Phenolic Composition and Antioxidant Activity of Some Agro-industrial Wastes
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ABSTRACT

The present study investigated the content and profile of phenolic compounds, antioxidant activity of methanolic extracts of selected agro-industrial waste (AIW) i.e. date palm racemes (Phoenix dactylifera, DPR), Prickly pear peels (Opuntia ficus-indica, PPP) and empty pea pods (Pisum sativum L., EPP). Non phenolic constitutes of DPR were also analyzed by GC-MS. The oxidative stability of sunflower oil using these methanolic extracts was also investigated. The major phenolic compounds were rutin in PPP, myrecetin in EPP and quercetin in DPR. Amongst the three methanolic extracts, DPR revealed the highest scavenging activity with IC₅₀ values of 21.6μg/ml, whereas EPP revealed the lowest scavenging activity with IC₅₀ of 94.5μg/ml. A significant difference in lipid oxidation indices was noticed between the control and the sunflower oil samples containing DPR, PPP and EPP extracts.

Keywords: Date palm racemes, Prickly pear peels, empty pea pods, antioxidant

INTRODUCTION

Nutraceutical compounds derived from vegetable and fruit wastes such as natural phenolics are in great demand as a food supplement. They have been contributed with a number of beneficial promoting properties such as antioxidant (Naidu et al., 2000). The antioxidant activity can probably be attributed to the major phenolic compounds, such as myrecetin, p-coumaric and catechin. Therefore, the polyphenols in waste might be used as a cheap source of natural compounds, with prospective applications in the food industry. Substitution of synthetic food additives with safe and effective natural additives may be of further benefit to the food (Barbosa-Pereira et al., 2014). They have been added to prolong the duration period of the oil and prevent oxidation deterioration. Butylated hydroxytoluene (BHT) and butylated hydroxy anisole (BHA) are the most widely used chemical antioxidants. (National Toxicology Program, 2011). The BHT has a toxic effect on the lungs and increases the incidence of liver tumors. Also, BHA can induce the formation of stomach tumors.

The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) stated that BHA has possible human carcinogenic effects (IARC, 1986). The BHT can proceed as a tumor promoter in certain situations. Therefore, there is a strong need to find out alternative antioxidants from natural sources to prevent food deterioration. Edible oils containing high levels of unsaturation are liable to oxidation deterioration. The efficiency of natural antioxidants has been evaluated in oil oxidation process. Nowadays, researchers have made a significant develop in substituting synthetic antioxidants with natural ones from agro-industrial wastes to stabilize oils and fats during processing and storage, thus increasing their shelf life (Hamadou et al., 2013). Recently, the number of researches on residual sources of antioxidants has grown substantially (Zeyada et al., 2008, Sachindra et al., 2010, Shiban et al., 2012 & AL-Rawahi et al., 2014). They noticed that natural antioxidants attained from agro-industrial wastes decelerated the rancidity process of oil to a higher extent than acted by synthetic antioxidants. Therefore, the aim of the present study was to assess the oxidative stability of sunflower oil using the methanolic extract of some Egyptian AIW i.e date palm racemes (DPR), prickly pear peels (PPP) and empty pea pods (EPP) as natural antioxidants.
MATERIALS AND METHODS

Materials:

Agro-industrial waste samples (AIW):

Empty pea pods (EPP) were obtained from a food processing company (Giverx), Alexandria, Egypt during January, 2014. Date palm racemes (DPR) of Zagloul date palm tree (*Phoenix dactylifera*) were obtained from a private farm located in Semoha district, Alexandria, Egypt at the end of October, 2014. Prickly pear fruits (*Opuntia ficus indica*) were obtained from Alexandria local market, Alexandria, Egypt at the 2nd week of August, 2014. The fruits were pear-shaped, green to yellow in colour and medium in size, 12-14 fruit per kg. These fruits were used to prepare prickly pear peels (PPP). Upon arrival at the laboratory, the aforementioned raw materials were thoroughly washed with tap water followed by distilled water to remove dirt from surfaces and drained. The DPR and EPP were divided into small pieces (strips) of approximately 2 cm length. Prickly pear fruits were peeled using a sharp knife. The obtained peels were sliced into small pieces of 1 cm². All the prepared samples were spreaded in a single layer on stainless steel trays and dehydrated at 55ºC for 12 h in a thermostatically controlled hot air oven drier (Memmert / UF). The dehydrated samples were ground electrically in an electrical grinder (FW-400) to pass through 150-µm sieve according to Zeyada et al. (2008). The dehydrated flour belonging to each sample was packed in air-tight Kilner Jar and kept at 4ºC.

Chemical reagents

Folin- Ciocalteu reagent, Gallic acid, 1,1-Diphenyl-2-picrylhydrazyl (DPPH), Butylated hydroxy toluene (BHT) food grade, HPLC grade methanol, acetonitrile, The derivatizing reagent (N-Methyl-N-trimethylsilyl- Trifluoroacetamide (MSTFA) and N-Trimethylsilyimidazole (TMSI), anhydrous Na₂SO₄, Sodium carbonate, Acetic acid, Chloroform, p-Anisidine and certified reference materials were purchased from Sigma Aldrich.

Sunflower oil

Refined, bleached and deodorized sunflower oil (RBD) used in the present study without any additives were obtained from Sila Company, Fayoum, Egypt.

Methods:

Preparation of the methanolic extracts:

The methanolic extracts containing antioxidant compounds were extracted according to the method described by Adegoke & Gopala Krishna (1998). Fine powder of each dried sample (100 g) was extracted using methanol (500 ml), with constant stirring for 24 hr at 25±2ºC. The sample extracts were filtered with filter paper (Whatmann No. 1). The residue was susceptible to re-extract for maximizing the antioxidant extract. The filtrate was evaporated under vacuum in a rotary evaporator (BUCHI- R-215, Switzerland) at 45 ºC to dryness, and then weighed to determine the extracted yield of each sample.

Determination of total phenolics content

The total phenolics content in the AIW methanolic extracts was determined according to Lim et al. (2006) with the Folin- Ciocalteu reagent. Concentrations of 10, 20, 30, 40 and 50 µg/ml of gallic acid were prepared and 0.5ml of each sample extract (1mg/ml) was presented into test tubes and mixed gently with 2.5ml of 10% Folin- Ciocalteu reagent and 2ml of sodium carbonate (7.5%), then allowed to stand at room temperature for 30 min. The absorbance reading was measured spectrometric ally (Jenway VIS/UV-6305, England) at 760 nm. The total phenolics content was expressed as gallic acid equivalent (GAE) in mg per g sample. For the gallic acid, the curve was established by plotting concentration (µg/ml) versus absorbance (nm) y = 0.0066x + 0.039, R²= 0.9991, where y is the absorbance and x is the concentration.

Determination of antioxidant activity:

Antioxidant activity of each extract was assayed by DPPH (1,1-Diphenyl-2-picrylhydrazyl) scavenging capacity method described by Brand-Williams et al. (1995). The methanolic extract was lyophilized and diluted from 200µg/ml to 10 µg/ml. One ml (0.135 mM) of DPPH solution was mixed with1.0 ml of the extract (in methanol). The mixture was mixed thoroughly using a vortex and incubated at 25±2ºC in the dark for 30 min. The absorbance at 515 nm was measured by the spectrophotometer (Shimadzu UV-1650PC).The half maximal inhibitory concentration (IC₅₀) values represented the concentration of sample requisite to scavenge 50% of DPPH free radicals is calculated. The capacity for neutralizing DPPH radicals was detected by the following equation:
The absorbance in the sample in the DPPH reagent, $Ac$, is the absorbance value of the control (containing only DPPH) and $Ab$ is the absorbance value of the sample solution without DPPH.

**Ultra-high pressure liquid chromatography (UPLC MS/MS) analysis:**

**Instrumentation**

The liquid Chromatographic (LC) system is comprised from LC (Agilent 1200) instrument and triple quad MS detector (6460). The separation occurred in capillary column $(2.1 \times 100\text{mm} \times 1.8 \text{µm}$, Eclipse plus Agilent), G1216C at a flow of 0.4 ml/min, with a two mobile phase (eluent A = water; eluent B = Acetonitrile). The eluent gradient used for all extracts was as follows: 3 min, A; 40%; B: 60%; 5.5 min, A: 90%; B: 10%; 9 min, A: 15%; B: 85%; 10 min, A: 15%, B: 85%. Sample injection volume was 20 µl.

**Mass spectrometry**

Agilent Jet stream fragmentation technology (ESI-MS/MS) was used. The chromatographic conditions applied to identify phenolic compounds were selected according to the method described by Anubhuti & Priti (2013), the temp was 350°C; Gas flow, 10 L min$^{-1}$; Nebulizer, 50 psi; Sheath gas temp 400°C with flow rate 10 L/min. Negative ionization mode capillary voltage 3000 V and charging 1500 were used (Demiray et al., 2009). Data was represented by triple quad Mass Hunter software (LC-MS).

**Gas chromatography with mass spectrometry (GC-MS) analysis:**

Silylated DPR methanolic extract compounds were prepared according to the method demonstrated by Blau & Halked (1993). The mixture of MST-FA + 1% TMCS (200 µl) was added to 10 mg of sample extract and sonicated at 70°C for 30 minute.

**Chromatographic analysis:**

The extracts were analyzed by Agilent gas chromatograph (6890) coupled Agilent mass spectrometer (5973). The separation occurred in capillary column HP-5 MS. The injection temperature of extract was 280°C in splitless mode and 300°C for interface. The mass detector operated by both “scanning” and “SIM” mode. Chromatographic program conditions were: initial temperature of 80°C (1 min) heating to 250°C, at a rate of 20°C/min (1 min), heating to 300°C (5 min) at a rate of 6°C/min. The integration was done using the Chemistation- GCMS software.

**Oxidative stability of sunflower oil (SFO).**

The methanolic extract of each of DPR, PPP and EPP at different concentrations (100, 200, 400, 600 and 800 ppm) were added separately to 50g SFO sample. At the same time, BHT as a synthetic antioxidant (200 ppm) was added to the SFO sample as the control. Sunflower oil and different additives were placed in 100 ml beakers and thoroughly mixed with ultrasonic waves (Zeyada et al., 2008). Beakers were transferred to a drying oven adjusted at $60 \pm 2^\circ C$ for up to 18 days. Samples were withdrawn at 0, 3, 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 days for determining the following parameters.

**Peroxide value (PV)** was determined iodometrically and the results were expressed in meq O$_2$ / kg oil according to the AOCS procedure (1989).

**p-Anisidine value (p-AV)** which is a measure of aldehyde content in oils was determined according to the IUPAC (1987) standard method.

**Conjugated dienes (CD) and conjugated trienes (CT) hydroperoxides** were measured according to the method reported by Vieira & Regitano-Darce (1999). The absorbance readings were recorded in UV region at 232 for measuring CD and 268 nm for CT.

**Statistical analysis:** Data were statistically analyzed and differences among means were implemented by Least Significant Differences method at $(\alpha = 0.05)$ probability level (L.S. D 0.05) according to Peterson (1985).

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Phenolics content (TPC) and antioxidant activity:**

The results in Table (1) show the TPC and antioxidant activity of AIW methanolic extracts. The TPC of DPR was 81.7 ± 5.7 mg GAE/g. It was significantly $(P \leq 0.05)$ higher than that of PPP (45.1 ± 3.6 mg GAE /g) and EPP (23.4 ± 2 mg GAE/g), respectively. This value was significantly higher than that found in several medicinal plants like *G. multifoliol* (12.36 mg GAE/g DW), *G. villosa* (20.81 mg GAE/g DW) and *M. edule* (70.07 mg GAE/g DW) (Laouini et al., 2012). Table (1) also shows that DPR revealed the highest scavenging activity with IC$_{50}$ value of 21.6µg/ml comparing with other natural phenolic extracts and BHT as the control.
whereas EPP revealed the lowest scavenging activity with IC$_{50}$ value of 94.5 $\mu$g/ml. This indicates that the DPR can be considered as a promising antioxidant source, and has the proficiency to substitute synthetic antioxidants with those that are naturally originated compounds. However calculated IC$_{50}$ value of PPP was 55.3 $\mu$g/ml. El-Houfi (2015) found that the DPPH inhibition % of the methanolic extract of PPP was 60.81 %. Thus, PPP as a by-product can indeed be used as a good and cheap source of beneficial antioxidant. The results in Table (1) also shows that the IC$_{50}$ of the methanolic extract of EPP was 94.5 $\mu$g/ml. The DPPH free radical scavenging activity (DPPH inhibition %) of the methanolic extract of EPP was 31.53% (El-Houfi, 2015).

Identification of phenolic compounds using UPLC/MS/MS.

In the present study, separation and identification of phenolic compounds in the different extracts using UPLC/MS/MS were studied. Multiple Reaction Monitoring technique (MRM) was used as a mode of data acquiring to tentatively identify 10 major phenolic compounds (rutin, myrecetin, quercetin, luteolin, catechien and chlorogenic, ellagic, caffeic, ascorbic, p-coumaric acid) in the tested samples according to the chromatographic conditions described in Table (2). These compounds are known for their broad spectrum of activities as antioxidants.

The data in Table (2) show that 4 phenolic compounds were presented in the DPR. Rutin, quercetin, ellagic acid and luteolin were tentatively identified at MS pre ions m/z signal 609, 301, 301 and 285 and MS/MS product ion fragment m/z signal 109, 179, 229 and 133, respectively.

The present data are considered as the first attempt to identify phenolic compounds in PPP by using UPLC/MS/MS. All previous studies have been focused on the fruit pulp (edible portion), while little is known about the peels and seeds because they

Table 1: Total phenolics content (TPC) and calculated IC$_{50}$ (µg/ml) values of some agro-industrial waste methanolic extracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agro-industrial waste</th>
<th>Total phenolic content mg GAE/g dry extract*</th>
<th>Calculated IC$_{50}$(µg/ml) values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>81.7 ± 5.7</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>45.1 ± 3.6</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP</td>
<td>23.4 ± 2</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean of three determinations ± S.D.
GAE: Gallic acid equivalent.
DPR: Date palm racemes
BHT: Butylated hydroxytoluene
PPP: Prickly Pear Peels.

Table 2: Tentative identification of the phenolic compounds in the methanolic extracts using UPLC/MS/MS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compounds</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Agro-industrial wastes *</th>
<th>***Chromatographic conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutin</td>
<td>Flavonols</td>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>3497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorogenic acid</td>
<td>Phenolic acids</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrecetin</td>
<td>Flavonols</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercetin</td>
<td>Flavonols</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellagic acid</td>
<td>Phenolic acids</td>
<td>4084</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catechien</td>
<td>Flavanol</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luteolin</td>
<td>Flavonos</td>
<td>69075</td>
<td>6593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caffeic acid</td>
<td>Phenolic acids</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascorbic acid</td>
<td>Phenolic acids</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-Coumaric acid</td>
<td>Phenolic acids</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1. Date Palm racemes; 2. Prickly pear peels; 3. Empty pea pods
**The area under the peak is proportional to the amount of compound which has passed the detector, and this area was calculated automatically by the computer linked to the display.
***Frag: Fragmentation energy. CE: Collision energy; Pre Ion: Precursor Ion; Pro Ion: product Ion.
Countenance of the antioxidant defense proteins such as ferritin in endothelial cells and heme oxygenase-1 (HO-1). Increased ferritin expression and hemeoxygenase activity enhance endothelial dysfunction recommending an antiatherogenic effect of L-alanine (Grosser et al., 2004). L-threonine can improve the expression of heat shock protein and counteract apoptosis and cellular injury (Baird et al., 2013).

Other organic acids identified were gallic, succinic, erythronic and phthalic acids. Gallic acid, a trihydroxybenzoic acid (3,4,5-trihydroxybenzoic acid) and its derivatives are strong natural antioxidants existing in many vegetables and fruits (Farahmandfar et al., 2014). α-tocopherol has been proposed to be the most effective lipid-soluble natural radical scavenging antioxidant (Packer, 2001).

Five fatty acids were identified at the DPR methanolic extract, two essential fatty acids, linoleic and α-linolenic acid. The essential fatty acids (ω3 and ω6) showed significant antioxidant activity and metal chelating characterization as well as significant (P<0.05) reducing power potentials (Sari-kurkcu et al., 2016).

Pentadecanoic acid (C15:0) is a saturated fatty acid uncommon in nature being found at the level of 1.2% in the dairy product from cows. Margaric acid (heptadecanoic acid C17:0), is a saturated fatty acid occurs as a rare component of the natural animal or vegetable fat (Beare-Rogers et al., 2001). Stearic acid (octadecanoic acid C18:0) is mostly prevalence saturated fatty acids existent in nature. Arachidic acid (eicosanoic acid C20:0) is another saturated fatty acid detected in DPR extract. Because of its surfactant-like properties, arachidic acid is used in the manufacture of pharmaceuticals, soaps, cosmetics, and food packaging. Caprylic acid, capric acid, n-pentadecanoic acid, heptadecanoic, stearic acid , arachidic acid, linoleic acid, α-linolenic acid, α.-tocopherol (vitamin E), campesterol and stigmasterol are among other compounds have been tentatively identified in the DPR extract analyzed by GC-MS. Caprylic acid, (C8:0) and Capric acid (C10:0) are antioxidants used in health care facilities (Avery et al., 2015).

Campesterol and stigmasterol are phytosterols that parallel cholesterol in structure, while are present exclusively in plants. These compounds are recognized for potential effects on blood cholesterol levels; however, investigate into their prospective role in antioxidant effect, has established comparably little attention. It has been proven that

discarded as food wastes. Table (2) shows that 5 phenolic constituents were tentatively identified in the PPP methanolic extract (Rutin, quercetin, ellagic acid, luteolin, and ascorbic acid) EL Houfi (2015) identified and quantified 11 peaks in the methanolic extract from prickly pear peels by HPLC. He revealed that caffeic and chlorogenic acid were the dominant hydroxycinnamic acids, whereas salicylic followed by gallic acids were dominant hydroxybenzoic acids. Catechin, ellagic acid and homogentisic acid were also determined. The content of phenolic compounds in EPP are shown in Table (2). Myrecetin, ellagic acid, luteolin, ascorbic acid and p-coumaric acid were tentatively identified by MS information for pre ions at m/z signal 317, 301, 285, 175 and 163, respectively, and followed by MS/MS spectrum of product ions at m/z signal 151,229, 133, 115 and 119. Hydroxycinnamic acid derivatives, caffeic and ferulic acids were the dominant, whereas gallic and vanillic acids were the dominant hydroxybenzoic acid derivaties. In addition, homogentisic acid was the abundant phenolic in the methanolic extract of pea pod (EL Houfi, 2015).

**Phenolic composition of DPR by GC-MS.**

The DPR extract showed the highest total phenolics content (81.7 ± 5.7 mg GAE/g) and the highest scavenging activity with the smallest IC50 value (21.6 μg/mL). Many studies showed that there is a correlation between TPC and antioxidant activity (Babbar et al., 2015). On the other hand, AL-Harithi et al. (2015) stated that the relation between antioxidant activity and TPC was figured out. This evidently reveals that other non-phenolic components existing are showing antioxidant activity. The methanolic DPR extract was subjected to GC-MS analysis for more chemical composition that might be responsible for the scavenging activity of this extract.

The GC-MS report tentatively identified 23 compounds in the methanolic DPR extract. Table (3) shows the chemical composition of the methanolic DPR extract that possess antioxidant activity. D(-)-lactic acid, L-malic acid were among the major components in this extract. There are several studies had proven their antioxidant activities (Ana et al., 2014&Florentina et al., 2017).

Different amino acids were also identified in the methanolic DPR extract using GC-MS. L-alanine, L-threonine, serine, L-aspartic acid and L-proline were among these amino acids. L-alanine motivates countenance of the antioxidant defense proteins such as ferritin in endothelial cells and heme oxygenase-1 (HO-1). Increased ferritin expression and hemeoxygenase activity enhance endothelial dysfunction recommending an antiatherogenic effect of L-alanine (Grosser et al., 2004). L-threonine can improve the expression of heat shock protein and counteract apoptosis and cellular injury (Baird et al., 2013).
Campesterol and stigmasterol act as physical stabilizers, antioxidant agents and radical scavengers (Yoshida & Niki, 2003).

**Stability of Sunflower Oil**

The antioxidant efficiencies of the DPR, PPP and EPP methanolic extracts in sunflower oil (SFO) were evaluated by determination peroxide value (PV), \( p \)-anisidine value (\( p \)-AV), conjugated dienes (CD) and conjugated trienes (CT) as indices of lipid oxidation.

**Peroxide Value (PV)**

Peroxide value (PV) is one of the most common tests for measuring the concentration of peroxides and hydro-peroxides formed in the primary stage of lipid oxidation. A continuous rising in PV with increasing the storage period was observed in all the tested samples (Fig. 1). Initially, the amount of peroxides formed was modest, while it elevated after 9 days of storing then further increment with expansion storing time. Peroxide value range was (1.45 ± 0.026 to 15.2 ± 0.06 meq O\(_2\) / kg), (1.7 ± 0.09 to 20.5 ± 0.13 meq O\(_2\) / kg) and (1.8 ± 0.02 to 23.5 ± 0.26 meq O\(_2\) / kg) for the methanolic extract of DPR, PPP and EPP, respectively. Control oil sample with no additives showed the highest PV of 50 ± 0.2 meq O\(_2\) / kg after 18 day. The difference in PV among the control and oil samples containing the natural methanolic extracts or BHT (synthetic antioxidant) was significant. The results obtained in the present study are in harmony with the results of Mohdaly-et al., (2010) who stated that the AIW methanolic extracts can be recommended as a potent source of antioxidants for the stabilization of unsaturated oils.

The PV of SFO containing 200 ppm of the methanolic extracts of DPR, PPP and EPP as well as the BHT after 18 days of storing was found to be 10.3 ± 0.11, 16.3 ± 0.1, 17.7 ± 0.26 and 11.3 ± 0.07 meq O\(_2\) / kg, respectively. The DPR methanolic extract at a concentration of 200 ppm exhibited the superiority stabilization efficiency, even comparable with those of synthetic antioxidants. The data obtained from the present study are in agreement with those obtained.

### Table 3: Composition of the methanolic DPR extract by GC-MS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compounds</th>
<th>RT(min)</th>
<th>Corr. % max</th>
<th>Ion (m/z, abundance between parenthesis)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D-(-)-Lactic acid</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>147 (100), 191 (89), 190 (70), 174 (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-Alanine</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>73 (100), 147 (60), 119 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caprylic acid</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>73 (100), 75 (70), 187 (28), 201 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallic acid</td>
<td>6.216</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>105 (100), 135 (62), 217 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succinic acid</td>
<td>6.623</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>147 (100), 73 (92) 44 (32), 55 (28);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-threonine</td>
<td>7.175</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>73 (100), 117 (28), 147 (73), 219 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serine</td>
<td>6.980</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>204 (100), 218 (60), 147 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decanoic acid</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>117 (100), 129 (65), 132 (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL-Malic acid</td>
<td>7.821</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>147 (100), 233 (46.5), 245 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-Aspartic acid</td>
<td>8.033</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>232 (100), 100 (28.8), 147 (20), 218 (15.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L- proline</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>156 (100), 157 (70), 230 (50.0), 258 (42.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythronic acid</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>147 (100), 205 (29), 292 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-pentadecanoic acid</td>
<td>10.463</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>73 (100), 117 (70), 229 (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dibutyl phthalate</td>
<td>10.677</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>149 (100), 150 (84), 205 (30), 223 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linoleic Acid</td>
<td>11.466</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>67 (100), 81 (87), 109 (37), 150 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octadecanoic acid (stearic acid)</td>
<td>11.636</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>74 (100), 87 (80), 143 (30), 298 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alpha.-Linolenic acid</td>
<td>12.375</td>
<td>25.39</td>
<td>75 (100), 79 (90), 108 (70), 117 (63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heptadecanoic acid</td>
<td>11.746</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>73 (100), 117 (88), 145 (34), 327 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arachidic acid</td>
<td>13.173</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>73 (100), 75 (88), 117 (73), 106 (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \alpha )-Tocopherol (vitamin E),</td>
<td>21.592</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>237 (100), 502 (93), 238 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campesterol</td>
<td>23.512</td>
<td>45.23</td>
<td>129 (100), 343 (88), 145 (34), 282 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stigmasterol</td>
<td>24.064</td>
<td>22.97</td>
<td>83 (100), 129 (80), 255 (35), 282 (20), 394 (25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Campesterol and stigmasterol act as physical stabilizers, antioxidant agents and radical scavengers (Yoshida & Niki, 2003).
by Ozcan & AL Juhaimi (2015). They concluded that date by-product methanolic extract can be used as an oxidation inhibitor agent in different oil products.

The $p$-anisidine value ($p$-AV):-

The $p$-AV is a measure for quantification oxidation products produced in the advanced stages of edible oil oxidation (De Abreu et al., 2010). Fig. (2) shows the significant ($P<0.05$) changes recorded for $p$-AV under accelerated conditions as affected by adding methanolic extract of DPR, PPP and EPP compared with BHT used as synthetic antioxidant. Addition of the different concentrations of the methanolic extracts and BHT lead to decrease in $p$-AV comparing with the control sample. The highest concentration (800 ppm) of the methanolic extracts affords the highest resistance to form carbonyl products such as aldehydes and ketones. Under accelerated condition, BHT in SFO samples reduced $p$-AV by approximately 42.5% comparative to the control, whereas $p$-AV was decreased by adding of the methanolic extracts depending on the concentration used. From these results, it can be concluded that the amount of secondary lipid oxidation compounds was significantly decreased by increasing the concentration of the methanolic extract in SFO. Bioactive compounds present in DPR extract appeared the highest restrictive effect on the carbonyl products.

Fig. 1: Peroxide value (PV) of treated SFO samples: (a) DPR, (b) PPP and (c) EPP methanolic extracts under accelerated storage conditions (60 ± 2°C).

Fig. 2: $p$-Anisidine value ($p$-AV) of treated sunflower oil samples: (a) DPR, (b) PPP and (c) EPP methanolic extract under accelerated storage conditions (60 ± 2 °C).
formation and exhibits the lowest value of p-AV (2.81) at 800 ppm followed by PPP (3.45). The results revealed that the higher phenolics content of DPR has the higher inhibition effect on producing secondary oxidation products (Fig. 2) and has great proficiency to prevent sunflower oil oxidation deterioration at concentrations 400ppm, 600 and 800 ppm used in the present study compared to the synthetic antioxidants BHT at 200 ppm. Therefore, some agro-industrial waste can be recommended as a viable source of antioxidants for the stabilization of food types, especially unsaturated edible oils such as sunflower oil (El-Shourbagy et al., 2013).

**Conjugated dienes (CD) and trienes (CT):**

The results presented in Figs. (3 & 4) indicate

---

**Fig. 3:** Conjugated Diene (CD) of treated sunflower oil samples: (a) DPR, (b) PPP and (c) EPP methanolic extracts under accelerated storage conditions (60 ± 2º C).

---

**Fig. 4:** Conjugated Triene (CT ) of treated sunflower oil samples: (a) DPR, (b) PS, (c) EPP methanolic extract under accelerated storage conditions (60 ± 2º C).
that as rearrange of the double bonds sites in SFO and, therefore, non-conjugated system was transformed to conjugated diene and triene system under accelerated storage conditions. These indicate the presence of oxidation by-products for instance carbonyl compounds (Ramadan & Moersel 2003). A significant decrease was perceived in the values of CD and CT in SFO samples containing different concentrations of the methanolic extracts of DPR, PPP and EPP with a dose response manner and synthetic antioxidant BHT. DPR at the concentration of 200 ppm exhibited similar efficiency in decreasing the amount of carbonyl compounds comparing with BHT at the same concentration. The concentration of 800 ppm DPR revealed the superiority efficacy in decreasing CD and CT. The data obtained here are harmonious with those reported by El Anany (2007).The natural phenolics extracted from AIW induced antioxidant activity and at the concentration of 800 ppm shown superiority to BHT in inhibiting the oxidation deterioration of sunflower oil (Ali, 2010). The data of the present study are in agreement with the results of Kiralan et al. (2015) and Reza et al. (2018).

As a conclusion, agro-industrial wastes (AIW) such as date palm racemes, prickly pear peels and empty pea pods contained several phenolic compounds in their methanolic extracts. These extracts showed antioxidant activity in a concentration – dependent manner. In addition, these AIW can be recommended as a potent source of antioxidants for stabilization unsaturated vegetable oils such as sunflower oil.
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تركيب المواد الفينولية والنشاط المضاد للأكسدة
لبعض مخلعات التصنيع الزراعي

خديجة عوضة 1, علي عبد النبي 2, هالة عوني 3
1- العمل المركزي - وزارة الصحة.
2- كلية الزراعة - جامعة الإسكندرية.
3- معهد الدراسات العليا والبحوث - جامعة الإسكندرية.

هدفت هذه الدراسة إلى تقدير القيمة الكلي للمواد الفينولية وتقدير النشاط المضاد للأكسدة وتعريف
على المركبات الفينولية لثلاثة من المخلعات الزراعية (شماريخ البلج، شماريخ الشوكى، قرون البصلة الفارغة)
ودراسة نشاط المستخلصات الميثانولية لهذه المخلعات على مدى التدحر التأكسدي لزيت دوار الشمس و لقد
أوضحت الدراسة أن أكثر المركبات الفينولية تواجدا في الزيوت في التين الشوكى، المربيتين في قرون البصلة
الفارغة، الكيورستين في شماريخ الشوكى وأوضحت الدراسة أن شماريخ البلج أعطت أعلى نشاط كاسح وقيمة
لاحتواء على مركبات فينولية وغير فينولية لها نشاط مضاد للأكسدة.

في حين أن قرون البصلة الفارغة أعطت أقل نشاط كاسح وقيمة IC50 (µg/ml 21.6), كما أظهرت النتائج أن
IC50 (%)، كما أظهرت النتائج أن هناك اختلافا جوهريا في قيمة أكسدة الدهون مابين العينة الكثيروول عينات أعطت أقل نشاط كاسح وقيمة IC50 (µg/ml 21.6).
زيت دوار الشمس تحتوي على المستخلصات الميثانولية مما يوصي باستخدام هذه المستخلصات
لإطالة فترة صلاحية الزيت بدلاً من استخدام مضافات الأكسدة المخلعة صناعياً.