

# Antioxidant and antibacterial potentials of some Thai native plant extracts

<sup>1\*</sup>Thummajitasakul, S., <sup>3</sup>Tumchalee, L., <sup>2</sup>Koolwong, S., <sup>2</sup>Deetae, P., <sup>4</sup>Kaewsri, W. and <sup>5</sup>Lertsiri, S.

<sup>1</sup>Department of Health Promotion, Faculty of Health Science, Srinakharinwirot University, Nakornayok 26120, Thailand

<sup>2</sup>Food Technology Program, Mahidol University, Kanchanaburi Campus, Saiyok, Kanchanaburi 71150, Thailand

<sup>3</sup>Agricultural Science Program, Mahidol University, Kanchanaburi Campus, Saiyok, Kanchanaburi 71150,

Thailand

<sup>4</sup>Mahidol University, Amnatcharoen Campus, Amnatcharoen Province, 37000, Thailand

<sup>5</sup>Department of Biotechnology, Faculty of Science, Mahidol University, Bangkok 10400, Thailand

#### Article history

Received: 17 December 2013 Received in revised form: 9 April 2014 Accepted: 10 April 2014

#### **Keywords**

Native Thai plant extracts Antibacterial activity Antioxidant activity Total phenolic content FIC and ABTS Eight native Thai plant rarely studied were extracted by using distilled water and 95% ethanol then were investigated for their total phenolics, free radical scavenging, metal chelating and five antibacterial capacities. Five bacteria consisted of one gram-negative (*Esherichia coli*) and four gram-positive (*Stapphylococcus aureus*, *Stapphylococcus epidermidis*, *Bacillus cereus* and *Bacillus subtilis*). Significant difference was observed among solvent extractions used and the plant species. The aqueous extracts gave higher antioxidant abilities but lower antibacterial capacities than the ethanol ones. Principle component analysis (PCA) revealed that the free radical scavenging was correlated to the total phenolics. Among the eight species, *S. gratum* extracts showed the strongest free radical scavenging ability, while, *C. harmandiana* showed the strongest chelating capacity. The *G. cowa* extracts were exception in antibacterial capacities because their activities against all the test bacteria. Some native Thai plant rarely studied could be used as alternative natural sources for antibacterial and antioxidant substances.

© All Rights Reserved

# Introduction

Nowadays consumers widely concern about hazards of synthetic antibacterial and antioxidant agents, and their preferences in using natural products for good quality with eco-friendliness continue to grow (Gupta et al., 2008). On the other hand, various plant extracts have been used as flavoring, coloring, and preservative agents for thousand years throughout the world (Brandi et al., 2006). As tropical regions provide tremendous resource of plants with wide range of biodiversity, various plants have been known to be beneficial; however many species are still not well investigated for their valuable bioactive phytochemicals. The largest class of such beneficial phytochemicals is phenolic compounds which possess physiological or functional properties such as antiinflammatory, antimicrobial and antioxidant (Segura et al., 1998; Kazłowska et al., 2010; Maddox et al., 2010). Among those properties, antioxidation and antimicrobial are of our interest. Normally, human body is equipped with mechanisms to eliminate the free radicals and reactive oxygen species which are produced from oxygen consumption in aerobic metabolisms (Barros et al., 2007). In addition, external

**Abstract** 

factors such as radiation, air pollutant and tobacco smoke may also generate free radicals. When these reactive radicals are excessive or the antioxidants are insufficient, damage of cellular components such as lipids, proteins and nucleic acids can be enhanced and eventually lead to cell death, tissue damage, aging, and lesions such as cancer, diabetes and cardiovascular disease metabolisms (Rojas et al, 2003; Barros et al., 2007). Antioxidant activities of phenolics can act as radical scavengers and metal chelators (Deetae et al., 2012; Fawole et al., 2012). Together with phenolics, various phytochemicals such as alkaloids, terpenes and coumarins exhibit antibacterial properties (Arruda et al., 2011). Such properties of plant extracts are also applied in preservation of raw and processed food as well as for alternative treatments. Interestingly, these compounds also possesses antimicrobial activities as observed in preventing rancidity, off-flavor, changes of color and texture, and spoilage of fish, fruits and vegetables products (Ponce et al., 2008; Maqsood et al., 2013).

Nowadays, a rich diversity of plants exists in many regions of Thailand. Some indigenous plants are infrequent found, however their potential bioactivities cannot be neglected. Therefore, the plant species namely Clausena harmandiana, Clausena excavate, Garcinia cowa, Dolichandrone serrulata, Syzygium gratum, Limnophila aromatic, Boesenbergia pulcherrima and Ocimum gratissimum were investigated. Their leaves are edible and commonly used as local vegetables in Thailand; however a few studies related to their antioxidation and antibacterial activities have been conducted (Daduang *et al.*, 2011; Maneerat *et al.*, 2012). In this work, total phenolic contents, antioxidant properties and antibacterial abilities against some foodborne pathogens of the 8 native plant extracts were evaluated.

# **Materials and Methods**

# **Chemicals**

Folin–Ciocalteu's phenol reagent, gallic acid monohydrate and absolute ethanol were supplied from Sigma-Aldrich (Steinheim, Germany). Ferrozine (3-(2-pyridyl)-5, 6-diphenyl-1,2,4-triazine), 2,2'azino-bis 3-ethylbenzothiazoline-6-sulfonic acid diammonium salt (ABTS) were obtained from Fluka (Buchs, Switzerland). Glycerol and tryptone powder were obtained from Bio basic Inc. Agar and yeast extract was obtained from HIMEDIA (Mumbi, India). Ampicilin sodium salt was United States Pharmacopeia grade.

# **Plant materials**

*C. harmandiana*, *C. excavata*, *B. pulcherrima*, *S. gratum* and *L. aromatic* were collected from Mahidol university, Kanchanaburi campus. *D. serrulata*, *G. cowa* and *O. gratissimum*, were purchased from local markets at Pathum Thani province. The plant leaves were washed with distilled water and dried at 45°C for 2 days. The dried leaves of the plants were finely homogenized using a blender (Philips, Japan) and kept in plastic bags.

# **Extractions**

Solvent extraction was performed according to Ceyhan *et al.* (2012) with a few modifications. Sample 25 g (dried basis) was mixed with 250 ml of sterile distilled water or 95% ethanol, continuously stirred at 37°C for 14 h, and then filtered over sterile cheesecloth. After that, the crude extract was concentrated using a rotary evaporator (BUCHI Rotavapor R-205) at 45°C under vacuum. The concentration of dried extract was adjusted to 1000 mg/ml with the extracting solvent and stored at -20°C prior to further analysis.

# Determination of total phenolic contents

Total phenolic content of the plant extract was determined using the Folin–Ciocalteu assay (Deetae

*et al.*, 2012). Briefly, 300  $\mu$ l of each plant extract was reacted with 1.5 ml of Folin–Ciocalteu's reagent and 1.2 ml of sodium carbonate (7.5% w/v). Then, the reaction mixture was left in the dark for 30 mins and measured at 765 nm using a spectrophotometer (Thermo Spectronic model 4001/4, USA). The concentration of total phenolic compounds in the plant extract was expressed as mg of gallic acid equivalent per g sample.

# Antioxidant activities

## ABTS assay

The ABTS free radical-scavenging activity of each plant extract was determined according to Deetae et al. (2012). The ABTS solution was diluted with distilled water to obtain the absorbance of  $0.700 \pm 0.050$  at 734 nm. After that, the prepared ABTS solution (3.9 ml) was reacted with the crude extract (20 µl) in the dark at room temperature for 6 min. The absorbance for the sample at 734 nm was recorded. The antioxidant capacity was calculated using an equation as reported by Deetae et al. (2012). Extract concentration providing the 50% effective concentration (EC<sub>50</sub>) was calculated from the graph plotted in percentage against each extract concentration. The  $EC_{50}$  values were adjusted to antiradical activity (AAR) determined as 1/EC<sub>50</sub> due to this factor increases follow their antioxidant activity.

# FIC assay

The Ferrous Ion-Chelating (FIC) ability of each plant extract was determined according to Deetae *et al.* (2012). One millilitre of the crude extracts was reacted with 0.1 mM FeSO<sub>4</sub> (1 ml) and 0.25 mM ferrozine (1 ml). After the prepared mixture was kept at room temperature in the dark for 10 min, absorbance at 562 nm was measured. The percentage of metal chelating ability was calculated using an equation as reported (Deetae *et al.*, 2012) and the EC<sub>50</sub> and 1/EC<sub>50</sub> was calculated as described above.

#### Antibacterial activity

Antibacterial activity was determined using an agar disc diffusion method (Thummajitsakul *et al.*, 2012). Five bacterial strains, i.e. *Esherichia coli* (TISTR780), *Stapphylococcus aureus* (TISTR1466), *Stapphylococcus epidermidis* (TISTR518), *Bacillus cereus* (TISTR687) and *Bacillus subtilis* (TISTR008) obtained from Thailand Institute of Scientific and Technological Research were used as indicator strains. Single colony of each bacterial strains was cultured in 25 ml Plate Count Broth (PCB) at 37°C, shaking for 18 h. After that, cell density was adjusted to the range

of 0.1-0.5 OD at 600 nm using a spectrophotometer (Thermo Spectronic model 4001/4, USA) and spread on Plate Counting Agar (PCA). Each Paper disc (6 mm in diameter) was immersed in varied amounts of plant extract and placed on the surface of the inoculated plate which was incubated for 18 h at 37°C. The inhibition zone around the paper disc was calculated by subtraction of diameter of a clear zone with diameter of the paper disc.

## Statistical analysis

Values were means  $\pm$  standard deviation. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Pearson correlation analysis was performed using the method of Soper, 2013 (p < 0.05). Principle component analysis (PCA) was performed using Multibase 2013 implemented on Excel.

#### **Results and Discussion**

## Total phenolic contents

Among the 8 tested plants, the aqueous extract of S. gratum showed the highest total phenolic contents  $(38.87 \pm 8.60 \text{ mg gallic acid/g extract})$ , followed by C. excavate > C. harmandiana > D. serrulata > O. Gratissimum > B. pulcherrima > L. aromatic > G. cowa, respectively. Likewise, the S. gratum plant exhibited also the highest value of total phenolics in ethanol solvent (31.73  $\pm$  0.42 mg gallic acid/g extract), followed by D. serrulata > C. excavate > CG. cowa > O. Gratissimum > C. harmandiana > L. *aromatic* > B. *pulcherrima*, respectively (Table 1). The results of statistical analysis showed that types of plant and extracting solvents significantly influenced on the total phenolic contents. The aqueous extracts of all tested plants showed significantly higher total phenolic contents than the ethanol extract. Generally, the phenolic compounds are more soluble in high polar solvent (Grigonisa et al., 2005; Naczk et al., 2006). However, non-phenolic components can be co-extracted in the crude extract if water content is too high in the extracting solvent. Extractable phenolic compounds mostly found in the extracts are phenolic acids, phenylpropanoids, flavanoids and quinones, and non-soluble phenolic compounds are tannin and lignins (Rice-Evans et al., 1997). It has been reported that the amounts of phenolics can be affected by geographic locations, environment, season, part used, processing and storage (Perez-Jimenez and Saura-Calixto, 2005; Prior et al., 2005).

#### Antioxidant activities

ABTS free radicals produced from oxidation reaction with potassium persulfate were used to measure the capacity of a primary antioxidant species

Table 1. Total phenolic contents, free radical scavenging activity and metal-chelating activity of plant extracts. Values are means  $\pm$  standard deviation. n=4.

| values are means – standard de viation, ir 1. |                              |                         |                               |                          |   |                     |  |  |  |
|---|------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---|---------------------|--|--|--|
|   | FIC<br>(1/EC <sub>50</sub> ) |                         | ABTS<br>(1/EC <sub>50</sub> ) |                          | Total Phenolic contents<br>(mg gallic acid eq./g extract) |                     |  |  |  |
| Plant species                                 |                              |                         |                               |                          |   |                     |  |  |  |
|   | aqueous                      | 95% Ethanol             | aqueous                       | 95% Ethanol              | aqueous   | 95% Ethanol         |  |  |  |
| C. harmandiana                                | 42.19 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> *   | 2.33 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> | 24.94 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> *    | 3.10 x 10 <sup>-2</sup>  | 30.93±1.52  | 16.94 <u>+</u> 0.31 |  |  |  |
| C. excavata                                   | 15.80 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> *   | 2.33 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> | 23.58 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> *    | 7.61 x 10 <sup>-2</sup>  | 31.05±4.38  | 26.83±0.14          |  |  |  |
| G. cowa                                       | 2.16 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> *    | 1.79 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> | 6.73 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> *     | 9.18 x 10 <sup>-2</sup>  | 7.55±1.16   | 20.84 <u>+</u> 0.46 |  |  |  |
| D. serrulata                                  | 14.68 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> *   | 2.29 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> | 19.69 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> *    | 12.72 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> | 24.03±2.71  | 27.13±0.33          |  |  |  |
| S. gratum                                     | 22.57 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> *   | 1.91 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> | 126.58 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> *   | 18.73 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> | 38.87 <u>+</u> 8.60                                       | 31.73±0.42          |  |  |  |
| L. aromatic                                   | 8.87 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> *    | 2.09 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> | 7.66 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> *     | 2.85 x 10 <sup>-2</sup>  | 8.24±1.35   | 15.70±0.31          |  |  |  |
| B. pulcherrima                                | 19.57 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> *   | 2.16 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> | 9.81 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> *     | 2.66 x 10 <sup>-2</sup>  | 10.35+1.13  | 9.42+0.23           |  |  |  |
| O. Gratissimum                                | 37.04 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> *   | 2.07 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> | 8.21 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> *     | 12.21 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> | 13.33±0.70  | 18.54 <u>+</u> 0.14 |  |  |  |
| * demonstrat                                  | ted that aqueo               | ous extracts            | showed signif                 | icantly higher           | properties  | than ethanol        |  |  |  |
| extracts (P <                                 | 0.05)                        |                         |                               |                          |   |                     |  |  |  |

to donate hydrogen atoms (Naczk and Shahidi, 2006). The 1/EC<sub>50</sub> values indicating antiradical activity (AAR) were in the range of  $2.66 \times 10^{-2}$  to  $126.58 \times 10^{-2}$ . The types of plant and extraction solvents dominated on antioxidant capacities. The aqueous extract of S. gratum had the strongest free radical scavenging ability with the  $1/EC_{50}$  of 126.58 x 10<sup>-2</sup>, followed by C. harmandiana > C. excavate > D. serrulata > B. pulcherrima > O. Gratissimum > L. aromatic >G. cowa. Likewise, the ethanol extract of S. gratum showed the strongest antioxidant ability (18.73 x 10<sup>-2</sup>), followed by D. serrulata > O. Gratissimum > G. cowa > C. excavate > C. harmandiana > L.aromatic > B. pulcherrima (Table 1). The results were consistent with the previous report that the free radical scavenging capacities were found in extracts of L. aromatic and G. cowa (Daduang et al., 2011). The ability of chelate off metal ions was determined by the FIC assay. This involves blocking of a Fenton reaction which generates harmful hydroxyl radicals leading to occurrence of many diseases (Aruoma et al., 1987). In our results, the aqueous extracts of all tested plants showed also significant higher chelating abilities than ethanol extracts with the  $1/EC_{50}$  values in range 1.91 x  $10^{-2}$  to 42.19 x  $10^{-2}$ . The aqueous extract of C. harmandiana showed the strongest chelating ability with 1/EC<sup>50</sup> of 42.19 x 10<sup>-2</sup>, followed by O. Gratissimum > S. gratum > B. pulcherrima >  $B_{1}$ *C.* excavate > *D*. serrulata > *L*. aromatic > *G*. cowa. For the ethanol extract, C. harmandiana and C. excavate had also the strongest chelating ability (2.33 x 10<sup>-2</sup>), followed by D. serrulata > B. pulcherrima > L. aromatic > O. Gratissimum > S. gratum > G. cowa (Table 1).

#### Antibacterial activities

The results of statistical analysis showed that types of plant and extracting solvents significantly impacted on antibacterial activities. The aqueous extract of *G. cowa* demonstrated the highest antibacterial activity effective against all tested bacteria with mean zones of inhibition ranging from  $6.17\pm1.72$  to  $11.33\pm1.37$  mm, followed by *D. serrulata* and *S. gratum*. For the ethanol extracts, *G. cowa* also had the highest antibacterial activity ( $6.67\pm0.52$  to  $9.17\pm0.98$ ), followed by *O.* 

Table 2. Antibacterial activities of eight plant extracts against five pathogens. Values are means  $\pm$ standard deviation n = 3

|                | Inhibition zone (mm) |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |  |  |  |
|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
| Plant species  | Extract              | Bacterial strains   |                     |                     |                     |                     |  |  |  |
|                | (1 g/ml)             | E. coli             | B. subtilis         | B. cereus           | S. aureus           | S. epidermi.        |  |  |  |
| C. harmandiana | aqueous              | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |  |  |  |
|                | 95% Ethanol          | 4.50±1.04*          | 6.00 <u>+</u> 0.63* | 8.17±1.17*          | 7.33±0.82*          | 8.67 <u>+</u> 0.52  |  |  |  |
| C. excavata    | aqueous              | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |  |  |  |
|                | 95% Ethanol          | 5.50 <u>+</u> 1.05* | 5.33 <u>+</u> 0.52* | 6.83 <u>+</u> 0.41* | 8.83 <u>+</u> 0.75* | 8.17 <u>+</u> 0.40' |  |  |  |
| G. cowa        | aqueous              | 6.17 <u>+</u> 1.72  | 7.83±1.47           | 8.67 <u>+</u> 1.51  | 6.17 <u>+</u> 0.98* | 11.33±1.37          |  |  |  |
|                | 95% Ethanol          | 6.67 <u>+</u> 0.52  | 6.83±0.75           | 8.33 <u>+</u> 0.82  | 9.17 <u>+</u> 0.98* | 8.33±0.82           |  |  |  |
| D. serrulata   | aqueous              | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |  |  |  |
|                | 95% Ethanol          | 0                   | 6.67 <u>+</u> 2.34* | 8.83±0.41*          | 0.67 <u>+</u> 0.26* | 8.33±1.63           |  |  |  |
| S. gratum      | aqueous              | 0                   | 3.00±1.55           | 4.00 <u>+</u> 0.00  | 3.67 <u>+</u> 0.52  | 3.83 <u>+</u> 0.41  |  |  |  |
|                | 95% Ethanol          | 0                   | 3.83 <u>+</u> 0.41  | 4.00±1.09           | 4.00 <u>+</u> 0.63  | 5.00 <u>+</u> 1.67  |  |  |  |
| L. aromatic    | aqueous              | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |  |  |  |
|                | 95% Ethanol          | 2.50±1.22*          | 2.83±0.41*          | 3.67 <u>+</u> 0.52* | 3.67 <u>+</u> 0.52* | 4.50 <u>+</u> 0.55' |  |  |  |
| B. pulcherrima | aqueous              | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |  |  |  |
|                | 95% Ethanol          | 1.50±1.76*          | 5.83 <u>+0.75</u> * | 3.17±1.47*          | 3.33±1.63*          | 6.17 <u>+</u> 3.49  |  |  |  |
| O. Gratissimum | aqueous              | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   | 0                   |  |  |  |
|                | 95% Ethanol          | 6.33±0.82*          | 6.66±1.03*          | 7.16±0.57*          | 9.33±0.81*          | 9.33±0.81           |  |  |  |
| * demonstra    | ted that ethan       | ol extracts sh      | nowed signifi       | cantly high         | er activities       | than aqueo          |  |  |  |

Gratissimum > C. excavata > D. serrulata > C.harmandiana > B. pulcherrima > S. gratum and L. aromatic, respectively (Table 2). However, the ethanol extracts of D. serrulata and S. gratum showed limited effect against the gram-negative bacteria E. coli. Our results consist with previously reported (Siridechakorn et al., 2012), who found new dihydrobenzopyran and xanthone derivatives from G. cowa stem exhibited the antibacterial activities against E. coli, S. typhimurium, S. aureus and methicillin-resistant S. aureus (MRSA). Similarly, the new carbazole alkaloids from C. harmandiana twigs had the antibacterial activity against E. coli, S. typhimurium, S. aureus and methicillin-resistant S. aureus (MRSA) (Maneerat et al., 2012). It has been reported that phenolics can form complexes with proteins and bacterial membranes, or involve membrane disruption to inactivate microbial growth (Prior et al., 2005). However, the gram-negative bacteria were more resistant to the plant extracts than the gram-positive bacteria because the cell wall of gram-negative bacteria had morphology more complex than those of gram-positive bacteria. It might be explained by the effect of lipopolysaccharides in their outer membrane (Spigno et al., 2007).

#### Statistical analysis

Pearsons' correlation coefficient between each mean variable was determined. The correlation between the content of total phenolics and the 1/ EC<sub>50</sub> values of ABTS assay was strongly significant positive (r = 0.641, p < 0.05), indicating that higher phenolic components affected to increase freeradical scavenging abilities of each plant extract. The correlation between the  $1/EC_{50}$  values of FIC assay and the total phenolic contents was not significant (r = 0.228, p > 0.05), indicating that some phenolic compounds in each plant extract might not show binding activities to metal ions. The correlation of antibacterial activities with the total phenolic contents and the EC<sub>50</sub> of ABTS assay were not significant (r = -0.085, -0.110; p > 0.05, respectively). The antibacterial activities and the 1/EC<sub>50</sub> values of FIC



Figure 1. PCA loading plot of variables, i.e. total phenolic contents, free radical scavenging activity, metal-chelating activity and antibacterial activity



Figure 2. PCA score plot demonstrating two groups of variances, i.e. plant water extracts and plant ethanol extracts of 8 species (*C. harmandiana*, *C. excavate*, *G. cowa*, *D. serrulata*, *S. gratum*, *L. aromatic*, *B. pulcherrima* and *O. Gratissimum*). Last letter followed the species name of A or E denoted water extract and ethanol extract respectively. Numbers 1 to 8 illustrated the descending order of total phenolic contents found in aqueous and ethanol extracts.

assay showed a significant negative correlation (r = -0.691, p < 0.05). It may be explained that some phenolic compounds or antioxidants in the extracts were not function as antibacterial agents, and other non-phenolics in plant extracts can act as antibacterial substances such as antibacterial peptides from edible plant leaves (Song *et al.*, 2012), and organic acids which can disrupt the bacteria cell wall of some pH-sensitive pathogens such as *E. coli* (Raybaudi-Massilia *et al.*, 2009). Therefore, the antibacterial abilities could not refer solely to total phenolic contents or antioxidants, even though, the FIC assay showed a significant negative correlation.

PCA was performed to get insight of interrelation between variables and group of variances. PC, and PC, explained 51% and 33% of variances, respectively. PC1 loadings consisted of free radical scavenging activity, metal-chelating ability and antibacterial activity, while PC2 loading was only the total phenolic content. Factor loading plot showed that total phenolic content located separately from free radical scavenging, metal-chelating and antibacterial activities (Figure 1). On the other hand, score plot showed that the plant extracts were divided into two groups based on their extracting solvents, i.e. water and 95% ethanol (Figure 2). When both of the plots were superimposed, interrelation among extracting solvent, antibacterial activity, the total phenolic content, free radical scavenging activity and metal-

chelating ability was demonstrated. It was clear that most of ethanol extracts showed higher antibacterial activity and metal chelating activity. It has been reported that plant ethanol extracts mostly has higher antibacterial activity than the aqueous extracts (Rispail et al., 2005). On the other hand, free radical scavenging activity of ethanol extracts of C. excavata, L. aromatic and B. pulcherrima were outstandingly high. However, these functional properties of interest seem not directly related to the total phenolic contents. It has been reported that some edible vegetables (i.e. L. aromatic from shoot tip) with low phenolic contents had high free radical scavenging activity abilities in ethanol extracts (Daduang et al., 2011). It may be affected by other antioxidants which are nonphenolic compounds such as pigments and ascorbic acids (Conklin et al., 2004).

## Conclusions

Our studies demonstrated that eight native Thai plants rarely studied had both antioxidant and antibacterial properties. However, the capacities depended on solvent extraction used and plant species. The aqueous plant extracts gave higher in total phenolic contents, free radical scavenging and metal-chelating abilities but lower in antibacterial activity than the ethanol ones. Among the 8 species, S. gratum extracts were the exception for free radical scavenging activity. C. harmandiana extract gave the highest metal chelating property. G. cowa extracts were outstanding for antibacterial capacities since their activities against all tested bacteria including Esherichia coli, Stapphylococcus aureus, Stapphylococcus epidermidis, Bacillus cereus and Bacillus subtilis. Therefore, some native Thai plants rarely studied had antioxidant and antibacterial potentials. They may be used as alternative natural sources applicable to agriculture, cosmetic and food products.

# Acknowledgements

This research project was supported by Mahidol University. We thank to the instrument center of Mahidol University, Kanchanaburi Campus.

# References

- Arruda, A. L., Vieira, C. J., Sousa, D. G., Oliveira, R. F. and Castilho, R. O. 2011. *Jacaranda cuspidifolia* Mart. (*Bignoniaceae*) as antibacterial agent. Journal of Medicinal Food 14 (12): 1604–1608.
- Aruoma, O. I., Grootveld, M. and Halliwell, B. 1987. The role of iron in ascorbate dependent deoxyribose

degradation. Evidence consistent with a sitespecifichydroxyl radical generation caused by iron ions bound to the deoxyribose molecule. Journal of Inorganic Biochemistry 29 (4): 289–299.

- Barros, L., Ferreira, M.J., Queiros, B., Ferreira, I. C. F. R. and Baptista, P. 2007. Total phenols, ascorbic acid, b-carotene and lycopene in Portuguese wild edible mushrooms and their antioxidant activities. Food Chemistry 103 (2): 413-419.
- Brandi, G., Amagliani, G., Schiavano, G. F., De Santi, M. and Sisti, M. 2006. Activity of *Brassica oleracea* leaf juice on food-borne pathogenic bacteria. Journal of Food Protection 69 (9): 2274-2279.
- Ceyhan, N., Keskin, D. and Uğur, A. 2012. Antimicrobial activities of different extracts of eight plant species from four different family against some pathogenic microorganisms. Journal of Food, Agriculture and Environment 10: 193-197.
- Conklin, P. L. and Barth, C. 2004. Ascorbic acid, a familiar small molecule intertwined in the response of plants to ozone, pathogens, and the onset of senescence. Plant Cell and Environment 27 (8): 959–970.
- Daduang, J., Vichitphan, S., Daduang, S., Hongsprabhas, P. and Boonsiri, P. 2011. High phenolics and antioxidants of some tropical vegetables related to antibacterial and anticancer activities. African Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmacology 5(5): 608-615.
- Deetae, P., Parichanon, P., Trakunleewatthana, P., Chanseetis, C. and Lertsiri, S. 2012. Antioxidant and anti-glycation properties of Thai herbal teas in comparison with conventional teas. Food Chemistry 133 (3): 953–959.
- Fawole, O.A., Makunga, N.P. and Opara, U.L. 2012. Antibacterial, antioxidant and tyrosinase-inhibition activities of pomegranate fruit peel methanolic extract. BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine 12 (1): 200-225.
- Grigonisa, D., Venskutonisa, P.R., Sivikb, B., Sandahlb, M. and Eskilssonc, C.S. 2005. Comparison of different extraction techniques for isolation of antioxidants from sweet grass (*Hierochloë odorata*). The Journal of Supercritical Fluids 33 (3): 223-233.
- Gupta, C., Garg, A.P., Uniyal, R.C. and Kumari, A. 2008. Antimicrobial activity of some herbal oils against common food-borne pathogens. African Journal of Microbiology Research 2: 258-261.
- Kazłowska, K., Hsu, T., Hou, C. C., Yang, W. C., Tsai and G. J. 2010. Anti-inflammatory properties of phenolic compounds and crude extract from *Porphyra dentata*. Journal of Ethnopharmacology 128 (1): 123-130.
- Maneerat, W., Phakhodee, W., Ritthiwigrom, T., Cheenpracha, .S, Promgool, T., Yossathera, K., Deachathai, S. and Laphookhieo, S. 2012. Antibacterial carbazole alkaloids from *Clausena harmandiana* twigs. Fitoterapia 83 (6): 1110–1114.
- Maddox, C.E., Laur, L. M. and Tian, L. 2010. Antibacterial activity of phenolic compounds against the phytopathogen *Xylella fastidiosa*. Current Microbiology 60 (1): 53–58.
- Maqsood, S., Benjakul, S. and Shahidi, F. 2013. Emerging

role of phenolic compounds as natural food additives in fish and fish products. Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition 53 (2): 162-179.

- Naczk, M. and Shahidi, F. 2006. Phenolics in cereals, fruits and vegetables: Occurence, extraction and analysis. Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis 41 (5): 1523-1542.
- Perez-Jimenez, J. and Saura-Calixto, F. 2005. Literature data may underestimate the actual antioxidant capacity of cereals. Journal of Agricultural Food Chemistry 53 (12): 5036-5040.
- Ponce, A., Roura, S., del Valle, C. and Moreira, M. 2008. Antimicrobial and antioxidant activities of edible coatings enriched with natural plant extracts: In vitro and in vivo studies. Postharvest Biology and Technology 49 (2): 294-300.
- Prior, R.L., Wu, X.L. and Schaich, K. 2005. Standardized methods for the determination of antioxidant capacity and phenolics in foods and dietary supplements. Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry 53 (10): 4290-4302.
- Raybaudi-Massilia, R., Mosqueda-Melgar, J., Soliva-Fortuny, R., Martin-Belloso, O. 2009. Control of Pathogenic and Spoilage Microorganisms in Fresh-cut Fruits and Fruit Juices by Traditional and Alternative Natural Antimicrobials. Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety 8 (3): 157-180.
- Rice-Evans, C. A., Miller, N. J. and Paganga, G. 1997. Antioxidant properties of phenolic compounds. Trends in Plant Science 2(8): 152–159.
- Rispail, N., Morris, P. and Webb, K.J. 2005. Phenolic compounds: extraction and analysis, p. 349-355. Lotus japonicus handbook.
- Rojas, R., Bustamante, B. and Bauer, J. 2003. Antimicrobial activity of selected Peruvian medicinal plants. Journal of Ethnopharmacology 88 (6): 199-204.
- Segura, A., Moreno, M., Molina, A. and Garcia-Olmedo, F. 1998. Novel defensin subfamily from spinach (*Spinacia oleracea*). FEBS Letters 435 (2-3): 159-162.
- Siridechakorn, I., Phakhodee, W., Ritthiwigrom, T., Promgool, T., Deachathai, S., Cheenpracha, S., Prawat, U. and Laphookhieo, S. 2012. Antibacterial dihydrobenzopyran and xanthone derivatives from *Garcinia cowa* stem barks. Fitoterapia 83 (8): 1430-424.
- Song, S.J., Li, L.Z., Gao, P.Y., Yuan, Y.Q., Wang, R.P., Liu, K. C. and Peng, Y. 2012. Isolation of antithrombotic phenolic compounds from the leaves of *Crataegus pinnatifida*. Planta Medica 78(18): 1967-1971.
- Internet: Soper, D.S. 2013. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Calculator - One-Way ANOVA from Summary Data [Software]. Downloaded from *http://www.danielsoper. com/statcalc.*
- Spigno, G., Tramelli, L. and Faveri, D.M. 2007. Effects of extraction time, temperature and solvent on concentration and antioxidant activity of grape marc phenolics. Journal of Food Engineering 81 (1): 200-208.
- Thummajitsakul, S., Silprasit, K. and Sittipraneed, S.

2012. Antibacterial activity of crude extracts of cyanobacteria *Phormidium* and *Microcoleus* species. African Journal of Microbiology Research 6 (10): 2574-2579