Infrared spectroscopy chemometric model for determination of phenolic content of plant leaf powder
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Abstract

Introduction: The leaf is the part of the plant often used in traditional medicine because it is rich in one class of secondary metabolite compounds, namely phenolic compounds. Objectives: This study aims to establish a chemometric model for determining the phenolic content of plant leaf powders using the infrared spectroscopy (FTIR and NIR) method with a combination of chemometrics. Methods: The dried and powdered plant leaves were scanned using FTIR and NIR spectroscopy. Spectra were used to form calibration models. The calibration models were Partial Least Square (PLS), Principal Component Regression (PCR), and Support Vector Regression (SVR). The selected calibration model was validated using LOOCV and external cross-validation. The best calibration model was PCR, with R² and RMSEC values of FTIR and NIR of 0.9918885; 0.9752648 and 0.8675906; 1.5150245, respectively. Results: The results of the Paired-Sample T-test analysis of actual samples determined by the selected calibration model compared to the comparison method showed no significant difference.

Materials
Twenty-five (25) leaf samples of medicinal plants with...
varieties of phenolic content were collected from the residential and plantation areas in Jember city, East Java, Indonesia (Table I). Reagents used were ethanol 96%, gallic acid (Sigma-Aldrich), Folin-Ciocalteu’s reagent (Merck), Na₂CO₃ (Merck), filter paper, and distilled aqua dest. Five commercial samples (capsule preparations) were purchased from a pharmacy department store in Jember city. The instruments used were Moisture Analyser type PMB 53, NIR spectroscopy (Brimrose Corporation Luminar 3070), FTIR spectroscopy (Bruker Alpha), and UV-Vis spectroscopy (Hitachi U 1800).

Table I: Samples of leaves used and total phenolic content of the samples

| No | Code | Training set sample Name | mg GAE/g powder ± RSD (%) |
|----|------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1  | A    | Carica papaya             | 14.43 ± 3.520             |
| 2  | B    | Moringa oleifera          | 28.33 ± 1.547             |
| 3  | C    | Averrhoa Carambola         | 29.60 ± 3.056             |
| 4  | D    | Ocimum basilicum          | 31.83 ± 1.248             |
| 5  | E    | Gnetum gnemon             | 33.31 ± 1.201             |
| 6  | G    | Pandanus amaryllifolius   | 34.50 ± 0.785             |
| 7  | H    | Leucaena leucocephala     | 34.59 ± 0.994             |
| 8  | I    | Artocarpus heterophyllus  | 35.19 ± 0.754             |
| 9  | J    | Morinda citrifolia        | 35.57 ± 1.817             |
| 10 | L    | Diplazium esculentum      | 37.08 ± 2.410             |
| 11 | N    | Syzygium aquum            | 39.06 ± 1.643             |
| 12 | O    | Annona muricata           | 39.42 ± 2.630             |
| 13 | Q    | Psidium guajava           | 41.56 ± 1.770             |
| 14 | R    | Saurous androgynous       | 45.19 ± 1.741             |
| 15 | T    | Anredera cordiflia        | 45.98 ± 0.833             |
| 16 | U    | Syzygium polyanthum       | 47.19 ± 0.873             |
| 17 | V    | Cosmos caudatus           | 47.31 ± 0.333             |
| 18 | W    | Nephelium lappaceum       | 50.28 ± 1.294             |
| 19 | Y    | Persea Americana          | 60.27 ± 0.527             |
| 20 | F    | Piper betle               | 34.12 ± 1.752             |
| 21 | K    | Coffea canephora          | 36.89 ± 1.598             |
| 22 | M    | Chrysophyllum cainito     | 38.20 ± 2.418             |
| 23 | P    | Pluchea indica            | 40.47 ± 3.556             |
| 24 | S    | Pometia pinnata           | 45.27 ± 1.608             |
| 25 | X    | Mangifera indica          | 55.34 ± 1.879             |

Sample preparation

Leaf samples were powdered by a blender and divided into two groups, the training set and the test set. All samples were dried to fulfil the requirement of the moisture content of herbal powder that is below 10%.

Determination of the total phenolic content by UV-Vis spectroscopy as a comparing method

For the standard solution, 25 mg and 50 mg of gallic acid were weighed and dissolved in ethanol 96%, then diluted to concentrations of 10 ppm, 20 ppm, 40 ppm, 60 ppm, 80 ppm, 100 ppm, 120 ppm, 140 ppm, and 200 ppm. Then, 100.0 μl of each standard and sample solution was pipetted and added with 500.00 μl of Folin-Ciocalteu’s reagent, left for six minutes, added with 400.0 μl of Na₂CO₃ at 7.5 %, then allowed to stand for 80 minutes. The mixed solution was measured at a wavelength of 743 nm.

Determination of FTIR and NIR Spectra Data

All samples and gallic acid standards were scanned five replications by placing difference powder in the sample compartment of NIR and FTIR spectrometers. Each scan had five shots (Rahmawati et al., 2015; Wulandari et al., 2016). The NIR and FTIR spectra data were obtained through Acquire Brimrose (NIR) and OPUS (FTIR) software and each spectra data were code-named.

Determination of model calibration and validation of the model

Spectral data from FTIR at 4000–650 cm⁻¹ and NIR at 850–2000 nm were analysed by chemometrics using the Unscrambler X software version 10.2. Partial Least Square (PLS), Principal Component Regression (PCR), and Support Vector Regression (SVR) analysed FTIR and NIR spectral data to form a calibration model, and then the best model was selected based on R² value close to
one and the smallest value of RMSEC (Root Mean Square of Calibration) and RMSECV (Root Mean Square Error of Cross-Validation). The chosen model was validated using leave one out cross-validation (LOOCV) by taking out one of the training set sample data. The remaining data were used to reform the model. For external cross-validation, the test set consisting of six independent samples was analysed by the model, and the accuracy data results were determined. After validation, the model could be applied to determine the phenolic content of actual samples on the market. The result of the actual sample analysis was compared with the reference method (UV-vis spectrophotometry) with paired sample T-test (Kumar et al., 2015; Nicenboim & Vasishth, 2016).

Results
Each sample was provided with an identity code. The moisture content of all samples was less than 10% to eliminate the interference of water spectra and prevent microbial growth. The water content of the training set and the sample test set ranged from 3-6%. FTIR spectra of sample and gallic acid showed similar profiles with different intensities of reflectance (Figure 1). The results of total phenolic levels from the training set and the sample test set can be seen in Table I. The results obtained by the comparison method are in the range of 14.43-60.27 mg GAE/g.
The formation of the calibration model carried out on the training set data was obtained from FTIR and NIR spectra, processed, and developed for a calibration model with chemometrics. Table II shows that the best calibration model of FTIR spectra was PCR, with $R^2$, RMSE (Root Mean Square Error), and RMSECV values of 0.992, 0.868, and 0.980, respectively. The best calibration model of NIR spectra was also PCR, with $R^2$, RMSE, and RMSECV values of 0.975, 1.515, and 1.577, respectively. The results of the cross-validation showed that the selected model (PCR) was related to infrared spectra and phenolic content based on the $R^2$ result of LOOCV, higher than 0.91, with RMSE (Root Mean Square Error) and RMSECV having already small values (Lengkey et al., 2013). The result of the external cross-validation that was carried out using independent samples from a test set of known groups (Jung & Hu, 2015) showed valid results with an $R^2$ value of 0.989 and an RMSE value of 0.748, indicating that the selected model has good reliability. The selected and validated model was applied to determine the phenolic content in five actual samples as described in Table III.

Table II: Calibration results of the chemometric model

| Spectra | Model | RMSE | R-Square |
|---------|-------|------|----------|
| FTIR    | PLS   | 1.079| 0.987    |
|         | Calibration | 1.192| 0.985    |
|         | PCR    | 0.868| 0.992    |
|         | Calibration | 0.980| 0.990    |
|         | SVR    | 1.837| 0.967    |
|         | Calibration | 1.837| 0.967    |
| NIR     | PLS   | 1.638| 0.971    |
|         | Calibration | 1.702| 0.969    |
|         | PCR    | 1.515| 0.975    |
|         | Calibration | 1.577| 0.973    |
|         | SVR    | 2.334| 0.943    |
|         | Calibration | 2.438| 0.937    |

Table III: Results of total phenolic levels in actual samples

| Real Sample | FTIR          | NIR           | UV-Vis        |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| SN 1        | 25.06 ± 0.028 | 24.94 ± 0.064 | 25.15 ± 1.569 |
| SN2         | 38.06 ± 0.015 | 39.13 ± 0.360 | 39.26 ± 2.927 |
| SN3         | 21.55 ± 0.039 | 21.77 ± 0.160 | 21.74 ± 3.049 |
| SN4         | 40.65 ± 0.020 | 40.46 ± 0.200 | 40.49 ± 1.903 |
| SN5         | 15.84 ± 0.018 | 16.02 ± 0.890 | 16.03 ± 1.338 |

Discussion

A total of 25 samples were used, divided into 19 training sets and six sample test sets. The standard used was gallic acid because of its three hydroxyl groups (the more the hydroxyl groups, the higher the antioxidant activity) and because it is a simple phenolic derivative (Fernandes & Salgado, 2016). In this study, the Folin-Ciocalteu’s reagent was used to measure phenolic compounds in the test sample by colourimetric oxidation and reduction reaction. This reagent can oxidise phenolic compounds and reduce heteropoly acid to a molybdenum-tungsten complex (Hudz et al., 2019). The addition of 7.5% Na$_2$CO$_3$ made the medium alkaline because phenolic compounds can only react...
with the Folin-Ciocalteu's reagent under alkaline conditions. The dark blue colour indicated the higher concentrations of phenolic compounds. More phenolic ions reduce heteropoly acids to detect them later by UV-Vis spectroscopy (Asrin et al., 2018). The calibration model showed good results with R² closer to one and a small RMSE value. RMSEC and RMSECV were based on the smallest value. R² was close to one, indicating a linear correlation between the response variable and the predictor variable. The smaller the RMSE, the smaller the error of the model in predicting the response (Georgieva et al., 2013).

Conclusion
The infrared spectroscopy chemometric model can be used to determine the phenolic content of plant leaf powders. This method is simple, accurate, and environmentally friendly.
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