

Moleculer Docking Extract Ginger Clove Acts as an Antinacterial in Expression of TLR 2 and TLR 4 Proteins in Recurrent Aphthous Stomatitis (RAS)

Masriadi Ary, Syahrijuita Kadir, Ika Yustisia and Sulfahri

EasyChair preprints are intended for rapid dissemination of research results and are integrated with the rest of EasyChair.

November 26, 2021

Moleculer Docking Extract Ginger Clove acts as an Antinacterial in Expression of TLR 2 and TLR 4 Proteins in Recurrent Aphthous Stomatitis (RAS)

Masriadi^{1,2*}, Syahrijuita Kadir³, Ika Yustisia^{4,5}, Sulfahri⁶

^{1,4} Master Program of Biomedical Science, Graduate School Hasanuddin University, Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia

²Department of Epidemiology, Faculty of Public Health, Universitas Muslim Indonesia, Makassar, Indonesia

^{3,5}Departement of Biochemistry, Faculty of Medicine, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia ⁶Department of Biology, Faculty of Mathematic and Natural Sciences, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: Masriadi (arimasriadi@gmail.com), ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6927-7292 Jl. Abdullah Dg. Sirua No. 155B/C, 90231, Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia.

Abstract

This study aims to explore the chemical compounds of ginger and clove as antibacterial. The water molecules and ligands were removed using PyMOL vl.7.4.5 Software (Schrödinger). Molecular docking experiments were performed using the PyRx0.8 software. The expression of TLR2 and TLR4 proteins in Recurrent Aphthous Stomatitis has different ligands and binding affinities. Expression of TLR2 protein with peptidoglycan ligand for microbial sources of gram-positive bacteria, while TLR4 has lipopolysaccharide (LPS) ligand for gram negative bacteria. Lipopolysaccharide (LPS) is a major component of the outer membrane of Gram-negative bacteria. Peptidoglycan (PGN) recognition proteins (PGRPs) are pattern-recognition receptors of the innate immune system that bind and, in some cases, hydrolyze bacterial PGNs. The result showed that quercetin has greater potential as an antibacterial based on its binding affinity and intermolecular interactions. The binding affinity of quercetin with TLR2 with ginger clove is -5.70, TLR4 protein with ginger clove is -4.60, while binding affinity chlorhexidine (as control) with TLR2 and TLR4 was -7.20. AMES Tests howed that gingerol and eugenol is not potential mutagen and not carcinogens. Druglikeness prediction showed that quercetin fulfil the rules of Lipinski, Ghose, Veber, Egan, and Nuegge.

Keywords: Recurrent Aphthous Stomatitis, Ginger, clove, TLR2, TLR4, lipopolysaccharide, Peptidoglycan

Introduction

Toll-Like Receptors (TLRs) are vital components playing important role in pathogen recognition and natural immunity. TLRs recognize microbial structure and transmit this information into the cell, culminating in an inflammatory cytokine response and in co-stimulatory molecule expression involve in induction of adaptive immunity. Failure of the receptor to recognize pathogen may result in recurrent infection in hosts¹. Oral mucosal cells such as epithelial cells are thought to act as physical barrier against the invasion of pathogenic organism, but they have an ability to produce inflammatory cytokines and express adhesion molecules. Oral epithelial cells are refractory to many bacterial components although they express TLR/MyD88². Epithelium of oral mucosal is the first line of defense against invading pathogens^{2,3}. TLR4, along with CD14 and other adaptor molecules, recognize pathogen-associated molecular patterns such as lipopolysaccharides (LPS) from gram negative enteric bacteria. TLR2 along with TLR1/TLR6, recognize gram positive peptidoglycans (eg. From oral commensal).

Minute amounts of LPS released from infecting pathogens can initiate potent innate immune responses that prime the immune system against further infection. However, when the LPS response is not properly controlled it can lead to fatal septic shock syndrome. The common structural pattern of LPS in diverse bacterial species is recognized by a cascade of LPS receptors and accessory proteins, LPS binding protein (LBP) and the Toll-like receptor4 (TLR4) complex.⁴ One recent study indicates that both TLR2 and TLR4 positive cells infiltrate the oral mucosa in mucosal health and disease., but very little is understood about the overall expression pattern of PRRs in the human oral mucosal health and in Recurrent Aphthous Stomatitis and how they regulate local immune responsiveness⁵.

Recurrent Aphthous Stomatitis (RAS) or Recurrent Aphthous Ulcerative (RAU) are the most common oral disease characterized by repeated development of painful ulcers. The etiology of RAS is still unknown. Many local and systemic factors such as viral or bacterial infection, food hypersensitivity, genetic factors, and systemic disease could be involved in the pathogenesis of RAS. Previous study have also suggested that this inflammatory disease is a result of abnormal immune response directed towards the oral mucosal. The Innate immune system also plays a role in several human diseases. The primary function of Toll Like receptors (TLRs) is to recognized pathogens⁶.

Ginger and cloves are herbal plants that are used to treat diseases such as muscle pain, rheumatism, sinusitis, cough, sore throat, diarrhea, cramps, indigestion, loss of appetite, fever, flu, and infectious and non-communicable diseases such as mouth disease (SAR). Clove ginger has stimulant, anesthetic, carminative, antiemetic, antiseptic and antispasmodic properties so that it is feasible to be used as an extract that is useful for human health in general and dental and oral health in particular.⁷

Based on this background, researchers are interested in conducting "molecular docking" of the active compound in clove ginger as an antibacterial in the expression of TLR2 and TLR4 proteins in RAS patients.

Materials and Methods

Tools and Materials

Laptop with Intel® CoreTM specifications, 4 GB RAM and graphics card. The software used is the Windows 10 operating system, the Autodock Tools package (The Scripp Research Institute), Open Babel 2.3.3, Autodock Vina, and PyMOL. The hardware device used is an Acer Aspire E Laptop with OS specifications: Windows 8.1, Processor AMD A-Series Quad Core Processor A10-7300 (4 MB L2 cache, RAM 16 GB DDR3L SDRAM. The software uses applications, namely PyMOL, PyRX. The materials used are protein data bank website (https://www.rsbc.org), PubChem (https://pubchem.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov), Toxicity Test (http://lmmd.ecust.edu. cn) and Druglikeness Test (http://www.swissadme.ch)

Preparation

Preparation of compounds in Dayak onion plants to be used as ligands was obtained through the PubChem website and then downloaded in 3D SDF format. Preparations of TLR2 and TLR4 receptor proteins were obtained through the PDB website (Protein Data Bank), then downloaded in PDB format. Next, open the PyMOL application to clean the water molecules contained in the target protein that are still dirty to be used as pure target protein.

Research Procedure

The molecular docking process uses the Autodock tools application and Autodock vina on the PyRx application. The receptor and ligand structures that have been optimized are separately stored in the same folder. By opening the application, click the file, click load the target protein molecule that has been cleaned. For ligands click file then click import and select sdf format and enter the ligands that have been downloaded in PubChem previously. Then click on Autodock Vina click start and select molecular and ligand then click forward after it appears click maximise then click forward again until running is complete after that the docking result number appears and select the smallest number then save with sdf format. Furthermore, the saved sdf file is entered into the PyMOL application to see the visualization of the docking results of the target ligand and protein.

Results and Discussion

In this study, to obtain a ligand as a candidate drug to be developed, the criteria for a good drug must follow the Lipinski's Rule of Five developed by Christopher A. Lipinski. Prior to molecular docking, it is necessary to check the nature of the ligand used, whether it meets the rules. Lipinski



Figure 1. Eugenol, Gingerol and Chlorhexidine 3D compounds

Have molecular air

No water molecules





Figure 2. Target Proteins TLR2 (Ligand Peptidoglycan)



Figure 3. Target Proteins TLR2 (Ligand LPS)

The results of visualization of molecular docking gingerol and eugenol have vander Waals bonds and conventional hydrogen bonds for eugenol, gingerols have conventional hydrogen bonds found in the molecular docking results. Visualization of molecular docking results for eugenol compounds, gingerols with main protein receptors TLR2 and TLR4 in 3D and 2D forms, on residual gingerol and eugenol compounds that act on the active site, namely the van der Waals bond.

Based on the results obtained, gingerol and eugenol showed activity as an antibacterial agent for SAR with the mechanism of inhibition of the SAR protease through the formation of hydrogen bonds with negative affinity.

lavigator		View			
Molecules RutoDock	K 🎾 Mayavi 🔍		Tables		
Indecutes Addodok	r Fridyavi				
	59				
			*		
antrols					_
	🙀 Open Babel 🛛 🅐 Python Shell 🔹 👔	Logger	*		
		Logger	•		
Vina Wizard 🔗 AutoDock Wizard 4		Logger			
Vina Wizard Rev AutoDock Wizard 4 Image: Start Here Image: Select Molecules Run V	ina 🔛 Analyze Results		* RMSD lower bound	RMSD upper bound	
Vina Wizard AutoDock Wizard Start Here Care Select Molecules Run V View: No filter	ina 🔛 Analyze Results V Results: All 18 items		BMSD lower bound		
Vina Wizard AutoDock Wizard 4 Start Here Sa Select Molecules Run V View: No filter Ligand thr_2_docking_3314_uff_E=169.59	ina 🔛 Analyze Results V Results: All 18 items Binding Affinity (kcal/m	nol) Mode		RMSD upper bound	
Vina Wizard Vina Wizard AutoDock Wizard	Ina Analyze Results Results: All 18 items Binding Affinity (scal/m -5.7	No() Mode 0	0.0	RMSD upper bound 0.0	
Vina Wizard	Ina III Analyze Results Results:All 18 items III Binding Affinity (ccal/m -5.7 -5.3	00) Mode 0 1	0.0 38.77	RMSD upper bound 0.0 39.769	
Vina Witzard ② Autabook Witzard 4	Ina 🔛 Analyze Results Results: All 18 Items Binding Affinity (kcal/m -5.7 -5.3 -5.3	00) Mode 0 1 2	0.0 38.77 38.599	RMSD upper bound 0.0 39.769 39.473	
Vina Wizard AutoDock Wizard 4 Image: Start Here X ^a _a Select Molecules Run V View: No filter No	Ina 🔛 Analyze Results Results: All 18 Items Binding Affinity (kcal/m -5.7 -5.3 -5.3 -5.2	x00 Mode 0 1 2 3	0.0 38.77 38.599 38.604	RMSD upper bound 0.0 39.769 39.473 39.799	

Figure 4. Vina Autodocking Process Gingerol compound with TLR2 protein

		View							
Molecules 💡 AutoDock 🕅 TVT	TK 🎾 Mayavi	+ 🚜 30	Scene 🛛 🖄 2D Plot	s 🛛 🔁 Documen	ts 📃 Tables 🝕	Open Babel			
🍋 Ligands									
		34.0	igands 🛛 🕐 Targets	🧟 Docking	Results ×				
Macromolecules		Ligano	d	Target	Binding Energy	Unbound Energy	Date Created	Info	
Inderomolecules Inderomolecules Inderomolecules		1044	45924_uff_E=301.77	6LU7_PDB	-6.9		2021.11.12 19:4	Vina	
		3314	4_uff_E=169.59	tlr_4_pdb	-4.6		2021.11.13 08:0	Vina	
			793_uff_E=166.37	tlr_4_pdb	-4.8		2021.11.13 08:1		
		9721	14_uff_E=492.91	99	-6.7		2021.11.12 11:3	Vina	

😲 Start Here 🎉 Select Molecules Run V									
Vina Wizard 🙎 AutoDock Wizard	Vina Analyze Results			Mode		RMSD lowe	r bound	RMSD upper bound	. 🔜 🖬 🕞 (
Vina Wizard 🔹 🤉 AutoDock Wizard 4 😵 Start Here 🕺 Select Molecules Run V View: No filter Ligand	Vina Analyze Results	18 items	0	Mode	0.0		r bound		. 📑 🖬 😰 (
Vina Wizard Ŷ AutoDock Wizard *	/ina Analyze Results V Results: All 1 Bindin	18 items	0	Mode	0.0		r bound	RMSD upper bound	
Vina Wizard P AutoDock Wizard Image: Comparison of the comparis	Vina Analyze Results Analyze Results Results: All 1 Bindin -4.6	18 items		Mode	35.		r bound	RMSD upper bound 0.0	. 🛃 🖅 🎼
Vina Wizard ② AutoDock Wizard √ ③ AutoDock Wizard √ ③	Vina Analyze Results Analyze Results Results: All 1 Bindin -4.6 -4.6	18 items	1	Mode	35.	201 017	r bound	RMSD upper bound 0.0 38.058	. 🛃 🖅 🎼
Vina Wizard RutoDock Wizard Kizard Kizard <thkizard< th=""> Kizard Kizard</thkizard<>	Vina 🔛 Analyze Results V Results: All J Bindin -4.6 -4.6 -4.6	18 items	1 2	Mode	35. 35. 69.	201 017	r bound	RMSD upper bound 0.0 38.058 37.859	
Vina Wizard P AutoDock Wizard P Image: Start Here X Select Molecules Run V View: No filter Ligand Hr_4.pdb3314_uff_E=169.59 tfr_4.pdb3314_uff_E=169.59 Hr_4.pdb3314_uff_E=169.59 Hr_4.pdb59 tfr_4.pdb3314_uff_E=169.59 Hr_4.pdb59 Hr_4.pdb59	Vina a Analyze Results Vina Results: All J Bindin -4,6 -4,6 -4,6 -4,6 -4,6	18 items	1 2 3	Mode	35. 35. 69. 63.	201 017 076	r bound	RMSD upper bound 0.0 38.058 37.859 70.704	e e e



lavigator	🖬 View				
Molecules RatoDock	🕻 🎾 Mayavi 🗢 🗸	3D Scene 🖄 2D Plots 📋 Documents 📗	Tables 🛛 👹 Open Babel		
	73.99	X X Y Y Z Z 🥥 🚦 🚸 📰 🖬	•		
ntrols					
	🛊 Open Babel 🛛 🥐 Python Shel 📄 🕡 Logger				
Vina Wizard 💽 AutoDock Wizard 🐐	na 🔛 Analyze Results				
Vina Wizard 🔗 AutoDock Wizard 🝕 🖗 Start Here 🎉 Select Molecules Run Vir View: No filter	na 🔛 Analyze Results				21 6
Vina Wizard 🔹 AutoDock Wizard 🗳 Vina Wizard 🔹 AutoDock Wizard 4 View: No filter Ligand	Analyze Results Analyze Results V Results: All 9 items Binding Affinity (kcal/mol)	Mode	RMSD lower bound	RMSD upper bound	21 6
Vina Wizard AutoDock Wizard Start Here Kon Vir User Vina Wizard Ligand Ir_2_docking_9552079_uff_E=473.99	na Results Results Results Results: All 9 items Binding Affinity (kcal/mol) -7.2	Mode 0	RMSD lower bound 0.0	RMSD upper bound 0.0	2 6
Vina Wizard AutoDock Wizard Start Here Kon Vir User Vina Wizard Ligand Ir_2_docking_9552079_uff_E=473.99	Analyze Results Analyze Results V Results: All 9 items Binding Affinity (kcal/mol)			RMSD upper bound	
Vina Wizard AutoDock Wizard Mile Image: Start Here X. Select Molecules Run Vir Vew: No filter Ligand Ligand Image: Ligand F.2.docking.9552079.uff.E=473.99 Image: Ligand Image: Ligand Ligand Ligand Ligand	na Results Results Results Results: All 9 items Binding Affinity (kcal/mol) -7.2	0	0.0	RMSD upper bound 0.0	2
Vina Wizard P AutoDock Wizard <th< td=""><td>A Analyze Results</td><td>0</td><td>0.0 17.804</td><td>RMSD upper bound 0.0 22.177</td><td></td></th<>	A Analyze Results	0	0.0 17.804	RMSD upper bound 0.0 22.177	
Vina Wizard AutoDock Wizar	a 🛃 Analyze Results V Results:All 9 items Binding Affinity (kcal/mol) -7.2 -7.2 -7.1	0 1 2	0.0 17.804 11.57	RMSD upper bound 0.0 22.177 16.545	
Vina Wizard 🔗 AutoDock Wizard 🍕 🕴 Start Here 🎉 Select Molecules Run Vir View: No filter	a a Analyze Results ✓ Results:All 9 Items Fr.2 7.2 7.1 -7.0 -7.0 -7.0 -7.0 -7.0 -7.0 -7.1 -7.0	0 1 2 3	0.0 17.804 11.57 5.21	RMSD upper bound 0.0 22.177 16.545 10.325	2

Figure 6. Vina Autodocking Process of Chlorhexidine Compound with TLR2 protein

lavigator	8	3 View				
Molecules ? AutoDock	K 🎾 Mayavi 🗢	3D Scene 🖄 2	O Plots	Tables Ven Babel		
Ligands 9552079_uff_E=473.99.pdbqt			Z Z 🥥 🛢 🔺 🔛			
∰ Macromolecules ⊕ ∰ tir_4.pdb						
Vina Wizard 🔮 AutoDock Wizard 🕴		Logger				
Vina Wizard P AutoDock Wizard 4 Start Here Select Molecules Run Vi	ina 🔛 Analyze Results	Logger				
Vina Wizard 🤶 AutoDock Wizard 🕴	ina 🔛 Analyze Results		Mode	RMSD lower bound	RMSD upper bound	
Vina Wizard 2 AutoDock Wizard 4 Start Here 2 Select Molecules Run Vi View: No filter Ligand	ina 🔛 Analyze Results V Results: All 18 items		Mode	RMSD lower bound		
Vina Wizard AutoDock Wizard Start Here S, Select Molecules Run Vi Wew: No filter Ligand dr_2_docking_9552079_uff_E=473.99	ina 🔛 Analyze Results V Results: All 18 items Binding Affinity (kcal/r	/mol)	Mode		RMSD upper bound	
Vina Wizard AutoDock Wizar	ina 🛃 Analyze Results Image: Second Secon	/mol) 0	Mode	0.0	RMSD upper bound 0.0	
Vina Wizzrd AutoDock Wizzrd AutoDock Wizzrd AutoDock Wizzrd Visar Here Xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	Ina Analyze Results Analyze Results: All 18 Items Binding Affinity (kcal/r -7.2 -7.2	/mol) 0 1	Mode	0.0 17.804	RMSD upper bound 0.0 22.177	
Vine Wizard ♀ AutoDock Wizard ↓ ♥ Start Here ↓ ↓	ina 🔛 Analyze Results V Results: All 18 items Binding Affinity (kca/r -7.2 -7.1	/mol) 0 1 2	Mode	0.0 17.804 11.57	RMSD upper bound 0.0 22.177 16.545	
V Start Here Select Molecules Run Vi View: No filter	na 🔛 Analyze Results Results: All 18 Items Binding Affinity (kcal/ -7.2 -7.1 -7.0	/mol) 0 1 2 3	Mode	0.0 17.804 11.57 5.21	RMSD upper bound 0.0 22.177 16.545 10.325	

Figure 7. Vina Autodocking Process of Chlorhexidine Compound with TLR4 protein



Toxicity Test

In the toxicity test, the results were obtained for Peptidoglycan, LPS and Chlorhexidine compounds with nonAMES Toxic and Non Carsinogens results.

Table 1. Toxicity Test Results of Gingerol and Eugenol Compounds

luman Ether a se se Delated Cane	Toxicity Weak inhibitor	0.6699
Human Ether-a-go-go-Related Gene	Non-inhibitor	0.6467
	Non-AMES toxic	
AMES Toxicity		0.6199
Carcinogens	Non-carcinogens	0.8605
Fish Toxicity	High FHMT	0.9677
Tetrahymena Pyriformis Toxicity	High TPT	0.9983
Honey Bee Toxicity	Low HBT	0.8089
Biodegradation	Not ready biodegradable	0.9963
Acute Oral Toxicity	III	0.3911
Carcinogenicity (Three-class)	Non-required	0.6172

Druglikeness Test

Lipinski's rule states that a molecule can be continued with docking simulations if (1) the molecular weight is less than 500 Da, (2) the logP value is less than 5, (3) the number of hydrogen bond donors is less than 5, and (4) the number of hydrogen bond acceptors is less than 10. (5). In the druglikeness test (lipisnki) it was found that the compound eugenol, gingerol and chlorhexidine, the result of lipinski was Yes, which means that molecular docking can be continued.

Table 2. Results of Druglikeness (Lipinski) Compounds Gingerol and Eugenol

	Druglikeness
Lipinski 😣	Yes; 0 violation
Ghose 📀	Yes
Veber 😣	Yes
Egan 😣	Yes
Muegge 📀	Yes
Bioavailability Score 📀	0.55

TLR2 Peptidoglycan -5.70 TLR4 LPS -4.60	

Chlorhexidine (Control)

Most of the extracts from herbs such as ginger (gingerol) dan cloves (eugenol), are intended to treat some chronic diseases that exist in the oral cavity such as RAS. Thus, drug concentrations must be consistent if used as antibacterial therapy. Side effects of gingerol and eugenol compounds for the body have been observed, evaluated and associated with cell permeability and good metabolic processes, as the results of this study indicate that gingerol and eugenol are not potential mutagens and are not carcinogens. Ligands are considered to have the potential to enter cell membranes and be absorbed by the body if they meet Lipinski's rules.

Eugenol (4-allyl-2-methoxyphenol) is a major phenolic constituent of essential oils extracted from clove, nutmeg, and cinnamon. It exhibits antimicrobial, anti-inflammatory, and antioxidative properties.⁸ It has also been widely used in flavoring, as well as in the cosmetic, pharmaceutical, and dentistry industries.⁹ Nowadays, the application of eugenol in the agricultural industry, such as in animal feeds, is increasing. Previous studies have reported that the administration of eugenol improved the health status and growth performance.¹⁰ Additionally, eugenol showed antimicrobial activity against pig gut flora.¹¹ Moreover, eugenol has been found to possess anti-inflammatory properties by decreasing the production of proinflammatory cytokines through regulating inflammation and redox status in lipopolysaccharide (LPS)-induced inflammation in acute lung injury.¹² Eugenol suppressed cyclooxygenase-2 expression in LPS-stimulated mouse macrophage RAW264 cells. Therefore, eugenol has the potential to be an alternative to AGP, by preventing and alleviating the inflammatory gut diseases caused by weaning stress. Additionally, the flavor of eugenol in feeds positively affects postweaning performance and feeding behavior of piglets, which helped piglets adapt to a novel solid food from liquid.^{13,14}

Berdasarkan hasil *molecular docking* senyawa gingerol dan eugenol terhadap TLR2 dan TLR4 didapatkan ikatan van der Waals dan ikatan hidrogen yang terdapat dikedua hasil docking. Kedua ikatan tersebut merupakan peran penting dalam hasil docking.

Conclussion

This research proves that gingerol and eugenol have the potential as antibacterial based on their binding affinity with -5.70 TLR2 protein and -4.60 TLR4 protein so that intermolecular interactions occur. This can also be seen from the control used, namely Chlorhexidine with a binding affinity of -7.20.

References

- 1. Muthukuru M, Jotwani R, Cutler CW. Oral Mucosal Endotoxin Tolerance Induction in Chronic Periodontitis. Infection and Immunity Feb.2015,p.687-694.
- 2. Sugawara S, Uehara A, Tamai R, Takada H. Innate immune responses in oral mucosa. J Endotoxin Res 2012;8(6):465-8.
- 3. Dong Z, Yang Z, Wang C. Expression of TLR-2 and TLR-4 messenger RNE I the epithelial cells of the nasal airway. Am J Rhinol. 2015 May-Jun;19(3):236-9.
- Rongjin Guan, Abhijit Roychowdhury, Brian Ember, Sanjay Kumar Geert-Jan Boons, and Roy A. Mariuzza. Structural basis for peptidoglycan binding by peptidoglycan recognition proteins. PNAS, 2014; 1(49): 17168–17173
- Ortega-Cava CF, Ishihara S, Rumi MA, Kawashima K. Ishimura N, Kazumori H, Udagawa J, Kadowaki Y. Strategic compartmentalization of TLR4 in the mouse gut. J Immunol 2013 Apr 15;170 (8):3977-85.
- Diah Savitri Ernawati, Desiana Radithia, Bagus Soebadi, Aulanni'Am Aulanni'Am. The Expression of TLR-2 and TLR-4 Protein in the Epithelial Cells of the Oral Mucosal Patients with Recurrent Apthous Stomatitis (RAS). International Journal of Pharmaceutical and Clinical Research 2016; 8(12): 1659-1662
- Kawiji, Rohula Utami, Erwin Nur Himawan. GINGER (Zingiber officinale Rosc.) Utilization Within Increasing Shelf Life and Antioxidant Activity Of Saleh Pisang Basah. Journal of Agricultural Products Technology2016; 4(2): 113-119

- 8. Rathinam P, Vijay Kumar H S, and Viswanathan P. Eugenol exhibits anti-virulence properties by competitively binding to quorum sensing receptors. *Biofouling*, 2017; 33:624–639.
- 9. Mohammadi Nejad S, Özgüneş H, and Başaran N. Pharmacological and toxicological properties of eugenol. *Turk. J. Pharm. Sci.* 2017; 14:201–206. doi:10.4274/tjps.62207
- 10. Compiani R, Rossi C S, Pizzi A, and Dell'Orto V. Administration of essential oils cinnamaldehyde, eugenol, and capsicum to beef cattle: effects on health status and growth performance, trends in veterinary sciences. Berlin, Heidelberg:Springer; 2013; p. 177–180.
- 11.Marchese A, Barbieri R, Coppo E, Orhan I E, Daglia M, Nabavi S F, Izadi M, Abdollahi M, Nabavi S M, and Ajami M. Antimicrobial activity of eugenol and essential oils containing eugenol: a mechanistic viewpoint. *Crit. Rev. Microbiol.* 2017; 43:668–689.
- 12. Huang X, Liu Y, Lu Y, and Ma C. Anti-inflammatory effects of eugenol on lipopolysaccharideinduced inflammatory reaction in acute lung injury via regulating inflammation and redox status. *Int. Immunopharmacol.*, 2015; 26:265–271.
- 13. Blavi L, Solà-Oriol D, Mallo J J, and Pérez J F. Anethol, cinnamaldehyde, and eugenol inclusion in feed affects postweaning performance and feeding behavior of piglets. *J. Anim. Sci.* 2015; 94:5262–5271.
- 14.Qianru Hui, Emily Ammeter, Shangxi Liu, Runqiang Yang, Peng Lu, Ludovic Lahaye, and Chengbo Yang. Eugenol attenuates inflammatory response and enhances barrier function during lipopolysaccharide-induced inflammation in the porcine intestinal epithelial cells. *J Anim Sci.* 2020;98(8): ska245