Comparative Evaluation of Phytochemical, Antioxidant, and Antibacterial Properties from the Essential Oils of Four Commonly Consuming Plants in Iran
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HIGHLIGHTS

- Clove had more antioxidant properties comparing to cumin, origanum, and anise Essential Oils (EOs).
- *Bacillus cereus* and *Escherichia coli* had the highest and lowest susceptibility to the EOs, respectively.
- Studied EOs can be regarded as antioxidant and antimicrobial agents in Iranian food industries.

ABSTRACT

**Background:** This study aimed at investigation of the chemical composition, antimicrobial activity, and antioxidant properties of clove, cumin, origanum, and anise Essential Oils (EOs).

**Methods:** Chemical compositions of the EOs were identified using Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry (GC/MS). The antibacterial activities of EOs against four important food-borne bacteria were assessed by disc diffusion, agar well diffusion, and broth micro-dilution assays. Evaluation of antioxidant properties of the EOs was carried out by 2,2-diphenyl-1-pircylhydrazyl (DPPH) assay, β-carotene-linoleic acid bleaching test, and total phenolic contents as well. Statistical analysis of data was performed using SPSS, Inc, Chicago, IL software.

**Results:** Eugenol (69.26%) was the main constituents of studied EOs. Although, all five tested bacteria were sensitive to EOs, but *Bacillus cereus* and *Escherichia coli* had the highest and lowest susceptibility to the antibacterial activity of EOs (p<0.05), respectively. Remarkable antioxidant capacity was observed in all EOs; however, clove EO had the highest antioxidant properties (p<0.05).

**Conclusion:** Clove, cumin, origanum, and anise EOs could be regarded as potential sources of natural antioxidant and antimicrobial agents in Iranian food industries and the best results was belonged to clove EO.

Introduction

Both natural and also synthetic antioxidants are widely applied for food preservation (Kamkar et al., 2014). The most common synthetic antioxidants in food are including butylated hydroxy anisole, Butylated hydroxytoluene (BHT), propyl gallate, and tertiary butyl hydroquinone...
that have been suspected to case harmful effects to the health (Kamkar et al., 2014). Nowadays, demand for reducing use of synthetic food preservatives have increased throughout the world. Therefore, substitution of synthetic antioxidants by natural agents has caused great interest in food research (Hur et al., 2014).

Reactive oxygen and nitrogen species are constantly produced in human and are controlled by some endogenous enzymes, e.g. glutathione peroxidase, superoxide dismutase, as well as catalase. When these radicals are overproduced, vital biomolecules may be damaged (Oke et al., 2009). Antioxidants have been reported to prevent oxidative damage and may prevent the occurrence of some diseases such as cancer. They can interfere with the oxidation process and diminish them by scavenging free radicals or chelating catalytic metals. A large number of vegetables and plants Essential Oils (EOs) are known to be rich sources in antioxidants (Kamkar et al., 2014; Oke et al., 2009). Fruits, vegetables, and plants contain some antioxidant compounds, including phenolic compounds, carotenoids, anthocyanins, and tocopherols (Hur et al., 2014; Naczk and Shahidi, 2006). The EOs of vegetables and plants are liquid volatile oily and aromatic with density less than water. They are widely used as food preservatives in order to control the growth of pathogenic and spoilage microorganisms in food (Abdollahzadeh et al., 2014; Alboofetileh et al., 2014; Azhdarzadeh and Hojjati, 2016; Azizkhani et al., 2013; Dashipour et al., 2015; Khorasany et al., 2016; Miguel, 2010; Shojaee-Aliabadi et al., 2013). There are various herbs in Iran in some other parts of the world that are used in traditional medicine and food preservation such as clove (Eugenia caryophyllata Thunberg), cumin (Cuminum cyminum L.), origanum (Origanum vulgare), and anise (Pimpinella anisum) (Al-Bayati, 2008; Dhandapani et al., 2002; Johri, 2011; Moradi et al., 2014; Shojaei and Abdollahi Fard, 2012; Singh et al., 2012).

The objectives of this study were (1) to determine the chemical composition of hydro-distilled EOs of clove, anise, cumin, and origanum, (2) to investigate the antimicrobial activity of these EOs against Escherichia coli, Salmonella thphimurium, Staphilococcus aureus, Listeria monocytogenes, as well as Bacillus cereus, (3) to evaluate antioxidant capacity of these EOs.

Materials and methods

Plant materials and EOs preparation

In this experimental study, the aerial parts of *E. caryophyllata*, *P. anisum*, *O. vulgare*, and *C. cyminum* were purchased from local markets in Urmia, West Azarbayjan, Iran. The plants were confirmed at Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Resources of Urmia University, Urmia, Iran. Extraction of EOs was performed using a Clevenger type apparatus for 3 h. The obtained EOs were dehydrated over anhydrous sodium sulfate, filtered by 0.22 μm filters, and were stored at 4 °C for further experiments (Hashemi et al., 2013; Raeisi et al., 2012).

Identification of the EOs components

According to Moradi et al. (2014), Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry (GC/MS) analysis of EOs was performed using Hewlett Packard 5890 equipped with an HP-5MS capillary column (30×0.25 mm ID×0.25 mm film thickness). Flow rate of helium was 1 ml/min. The column temperature was initially 50 °C and then gradually increased to 120 °C at a 2 °C/min rate, held for 3 min, and finally increased to 300 °C. The MS procedure was operated with ionization energy of 70 eV. The compounds were identified by comparing their retention indices with those of credible samples and mass spectral data available in the Wiley library (Wiley-VCH 2001 data software, Weinheim, Germany).

Determination of antibacterial activities of EOs

Two Gram-negative bacteria, including *E. coli* (PTCC 1533) and *S. thphimurium* (PTCC 1730); and three Gram-positive bacteria, including *S. aureus* (PTCC 1015), *L. monocytogenes* (PTCC 1298), and *B. cereus* (PTCC 1665) were obtained from microbial collection of Department of Food Hygiene and Quality Control, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Urmia University, Urmia, Iran.

For disk diffusion method, an amount of 0.1 ml of 18 h grown bacterial cultures (1.5×10^8 CFU/ml) were spread on plates containing Mueller-Hinton agar (Merck Darmstadt, Germany) and sterile paper disks (Patan Teb, Iran) with 6 mm diameter were impregnated with 10 μl EOs and placed on the agar media. The plates were then incubated at 37 °C for 24 h and diameters of inhibition zones were measured in mm (Moradi et al., 2014).

To do well diffusion method, an amount of 1 ml of 18 h broth culture of bacteria was added to 100 ml of molten Mueller-Hinton agar (Merck Darmstadt, Germany), which were cooled to 45 °C, completely mixed for 2 min and poured into sterile plates. When agar was set, four wells were cut in each plate using a sterile cork-borer and 10 μl EOs were poured in each well. The plates were incubated at 37 °C for 72 h and the diameter of inhibitory zones was measured in mm (Boyanova et al., 2005).

Micro-well dilution assay was used to determine the Minimum Inhibitory Concentration (MIC) of EOs for the bacterial strains (Hashemi et al., 2013). Bacterial suspensions were prepared from 18 h broth cultures (1.5×10^8 CFU/ml), EOs was dissolved in 10% dimethyl sulfoxide. Then, the solutions firstly were diluted to the highest
concentration (100000 μg/ml) as a stock solution, and then serial two-fold dilutions were made in a concentration range from 100000 to 1562.5 μg/ml in nutrient broth. Aliquots of 160 μl Brain Heart Infusion (BHI) broth (Merck Darmstadt, Germany) and 20 μl inoculums were dispensed into 96-well micro plate. Amount of 20 μl EOs concentrations was then added into each well. Positive control (180 μl BHI broth+20 μl inoculums) and negative controls (180 μl uninoculated BHI broth+20 μl EOs) were considered in the last wells. The ultimate volume in each well was 200 μl, the final concentrations of EOs were in a range between 10000 to 156.2 μg/ml and final bacterial suspensions in each well was approximately 1.5×10⁵ CFU/ml. The lowest concentration with no visible bacterial growth was regarded as the MIC values of EOs.

**Determination of antioxidant properties of EOs**

The 2,2-diphenyl-1-picrylhydrazyl (DPPH) assay was performed as previously described with minor modification (Aminzare et al., 2015). The amount of 50 μl from various concentrations of EOs and a reference antioxidant (BHT) were added to 2 ml methanolic solution of DPPH (24 μg/ml). The mixture was shaken and maintained for 60 min at room temperature in a dark place. Then, the absorbance was measured at 515 nm against a blank sample, a solution without any antioxidant, using a spectrophotometer (LKB Novaspec II; Pharmacia, Sweden). The capability of EOs to scavenge the DPPH radicals was calculated using the following equation:

\[ I\% = (A_{\text{blank}} - A_{\text{sample}})/A_{\text{blank}} \times 100 \]

EOs concentration providing 50% inhibition (IC₅₀) was measured according to the curve of inhibition percentage of each sample.

β-carotene-linoleic acid bleaching test was carried out as previously described by Miraliakbari and Shahidi (2008) with minor modification. In order to prepare stock solution of β-carotene-linoleic acid, approximately 0.5 mg β-carotene (type I synthetic, Sigma–Aldrich) was dissolved in chloroform (1 ml) in a flask. Then, 20 μl linoleic acid (Sigma–Aldrich) and 200 mg tween 40 (Sigma–Aldrich) were added into the flask. The chloroform was removed completely using a rotary evaporator (Heidolph laborta 4003, SchwaBach, Germany) at 40 °C and 100 ml distilled water was added and vigorously shaken. Aliquots of this mixture (2.5 ml) were pipetted in test tubes containing 350 μl EOs (concentration: 2 mg/ml). The same procedure was repeated with BHT and a blank. The absorbance of each tube was measured at 470 nm immediately at zero time and after a two-hour period; the tubes were kept in a water bath at 50 °C. The capacity of EOs to protect against oxidation of β-carotene was determined as following equation:

\[ I\% = (A_{\text{β-carotene after 2 h assay}}/A_{\text{initial β-carotene}}) \times 100 \]

Total phenolic contents of EOs were carried out using Folin-Ciocalteu reagent assay with gallic acid as a standard (Aliakbarlu et al., 2013). Briefly, 0.5 ml EO (concentration: 2 mg/ml) was mixed with 2.25 ml distilled water and 250 μl Folin-Ciocalteu reagent, and completely vortexed. The mixtures were allowed to react for 5 min; and then, aliquots of 2 ml Na₂CO₃ solution (7.5%) were added. After incubation period of 120 min at room temperature, absorbance of the mixtures was measured at 760 nm and data were expressed as mg of gallic acid equivalent per g of EOs, relative to the values obtained with a standard curve prepared using known concentrations of gallic acid.

**Statistical analysis**

All assays were performed in triplicate. Statistical analysis of data was carried out using SPSS, Inc, Chicago, IL software (v. 16.0). Tukey’s test was used to compare differences among mean values obtained from the experiments (p<0.05).

**Results**

The main constituents of EOs are summarized in Table 1. GC/MS analysis of the clove, cumin, origanum, and anise EOs identified 7, 13, 25, and 17 components representing 98.10, 99.27, 97.23, and 96.35% of total content of studied EOs, respectively. Eugenol (69.26%), cuminaldehyde (38.27%), thymol (21.83%), and also trans-anethole (59.67%) were determined as the main constituents of clove, cumin, origanum, as well as anise EOs, respectively.

Results of *in vitro* antibacterial activities of EOs against tested food-borne bacterial strains were assessed using disk diffusion, well diffusion, and broth micro-dilution methods, as shown in Table 2 to Table 4, respectively. All EOs had antibacterial effect against tested Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria. *B. cereus* as well as *E. coli* had the highest and lowest susceptibility to the antibacterial activity of EOs (p<0.05), respectively. On the other hand, inhibition pattern of antibacterial effect of applied EOs on each bacterium was compared and the following order was observed in all tested bacteria, clove>origanum>cumin>anise.

Results of antioxidant activities of EOs, assessed by three basically different systems namely DPPH radical scavenging activity, β carotene-linoleic acid bleaching test, and total phenolic content assays has been shown in Table 5.
As it can be seen, results disclosed remarkable antioxidant capacity in all tested EOs using different methods. However, clove EO had the highest antioxidant properties (38.20 µg/ml for DPPH test, 211.80 mg gallic acid equivalent/g EO for total phenolic content as well as 93.03% for β-carotene-linoleic acid bleaching test) among the tested EOs having significant difference (p<0.05).

Table 1: Chemical components of clove, anise, cumin, and origanum EOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>KI</th>
<th>Concentration of chemical component (%) in EOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>α-thujene</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>α-pinene</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-octen-3-ol</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3-octanone</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>β-myrcene</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>α-terpinene</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Limonene</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>γ-terpinene</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>β-linalool</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>β-thujone</td>
<td>1122</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sabinol</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bornol</td>
<td>1174</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>α-terpinelol</td>
<td>1188</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Citronellol</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Carvone</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Thymol</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Thymol acetate</td>
<td>1347</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Carvacrol acetate</td>
<td>1364</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Eugenol</td>
<td>1402</td>
<td>69.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Caryophyllene</td>
<td>1453</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>α-humulene</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Germacrene-D</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>γ-cardinene</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Myristicin</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Spathulenol</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>α-Farnesene</td>
<td>1495</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>P-cymene</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Terpinene-4-ol</td>
<td>1182</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2-carene-10-al</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Cinnamaldehyde</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Myrtanol</td>
<td>1211</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Camphene</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>β-pinene</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>β-myrcene</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>α-phellandrene</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>P-cymene</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Methyl chavicol</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Trans-anethole</td>
<td>1285</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Elemene</td>
<td>1335</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>β-phellandrene</td>
<td>1449</td>
<td>18.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>γ-himachalene</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Methyl eugenol</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Germacrene-D</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total content</td>
<td>98.10</td>
<td>99.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Kovats Indices (KI) calculated against n-alkanes on HP-5 column

Table 2: Antibacterial effect of EOs on tested bacterial strains based on disk diffusion method (mean±standard deviation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EOs</th>
<th>E. coli</th>
<th>S. thymaurnium</th>
<th>S. aureus</th>
<th>L. monocytogenes</th>
<th>B. cereus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clove</td>
<td>9.17±0.45</td>
<td>11.77±0.15</td>
<td>15.24±0.47</td>
<td>12.83±0.21</td>
<td>15.37±0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumin</td>
<td>6.90±0.47</td>
<td>9.37±0.21</td>
<td>9.57±0.40</td>
<td>9.53±0.31</td>
<td>10.53±0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origanum</td>
<td>6.93±0.30</td>
<td>9.53±0.31</td>
<td>13.93±0.31</td>
<td>12.56±0.26</td>
<td>14.20±0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anise</td>
<td>6.37±0.47</td>
<td>9.04±0.25</td>
<td>8.27±0.31</td>
<td>8.27±0.31</td>
<td>11.27±0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values followed by the same letter are not significantly different (p>0.05) according to Tukey’s multiple range test
Results of previous studies showed that antibacterial effect of EOs against Gram-positive are higher than Gram-negative bacteria, because, polysaccharide part of lipopolysaccharides and divalent cations in the outer cell membrane of Gram-negative bacteria has hydrophilic properties that prevents the contact of the hydrophobic constituents of EOs with the bacterial cell. Results of the present study were completely consistent with results obtained by other researchers (Akhondzadeh Basti et al., 2014; Moradi et al., 2014; Nunez and D’Aquino, 2012; Shojaei and Abdollahi Fard, 2012). Hashemi et al. (2013) reported that Minimum Inhibitory Concentration (MIC) values of *Echinophora platyloba* EO against *L. monocytogenes* as well as *S. aureus* were found more sensitive to EOs than *S. typhimurium* and *E. coli*. Results of previous studies showed that antibacterial effect of EOs against Gram-negative bacteria has hydrophilic properties that prevents the contact of the hydrophobic constituents of EOs with the bacterial cell. Results of the present study were completely consistent with results obtained by other researchers (Akhondzadeh Basti et al., 2014; Moradi et al., 2014; Nunez and D’Aquino, 2012; Shojaei and Abdollahi Fard, 2012). Hashemi et al. (2013) reported that Minimum Inhibitory Concentration (MIC) values of *Echinophora platyloba* EO against *L. monocytogenes* as well as *S. aureus* were 6250 and 12500 ppm, respectively. Tajik et al. (2015) reported that the MIC value of *Zataria multiflora* Boiss EO against *L. monocytogenes* was 625 μg/ml. Based on the results, clove EO had the highest antibacterial effect against all tested bacteria, probably due to the presence of high amount of eugenol (69.26%), which was a known phenolic agent (Burt, 2004). Due to existence of different chemical components, there was not a specific mechanism for antibacterial effects of EOs. Among the proposed mechanisms, including cell walls disruption, loss of cell contents, destroying of cytoplasm.

The major components of clove EO seen in the current study were orderly eugenol, β-caryophyllene as well as α-caryophyllene which were similar to components of native clove EO collected from India and also Argentina (Nunez and D’Aquino, 2012; Singh et al., 2012). Cuminaldehyde, γ-terpinene, β-pinene, o-cymene, and myrtenal were the major compounds of clove EO that were confirmed in another study as well (Johri, 2011). The major compounds of origanum EO, including tAMILY, citronellol, carophyllene, spathulenol, and α-terpinol were completely consistent with results of former studies (Mitchell et al., 2010; Teixeira et al., 2013). Also, we found that the major compounds of *P. anisetum* EO were orderly trans-anethole, limonene, methyl chavicol, and γ-himachalene. However, Shojaei et al. (2012) determined trans-anethole and estragol as major components of the oil belonging to *P. anisetum* collected from Iran. Results of other studies were completely consistent with the present study; although there were some differences in components and their quantities. This variation can be due to the various factors affecting on EOs chemical composition such as differences in climate, seasonal, and geographic conditions (Baydar et al., 2004).

The results of this study showed all five tested bacteria were sensitive to EOs; however, using various assays confirmed that *B. cereus, L. monocytogenes*, as well as *S. aureus* were found more sensitive to EOs than *S. typhimurium* and *E. coli*. Results of previous studies showed that antibacterial effect of EOs against Gram-positive are higher than Gram-negative bacteria, because, polysaccharide part of lipopolysaccharides and divalent cations in the outer cell membrane of Gram-negative bacteria has hydrophilic properties that prevents the contact of the hydrophobic constituents of EOs with the bacterial cell. Results of the present study were completely consistent with results obtained by other researchers (Akhondzadeh Basti et al., 2014; Moradi et al., 2014; Nunez and D’Aquino, 2012; Shojaei and Abdollahi Fard, 2012). Hashemi et al. (2013) reported that Minimum Inhibitory Concentration (MIC) values of *Echinophora platyloba* EO against *L. monocytogenes* as well as *S. aureus* were 6250 and 12500 ppm, respectively. Tajik et al. (2015) reported that the MIC value of *Zataria multiflora* Boiss EO against *L. monocytogenes* was 625 μg/ml. Based on the results, clove EO had the highest antibacterial effect against all tested bacteria, probably due to the presence of high amount of eugenol (69.26%), which was a known phenolic agent (Burt, 2004). Due to existence of different chemical components, there was not a specific mechanism for antibacterial effects of EOs. Among the proposed mechanisms, including cell walls disruption, loss of cell contents, destroying of cytoplasm-
mic membrane and membrane proteins, coagulation in
the cytoplasm, and dysfunction of the system activated
proton transfer; membrane damages are the most
important inhibitory effect of EOs (Bakkali et al., 2008;
Burt, 2004).

The DPPH assay is based on scavenging free radicals
(Oke et al., 2009). The DPPH radical scavenging ability
of EOs was compared together using IC_{50} value of each
EO. The EOs lower IC_{50} value indicated higher antiox-
diant activity. The DPPH results showed antioxidant ac-
tivity of the tested EOs orderly clove, cumin, origanum,
and anise. Clove EO showed a remarkable capacity in
scavenging of radicals, which was highly comparable
with BHT. These results have been confirmed in another
study carried out by Tepe et al. (2007). Regarding the
basis of this test, the yellowish color of β-carotene dis-
ppears in β-carotene bleaching test due to reaction with
radicals derived by linoleic acid oxidation as well as
antioxidants prevent its oxidation and delay bleaching of
β-carotene. The rate of this bleaching can be slowed
down in presence of any antioxidant (Kulisic et al., 2004;
Oke et al., 2009). The antioxidant activity measured by
β-carotene bleaching assay showed similar results to
those obtained by the DPPH assay. However, all tested
EOs had a strong capacity in maintenance of β-carotene,
but clove EO had the strongest capacity completely close
to the BHT. The activated methylene groups of
monoterpene hydrocarbons are major reason of their a-
ntioxidant capacity especially in β-carotene bleaching
assay (Ruberto and Baratta, 2000). In this study, various
monoterpene hydrocarbons in components of each EO
may play major role in maintenance of β-carotene. The
Folin-Ciocalteu procedure, known as a useful and rapid
method, is used for estimating the phenolic content of
plant EOs and extracts (Aliakbarlu et al., 2013). In this
study, the highest total phenolic content was identified in
clove EO, followed by cumin, origanum, and anise EOs.
Ghasemzadeh et al. (2012) reported the level of phenolic
compounds in methanolic extracts of the six different
varieties of sweet potato (Ipomoea batatas) as 1.82±0.84
to 3.95±0.91 mg/g dry weight. This result is in agreement
with those obtained by two other antioxidant assays as
well as results of GC/MS analysis, showing that the
major reason of antioxidant activity of these EOs may be
due to their high total phenolic contents; however, the
effect of minor constituents of EOs should be considered
as well. According to these findings, there was a relation-
ship between antioxidant activity and total phenolic con-
tents of an antioxidant. Phenolic compounds are the main
agents that can donate hydrogen to free radicals and thus
block the chain reaction of lipid oxidation at the initiation
step. These high potential of phenolic compounds to
scavenge radicals may be due to their phenolic hydroxyl
groups (Oke et al., 2009). Indeed, redox properties of
phenolic compounds allow them to act as reducing
agents, hydrogen donators, singlet oxygen quenchers as
well as metal chelating ability (Oke et al., 2009).

Conclusion

In this study, the chemical composition, antibacterial
activity, and antioxidant properties of four commonly
consuming plants of Iran were analyzed. According to
the obtained results indicating remarkable and strong
antibacterial and antioxidant activities clove, cumin,
origanum, and anise EOs could be regarded as potential
sources of natural antioxidant and antimicrobial agents in
Iranian food industries and the best results belonged to
clove EO.
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