



15 **ABSTRACT**

16 Traditional ethnomedical use of plants is recognized as an important potential source of  
17 compounds used in mainstream medicine. Herein, the *in vitro* antioxidant properties,  
18 nutrients and phytochemical composition of six medicinal plants widely used in the  
19 north-eastern Portuguese region were evaluated. The antioxidant activity was screened  
20 through: radical scavenging effects, reducing power, and inhibition of lipid peroxidation  
21 in brain homogenates. Nutrients and phytochemical characterization included  
22 determination of sugars by HPLC-RI, fatty acids by GC-FID, tocopherols by HPLC-  
23 fluorescence, phenolics, flavonoids, carotenoids and ascorbic acid, by  
24 spectrophotometric techniques. *Rubus ulmifolius* flowers revealed the highest  
25 antioxidant activity, and the highest contents in phenolics, flavonoids, ascorbic acid and  
26 lycopene. *Castanea sativa* flowers revealed the highest concentration of individual and  
27 total tocopherols, and total sugars, including the reducing sugars glucose and fructose.  
28 *Helichrysum stoechas* aerial parts gave the highest levels of  $\beta$ -carotene, *Matricaria*  
29 *recutita* aerial parts revealed the highest PUFA levels, including linoleic acid. The  
30 studied medicinal plants have interesting antioxidant properties and a phytochemical  
31 composition that could provide scientific evidence for some folk uses in the treatment of  
32 diseases related to the production of ROS and oxidative stress, but further experiments  
33 are required to explore the mechanisms of action.

34

35 **Keywords:** Medicinal plants; Antioxidant properties; Phytochemicals; Portuguese  
36 ethnobotany

37 **1. Introduction**

38

39 More and more chronic diseases are crippling the ageing population: cancers, arthritis  
40 and arthrosis, cardiovascular and neurodegenerative diseases bring more people to  
41 hospitals and retirement boarding houses (Montagnier, 2009). At the individual level,  
42 there is a common biochemical denominator resulting from the summation of genetic,  
43 behavioural and environmental factors: oxidative stress. There are intrinsic factors for  
44 the generation of ROS (reactive oxygen species): dysfunction of mitochondria, thymic  
45 involution favouring chronic inflammation and infections (Montagnier, 2009).

46 Natural products represent a rich source of biologically active compounds and are an  
47 example of molecular diversity, with recognized potential in drug discovery and  
48 development (Mishra *et al.*, 2008). Particularly, the plant kingdom offers a wide range  
49 of natural antioxidants. However, little is known about the practical usefulness of most  
50 of them. Many herbal and plant infusions frequently used in folk medicine have  
51 antioxidative and pharmacological properties connected with the presence of phenolic  
52 compounds, especially flavonoids (Dawidowicz *et al.*, 2006). The biological,  
53 pharmacological and medicinal properties of this group of compounds have been  
54 extensively reviewed (Marchand, 2002).

55 In rural areas, such as the north-eastern region of Portugal, folk medicine and traditional  
56 healing practices often coexists with formalized and institutionalized medicine systems.  
57 Since a long time ago, several species from the local flora have become very popular  
58 and are widely consumed due to their pharmacological properties and therapeutic  
59 effects. These species are mainly recommended for disorders of the respiratory system,  
60 digestive system, inflammation, cholesterol and hypertension (Neves *et al.*, 2009;  
61 Carvalho, 2010).

62 Ethnobotanical surveys conducted in this Portuguese region highlighted (Frazão-  
63 Moreira et al., 2007; Carvalho, 2010; Carvalho and Morales, 2010) some widespread  
64 examples of traditional plant use such as the decoction of upright catkins of the  
65 Fagaceae *Castanea sativa* Miller for cold and caught, diarrhea and cholesterol; infusions  
66 and decoctions of the flowering aerial parts of the Asteraceae *Centaurea paniculata* L.  
67 for inflammation, *Helichrysum stoechas* (L.) Moench for the respiratory system and to  
68 reduce fever, *Matricaria recutita* L. for cold, bronchitis, inflammation and as digestive;  
69 decoctions of the inflorescences of the Fabaceae *Trifolium angustifolium* L. and of  
70 flower buds and flowers of the Rosaceae *Rubus ulmifolius* Schott for stomachache and  
71 diarrhea.

72 Although antioxidant properties of some of these plants, such as *Helichrysum stoechas*  
73 (Carini et al., 2001; Albayrak et al., 2010), *Matricaria recutita* (Miliauskas et al., 2004;  
74 Schempp et al., 2006) and *Rubus ulmifolius* (Dall'Acqua et al., 2008; Martini et al.,  
75 2009) have been investigated in different countries, there are no reports on material  
76 collected in Portugal. *Castanea sativa* flowers antioxidant properties were reported by  
77 our research group (Barreira et al., 2008), but without a complete characterization of the  
78 chemical constituents.

79 This work aims to study the antioxidant potential of six medicinal plants traditionally  
80 used in the northeastern region of Portugal (*Castanea sativa* flowers, *Centaurea*  
81 *paniculata*, *Helichrysum stoechas* *Matricaria recutita* and *Trifolium angustifolium*  
82 flowering aerial parts, and *Rubus ulmifolius* flower buds and flowers), characterize their  
83 nutrients and phytochemical composition, and find correlations with their folk  
84 medicinal uses.

85

## 86 **2. Materials and methods**

### 87 *2.1. Samples*

88 All the samples were collected in 2009, in the Natural Park of Montesinho territory,  
89 Trás-os-Montes, North-eastern Portugal, considering the Portuguese folk  
90 pharmacopoeia, the local medicinal criteria of use and the plants growth patterns. From  
91 *Castanea sativa*, the upright catkins during anthesis in late summer; from *Centaurea*  
92 *paniculata*, *Helichrysum stoechas* *Matricaria recutita* and *Trifolium angustifolium*, the  
93 inflorescences and leafy flowering stems of about 15 cm long, in late spring and early  
94 summer; the flower buds and fully opened flowers (each part constituting one different  
95 sample according to folk uses) of *Rubus ulmifollius* in spring.

96 Morphological key characters from the Flora Iberica (Castroviejo 1991, 2001 and 2007)  
97 and the “Nova Flora de Portugal” (Franco 1994) were used for plant identification.  
98 Voucher specimens are deposited in the “Herbarium of Escola Superior Agrária de  
99 Bragança” (BRESA). Each sample was lyophilized (Ly-8-FM-ULE, Snijders, Holland)  
100 and kept in the best conditions for subsequent use.

101

### 102 *2.2. Standards and Reagents*

103 Acetonitrile 99.9%, *n*-hexane 95%, and ethyl acetate 99.8% were of HPLC grade (Lab-  
104 Scan, Lisbon, Portugal). The fatty acids methyl ester (FAME) reference standard  
105 mixture 37 (standard 47885-U) was purchased from Sigma (St. Louis, MO), as also  
106 other individual fatty acid isomers, ascorbic acid, tocopherols, and sugars standards,  
107 Trolox (6-hydroxy-2,5,7,8-tetramethylchroman-2-carboxylic acid), gallic acid, and (+)-  
108 catechin. Racemic tocol, 50 mg/mL, was purchased from Matreya (Chalfont, PA). 2,2-  
109 Diphenyl-1-picrylhydrazyl (DPPH) was obtained from Alfa Aesar (Ward Hill, MA). All

110 other chemicals and solvents were of analytical grade and purchased from common  
111 sources. Water was treated in a Milli-Q water purification system (Pure Water Systems,  
112 Brea, CA).

113

### 114 2.3. *In vitro* evaluation of antioxidant properties

#### 115 2.3.1. Preparation of the methanolic extracts

116 A fine dried powder (20 mesh; ~1 g) was extracted by stirring with 30 mL of methanol  
117 at 25 °C at 150 rpm for 1 h and filtered through Whatman No. 4 paper. The residue was  
118 then extracted with one additional 30 mL portion of methanol. The combined  
119 methanolic extracts were evaporated at 35°C under reduced pressure, re-dissolved in  
120 methanol at a concentration of 10 mg/mL, and stored at 4 °C for further use.

121 *In vitro* assays which have already been described by the authors ([Guimarães \*et al.\*,  
122 2010](#)) were applied to evaluate the antioxidant activity of all the samples. Different  
123 concentrations of the extracts (4.00 to 0.03 mg/mL) were used to find EC<sub>50</sub> values.

124

#### 125 2.3.2. DPPH radical-scavenging activity

126 This methodology was performed using an ELX800 Microplate Reader (BioTek  
127 Instruments, Inc., Winooski, VT). The reaction mixture in each of the 96-wells  
128 consisted of one of the different concentrations of the extracts (30 µL) and aqueous  
129 methanolic solution (80:20, v/v, 270 µL) containing DPPH radicals ( $6 \times 10^{-5}$  mol/L).  
130 The mixture was left to stand for 60 min in the dark. The reduction of the DPPH radical  
131 was determined by measuring the absorption at 515 nm. The radical scavenging activity  
132 (RSA) was calculated as a percentage of DPPH discolouration using the equation: %  
133  $RSA = [(A_{DPPH} - A_S) / A_{DPPH}] \times 100$ , where  $A_S$  is the absorbance of the solution when the

134 sample extract has been added at a particular level, and  $A_{\text{DPPH}}$  is the absorbance of the  
135 DPPH solution. The extract concentration providing 50% of radicals scavenging activity  
136 ( $\text{EC}_{50}$ ) was calculated from the graph of RSA percentage against extract concentration.  
137 Trolox was used as standard.

138

### 139 *2.3.3. Reducing power*

140 This methodology was performed using the Microplate Reader described above. The  
141 different concentrations of the extracts (0.5 mL) were mixed with sodium phosphate  
142 buffer (200 mmol/L, pH 6.6, 0.5 mL) and potassium ferricyanide (1%, w/v, 0.5 mL).  
143 The mixture was incubated at 50 °C for 20 min, and trichloroacetic acid (10%, w/v, 0.5  
144 mL) was added. The mixture (0.8 mL) was poured in the 48-wells, as also deionised  
145 water (0.8 mL) and ferric chloride (0.1%, w/v, 0.16 mL), and the absorbance was  
146 measured at 690 nm. The extract concentration providing 0.5 of absorbance ( $\text{EC}_{50}$ ) was  
147 calculated from the graph of absorbance at 690 nm against extract concentration. Trolox  
148 was used as standard.

149

### 150 *2.3.4. Inhibition of $\beta$ -carotene bleaching*

151 A solution of  $\beta$ -carotene was prepared by dissolving  $\beta$ -carotene (2 mg) in chloroform  
152 (10 mL). Two millilitres of this solution were pipetted into a round-bottom flask. After  
153 the chloroform was removed at 40°C under vacuum, linoleic acid (40 mg), Tween 80  
154 emulsifier (400 mg), and distilled water (100 mL) were added to the flask with vigorous  
155 shaking. Aliquots (4.8 mL) of this emulsion were transferred into different test tubes  
156 containing different concentrations of the extracts (0.2 mL). The tubes were shaken and  
157 incubated at 50°C in a water bath. As soon as the emulsion was added to each tube, the

158 zero time absorbance was measured at 470 nm using a 200-2004 spectrophotometer  
159 (Analytikjena, Jena, Germany). A blank, devoid of  $\beta$ -carotene, was prepared for  
160 background subtraction.  $\beta$ -Carotene bleaching inhibition was calculated using the  
161 following equation: ( $\beta$ -carotene content after 2h of assay/initial  $\beta$ -carotene content)  $\times$   
162 100. The extract concentration providing 50% antioxidant activity (EC<sub>50</sub>) was calculated  
163 by interpolation from the graph of  $\beta$ -carotene bleaching inhibition percentage against  
164 extract concentration. Trolox was used as standard.

165

#### 166 2.3.5. Inhibition of lipid peroxidation using thiobarbituric acid reactive substances 167 (TBARS)

168 Brains were obtained from pig (*Sus scrofa*) of body weight ~150 Kg, dissected and  
169 homogenized with a Polytron in ice-cold Tris-HCl buffer (20 mM, pH 7.4) to produce a  
170 1:2 (w/v) brain tissue homogenate which was centrifuged at 3000g for 10 min. An  
171 aliquot (0.1 mL) of the supernatant was incubated with the different concentrations of  
172 the extracts (0.2 mL) in the presence of FeSO<sub>4</sub> (10  $\mu$ M; 0.1 mL) and ascorbic acid (0.1  
173 mM; 0.1 mL) at 37°C for 1 h. The reaction was stopped by the addition of  
174 trichloroacetic acid (28%, w/v, 0.5 mL), followed by thiobarbituric acid (TBA, 2%, w/v,  
175 0.38 mL), and the mixture was then heated at 80 °C for 20 min. After centrifugation at  
176 3000g (Centorion K24OR- 2003 refrigerated centrifuge) for 10 min to remove the  
177 precipitated protein, the colour intensity of the malondialdehyde (MDA)-TBA complex  
178 in the supernatant was measured by its absorbance at 532 nm. The inhibition ratio (%)  
179 was calculated using the following formula: Inhibition ratio (%) = [(A - B)/A]  $\times$  100%,  
180 where A and B were the absorbance of the control and the compound solution,  
181 respectively. The extract concentration providing 50% lipid peroxidation inhibition

182 (EC<sub>50</sub>) was calculated from the graph of TBARS inhibition percentage against extract  
183 concentration. Trolox was used as standard.

184

## 185 *2.4. Characterization in nutrients and phytochemicals*

### 186 *2.4.1. Phenolic compounds*

187 For total phenolics estimation an aliquot of the methanolic extract solution (1 mL) was  
188 mixed with *Folin-Ciocalteu* reagent (5 mL, previously diluted with water 1:10, v/v) and  
189 sodium carbonate (75 g/L, 4 mL). The tubes were vortexed for 15 s and allowed to stand  
190 for 30 min at 40 °C for colour development. Absorbance was then measured at 765 nm  
191 ([Wolfe et al., 2003](#)). Gallic acid was used to calculate the standard curve (0.0094-0.15  
192 mg/mL), and the results were expressed as mg of gallic acid equivalents (GAE) per g of  
193 extract.

194

### 195 *2.4.2. Flavonoids*

196 For total flavonoids content determination, an aliquot (0.5 mL) of the methanolic extract  
197 solution was mixed with distilled water (2 mL) and subsequently with NaNO<sub>2</sub> solution  
198 (5%, 0.15 mL). After 6 min, AlCl<sub>3</sub> solution (10%, 0.15 mL) was added and allowed to  
199 stand further 6 min, thereafter, NaOH solution (4%, 2 mL) was added to the mixture.  
200 Immediately, distilled water was added to bring the final volume to 5 mL. Then the  
201 mixture was properly mixed and allowed to stand for 15 min. The intensity of pink  
202 colour was measured at 510 nm ([Jia et al., 1999](#)). (+)-Catechin was used to calculate the  
203 standard curve (0.0045-0.29 mg/mL) and the results were expressed as mg of (+)-  
204 catechin equivalents (CE) per g of extract.

205

206 2.4.3. *Ascorbic acid*

207 A fine dried powder (20 mesh; 150 mg) was extracted with metaphosphoric acid (1%,  
208 10 mL) for 45 min at room temperature and filtered through Whatman N° 4 filter paper.  
209 The filtrate (1 mL) was mixed with 2,6-dichloroindophenol (9 mL) and the absorbance  
210 was measured within 30 min at 515 nm (Klein and Perry, 1982). Content of ascorbic  
211 acid was calculated on the basis of the calibration curve of authentic L-ascorbic acid  
212 (0.006-0.1 mg/mL), and the results were expressed as mg of ascorbic acid per 100 g of  
213 dry weight.

214

215 2.4.4. *Tocopherols*

216 Tocopherols content was determined following a procedure previously optimized and  
217 described by the authors (Barros *et al.*, 2010). BHT solution in *n*-hexane (10 mg/mL;  
218 100 µL) and IS solution in *n*-hexane (tocol; 50 µg/mL; 400 µL) were added to the  
219 sample prior to the extraction procedure. The samples (~500 mg) were homogenized  
220 with methanol (4 mL) by vortex mixing (1 min). Subsequently, *n*-hexane (4 mL) was  
221 added and again vortex mixed for 1 min. After that, saturated NaCl aqueous solution (2  
222 mL) was added, the mixture was homogenized (1 min), centrifuged (5 min, 4,000g) and  
223 the clear upper layer was carefully transferred to a vial. The sample was re-extracted  
224 twice with *n*-hexane. The combined extracts were taken to dryness under a nitrogen  
225 stream, redissolved in 2 mL of *n*-hexane, dehydrated with anhydrous sodium sulphate,  
226 filtered through 0.2 µm nylon filters from Whatman and transferred into a dark injection  
227 vial. The equipment consisted of an integrated system with a Smartline 1000 pump  
228 (Knauer, Berlin, Germany), a Smartline manager 5000 degasser, an AS-2057 auto-  
229 sampler (Jasco, Easton, MD) and an FP-2020 fluorescence detector (Jasco, Easton, MD)

230 programmed for excitation at 290 nm and emission at 330 nm. The column used was a  
231 normal-phase 250 mm × 4.6 mm i.d., 5 μm, Polyamide II, with a 10 mm × 4 mm i.d.  
232 guard column of the same material (YMC Waters, Dinslaken, Germany), operating at  
233 30 °C. The mobile phase used was a mixture of *n*-hexane and ethyl acetate (70:30, v/v)  
234 at a flow rate of 1 mL/min. The compounds were identified by chromatographic  
235 comparisons with authentic standards. Quantification was based on the fluorescence  
236 signal response, using the internal standard method. Tocopherol contents in the samples  
237 are expressed in mg per 100 g of dry weight.

238

#### 239 2.4.5. Liposoluble pigments

240 A fine dried powder (150 mg) was vigorously shaken with 10 mL of acetone–hexane  
241 mixture (4:6) for 1 min and filtered through Whatman No. 4 filter paper. The  
242 absorbance of the filtrate was measured at 453, 505, 645 and 663 nm (Nagata and  
243 Yamashita, 1992). Content of β-carotene was calculated according to the following  
244 equation: β-carotene (mg/100 mL) = 0.216 × A<sub>663</sub> – 1.220 × A<sub>645</sub> - 0.304 × A<sub>505</sub> + 0.452  
245 × A<sub>453</sub>; Lycopene (mg/100 mL) = – 0.0458 × A<sub>663</sub> + 0.204 × A<sub>645</sub> - 0.304 × A<sub>505</sub> + 0.452  
246 × A<sub>453</sub>; Chlorophyll a (mg/100 mL) = 0.999 × A<sub>663</sub> - 0.0989 × A<sub>645</sub>; Chlorophyll b  
247 (mg/100 mL) = - 0.328 × A<sub>663</sub> + 1.77 × A<sub>645</sub>, and further expressed in mg per 100 g of  
248 dry weight.

249

#### 250 2.4.6. Sugars

251 Free sugars were determined by high performance liquid chromatography coupled to a  
252 refraction index detector (HPLC-RI) as previously described by the authors (Guimarães  
253 *et al.*, 2010). Dried sample powder (1.0 g) was spiked with the melezitose as internal

254 standard (IS, 5 mg/ml), and was extracted with 40 mL of 80% aqueous ethanol at 80 °C  
255 for 30 min. The resulting suspension was centrifuged at 15,000g for 10 min. The  
256 supernatant was concentrated at 60 °C under reduced pressure (rotary evaporator Büchi  
257 R-210) and defatted three times with 10 mL of ethyl ether, successively. After  
258 concentration at 40 °C, the solid residues were dissolved in water to a final volume of 5  
259 mL and filtered through 0.2 µm nylon filters from Whatman. The equipment described  
260 above was connected to a Smartline 2300 RI detector. Data were analysed using Clarity  
261 DataApex 2.4 Software. The column used was a 250 mm × 4.6 mm i.d., 5 µm,  
262 Eurospher 100-5 NH<sub>2</sub> with a 5 mm × 4mm i.d. guard column of the same material  
263 (Knauer, Berlin, Germany), operating at 30 °C in a 7971 R Grace oven. The mobile  
264 phase was acetonitrile/deionized water, 7:3 (v/v) at a flow rate of 1 mL/min. Sugar  
265 identification was made by comparing the relative retention times of sample peaks with  
266 standards. Quantification was made by internal normalization of the chromatographic  
267 peak area and the results are expressed in g per 100 g of dry weight.

268

#### 269 2.4.7. Fatty Acids

270 Fat was extracted with petroleum ether in a Soxhlet apparatus. Fatty acids were  
271 determined by gas chromatography with flame ionization detection (GC-FID) as  
272 described previously by the authors ([Guimarães et al., 2010](#)), and after the following  
273 transesterification procedure: fatty acids (obtained after Soxhlet extraction) were  
274 methylated with 5 mL of methanol:sulphuric acid:toluene 2:1:1 (v/v/v), during at least  
275 12 h in a water bath at 50 °C and 160 rpm; then 3 mL of deionised water were added to  
276 obtain phase separation; the FAME were recovered with 3 mL of diethyl ether by  
277 shaking in vortex, and the upper phase was passed through a micro-column of sodium

278 sulphate anhydrous, in order to eliminate the water; the sample was recovered in a vial  
279 with Teflon, and filtered with 0.2 µm nylon filter from Whatman. The equipment was a  
280 DANI model GC 1000 with a split/splitless injector, and a FID. The column used was a  
281 30 m × 0.32 mm i.d., 0.25 µm, 50% cyanopropyl-methyl-50%  
282 phenylmethylpolysiloxane (Macherey-Nagel, Düren, Germany). The oven temperature  
283 program was as follows: the initial temperature of the column was 50 °C, held for 2 min,  
284 then a 10°C/min ramp to 240 °C and held for 11 min. The carrier gas (hydrogen) flow-  
285 rate was 4.0 mL/min (0.61 bar), measured at 50 °C. Split injection (1:40) was carried  
286 out at 250 °C. Fatty acid identification was made by comparing the relative retention  
287 times of FAME peaks from samples with standards. The results were recorded and  
288 processed using CSW DataApex 1.7 software and expressed in relative percentage of  
289 each fatty acid.

290

### 291 *2.5. Statistical analysis*

292 For each species, three samples were analysed and the assays were carried out in  
293 triplicate. The results are expressed as mean values and standard deviation (SD). The  
294 results were analyzed using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) followed by  
295 Tukey's HSD Test with  $\alpha = 0.05$  (different letters mean significant differences; the  
296 letter a is attributed to the highest value). This treatment was carried out using SPSS v.  
297 16.0 program.

298

## 299 **3. Results and discussion**

### 300 *3.1. In vitro evaluation of antioxidant properties*

301 A great number of aromatic, spicy, medicinal and other plants contain chemical  
302 compounds that exhibit antioxidant properties. Numerous studies were carried out on  
303 some of these plants, e.g. rosemary, sage, oregano, which resulted in a development of  
304 natural antioxidant formulations for food, cosmetic and other applications. However,  
305 scientific information on antioxidant properties of various plants, particularly those that  
306 are less widely used in culinary and medicine is still rather scarce. Therefore, the  
307 assessment of such properties remains an interesting and useful task, particularly for  
308 finding new sources for natural antioxidants, functional foods and nutraceuticals  
309 (Miliauskas *et al.*, 2004).

310 Herein, four different assays were used for the *in vitro* evaluation of the antioxidant  
311 properties of six medicinal plants widely used in Portugal as described in **Table 1**. The  
312 results of scavenging activity on DPPH radicals, reducing power, inhibition of  $\beta$ -  
313 carotene bleaching, and inhibition of lipid peroxidation in brain tissue homogenates, and  
314 also phenolic and flavonoids contents are shown in **Table 2**. *Rubus ulmifolius* 2  
315 (flowers) proved to have the most promissory antioxidant activity (the lowest  $EC_{50}$   
316 values, ranging from 0.02 to 0.07 mg/mL), with the highest phenolic (715.94 mg GAE/g  
317 extract) and flavonoids (624.76 mg CE/g extract; **Table 2**) contents which is according  
318 with its traditional use for gastrointestinal disorders and inflammatory processes.  
319 Moreover,  $EC_{50}$  values obtained in radical scavenging activity and reducing power of  
320 this sample (**Table 2**) were similar to those obtained for the standard trolox (0.04 and  
321 0.03 mg/mL, respectively). Two different Italian group researchers reported the strong  
322 antioxidant properties of *Rubus ulmifolius* leaves attributing them to the activity of  
323 caffeic acid, ferulic acid and caffeic quinic esters as well as quercetin-3-O-glucuronide,

324 kaempferol-3-O-glucuronide (Dall'Acqua *et al.*, 2008), and to ellagic acid (Martini *et*  
325 *al.*, 2009).

326 *Centaurea paniculata* revealed the lowest antioxidant properties (the highest EC<sub>50</sub>  
327 values, ranging from 3.62 to 0.74 mg/mL) which are compatible to its lower phenolics  
328 (35.87 mg GAE/g extract) and flavonoids (22.47 mg CE/g extract; **Table 2**) content.

329 Miliauskas *et al.* (2004) described a sample of *Matricaria recutita* (blossoms, full  
330 bloom stage) from Lithuania as a relatively weak antioxidant (44.7% of DPPH  
331 inhibition and 7.5 mg GAE/g extract for total phenolics). The sample analysed in the  
332 present study gave much higher phenolic content (139.62 mg GAE/g) and a DPPH  
333 radical scavenging activity of 62.35% at 1 mg/mL (**Table 2**). *Matricaria recutita* is one  
334 of the nine medicinal plants successfully used in STW 5 (Iberogast®) for treatment of  
335 gastrointestinal disorders (Schempp *et al.*, 2006). All the single extracts combined in  
336 STW 5 are of importance for the therapeutic effect, working in concert. This  
337 phytomedicine is prepared with ethanolic extracts and the mechanism of action is  
338 related to their antioxidant properties. In fact, functional gastrointestinal diseases, such  
339 as non-ulcer dyspepsia (NUD) and irritable bowel syndrome, are often initiated by or  
340 correlated to inflammatory processes, where oxidants such as ROS play a crucial role  
341 (Schempp *et al.*, 2006).

342 The phenolic content obtained in *Helichrysum stoechas* (184.42 mg GAE/g extract;  
343 **Table 2**) was higher than the content found in a sample from Turkey (94.16 mg GAE/g;  
344 Albayrak *et al.*, 2010). Both were methanolic extracts but the Turkish authors  
345 performed the extraction in a Soxhlet apparatus, which could destroy some phenolic  
346 compounds. Some authors reported that phenolic compounds are unstable and readily  
347 become non-antioxidative under heating and in the presence of antioxidants (Yen and

348 Hung, 2000; Barros *et al.*, 2007. Nevertheless, Carini *et al.* (2001) obtained a very high  
349 antioxidant activity with a sample from Italy. They reported that the polar fraction  
350 isolated from the flowering tops of *Helichrysum stoechas*, displays radical scavenging  
351 properties, with potency comparable to that of Trolox, the water-soluble analogue of  
352 vitamin E. The extract included approximately 50% of polyphenols and 4% of  
353 kaempferol-3-*O*-glucoside, the more prominent component of the extract (Carini *et al.*,  
354 2001).

355 *Castanea sativa* flowers (methanolic extract) gave highest DPPH scavenging activity  
356 (0.07 mg/mL), reducing power (0.07 mg/mL),  $\beta$ -carotene bleaching inhibition (0.11  
357 mg/mL), but lowest TBARS inhibition (0.03 mg/mL; **Table 2**) than a sample (aqueous  
358 extract) also from Portugal (0.08 mg/mL, 0.09 mg/mL, 0.16 mg/mL and 0.01 mg/mL,  
359 respectively; Barreira *et al.*, 2008). This is in agreement with the higher phenolics  
360 (587.61 mg GAE/g extract) and flavonoids (165.45 mg CE/g; **Table 2**) content found in  
361 our sample in comparison to the other sample (298.18 mg GAE/g and 159.56 mg CE/g,  
362 respectively; Barreira *et al.*, 2008). This proves that the solvent used for phenolic  
363 extraction has significant influence on the results. Herein, we decided to use methanol  
364 according to previous results in experiments performed with different extraction  
365 conditions to achieve the best procedure leading to highest contents in phenolics and  
366 better antioxidant properties (Barros *et al.*, 2010). Furthermore, chemical and biological  
367 diversity of aromatic and medicinal plants depend on such factors, as growth habitat,  
368 climatic conditions, vegetation phase and genetic modifications (Miliauskas *et al.*,  
369 2004).

370 Overall, among the medicinal plants analysed in the present study, *Rubus ulmifolius*  
371 flowers revealed the highest antioxidant activity in all the tested assays.

372

### 373 3.2. Nutrients and Phytochemicals

374 Vitamins (tocopherols and ascorbic acid) and liposoluble pigments (carotenoids and  
375 chlorophylls) contents of the six studied medicinal plants are given in **Table 3**.  $\alpha$ -  
376 Tocopherol was the major compound in all the samples, and  $\delta$ -tocopherol was not  
377 detected in *Centaurea paniculata* aerial parts. *Castanea sativa* flowers presented the  
378 highest content of tocopherols (163.42 mg/ 100 g of dry weight), with the highest levels  
379 of all the isoforms-  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\delta$ , and  $\gamma$ -tocopherols. *Centaurea paniculata* and *Matricaria*  
380 *recutita* aerial parts, *Rubus ulmifolius* flower buds and flowers revealed the lowest  
381 contents without significant statistical differences ( $p<0.05$ ).

382 Ascorbic acid was the most abundant vitamin in all the studied medicinal plants; *Rubus*  
383 *ulmifolius* flower buds and flowers gave the highest levels (172.88 and 177.82 mg/100 g  
384 dry weight, respectively and without significant statistical differences,  $p<0.05$ ).

385 Carotenoids and chlorophylls were found in all the studied medicinal plants. ,  
386 *Helichrysum stoechas* aerial parts revealed the highest concentration of  $\beta$ -carotene  
387 (183.05 mg/100 g dry weight) and *Matricaria recutita* aerial parts gave the highest  
388 concentration of chlorophylls a (170.26 mg/100 g) and b (56.37 mg/100 g). Lycopene  
389 was found in very low amounts and only in *Rubus ulmifolius* flower buds and flowers,  
390 and *Castanea sativa* flowers.

391 The levels of vitamins C and E, and  $\beta$ -carotene found in the medicinal plants would  
392 make them suitable sources of these antioxidants that might be used commercially to  
393 retard rancidity in fatty materials in food manufacturing, to reduce the effects of ageing  
394 and to help to prevent oxidative-stress related diseases such as cancer and heart disease  
395 ([Dewick, 2002](#)). In fact, synthetic antioxidants are being questioned while natural

396 antioxidants such as tocopherols, polyphenols and carotenoid pigments are having a  
397 greater relevance in the protection against lipid oxidation. Due to the role as a scavenger  
398 of free radicals, vitamins C and E are also believed to exert a protective role against  
399 various oxidative stress-related diseases such as heart disease, stroke, cancer, several  
400 neurodegenerative diseases and cataractogenesis (Halliwell, 1996). Also carotenoids  
401 have an important antioxidant role in the cellular protection against lipid peroxidation,  
402 thus preventing the risk of degenerative illnesses such as cancer, cardiovascular disease  
403 and macular degeneration. It also reduces the risk of cataracts and strengthens the  
404 immune system (Rao and Rao, 2007).

405 In summary, *Rubus ulmifolius* flowers revealed the highest contents in phenolics,  
406 flavonoids, ascorbic acid and lycopene, which is in agreement with its highest  
407 antioxidant activity. *Castanea sativa* flowers revealed the highest concentration of  
408 individual and total tocopherols. *Helichrysum stoechas* aerial parts gave the highest  
409 levels of  $\beta$ -carotene.

410

411 The effects of these compounds on the immune system could explain the empirical use  
412 of these plants to control inflammation, gastroenteritis and infectious diarrhea. In  
413 relation to sugar composition (**Table 4**) *Castanea sativa* flowers and *Trifolium*  
414 *angustifolium* aerial parts gave fructose as the main sugar, while sucrose predominated  
415 in *Centaurea paniculata*, *Helichrysum stoechas* and *Matricaria recutita* aerial parts, and  
416 glucose was the main sugar in *Rubus ulmifolius* flower buds and flowers. *Castanea*  
417 *sativa* flowers revealed the highest total sugars content (11.91 g/100 g dry weight), with  
418 the highest levels of fructose (5.05 g/100 g) and glucose (4.62 g/100 g). Otherwise,  
419 *Helichrysum stoechas* aerial parts showed the lowest levels in total sugars (3.87 g/100

420 g). Some of the identified sugars, mostly the reducing sugars fructose, glucose and  
421 raffinose could also contribute to the antioxidant activity observed in the studied plants.

422 Overall, *Castanea sativa* flowers revealed the highest concentration of total sugars,  
423 including the reducing sugars glucose and fructose.

424

425 The results for fatty acid composition, total saturated fatty acids (SFA),  
426 monounsaturated fatty acids (MUFA), polyunsaturated fatty acids (PUFA), and the  
427 ratios of PUFA/SFA and n-6/n-3 of the studied medicinal plants are shown in **Table 5**.

428 Twenty three fatty acids were identified and quantified. The major fatty acids found  
429 were linoleic acid (C18:2n6) and  $\alpha$ -linolenic acid (C18:3n3) and contributing to the  
430 prevalence of PUFA. Palmitic acid (C16:0) was also a main fatty acid in all the studied  
431 plants, while arachidic acid (C20:0) and behenic acid (C22:0) were abundant in  
432 *Castanea sativa* flowers, contributing to the highest SFA content found in this sample  
433 (51%). Oleic acid (C18:1n9) was abundant in *Centaurea paniculata* aerial parts  
434 contributing to the increase of its MUFA content (18.5%). *Matricaria recutita* aerial  
435 parts revealed the highest PUFA contents (68.9%) with the highest levels of linoleic  
436 acid (44.8%).

437  $\alpha$ -Linolenic and linoleic acids, as also high ratios of PUFA/SFA ( $> 0.45$ ) and low n-6/n-  
438 3 fatty acids ratios ( $< 4.0$ ) can decrease the total amount of fat in blood (cholesterol),  
439 reducing the risk of cancer, cardiovascular, inflammatory and autoimmune diseases  
440 (HMSO, 1994; Kanu *et al.*, 2007). Once again these results are according to folk  
441 recommendations. For instance, it is considered that chestnut catkins decoctions, drunk  
442 for nine days, can lower blood cholesterol levels, and several informants pointed out  
443 that German chamomile infusion may help reduce cholesterol.

444 Overall, *Matricaria recutita* aerial parts revealed the highest PUFA levels, including  
445 linoleic acid.

446

447 In conclusion, the studied medicinal plants revealed interesting antioxidant properties,  
448 nutrients and phytochemicals such as phenolics, flavonoids, vitamins, carotenoids,  
449 sugars, and fatty acids that could provide scientific evidence for some folk uses in the  
450 treatment of diseases related to the production of ROS and oxidative stress, but further  
451 experiments are required to explore the mechanisms of action. Traditional medicines,  
452 whose knowledge and practices have been orally transmitted over the centuries, are  
453 important approaches for discovering therapeutic molecules and compounds. This study  
454 provides information useful not only to chemical analysis, activity assays and  
455 standardization of phytochemical composition of wild species traditionally used, but to  
456 researchers in phytopharmacology, phytotherapy and phytotoxicology as well. As far as  
457 we know this is the first report on chemical characterization of six medicinal plants  
458 from the Portuguese folk medicine: *Castanea sativa*, *Centaurea paniculata*,  
459 *Helichrysum stoechas*, *Matricaria recutita*, *Rubus ulmifollius* and *Trifolium*  
460 *angustifolium*.

461

#### 462 **Acknowledgements**

463 The authors are grateful to the Foundation for Science and Technology (Portugal) for  
464 financial support to the research centre CIMO, L. Barros (SFRH/BPD/4609/2008) and  
465 S. Oliveira (BII/CIMO/09/18) grants.

466

#### 467 **References**

468

469 Albayrak, S., Aksoy, A., Sagdic, O., Hamzaoglu, E. 2010. Compositions, antioxidant  
470 and antimicrobial activities of *Helichrysum* (Asteraceae) species collected from  
471 Turkey. *Food Chem.* 119, 114–122.

472 Barreira, J.C.M., Ferreira, I.C.F.R., Oliveira, M.B.P.P., Pereira, J.A. 2008. Antioxidant  
473 activities of the extracts from chestnut flower, leaf, skins and fruit. *Food Chem.*  
474 107, 1106–1113.

475 Barros, L., Baptista, P., Correia, D.M., Morais, J.S., Ferreira, I.C.F.R. 2007. Effects of  
476 conservation treatment and cooking on the chemical composition and antioxidant  
477 activity of Portuguese wild edible mushrooms. *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 55, 4781-  
478 4788.

479 Barros, L., Heleno, S.A., Carvalho, A.M., Ferreira, I.C.F.R. 2010. Lamiaceae often used  
480 in Portuguese folk medicine as a source of powerful antioxidants: Vitamins and  
481 phenolics. *LWT* 43, 544–550.

482 Carini, M., Aldini, G., Furlanetto, S., Stefani, R., Facino, R.M. 2001. LC coupled to ion-  
483 trap MS for the rapid screening and detection of polyphenol antioxidants from  
484 *Helichrysum stoechas*. *J. Pharm. Biomed. Anal* 24, 517–526.

485 Carvalho, A.M. 2010. *Plantas y sabiduría popular del Parque Natural de Montesinho.*  
486 *Un estudio etnobotánico en Portugal.* Madrid: CSIC, Biblioteca de Ciencias.

487 Carvalho, A.M., Morales, R. 2010. ‘Persistence of Wild Food and Wild Medicinal Plant  
488 Knowledge in a North-Eastern Region of Portugal’. In M. Pardo de Santayana, A.  
489 Pieroni, & R. Puri (eds.), *Ethnobotany in the New Europe: People, Health and*  
490 *Wild Plant Resources.* Oxford, UK: Berghahn Books.

491 Castroviejo, S. (coord.). 1991, 2001, 2007. *Flora Iberica. Plantas vasculares de la*  
492 *Península Ibérica e Islas Baleares.* Real Jardín Botánico, CSIC, Madrid.

493 Dall'Acqua, S., Cervellati, R., Loi, M.C., Innocenti, G. 2008. Evaluation of in vitro  
494 antioxidant properties of some traditional Sardinian medicinal plants: Investigation  
495 of the high antioxidant capacity of *Rubus ulmifolius*. *Food Chem.* 106, 745–749.

496 Dawidowicza, A.L., Wianowska, D., Baraniak, B. 2006. The antioxidant properties of  
497 alcoholic extracts from *Sambucus nigra* L. (antioxidant properties of extracts).  
498 *LWT* 39, 308–315.

499 Dewick, P.M. 2002. Medicinal Natural Products. John Wiley & Sons, Lda.

500 Franco, J.A. 1984. *Nova Flora de Portugal*, Volume II. Lisboa.

501 Frazão-moreira, A., Carvalho, A.M., Martins, M.E. 2007. Conocimientos acerca de  
502 plantas en la nueva ruralidad. Cambio social y agro ecología en el Parque Natural  
503 de Montesinho (Portugal). *Revista Periféria* 7.

504 Guimarães, R., Barros, L., Carvalho, A.M., Ferreira, I.C.F.R. 2010. Studies on chemical  
505 constituents and bioactivity of *Rosa micrantha*: An alternative antioxidants source  
506 for food, pharmaceutical, or cosmetic applications. *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 58,  
507 6277-6284.

508 Halliwell, B. 1996. Antioxidants in human health and disease. *Annu. Rev. Nutr.* 16, 33-  
509 50.

510 HMSO, U.K. 1994. Department of Health. Nutritional aspects of cardiovascular disease.  
511 London, Report on Health and Social Subjects 46, 37–46.

512 Jia, Z., Tang, M., Wu, J. 1999. The determination of flavonoid contents in mulberry and  
513 their scavenging effects on superoxide radicals. *Food Chem.* 64, 555-559.

514 Kanu, P.J., Zhu, K., Kanu, J.B., Zhou, H., Qian, H., Zhu, K. 2007. Biologically active  
515 components and nutraceuticals in sesame and related products: a review and  
516 prospect. *Trends Food Sci. Technol.* 18, 599-608.

517 Klein, B.P., Perry, A.K. 1982. Ascorbic acid and vitamin A activity in selected  
518 vegetables from different geographical areas of the United States. *J. Food Sci.* 47,  
519 941–945.

520 Marchand, L.L. 2002. Cancer preventive effects of flavonoids- a review. *Biomed*  
521 *Pharmacother* 56, 296-301.

522 Martinia, S., D’Addario, C., Colacevich, A., Focardi, S., Borghinic, F., Santucci, A.,  
523 Figura, N., Rossi, C. 2009. Antimicrobial activity against *Helicobacter pylori*  
524 strains and antioxidant properties of blackberry leaves (*Rubus ulmifolius*) and  
525 isolated compounds. *Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents* 34, 50–59.

526 Miliauskas, G., Venskutonis, P.R., van Beek, T.A. 2004. Screening of radical scavenging  
527 activity of some medicinal and aromatic plant extracts. *Food Chem.* 85, 231–237.

528 Mishra, K.P., Ganju, L., Sairam, M., Banerjee, P.K., Sawhney, R.C. 2008. A review of  
529 high throughput technology for the screening of natural products. *Biomed.*  
530 *Pharmacother* 62, 94-98.

531 Montagnier, L. 2009. Oxidative stress in preventive medicine. *Free Rad. Res.* 43, S27-  
532 97.

533 Nagata, M., Yamashita, I. 1992. Simple method for simultaneous determination of  
534 chlorophyll and carotenoids in tomato fruit. *Nippon Shokuhin Kogyo Gakkaish* 39,  
535 925–928.

536 Neves, J.M., Matosa, C., Moutinho, C., Queiroz, G., Gomes, L.R. 2009.  
537 Ethnopharmacological notes about ancient uses of medicinal plants in Trás-os-  
538 Montes (northern of Portugal). *J. Ethnopharmacol.* 124, 270–283.

539 Rao, A.V, Rao, L.G. 2007. Carotenoids in human health. *Pharmacol. Res.* 55, 207-216.

- 540 Schemppa, H., Weiserb, D., Kelberb, O., Elstner, E.F. 2006. Radical scavenging and  
541 anti-inflammatory properties of STW 5 (Iberogasts) and its components.  
542 *Phytomedicine* 13, SV 36–44.
- 543 Wolfe, K., Wu, X., Liu, R.H. 2003. Antioxidant activity of apple peels. *J. Agric. Food*  
544 *Chem.* 51, 609-614.
- 545 Yen, G-C, Hung, C-Y. 2000. Effects of alkaline and heat treatment on antioxidative  
546 activity and total phenolics of extracts from Hsian-tsao (*Mesona procumbens*  
547 Hemsl.). *Food Res. Int.* 33, 487-492.

**Table 1.** Medicinal uses of the studied plants reported in Portuguese ethnobotanical studies conducted in the north-eastern region.

Scientific name	English name	Local name	Medicinal uses
<i>Castanea sativa</i>	Chestnut flower	Flor-de-castanheiro	Cold, cough, diarrhea, cholesterol
<i>Centaurea paniculata</i>	starthistles, knapweeds	Escalabriosa	Inflammation
<i>Helichrysum stoechas</i>	Shrubby everlasting	Douradinha	Cold, bronchitis, fever
<i>Matricaria recutita</i>	German chamomile	Maçuela	Respiratory and digestive systems, inflammation
<i>Rubus ulmifolius</i>	Elm-leaved blackberry;	Silva, silva-gravanceira	Stomachache or abdominal pain, diarrhea
<i>Trifolium angustifolium</i>	Narrow clover	Rabo-de-gato	Diarrhea

**Table 2.** Extraction yields, antioxidant activity (EC<sub>50</sub> values, mg/mL) of six medicinal plants, and composition in phenolics and flavonoids (mean ± SD; n=3). In each row different letters mean significant differences (*p*<0.05).

	<i>Castanea sativa</i>	<i>Centaurea paniculata</i>	<i>Helichrysum stoechas</i>	<i>Matricaria recutita</i>	<i>Rubus ulmifolius 1</i>	<i>Rubus ulmifolius 2</i>	<i>Trifolium angustifolium</i>
η (%)	38.46 ± 0.94	40.32 ± 1.18	17.13 ± 0.23	16.09 ± 1.01	38.35 ± 0.79	39.52 ± 2.96	15.74 ± 0.89
DPPH scavenging activity	0.07 ± 0.00 fe	3.62 ± 0.13 a	0.52 ± 0.00 d	0.80 ± 0.05 b	0.12 ± 0.00 e	0.04 ± 0.00 f	0.70 ± 0.04 c
Reducing power	0.07 ± 0.00 f	1.33 ± 0.02 a	0.14 ± 0.01 d	0.21 ± 0.02 c	0.10 ± 0.00 e	0.04 ± 0.00 g	0.45 ± 0.01 b
β-carotene bleaching inhibition	0.11 ± 0.01 e	1.25 ± 0.09 a	0.25 ± 0.08 d	0.66 ± 0.02 c	0.21 ± 0.00 d	0.07 ± 0.00 e	0.91 ± 0.11 b
TBARS inhibition	0.03 ± 0.00 f	0.74 ± 0.03 a	0.13 ± 0.00 d	0.18 ± 0.00 c	0.07 ± 0.00 e	0.02 ± 0.00 f	0.29 ± 0.01 b
Phenolics (mg GAE/g extract)	587.61 ± 3.91 b	35.87 ± 1.79 g	184.42 ± 0.35 d	139.62 ± 3.02 e	257.89 ± 3.28 c	715.94 ± 28.55 a	95.61 ± 1.48 f
Flavonoids (mg CE/g extract)	165.45 ± 2.48 b	22.47 ± 0.29 d	34.75 ± 0.83 d	126.82 ± 3.95 c	172.45 ± 3.42 b	624.76 ± 1.18 a	26.78 ± 3.10 d

EC<sub>50</sub> values for the standard trolox: 43 µg/ml (DPPH scavenging activity); 30 µg/ml (Reducing power); 3 µg/ml (β-carotene bleaching inhibition) and 4 µg/ml (TBARS inhibition).

**Table 3.** Composition in vitamins and liposoluble pigments (mg/100 g dry weight) of six medicinal plants (mean  $\pm$  SD; n=3). In each row different letters mean significant differences ( $p < 0.05$ ).

	<i>Castanea sativa</i>	<i>Centaurea paniculata</i>	<i>Helichrysum stoechas</i>	<i>Matricaria recutita</i>	<i>Rubus ulmifolius 1</i>	<i>Rubus ulmifolius 2</i>	<i>Trifolium angustifolium</i>
$\alpha$ -tocopherol	124.64 $\pm$ 2.28 a	8.54 $\pm$ 0.46 dc	66.43 $\pm$ 3.61 b	3.52 $\pm$ 0.30 e	5.97 $\pm$ 0.20 de	5.84 $\pm$ 0.01 de	12.73 $\pm$ 1.14 c
$\beta$ -tocopherol	3.62 $\pm$ 0.20 a	0.25 $\pm$ 0.05 c	1.70 $\pm$ 0.23 b	0.18 $\pm$ 0.02 c	0.28 $\pm$ 0.10 c	0.18 $\pm$ 0.00 c	0.60 $\pm$ 0.06 c
$\gamma$ -tocopherol	20.26 $\pm$ 0.94 a	1.82 $\pm$ 0.15 d	4.20 $\pm$ 0.01 c	2.44 $\pm$ 0.06 d	4.05 $\pm$ 0.01 c	2.55 $\pm$ 0.01 d	5.41 $\pm$ 0.62 b
$\delta$ -tocopherol	14.90 $\pm$ 0.80 a	nd	1.28 $\pm$ 0.01 b	1.20 $\pm$ 0.23 cb	1.98 $\pm$ 0.01 b	1.28 $\pm$ 0.05 b	0.39 $\pm$ 0.02 d
Total tocopherols	163.42 $\pm$ 4.22 a	10.60 $\pm$ 0.66 d	73.61 $\pm$ 3.85 b	7.35 $\pm$ 0.03 d	12.28 $\pm$ 0.21 d	9.86 $\pm$ 0.05 d	19.13 $\pm$ 2.00 c
Ascorbic acid	163.48 $\pm$ 8.20 b	40.45 $\pm$ 1.15 d	157.07 $\pm$ 10.48 b	61.57 $\pm$ 0.81 c	172.88 $\pm$ 1.89 a	177.82 $\pm$ 6.97 a	163.80 $\pm$ 2.48 b
$\beta$ -carotene	43.53 $\pm$ 0.08 e	69.25 $\pm$ 0.08 d	183.05 $\pm$ 0.75 a	127.68 $\pm$ 0.29 c	34.22 $\pm$ 0.28 g	38.77 $\pm$ 0.15 f	160.69 $\pm$ 1.13 b
Lycopene	0.05 $\pm$ 0.00 b	nd	nd	nd	0.01 $\pm$ 0.00 c	0.07 $\pm$ 0.00 a	nd
Chlorophyll a	1.06 $\pm$ 0.00 e	1.23 $\pm$ 0.00 d	2.72 $\pm$ 0.00 c	170.26 $\pm$ 0.08 a	0.63 $\pm$ 0.00 f	1.09 $\pm$ 0.00 e	4.75 $\pm$ 0.00 b
Chlorophyll b	0.46 $\pm$ 0.00 d	0.35 $\pm$ 0.00 d	1.02 $\pm$ 0.00 c	56.37 $\pm$ 0.36 a	0.27 $\pm$ 0.00 d	0.59 $\pm$ 0.00 d	1.77 $\pm$ 0.00 b

nd- not detected.

**Table 4.** Composition in sugars (g/100 g of dry weight) of six medicinal plants (mean  $\pm$  SD; n=3). In each row, different letters mean significant differences ( $p < 0.05$ ).

	<i>Castanea sativa</i>	<i>Centaurea paniculata</i>	<i>Helichrysum stoechas</i>	<i>Matricaria recutita</i>	<i>Rubus Ulmifolius 1</i>	<i>Rubus Ulmifolius 2</i>	<i>Trifolium angustifolium</i>
Fructose	5.05 $\pm$ 0.66 a	0.89 $\pm$ 0.01 c	1.02 $\pm$ 0.04 c	1.64 $\pm$ 0.04 c	3.33 $\pm$ 0.01 b	1.66 $\pm$ 0.21 c	3.48 $\pm$ 0.31 b
Glucose	4.62 $\pm$ 0.59 a	0.50 $\pm$ 0.01 d	0.59 $\pm$ 0.02 d	0.89 $\pm$ 0.01 d	3.71 $\pm$ 0.03 b	2.23 $\pm$ 0.19 c	1.15 $\pm$ 0.10 d
Sucrose	1.65 $\pm$ 0.14 b	2.28 $\pm$ 0.04 a	1.84 $\pm$ 0.09 b	2.53 $\pm$ 0.10 a	0.85 $\pm$ 0.01 d	1.34 $\pm$ 0.15 c	1.21 $\pm$ 0.13 c
Trehalose	0.44 $\pm$ 0.04 b	0.44 $\pm$ 0.00 b	0.42 $\pm$ 0.05 b	0.84 $\pm$ 0.13 a	0.84 $\pm$ 0.01 a	0.72 $\pm$ 0.04 a	0.17 $\pm$ 0.01 c
Raffinose	0.15 $\pm$ 0.05 dc	0.58 $\pm$ 0.00 a	nd	0.19 $\pm$ 0.00 c	0.09 $\pm$ 0.01 d	0.10 $\pm$ 0.01 d	0.51 $\pm$ 0.01 b
Total sugars	11.91 $\pm$ 1.49 a	4.69 $\pm$ 0.05 de	3.87 $\pm$ 0.07 e	6.08 $\pm$ 0.19 dc	8.83 $\pm$ 0.02 b	6.03 $\pm$ 0.59 dc	6.52 $\pm$ 0.63 c

nd- not detected

**Table 5.** Composition in fatty acids of six medicinal plants (mean  $\pm$  SD; n=3). In each column different letters mean significant differences ( $p<0.05$ ).

	<i>Castanea</i>	<i>Centaurea</i>	<i>Helichrysum</i>	<i>Matricaria</i>	<i>Rubus</i>	<i>Rubus</i>	<i>Trifolium</i>
	<i>sativa</i>	<i>paniculata</i>	<i>stoechas</i>	<i>recutita</i>	<i>ulmifolius 1</i>	<i>ulmifolius 2</i>	<i>angustifolium</i>
C6:0	0.16 $\pm$ 0.01	0.11 $\pm$ 0.00	0.15 $\pm$ 0.01	0.24 $\pm$ 0.03	0.31 $\pm$ 0.00	0.09 $\pm$ 0.01	2.00 $\pm$ 0.13
C8:0	0.51 $\pm$ 0.05	0.11 $\pm$ 0.01	2.42 $\pm$ 0.13	0.22 $\pm$ 0.03	0.10 $\pm$ 0.00	0.08 $\pm$ 0.00	0.79 $\pm$ 0.14
C10:0	0.32 $\pm$ 0.01	0.11 $\pm$ 0.00	1.71 $\pm$ 0.12	0.23 $\pm$ 0.02	0.08 $\pm$ 0.00	0.07 $\pm$ 0.00	0.24 $\pm$ 0.06
C11:0	nd	nd	0.52 $\pm$ 0.13	0.10 $\pm$ 0.00	nd	nd	nd
C12:0	0.33 $\pm$ 0.01	1.65 $\pm$ 0.21	7.58 $\pm$ 0.05	0.20 $\pm$ 0.01	0.62 $\pm$ 0.03	0.49 $\pm$ 0.00	2.28 $\pm$ 0.16
C13:0	0.02 $\pm$ 0.00	0.02 $\pm$ 0.00	0.17 $\pm$ 0.02	0.02 $\pm$ 0.00	0.02 $\pm$ 0.00	0.02 $\pm$ 0.00	0.02 $\pm$ 0.00
C14:0	1.06 $\pm$ 0.05	1.02 $\pm$ 0.08	7.91 $\pm$ 0.70	1.34 $\pm$ 0.03	1.12 $\pm$ 0.02	0.47 $\pm$ 0.05	4.84 $\pm$ 0.25
C14:1	0.18 $\pm$ 0.00	0.23 $\pm$ 0.00	0.15 $\pm$ 0.00	0.17 $\pm$ 0.01	0.07 $\pm$ 0.00	0.06 $\pm$ 0.01	0.15 $\pm$ 0.01
C15:0	0.30 $\pm$ 0.01	0.31 $\pm$ 0.01	0.63 $\pm$ 0.01	0.26 $\pm$ 0.01	0.19 $\pm$ 0.03	0.16 $\pm$ 0.01	0.33 $\pm$ 0.02
C16:0	14.40 $\pm$ 0.82	17.46 $\pm$ 0.37	13.24 $\pm$ 0.16	13.56 $\pm$ 0.22	11.99 $\pm$ 0.03	12.05 $\pm$ 0.51	15.42 $\pm$ 0.72
C16:1	0.19 $\pm$ 0.03	2.24 $\pm$ 0.14	0.24 $\pm$ 0.02	0.23 $\pm$ 0.00	0.22 $\pm$ 0.00	0.15 $\pm$ 0.02	0.27 $\pm$ 0.03
C17:0	0.47 $\pm$ 0.02	0.45 $\pm$ 0.07	0.61 $\pm$ 0.05	0.40 $\pm$ 0.00	0.34 $\pm$ 0.01	0.33 $\pm$ 0.05	0.44 $\pm$ 0.02
C18:0	4.82 $\pm$ 0.11	3.64 $\pm$ 0.22	2.60 $\pm$ 0.14	2.80 $\pm$ 0.01	3.08 $\pm$ 0.02	2.96 $\pm$ 0.07	3.22 $\pm$ 0.03
C18:1n9c	5.84 $\pm$ 0.06	15.76 $\pm$ 1.06	6.15 $\pm$ 0.79	7.99 $\pm$ 0.02	4.30 $\pm$ 0.00	3.04 $\pm$ 0.09	6.11 $\pm$ 1.28
C18:2n6c	20.88 $\pm$ 0.89	34.92 $\pm$ 0.87	25.67 $\pm$ 0.08	44.83 $\pm$ 0.04	16.02 $\pm$ 0.07	14.98 $\pm$ 0.13	20.15 $\pm$ 0.40
C18:3n3	21.24 $\pm$ 0.14	14.71 $\pm$ 0.83	22.79 $\pm$ 1.86	22.89 $\pm$ 0.12	39.56 $\pm$ 0.03	38.04 $\pm$ 0.08	34.72 $\pm$ 1.13
C20:0	11.15 $\pm$ 0.52	2.30 $\pm$ 0.24	1.75 $\pm$ 0.13	0.65 $\pm$ 0.02	6.14 $\pm$ 0.10	7.77 $\pm$ 0.59	2.55 $\pm$ 0.05
C20:1c	0.08 $\pm$ 0.00	0.27 $\pm$ 0.01	0.44 $\pm$ 0.03	0.03 $\pm$ 0.00	0.02 $\pm$ 0.00	0.03 $\pm$ 0.00	0.24 $\pm$ 0.06
C20:2c	0.06 $\pm$ 0.00	0.05 $\pm$ 0.00	0.29 $\pm$ 0.04	0.06 $\pm$ 0.00	0.12 $\pm$ 0.01	0.17 $\pm$ 0.00	0.12 $\pm$ 0.03
C20:3n3+C21:0	0.55 $\pm$ 0.00	0.05 $\pm$ 0.01	0.23 $\pm$ 0.02	1.17 $\pm$ 0.03	0.54 $\pm$ 0.05	0.55 $\pm$ 0.09	0.37 $\pm$ 0.03
C22:0	11.54 $\pm$ 0.78	2.93 $\pm$ 0.61	2.06 $\pm$ 0.04	0.68 $\pm$ 0.05	8.69 $\pm$ 0.02	11.41 $\pm$ 0.77	2.36 $\pm$ 0.23
C23:0	nd	nd	nd	nd	0.27 $\pm$ 0.05	0.08 $\pm$ 0.02	0.17 $\pm$ 0.01
C24:0	5.90 $\pm$ 0.41	1.68 $\pm$ 0.13	2.68 $\pm$ 0.38	1.93 $\pm$ 0.13	6.20 $\pm$ 0.16	7.02 $\pm$ 0.45	3.21 $\pm$ 0.10
Total SFA	51.00 $\pm$ 0.72 a	31.78 $\pm$ 0.25 e	44.04 $\pm$ 0.89 b	22.63 $\pm$ 0.16 f	39.16 $\pm$ 0.18 c	42.99 $\pm$ 0.73 b	37.86 $\pm$ 0.66 d
Total MUFA	6.28 $\pm$ 0.03 cd	18.49 $\pm$ 2.21 a	6.98 $\pm$ 0.84 cb	8.42 $\pm$ 0.03 b	4.61 $\pm$ 0.01 ed	3.28 $\pm$ 0.85 e	6.77 $\pm$ 1.33 cb
Total PUFA	42.67 $\pm$ 0.75 e	49.68 $\pm$ 1.97 d	48.69 $\pm$ 1.77 d	68.89 $\pm$ 0.19 a	56.11 $\pm$ 0.16 cb	53.56 $\pm$ 0.13 c	55.24 $\pm$ 0.71 cb
PUFA/SFA	0.84 $\pm$ 0.03 f	1.56 $\pm$ 0.05 b	1.11 $\pm$ 0.06 e	3.04 $\pm$ 0.03 a	1.43 $\pm$ 0.01 c	1.25 $\pm$ 0.02 d	1.46 $\pm$ 0.01 c
n-6/n-3	0.98 $\pm$ 0.05 c	2.43 $\pm$ 0.53 a	1.13 $\pm$ 0.10 c	1.96 $\pm$ 0.01 b	0.40 $\pm$ 0.00 d	0.39 $\pm$ 0.00 d	0.58 $\pm$ 0.03 d

nd- not detected. Caproic acid (C6:0); Caprylic acid (C8:0); Capric acid (C10:0); Undecanoic acid (C11:0); Lauric acid (C12:0); Tridecanoic acid (C13:0); Myristic acid (C14:0); Myristoleic acid (C14:1); Pentadecanoic acid (C15:0); Palmitic acid (C16:0); Palmitoleic acid (C16:1); Heptadecanoic acid (C17:0); Stearic acid (C18:0); Oleic acid (C18:1n9); Linoleic acid (C18:2n6c);  $\alpha$ -Linolenic acid (C18:3n3); Arachidic acid (C20:0); Eicosanoic acid (C20:1c); Eicosadienoic acid (C20:2c); Eicosatrienoic acid + Heneicosanoic acid (C20:3n3+C21:0); Behenic acid (C22:0); Tricosanoic acid (C23:0); Lignoceric acid (C24:0).