

RESEARCH ARTICLE | OCTOBER 03 2017

Antioxidant and antimicrobial activity of stingless bee bread and propolis extracts **FREE**

Rabieatul Adawieah Md Akhir; Mohd Fadzelly Abu Bakar; Shuaibu Babaji Sanusi



AIP Conf. Proc. 1891, 020090 (2017)

<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5005423>



Boost Your Optics and Photonics Measurements

Lock-in Amplifier

Zurich Instruments

Find out more

Boxcar Averager

Antioxidant and Antimicrobial Activity of Stingless Bee Bread and Propolis Extracts

Rabieatul Adawieah Md Akhir^{1, a)}, Mohd Fadzelly Abu Bakar^{1, 2, b)}, and Shuaibu Babaji Sanusi^{1, 2, c)}

¹Faculty of Science, Technology & Human Development, Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia (UTHM), 86400 Parit Raja, Batu Pahat, Johor, Malaysia

²Centre of Research- Sustainable Research of Natural Resources (CoR-SUNR), Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia (UTHM), 86400 Parit Raja, Batu Pahat, Johor, Malaysia

^{a)} rabieatuladawieah22@gmail.com

^{b)}Corresponding author: fadzelly@uthm.edu.my

^{c)}sanusishuaibu@gmail.com

Abstract. Bee bread and propolis are by-products of honey bee. The main objective of this research was to investigate the antioxidant and antimicrobial activity of stingless bee bread and propolis extracted using 70% ethanol and n-hexane. The antioxidant activity of the sample extracts were determined by spectrophotometry analysis while for the antimicrobial activity, the sample extracts were analyzed using disc diffusion and broth dilution assays. For DPPH and ABTS assays, the results showed that ethanolic extract of bee bread showed the highest free radical scavenging (%) as compared to other samples. However, FRAP values for both hexanic extracts are higher as compared to the ethanolic extracts. For disc diffusion assay, the results showed that the ethanolic extract of bee bread and propolis as well as hexanic extract of propolis were able to inhibit all tested bacteria. Meanwhile, broth dilution assay showed minimum inhibition zone (MIC) ranging from <6.67 to 33.33 $\mu\text{L}/\text{mL}$. As the conclusion, both bee bread and propolis produced by stingless bee in this study displayed antioxidant and antimicrobial effect but there are different in the degree of antioxidant and antimicrobial activity exhibited between each of the samples.

INTRODUCTION

Stingless bees are a vast monophyletic class of highly eusocial bees commonly found in abundance in warm humid forests around the world. They belong to the family Apidae, subfamily Apinae and tribe Meliponini. *Heterotrigona itama* is the most abundant species found in Southern part of Malaysia [1]. Bee bread and propolis are among the stingless bee products that have high potential to be explored for their benefits and uses, which also have high commercial value in Malaysia [2, 3]. There are numerous factors that can greatly affect the bioactivities of the stingless bee products viz., the bee species, chemical composition, geographical zones, type of source plant, season and harvesting time as well as extraction methods [4–7]. In spite of this variability, primarily all samples have antioxidant and antimicrobial properties, since this is the function of bee bread and propolis in beehives. Many studies revealed that bee bread and propolis possesses some biological roles, including antioxidant and antimicrobial activity [8–15]. Basically, their bioactivities were mainly as a result of substances belonging to the phenolic group, particularly flavonoids, which make bee bread and propolis a vital object of study for the most diverse food and pharmaceutical applications [9]. However, there are very little information available in the literatures regarding the

antioxidant and antimicrobial activity of the stingless bee products in Malaysia especially for the bee bread. Therefore, the present study was conducted to investigate the antioxidant and antimicrobial activity in the stingless bee bread and propolis extracts.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Samples Collection

Samples of the stingless bee products (bee bread and propolis) from the *Heterotrigona itama* species were harvested at National Apiary Centre, Malaysian Department of Agriculture, Parit Botak, Johor, Malaysia in May, 2016. Harvesting process was done by removing the samples from the hive, separating between the bee bread and propolis and then grounding the samples into small pieces. The samples were stored at 4°C.

Samples Extraction

Both samples were extracted using solvent extraction method, and the solvents used were hexane and 70% ethanol. The samples were extracted according to the method described previously with some modifications [16]. For every 60g of sample, 300 ml of solvent was used for the extraction which last for about 2 hours using Soxhlet apparatus. Thereafter, it was filtered through a Whatmann No. 1 filter paper, then the filtrate was evaporated using the Rotary Evaporator for about 3 to 4 hours and was left evaporated in water bath with 50°C until the solvent totally evaporated. All final extracts were stored at 4°C condition until used.

Determination of Free radical Scavenging Activity

DPPH Assay

The DPPH free radical of the stingless bee bread and propolis was measured according to the previous method by with some modifications [17]. A 150µL of sample extract was added into the 3.0ml of DPPH solution each in the test tube. It was then shaken vigorously and left in the dark at room temperature for 15 minutes. By using the spectrophotometer, the absorbance of the mixture was determined at 517nm. All of the tests were done triplicate. The Ascorbic Acid was used as standard for positive control while the distilled water as the negative control. The ability of extract to scavenge DPPH free radical was calculated using the following equation.

$$\text{Scavenging activity (\%)} = \left[\frac{A(-ve) - A_s}{A(-ve) - A(+ve)} \right] \times 100$$

Where, A_s is the absorbance of the sample, $A(-ve)$ and $A(+ve)$ are the absorbance values of negative and positive controls, respectively.

ABTS Assay

The ABTS scavenging assay was performed based on the previous experiment procedure with some modifications [18]. The scavenging activity of each sample was measured by mixing about 150µL of samples extract with 2.0ml of the ABTS solution. The absorbance of the samples at 734nm against the absolute ethanol (blank) was recorded after 20 minutes by using the spectrophotometer. The Ascorbic acid was run with the samples extracts and act as positive control. The percentage of the inhibition was calculated using the similar formula as used in the DPPH assay.

FRAP Assay

The reducing capacity of the stingless bee bread and propolis sample were determined using FRAP Assay according to the procedure from the previous experiment with slight modifications [19]. A 3ml of FRAP reagent was added to a cuvette and a blank reading was taken at absorbance of 593nm using spectrophotometer. A total of 150 µL of samples extract and 300µL of ethanol were added to the cuvette. After mixing the FRAP reagent with sample extract, a second reading was recorded again at the similar absorbance after 4 minutes. The comparison between the changes in absorbance after 4 minutes from initial blank reading with ferrous sulphate, standard curve

was recorded. A standard curve of FRAP values of each standard versus its concentration was plotted and the final result was expressed as mM ferric iron reduction to ferrous iron in 150µg samples extract (mM/µg). The final result was presented as the concentration of antioxidant having a ferric reducing activity.

Determination of the Antimicrobial Activity

Disc Diffusion Assay

Disc diffusion method was conducted following the method from previous research [20]. 0.5 McFarland standards (1×10^8 CFU/mL) overnight bacterial cultures (*B. subtilis*, *S. aureus*, *E. coli* and *Salmonella*) were prepared in peptone water. Ten µL of each suspension was spread on the solid Nutrient agar plates. Six millimetres sterile discs impregnated with 10µL of each sample extract, antibiotic (ampicillin) positive and distilled water as negative control were then placed onto the surface of the inoculated Nutrient agar plates. Then, the agar plates were incubated at 37°C for 24 hours. The diameter of the inhibition zones was measured in millimetre (mm).

Broth Dilution Method

The minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) of the stingless bee bread and propolis extracts was determined using previous research [21]. The isolated colonies of the selected bacteria were grown in 10 ml sterile nutrient broth and adjusted to appropriate turbidity. Then, it was cultured in different concentrations of samples for 24 hours. The initial turbidity of culture was measured at wavelength 600nm using the UV-Vis spectrophotometer. The MIC of the samples was determined based on the cultures that were incubated aerobically at 37°C by using the UV-Vis spectrophotometer method at the same wavelength. It was identified from the lowest concentration without visible growth or when the absorbance decline sharply or at zero absorbance.

Statistical Analysis

Values were expressed as mean of three replicates. All statistical analyses were carried out using Prism 5 software. To determine whether there were any differences between activities of samples, variance analysis (one-way ANOVA) was applied to the results. Values of $p \leq 0.05$ were considered as significant different.

RESULTS

Table 1 showed the results of the scavenging activity of the samples at 150µL/ml concentration in DPPH assay. The highest percentage (%) of inhibition was shown by ethanolic extract of bee bread (EEB) (93.60 ± 0.03), followed by hexane extract of bee bread (HEB) (83.81 ± 0.05). Ethanolic extract of propolis (EEP) and hexane extract of propolis (HEP) were less active with values of 80.07 ± 0.09 and 80.37 ± 0.40 , respectively.

TABLE 1. The DPPH radical scavenging activity of both ethanol and n-hexane extract stingless bee bread and propolis.

Sample in 150µL/ml	Percentage inhibition (%)
EEB	93.60 ± 0.03
EEP	80.07 ± 0.09
HEB	83.81 ± 0.05
HEP	80.37 ± 0.40

Values are expressed as mean \pm standard deviation of three replicate measurements. Antioxidant activity of all samples is expressed as percentage of inhibition (%).

The effect of different solvent extraction used for both bee bread and propolis on free radical scavenging activity in the ABTS assay was presented in the Table 2. Ethanolic extract bee bread (EEB) has the highest percentage inhibition (97.95%) at 150µL/ml concentration of sample, followed by ethanolic extract propolis (EEP) (89.56 %), hexane extract bee bread, HEB (71.23 %) and hexane extract propolis, HEP (82.18%).

TABLE 2. The ABTS scavenging activity of both ethanol and n-hexane extract stingless bee bread and propolis.

Sample in 150 μ L/ml	Percentage Inhibition (%)
EEB	97.95 \pm 0.01
EEP	89.56 \pm 0.01
HEB	71.23 \pm 0.01
HEP	82.18 \pm 0.01

Values are expressed as mean \pm standard deviation of three replicate measurements. Antioxidant activity of all samples is expressed as percentage inhibition (%).

Table 3 showed that the hexane extract of propolis (HEP) had the highest FRAP value of 6.64mM FE/g, followed by hexane extract of bee bread, HEB (2.41mM FE/g), ethanolic extract propolis, EEP (0.87mM FE/g) and the least was ethanolic extract of bee bread (EEB) with the value of 0.85mM FE/g.

TABLE 3. The FRAP reducing of both ethanol and n-hexane extract stingless bee bread and propolis.

Sample in 150 μ L/ml	mM ferric ion reduced (mM FE/g)
EEB	0.85 \pm 0.01
EEP	0.87 \pm 0.00
HEB	2.41 \pm 0.02
HEP	6.64 \pm 0.04

Values are expressed as mean \pm standard deviation of three replicate measurements. Antioxidant activity of all samples is expressed as mM ferric ion reduced (mM FE/g).

The result of antimicrobial activity of both ethanolic and hexane of propolis and bee bread showed that the zones of inhibitions of gram positive bacteria (*B. cereus* and *S. aureus*) were bigger than that of gram negative bacteria (*E. coli* and *Salmonella*), thus indicated that the gram positive bacteria were highly sensitive to the samples tested. However, the results were not statistically significant ($p>0.05$). When comparing based on the solvents used, the samples extracted with ethanol showed stronger antimicrobial activity as compared to those extracted with hexane.

DISCUSSION

The high percentage inhibition of bee bread for both ethanol and hexane extract is in an agreement with previous study which have mentioned that in the DPPH reaction system, the antioxidant activity of bee bread was between 90-94% [22]. Both samples showed higher percentage of inhibition when using 70% ethanol as compared to n-hexane. This is because ethanol has the capability to extract a wide range of the component in the samples [23, 24]. Principle in DPPH assay explained when there is high in inhibition, means that the radicals was effectively trapped by high antioxidant potential, thereby the propagation was prevented as reported previously [25]. Other study reported that the synergistic effects of multiple components present in the whole extract also strongly contributed to the antioxidant potential of the bee's products extract [26].

Ethanolic extract for both of the samples showed the higher percentage of inhibition (%) than the hexane extract samples in ABTS assay. This pattern of results was in line with previous studies, where they reported that antioxidant activity of ethanolic extract of propolis was higher than that of hexane extract (using ABTS assay) [27, 28]. Both DPPH and ABTS assay actually has the same principle, thus, the results for both assays should be the same with similar trend or pattern. However, the results from the ABTS assay were significantly higher than that obtained from DPPH assay. This is in agreement with the previous study; where the following reasons were given, firstly, it might be due to the wavelength used; both ABTS and DPPH assay used different wavelength measurement, 734nm and 517nm respectively. This can cause the interfering of the measurement which may happen when the visible region with colored compound presented in the test samples which may have the spectra overlapped with the DPPH at 517nm [29]. Secondly, this situation might be related to the factor of the reaction

mechanism of the ABTS and free radical scavengers in which it can affect the structural conformations of the antioxidants [30].

Propolis sample was found to have higher FRAP value when compared to the bee bread in both extracts of ethanol and n-hexane. These results were proven in the previous study that the propolis is one of the natural powerful antioxidative agents [26]. Unlike in DPPH assay, the results in FRAP assay showed that ethanolic extract sample has very low FRAP value as compared to hexane extract. Even though ethanol has the ability to extract various phenolic constituent from the sample which may contribute to the antioxidant level [23, 24], however, the previous study by Mărghitaş *et al.* [31] showed that low FRAP value is not in any way related to any of the polyphenolic content in the bee bread.

Gram positive bacteria were more sensitive to all extracts in this study, with ethanol extract showing higher activity than hexane extract. The findings obtained from this study agreed with data from the previous studies [22, 32]. Besides origin of the matrix and method of extraction, other factor such as osmotic effect, pH level as well as the presence of the hydrogen peroxide and phytochemicals in the samples extract might be responsible for the differences in size of inhibition zone [27, 33].

CONCLUSION

Both of the stingless bee bread and propolis extract extracted using 70% ethanol and n-hexane were antioxidatively active. However, different samples extract exhibited different degree of antioxidant capacity. Likewise, the result for antimicrobial activity also showed that both hexane and ethanol extract of bee bread and propolis showed various degrees of inhibitory effect against the *B. subtilis*, *S. aureus*, *E. coli* and *Salmonella*. Thus, this indicated that bee bread and propolis from stingless bee, *Heterotrigona itama* from southern Malaysia have broad-spectrum of antimicrobial and antioxidant activity.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors are thankful to University Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia (UTHM) for providing internal research funding and technical support for this research. Special thanks to National Apiary Centre, Malaysian Department of Agriculture, Parit Botak, Johor for providing the sample materials (bee bread and propolis) for this research.

REFERENCES

1. C. Rasmussen and S. A. Cameron, "Global stingless bee phylogeny supports ancient divergence, vicariance, and long distance dispersal," *Biol. J. Linn. Soc.*, vol. 99, no. 1, pp. 206–232, 2010.
2. N. Kelly, M. S. N. Farisyah, T. K. Kumara, and P. Marcela, "Species Diversity and External Nest Characteristics of Stingless Bees in Meliponiculture," *Pertanika J. Trop. Agric. Sci.*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 293–298, 2014.
3. T. Nagai, T. Nagashima, N. Suzuki, and R. Inoue, "Antioxidant Activity and Angiotensin I-Converting Enzyme Inhibition by Enzymatic Hydrolysates from Bee Bread," *Zeitschrift für Naturforsch. C*, vol. 60, no. 1–2, pp. 133–138, 2005.
4. P. Yap, M. Fadzelly, A. Bakar, H. Lim, and D. Carrier, "Antibacterial activity of polyphenol-rich extract of selected wild honey collected in Sabah, Malaysia," vol. 8839, no. March, 2016.
5. G. DeGrandi-Hoffman, B. J. Eckholm, and M. H. Huang, "A comparison of bee bread made by Africanized and European honey bees (*Apis mellifera*) and its effects on hemolymph protein titers," *Apidologie*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 52–63, 2013.
6. P. M. Kustiawan, S. Puthong, E. T. Arung, and C. Chanchao, "In vitro cytotoxicity of Indonesian stingless bee products against human cancer cell lines," *Asian Pacific J. Trop. Biomed.*, vol. 4, no. 7, pp. 549–556, 2014.
7. F. Missima and J. M. Sforcin, "Green Brazilian Propolis Action on Macrophages and Lymphoid Organs of Chronically Stressed Mice," *Evidence-Based Complement. Altern. Med.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 71–75, 2008.
8. G. M. S. Gonçalves, N. P. Santos, and S. M. Srebernick, "Antioxidant and antimicrobial activities of propolis and açai (*Euterpe oleracea* Mart.) extracts," *Rev. Ciencias Farm. Basica e Apl.*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 349–356, 2011.

9. A. Kurek-Górecka, A. Rzepecka-Stojko, M. Górecki, J. Stojko, M. Sosada, and G. Świerczek-Zięba, "Structure and Antioxidant Activity of Polyphenols Derived from Propolis," *Molecules*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 78–101, 2013.
10. J. Ferreira, U. Pereira, L. Fernando, B. Macorini, A. Mary, M. Felipe, D. Melo, J. Benedito, P. Balestieri, E. J. Paredes-gamero, C. Andrea, L. Cardoso, K. De Picoli, and E. Lucas, "Antimicrobial, antioxidant and cytotoxic activities of propolis from *Melipona orbignyi* (Hymenoptera, Apidae)," *Food Chem. Toxicol.*, vol. 65, pp. 374–380, 2014.
11. E. Ivanišová, M. Kačániová, H. Frančáková, J. Petrová, J. Hutková, V. Brovarskyi, and J. Musilová, "Bee bread-perspective source of bioactive compounds for future," *Potravin. Slovak J. Food Sci.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 592–598, 2015.
12. P. Ristivojevi, I. Dimki, J. Trifkovi, T. Beri, and I. Vovk, "Antimicrobial Activity of Serbian Propolis Evaluated by Means of MIC, HPTLC, Bioautography and Chemometrics," *PLoS One*, vol. 11, no. 6, pp. 1–15, 2016.
13. V. U. Eswaran and H. R. Bhargava, "Chemical Analysis and Anti-Microbial Activity of Karnataka Bee Bread of *Apis* species," *World Appl. Sci. J.*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 379–385, 2014.
14. Y. M. Choi, D. O. Noh, S. Y. Cho, H. J. Suh, K. M. Kim, and J. M. Kim, "Antioxidant and antimicrobial activities of propolis from several regions of Korea," *LWT-Food Sci. Technol.*, vol. 39, no. 7, pp. 756–761, 2006.
15. M. K. Choudhari, S. A. Puneekar, R. V. Ranade, and K. M. Paknikar, "Antimicrobial activity of stingless bee (*Trigona* sp.) propolis used in the folk medicine of Western Maharashtra, India," *J. Ethnopharmacol.*, vol. 141, no. 1, pp. 363–367, 2012.
16. V. A. Isidorov, A. G. Isidorova, and L. Szczepaniak, "Gas chromatographic – mass spectrometric investigation of the chemical composition of beebread," *Food Chem.*, vol. 115, pp. 1056–1063, 2009.
17. L. L. Mensor, F. S. Menezes, G. G. Leitão, A. S. Reis, T. C. D. Santos, C. S. Coube, and S. G. Leitão, "Screening of Brazilian Plant Extracts for Antioxidant Activity by the Use of DPPH Free Radical Method," *Phyther. Res.*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 127–130, 2001.
18. R. Re, N. Pellegrini, A. Proteggente, A. Pannala, M. Yang, and C. Rice-Evans, "Antioxidant activity applying an improved ABTS radical cation decolorization assay," *Free Radic. Biol. Med.*, vol. 26, no. 9–10, pp. 1231–1237, 1999.
19. I. F. F. Benzie and J. J. Strain, "The Ferric Reducing Ability of Plasma (FRAP) as a Measure of "Antioxidant Power": The FRAP Assay," *Anal. Biochem.*, vol. 239, no. 1, pp. 70–76, 1996.
20. A. T. Hassanain, A. K. Alyaa, and A. J. Karim, "Antimicrobial Effect of Malaysian Honey on Some Human Pathogens: an in vitro Study," *Int. Med. J. Malaysia*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 15–18, 2010.
21. S. C. A. Chen, M. L. O'Donnell, S. Gordon, and G. L. Gilbert, "Antifungal susceptibility testing using the E test: Comparison with the broth macrodilution technique," *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 265–273, 1996.
22. V. Baltrušaitytė, P. R. Venskutonis, and V. Čeksterytė, "Antibacterial Activity of Honey and Beebread of Different Origin Against *S. aureus* and *S. epidermidis*," *Food Technol. Biotechnol.*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 201–208, 2007.
23. T. M. S. Silva, C. A. Camara, A. C. da Silva Lins, J. M. Barbosa-Filho, E. M. S. da Silva, B. M. Freitas, and F. D. A. R. dos Santos, "Chemical composition and free radical scavenging activity of pollen loads from stingless bee *Melipona subnitida* Ducke," *J. Food Compos. Anal.*, vol. 19, pp. 507–511, 2006.
24. M. Leja, A. Mareczek, G. Wyżgolik, J. Klepacz-Baniak, and K. Czekońska, "Food Chemistry Antioxidative properties of bee pollen in selected plant species," *Food Chem.*, vol. 100, pp. 237–240, 2007.
25. W. Brand-Williams, M. E. Cuvelier, and C. Berset, "Use of a free radical method to evaluate antioxidant activity," *LWT - Food Sci. Technol.*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 25–30, 1995.
26. M. Hamburger and K. Hostettmann, "7. Bioactivity in plants: the link between phytochemistry and medicine," *Phytochemistry*, vol. 30, no. 12, pp. 3864–3874, 1991.
27. B. A. S. Machado, R. P. D. Silva, G. de Abreu Barreto, S. S. Costa, D. F. da Silva, H. N. Brandão, and F. F. Padilha, "Chemical Composition and Biological Activity of Extracts Obtained by Supercritical Extraction and Ethanol Extraction of Brown, Green and Red Propolis Derived from Different Geographic Regions in Brazil," *PLoS One*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 1–26, 2016.
28. S. Alves de Souza, C. A. Camara, E. Monica Sarmento da Silva, and T. M. S. Silva, "Composition and Antioxidant Activity of Geopropolis Collected by *Melipona subnitida* (Jandaíra) Bees," *Evidence-Based Complement. Altern.*, vol. 2013, 2013.

29. M. B. Arnao, "Some methodological problems in the determination of antioxidant activity using chromogen radicals : a practical case," *Trends Food Sci. Technol.*, vol. 11, no. 11, pp. 419–421, 2001.
30. R. L. Prior, X. Wu, and K. Schaich, "Standardized Methods for the Determination of Antioxidant Capacity and Phenolics in Foods and Dietary Supplements," *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, vol. 53, no. 10, pp. 4290–4302, 2005.
31. L. A. Mărghitaş, O. G. Stanciu, D. S. Dezmirean, O. Bobiş, O. Popescu, S. Bogdanov, and M. G. Campos, "In vitro antioxidant capacity of honeybee-collected pollen of selected floral origin harvested from Romania," *Food Chem.*, vol. 115, pp. 878–883, 2009.
32. M. Jug and M. Z. Kon, "Modulation of antioxidant , chelating and antimicrobial activity of poplar chemo-type propolis by extraction procures," *LWT - Food Sci. Technol.*, vol. 57, pp. 530–537, 2014.
33. D. P. Mohapatra, V. Thakur, and S. K. Brar, "Antibacterial Efficacy of Raw and Processed Honey," *Biotechnol. Res. Int.*, vol. 2011, 2011.