by previous studies where IC_{50} values for scavenging were 24.48±2.31 µg/mL and 6.48±0.08 µg/mL for S. pinnata and B. variegate, respectively [2, 12]. Previous studies showed that DPPH free radical scavenging activity of different fractions of S. pinnata was found to be concentration-dependent, i.e., scavenging property increases with the increase in concentration and the finding of the present study is supported by the recent result not only in S. pinnata but also in rest of the plant extracts. Sharma et al. and Manik et al. concluded the fact about the potentiality of B. variegate and S. pinnata to act as a natural antioxidants [12, 13]. The antioxidant activity of Lepidium sativum ethanol extract showed IC_{50} values of 162.4±2.3, 35.29±1.02, 187.12±3.4, and 119.32±1.5 µg/mL in terms of DPPH which is comparable to the antioxidant activity showed by the plant extracts in the present study [14].

**TPC**

A calibration curve was constructed using gallic acid as standard. The TPC in each plant extracts was estimated with the help of calibration curve. The result is shown in Table 4.
Table 4: Total phenolic content of different plant extracts

| Name of plants | Absorbance | TPC (mg GAE/g) |
|----------------|------------|----------------|
|               | A1         | A2             | A3             | C1      | C2      | C3      | Mean±SD |
| SP             | 0.742      | 0.761          | 0.744          | 47.44   | 49.67   | 47.67   | 48.26±1.23 |
| CL             | 0.54       | 0.601          | 0.554          | 28.78   | 31.78   | 26.56   | 29.04±2.62 |
| Eleocarpus anjoustitifolius | 0.402       | 0.351          | 0.39           | 9.67    | 4.00    | 8.33    | 7.3±3.298 |
| BV             | 0.620      | 0.572          | 0.630          | 33.89   | 28.56   | 35.00   | 32.48±3.44 |
| MA             | 0.461      | 0.410          | 0.451          | 16.22   | 10.56   | 15.11   | 13.96±2.99 |
| AA             | 0.401      | 0.350          | 0.373          | 9.56    | 3.89    | 6.44    | 6.63±2.84 |
| PG             | 0.55       | 0.673          | 0.662          | 26.11   | 39.78   | 33.89   | 33.26±6.36 |

GAE: Gallic acid equivalent, SD: Standard deviation, SP: Spondias pinnata, BV: Bauhinia variegata, CL: Curcuma longa, MA: Melia azedarach, PG: Psidium guajava, AA: Achyranthes aspera, TPC: Total phenolic content

Table 5: Total flavonoid content of different plant extracts

| Name of plants | Absorbance | TPC (mg QE/g) |
|----------------|------------|---------------|
|               | A1         | A2             | A3             | C1      | C2      | C3      | Mean±SD |
| SP             | 0.123      | 0.133          | 0.129          | 8.39    | 10.00   | 9.35    | 9.24±0.89 |
| CL             | 0.199      | 0.222          | 0.215          | 20.65   | 24.35   | 23.23   | 22.74±1.89 |
| BV             | 0.106      | 0.099          | 0.109          | 5.65    | 4.52    | 6.13    | 5.53±0.82 |
| MA             | 0.333      | 0.315          | 0.329          | 42.26   | 39.35   | 41.61   | 41.07±1.53 |
| AA             | 0.086      | 0.093          | 0.081          | 2.42    | 3.35    | 1.61    | 2.52±0.97 |
| PG             | 0.132      | 0.139          | 0.145          | 9.84    | 10.97   | 11.94   | 10.92±1.05 |

SP: Spondias pinnata, BV: Bauhinia variegata, CL: Curcuma longa, MA: Melia azedarach, PG: Psidium guajava, AA: Achyranthes aspera, SD: Standard deviation, QE: Quercetin equivalent, TPC: Total flavonoid content

The TPC of extract of all selected medicinal plants showed varied results ranging from 6.63±2.84 to 48.26±1.23 mg GAE/g in Achyranthes aspera and Spondias pinnata, respectively. The total phenol content of the rest of the plant extract lied between these two extremes. The extract of Ageratina adenophora and U. dioica showed poor antioxidant property with not significance TPC. Similarly, Achyranthes aspera showed poor antioxidant property was also a moderate source of TPC. On the other hand, those plant extracts (S. pinnata and B. variegata) which showed potent antioxidant property also have appreciable TPC. The present findings agree with the view that DPPH scavenging activity and phenolic content of the plant extract are related as an antioxidant property of plant extract is directly correlated with its phenolic content [12]. A high correlation between antioxidant capacities and their TPCs indicated that phenoic compounds were a major contributor to antioxidant activity of these plant extracts. The absorbance of quercetin (standard) was recorded from the spectrophotometer and the result is tabulated in Table 5.

The TPC of different selected medicinal plant extracts was found and the results revealed that the TPC varied from 2.52±0.97 mg QE/g in Achyranthes aspera to 41.07±1.53 mg QE/g in Melia azedarach. All the remaining plant extracts showed the TPC in between two extremes; however, U. dioica, Elaeocarpus anjoustitifolius Blume, and Ageratina adenophora are the moderate sources of TPC. Sharma et al. and Hazra et al. have suggested that greater flavonoid content of plant extract could be directly correlated with higher free radical scavenging property [12]. The present study showed that the antioxidant activity is not only due to the presence of flavonoid and phenolic compounds but also the presence of some other organic compounds that act as reducing agents.

CONCLUSIONS

The DPPH radical scavenging activities and subsequently the IC_{50} values of methanolic extracts of the selected plants showed a varied degree of antioxidant property; of which, S. pinnata showed appreciable percent scavenging followed by B. variegata. The highest percent scavenging showed by S. pinnata has IC_{50} value 17.51±1.27 μg/ml while the standard, ascorbic acid has 20.13±0.89 μg/ml. Further, the ethyl acetate fraction of S. pinnata showed the maximum scavenging (85.92±1.37) with IC_{50} value 46.95±1.17 μg/ml. The greater antioxidant property on them is credited to bioactive secondary metabolites especially phenols but not flavonoids. Hence, these plants could be the potential substitutes of synthetic antioxidants. Although, some medicinal plants showed a significant antioxidant property, they cannot directly be referred for pharmaceutical usage. Further extensive phytochemical and pharmacological investigation must be done to explore the mechanism of action and to isolate and characterize lead compounds that are responsible for pharmacological properties. This study demonstrates that these medicinal plants could be a potential source of natural antioxidants. Further studies need to be conducted to identify alkaloids and phenolic compounds that are correlated with the antioxidant activity of S. pinnata as well as their synergistic interactions.

Statistics

All the analyses were carried out in triplicate, and the results are expressed as mean ±SD.
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