Submittion article

rr retno widyowati <rr-retno-w@ff.unair.ac.id>
to fabadankara

Dear Editor of FABAD Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences,

Herewith I want to submit our article on FABAD Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences. Hoping our article can be accepted and published in this journal, so it will give good cor

Best regards,

Retno Widyowati, PhD

5 Attachments • Scanned by Gmail



Manuscript FABA..



CONTACT INI

Reply Forward

FABAD Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences- Manus

FABAD Ankara <fabadankara@gmail.com>
to me

Dear Retno WIDYOWATI,

Thank you for choosing FABAD Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences for publi

Reviewers have been assigned for the evaluation of your manuscript. You will

Please indicate your manuscript code for your further inquiries.



Regards,
Prof. Dr. Nesrin Gökhan Kelekçi
FABAD Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences
Editor

rr retno widyowati <rr-retno-w@ff.unair.ac.id>
to FABAD

Dear Prof. Dr. Nesrin,

Here with I want to ask about my article's status that I submited on Des 24 as code A-6

Best regards

Retno Widyowati, PhD

rr retno widyowati <rr-retno-w@ff.unair.ac.id>

FABAD A-602 Revision

2 messages

FABAD Ankara <fabadankara@gmail.com> Thu, Apr 16, 2020 at 5:27 PM
To: rr-retno-w@ff.unair.ac.id

Dear Retno WIDYOWATI,

Your manuscript (code: A-602) has been evaluated by the reviewers and the comments are given in the attached file. As you will see from the comments of the referees, your manuscript needs to be reevaluated. Attached please find the reviewer's comments for your submitted manuscript.

Kindly effect the recommended corrections and send it back within two weeks. The revised version of your manuscript will be sent to the same reviewers again, which means that a further evaluation of your contribution will be made. Final decision about acceptance or rejection is, therefore, still pending.

If the revised version is not submitted in time the manuscript will be withdrawn. Should you need additional time to prepare your review, please let us know.

The revised manuscript should follow the guideline listed below:

1. Response to the reviewers' comments should be on point by point basis and you should write your each answer just below the relevant comment of the reviewer in the word document I have mailed to you.

2. Also please indicate where changes have been made (with a different highlighted color in the text) in the revised manuscript.

Regards,

Prof. Dr. Nesrin Gökhan Kelekçi
FABAD Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences
Editor

Reviewer comments:

Reviewer 1.

In this manuscript, briefly, the 96%, 70% or 50% ethanol extracts of Orthosiphon stamineus Benth. Was applied onto T47D cell line of human breast cancer and a "metabolite profiling" study for the extracts were performed through fingerprint chromatography to compare the ingredients in the extracts.

Even though the manuscript looks fine in the first impression there are some major

handicaps of the methodology applied in the current study. These are questioned below:

Major issues:

How authors decided to use 96%, 70% or 50% ethanol (EtOH, 3 x 10 minutes) using ultrasonic?

Why not 80% or 20%? Is there any discussion about this situation

How the analysis time effect the concentration of the ingredients? Is there any experiment?

With or without samples for cell line means control and treated group.. so how the dosage for the extracts were selected? Have them ever tried different amount of the extracts against cell! This part is not clear.. and if they have not tried.. it must be given a reason inside the text

Have the authors tried “only ethanol” against cell lines? How they have decided if the effect caused by the extract or ethanol itself?

They have compared the activity of extracts with Dox.. (Table 3) However, as I have said above, the dosage is really important.. how they compare two different things within each other?

How long they kept the cell with treated extracts? 24 h, 48 h, 72 h.. it is really important to investigate the cell viability. If they have not tried any other condition, the authors must clearly indicate the reason

I have not understood how the authors found the %yield given in Table 1. It is really not clear and it needs some additional discussion

The conclusion is really poor to indicate the final results.

Minor issues

Proteins are not metabolites, please correct this phrase “metabolites such as protein, polysaccharides and saponins..”

The term “metabolite profiling” in the title must be changed. Metabolite profiling is a term to be used generally for untargeted studies. It does not indicate the analysis of two different compounds.

Reviewer 2.

1. Line spacing should be 1.5 according to the journal rules.

2. Similar studies are included in the literature, as the authors point out. Therefore, the superiority of the study should be explained in more detail.

3. Trademark and specification of used ethanol, TLC plates, and TLC system must be given. All trademarks must be given their country.

4. If the addition of water improved the extraction efficiency, why did not author try

the ethanol percentage less then 50?

5. According to the Fig 1, results of with 70% ethanol more brighten then others. More explanation is needed.

6. Fig 2 has two spectra. The author have to explain detail.

2 attachments

A-602 Revision .docx
20K

FABAD A-602 Manuscript.docx
247K

rr retno widyowati <rr-retno-w@ff.unair.ac.id> Sat, Apr 25, 2020 at 8:21 PM
To: FABAD Ankara <fabadankara@gmail.com>

Dear Editor FABAD Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences,

Thank you very much for your reviews on my article (A-602).
Herewith I send revisions and answers from the reviewer comments.
It is an honor for us to be able to contribute in this journal, so we hope our articles can be accepted.
Thank you very much.

Best regards,

Retno Widyowati, Phd.
[Quoted text hidden]

2 attachments

paper fabad-rev.docx
341K

A-602 Revision .docx
28K

Dear Retno WIDYOWATI,

Your manuscript (code: A-602) has been evaluated by the reviewers and the comments are given in the attached file. As you will see from the comments of the referees, your manuscript needs to be reevaluated. Attached please find the reviewer's comments for your submitted manuscript.

Kindly effect the recommended corrections and send it back within two weeks. The revised version of your manuscript will be sent to the same reviewers again, which means that a further evaluation of your contribution will be made. Final decision about acceptance or rejection is, therefore, still pending.

If the revised version is not submitted in time the manuscript will be withdrawn. Should you need additional time to prepare your review, please let us know.

The revised manuscript should follow the guideline listed below:

1. Response to the reviewers' comments should be on point by point basis and you should write your each answer just below the relevant comment of the reviewer in the word document I have mailed to you.

2. Also please indicate where changes have been made (with a different highlighted color in the text) in the revised manuscript.

Regards,

Prof. Dr. Nesrin Gökhan Kelekçi
FABAD Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences
Editor

Reviewer comments:

Reviewer 1.

In this manuscript, briefly, the 96%, 70% or 50% ethanol extracts of Orthosiphon stamineus Benth. Was applied onto T47D cell line of human breast cancer and a "metabolite profiling" study for the extracts were performed through fingerprint chromatography to compare the ingredients in the extracts.

Even though the manuscript looks fine in the first impression there are some major handicaps of the methodology applied in the current study. These are questioned below:

Major issues:

How authors decided to use 96%, 70% or 50% ethanol (EtOH, 3 x 10 minutes) using ultrasonic?

In previous study, we had extracted using maceration method (3 x 24 hours) with the same solvent systems (Arifianti *et al*., 2014). In this study, we used ultrasonic method to accelerate the extraction process with optimum results at several concentrations of the solvent. The extraction time was 3 x 10 minutes, It based on the orientation results and availability of instruments in our laboratory

Why not 80% or 20%? Is there any discussion about this situation?

The solvent concentration was chosen based on the orientation of previous studies to observe the increase or effect of active compounds in the plant. In previous studies the selectied solvents are 96, 70 and 50% ethanol (Arifianti *et al*., 2014).

How the analysis time effect the concentration of the ingredients? Is there any experiment?

Of course, the analysis time can affect the ingredients. Through the previous orientation, the extraction time was chosen 3 x 10 times because it is the optimum time. If we use more than 10 minutes, it is suspected that there are some compounds that are damaged during the ultrasonic extraction process.

With or without samples for cell line means control and treated group.. so how the dosage for the extracts were selected? Have them ever tried different amount of the extracts against cell! This part is not clear.. and if they have not tried.. it must be given a reason inside the text

Thank you for the corrections, without samples for the cell line means the medium control group while with samples means the cells were treated extracts. The dosage of extracts were in several concentrations, the range of 15-1,000 μg/mL. We apologize that we had not added the data.

Have the authors tried “only ethanol” against cell lines? How they have decided if the effect caused by the extract or ethanol itself?

The ethanol extracts were dissolved in DMSO at a safety limit of no more than 1% and it was tested (1% Dmso in medium) to know the effect against cell lines which called as cell control. We had added this information in the text.

They have compared the activity of extracts with Dox.. (Table 3) However, as I have said above, the dosage is really important.. how they compare two different things within each other?

We apologize for forgetting to enter the sample concentration in the method section. In this study, the sample concentrations were used in the range of 15-1,000 μg/ml and doxorubicin concentrations of 2.5-100 μg/ml. We had added this information in the text.

How long they kept the cell with treated extracts? 24 h, 48 h, 72 h.. it is really important to investigate the cell viability. If they have not tried any other condition, the authors must clearly indicate the reason

Based on the Freshney method (2005), we incubated cells with extracts for 24 hours on 96 well plates. This periode of 24-hour incubation had resulted in 70-80% confluent.

I have not understood how the authors found the %yield given in Table 1. It is really not clear and it needs some additional discussion

Thank you for your comments. We presented % yield data (table 1) in this study to show the theory of solvents with various polarity is the most important parameters in the extraction process. The extraction yield increases with increasing polarity (50% etanol) of the solvent used in extraction. Increasing the concentration of water in the solvent can increase the extraction yield. Compounds other than sinensetin and rosmarinic acid in the extract may have been extracted and contributed to higher yields. We added this explanation in results and discussion.

The conclusion is really poor to indicate the final results.

We apologize and had revised it.

Minor issues

Proteins are not metabolites, please correct this phrase “metabolites such as protein, polysaccharides and saponins..”

Thank you very much for your corrections

The term “metabolite profiling” in the title must be changed. Metabolite profiling is a term to be used generally for untargeted studies. It does not indicate the analysis of two different compounds.

Thank you very much for your suggestion and we had revised it.

Reviewer 2.

1. Line spacing should be 1.5 according to the journal rules. Thank you very much for your corrections and we had revised it.
2. Similar studies are included in the literature, as the authors point out. Therefore, the superiority of the study should be explained in more detail. Thank you very much and we added few explanations.
3. Trademark and specification of used ethanol, TLC plates, and TLC system must be given. All trademarks must be given their country. Thank you and done
4. If the addition of water improved the extraction efficiency, why did not author try the ethanol percentage less then 50? Thank you for the question, it should be extracted by water extract (100%) or ethanol percentage below 50%. we didn’t do it because we had experienced problems during the drying process of extract. We apologized.
5. According to the Fig 1, results of with 70% ethanol more brighten then others. More explanation is needed. Thank you very much and we added few explanations. At 70% ethanol extract had more intensity spot because it contained higest rosmarinic acid compare than other extracts.
6. Fig 2 has two spectra. The author has to explain detail. Thank you very much and we added few explanations that Figure 2a showed the standard UV-VIS spectra of sinensetin (black) with samples, while in figure 2b was rosmarinic acid (pink) with samples.

Anticancer Property of *Orthosiphon stamineus* Benth. Extracts in Different Solvent Systems against T47D Human Breast Cancer Cell Lines

Lusiana ARIFIANTI[1], Sukardiman SUKARDIMAN[1], Niken INDRIYANTI[2], Retno WIDYOWATI[1]*

[1]*Department of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry, Faculty of Pharmacy, Universitas Airlangga, Indonesia*

[2]*Departement of Pharmacology, Faculty of Pharmacy, Mulawarman University, Indonesia*

Corrresponding Author: rr-retno-w@ff.unair.ac.id

SUMMARY

Solvent system is an important factor in extraction process in order to obtain compounds that have pharmacological activity. The aim of this research is to develop a comprehensive extraction methods by modification of solvents used that might produce compounds possessing pharmacological activity for anticancer. In this study, Orthosiphon stamineus Benth. extract was used as sample in different solvent systems to observe their metabolite profiles. Extraction carried out using sonication techniques with ethanol solvents in three types of concentrations (96%, 70% and 50%). Then, the extracts introduced into anticancer activity profiles in order to find its active compounds. The anticancer activity had explored against breast cancer cells (T47D) using the MTT assay and doxorubicin as a positive control. The best IC_{50} value obtained from the 50% ethanol extract of Orthosiphon stamineus Benth. Based on the scanning chromatogram at 366 nm using Thin Layer Chromatography, each sample contains sinensetin and rosmarinic acid. The largest percentage of rosmarinic acid area was found on 70% ethanol extract of Orthosiphon stamineus Benth, while the highest percentage of sinensetin was found on 50% ethanol extract of Orthosiphon stamineus Benth. Thus, it can be concluded that sinensetin which has the most influence on anticancer activity.

Keywords: *Orthosiphon stamineus, breast cancer, rosmarinic acid, sinensetin, T47D*

INTRODUCTION

Recently, the efforts to treat cancer patients have focused on inhibiting the growth or killing cancer cells. The investigations to find an ideal drug that targets cancer cells with minimal side effects are ongoing. Some Indonesia medicinal plants may have a potential bioactive compound to be developed into an ideal drug for cancer. One of them is *Orthosiphon stamineus* Benth.

Orthosiphon stamineus Benth. (Lamiaceae) is a Indonesia plant native, traditionally used for diuretics, rheumatism, diabetes and hypertension (Fei *et al*., 2010). Previous study reported the activity of this plant extract inhibits human oral cancer cells (Younis *et al*., 2013). The methanol extract of this plant enhanced tamoxifen on breast cancer cell (MCF 7) proliferation (Sahib *et al*., 2009). In addition, 200 mg/kg ethanol extract of this plant showed no tumor cell growth compared to control group using xenograph method of tumor models that transplanted with breast cancer cells (MCF7) and colon cancer cells (HCT116) (Ahmad *et al*., 2010).

The bioactive compound will become lead compound to find an effective drug for cancer. One of the bioactive compounds found in this plant is sinensetin (5,6,6,7,3',4'-pentamethoxy flavone). It also contains orthosiphol D, orthosiphol E (Takeda *et.al*, 1993), orthosiphol A orthosiphol B, 3'- hydroxy-5,6,7,4'-tetramethoxyflavone neoorthosiphol A, neoorthosiphol B, α-amyrin, β-amyrin maslinic acid, urosolic acid, orthosiphonone A, orthosiphonone B, myo-inositol, neoorthosiphol A, neoorthosiphol B, β-caryophyllene caffeic acid, sinensetin tetra-methyl scutellarein, eupatorin cirsimaritin, acetovanillochromene orthochromene A, methylripario chromene agermacrene-D, β-selinen α-cadinol, choline betaine, O-cyamenea-terpineol, lyrol valencene, nephthalin camphor α-elemene (Singh *et al* 2015), 5,6,7,8-tetra hydroxy-6-methoxy-flavones (Hossain *et.al*, 2008), potassium, flavonol glycosides, caffeic acid (rosmarinic acid) (Sumaryono, *et al*., 1991), essential oils, diterpenes, lipophilic flavones such as eupatorin, (6-hydroxy-5,7,4-trimethoxy flavone), and TMF (3'-hydroxy-5, 6, 7, 4 'tetrametoxy flavone) (Awale *et.al*, 2001), triterpenes such as betulinic, ursolic, oleanolic acids, β sitosterol (Tezuka *et al*., 2000) and flavonoids such as 5-hydroxy-6,7,30,40-tetrametoxiflavone, salvigenin, 6-hydroxy-5,7,40-trimethoxyflavone, 5,6,7,30-tetramethoxy-40-hydroxy-8-Cprenylflavone (Hossain and Rahman, 2015). The chloroform extract of this plant contained 1.48% of sinensetin, 2.26% of eupatorin, and 0.58% of 30-hydroxy- 5,6,7,40-tetrametoksiflavon (Mohamed *et al*., 2013, Yam *et al*., 2012).

Previous studies showed that the 50% methanol extract of this plant using freezed and sprayed dried methods contained protein, polysaccharides and saponins (Siddiqui *et al*.,

2009). Research on metabolite profiles in this plants had been carried out using chromatographic and spectroscopic techniques combined with chemometrics (Akowuah *et al*., 2004; Sumaryono, *et al*., 1991; Saidan *et al*., 2015a). Ethanol extract using maceration method contained high phenolics and flavonoids, (rosmarinic acid and eupatorin) as antioxidants, while 50% ethanol and methanol extracts using soxhlet contained high protein and glycosaponin. Water extracts using reflux and maceration showed high polysaccharides (Saidan *et al*., 2015b).

Solvent system is an important factor in extraction process in order to obtain compounds that have pharmacological activity. In this study, the effect of different solvents on the metabolites profile in each extract had been determined. Extractions with 96, 70 and 50% ethanol were carried out according to the previous study with different method (Arifianti *et al*., 2014). Arifianti had extracted this plant using maceration method while this study used ultrasonic method to accelerate the extraction process and % yield with optimum results at same concentrations. It correlated to the anticancer activity (breast cancer) and their secondary metabolites are responsible for their activity.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

General Experimental Procedures and Materials

The plant was extracted on CAMAG ultrasonic and then evaporated by BUCHI rotary evaporator. The metabolite profiles of *Orthosiphon stamineus* Benth leaves were measured on a CAMAG Scanner 3 Densitometer and Linomat 5. The solvent extracts were combination between ethanol p.a (Merck) and aquadest. Sinensetin and rosmarinic acid from Sigma used as standard. The material used for breast cancer activity of T47D cells were RPMI 1640 medium (Gibco, Invitrogen), Fetal Bovine Serum (FBS, Sigma), Penicillin-Streptomycin (Sigma), Amphotericine B (Sigma), Dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO, Sigma), Phosphate Buffer Saline (PBS, Sigma), 3-(4,5-dimethylthiazol-2-yl)2-5- diphenyl tetrazolium bromide (MTT, ThermoFisher) and sodium dodecylsulfate (Sigma). The cancer cells inhibition was determined with Robonik Elisa Reader.

Plant Materials

Orthosiphon stamineus Benth leaves were obtained on late April 2018 from Balai Materia Medika, Malang and voucher specimens were deposited in Department of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry, Faculty of Pharmacy, Universitas Airlangga.

Extraction of plant materials

Extraction was carried out by ultrasonic method according to the previous published method by modification (Juliana *et al*., 2019). The dried leaves of *Orthosiphon stamineus* Benth (50 g) were extracted with 250 mL of each 96%, 70% or 50% ethanol (3 x 10 minutes) using CAMAG ultrasonic. Then the extracts were separated by filtration. The residue was re-extracted by using same procedure (3 times repeated). The filtrates were evaporated by BUCHI rotary evaporator to dryness under *vacuo* to get 96%, 70% or 50% ethanol extracts. The extracts were used to examine bioassay activity and phytochemical analysis. It performed by thin layer chromatography (TLC) to observe the sinensetin and rosmarinic acid profile.

Phytochemical analysis of plant extracts using TLC

The 10 µL of each 96%, 70%, 50% ethanol extracts of *Orthosiphon stamineus* Benth, sinensetin and rosmarinic acid were applied on a pre-coated TLC plate, silica gel 60F 254 (10 cm x 20 cm) as 7 mm bands using a Camag automatic TLC sampler (Linomat 5) spray-on band applicator equipped with 100 µL syringe, and the space between two spots was 2 mm of the plate. The extracts were each applied duplicates on the plate. The TLC plates were developed with chloroform-ethyl acetate in a ratio of 6:4 as mobile phase. Then, they were identified using a UV lamp at 365 nm. The phytochemical were analyzed based on chromatogram pattern using a CAMAG TLC Scanner 3 Densitometer and winCATS software, using a deuterium light source, the slit dimension was 6.00 x 0.45 mm. Peak areas were recorded and the spot of sinensetin and rosmarinic acid in the sample were confirmed by comparing the RF and spectra of the spot with that of sinensetin and rosmarinic acid standard (Arifianti *et al*., 2014, Hossain and Ismail, 2016).

Cell line

The T47D Human breast cancer cell lines were obtained from the CCRC (Cancer Chemoprevention Research Center), Gajah Mada University, Indonesia and a modification method described by Fresney Method (Freshney, 2005). The T47D Human breast cancer cells were maintained in RPMI 1640 that contained 10% of FBS, 2% of Penicillin-Streptomycin and 1% of Amphotericine B. It was stored at 37°C with humidified atmosphere of 5% CO_2 (Eppendorf). The cells were routinely observed to keep them from contamination.

Measurement of inhibition of cancer cell by MTT method

The MTT method used was a method that has been modified by Freshney (Freshney, 2005). The 5 x 10^4 cells/wells of T47D cells with or without samples (96%, 70%, 50% ethanol extracts of *Orthosiphon stamineus* Benth) were cultured in RPMI 1640 medium that

contained 10% of FBS and 1 % (v/v) of penicillin-streptomycin into 96 well plate then incubated for 24 hours at 37°C and 5% CO_2 (70-80% confluent). The samples were dissolved in DMSO and further diluted with medium to make series of concentrations (15 – 1,000 µg/mL). The final concentration of DMSO in the test solution should not more than 1%. Control cell was treated with 1% DMSO. Cells were then treated with a serial dilution of tested samples. The doxorubicin concentrations of 2.5-100 µg/ml were used as positive control. After 24 h incubation, 0.5 mg/ml of MTT was added to each well and incubated for 4 hours. Then, the stopper solution (sodium dodecylsulfate 10% in 0.1 N HCl) was added to dissolve the formazan crystal and incubated overnight at room temperature and dark. Finally, the cells viability was measured using ELISA reader at λ 570 nm. The absorbance of each well then converted into percentage of viable cells using calculation below and the IC_{50} values were determined by Probit analysis using SPSS software. Experiments were done in triplicates.

$$\% \text{ cell viability} = \frac{\text{sample absorbance - medium control absorbance}}{\text{cell control absorbance - medium control absorbance}} \times 100\%$$

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Extraction

Several ways can be do to obtain phytochemicals from plants, one of which is extraction. Extraction efficiency is influenced by the chemical properties of the compound, the extraction method used, the particle size of the sample, the solvent used, and the presence of disturbing substances (Stalikas, 2007). Conventional extraction techniques are often associated with long heating times and a risk of bioactive compounds degradation. This has led to sophisticated techniques such as ultrasonic extraction which are efficient in terms of extraction time and solvent consumption. In view of this method, ultrasonic cavitation produces shock waves that are able to disrupt the external structure of plant samples and release plant bioactives effectively (Budynas & Nisbett, 2008; Floros & Liang, 1994).

Ultrasonic extraction using ultrasonic frequencies at >20 kHz can accelerate the contact time between samples and solvents at room temperature. It causes the mass transfer of bioactive compounds from plant cells to solvent to be faster. Sonication relies on sound energy that causes the cavitation. It forms small bubbles due to ultrasonic frequency transmission to help the diffusion of solvents into plant cell walls (Ashley *et al*., 2001).

General extraction parameters such as concentration and ratio of solvents using ultrasonic method were first optimized. The solvent used was ethanol because it is non-toxic, good polarity for the sound energy and ultrasonic frequencies, so it is able to dissolve interesting bioactive compounds (Xiao *et al*.,2008). The extraction yield depends on the solvent with various polarity, pH, temperature, extraction time, and sample composition. At the effect of the same extraction time and temperature, the solvent and sample composition are the most important parameters. In this study, *Orthosiphon stamineus* Benth. extracts were obtained using ethanol and water at various concentrations (50%, 70%, and 96%). Their extraction yields were ranged between 15.64%, 12.39% and 3.44%, respectively (Table 1). The results of extraction with various solvents decreased in the following order: 50% ethanol> 70% ethanol> 96% ethanol. It showed that the extraction yield increases with increasing polarity of the solvent used in the extraction. Increasing the concentration of water in the solvent can increase the extraction yield. Compounds other than sinensetin and rosmarinic acid in the extract, it may have been extracted and contributed to higher yields. This might be caused by higher solubility of protein and carbohydrate in water-ethanol than pure ethanol (Zieliński and Kozłowska, 2000). The use of a combination of water in organic solvents can facilitate the extraction of water-soluble chemicals and/or organic solvents. This might be the reason why the ethanol extract yield is 50% higher than other extracts. The results of this study are in accordance with the results of extraction in *Limnophila aromatica* (Do *et al.*, 2014) and several medicinal plants (Sultana *et al*., 2009).

Table 1. % yield of *Orthosiphon stamineus* Benth extracts

Sample	% yield
96% ethanol extract	3.444
70% ethanol extract	12.390
50% ethanol extract	15.636

The addition of water in the extraction solvent showed that the extraction yield is improved, because the presence of water increased heating efficiency due to its high dielectric constant (Sato & Buchner, 2004), and increased the permeability of plant matrices to encourage mass transfer and diffusion of bioactive compounds (Boeing *et al*., 2014). The effects of aqueous ethanol have different effects, the optimum solvent concentration was found to be 50% (v/v) ethanol.

The phytochemical analysis

A number of sinensetin and rosmarinic acid found in the leaves of *Orthosiphon stamineus* Benth. TLC-densitometry is the current method for the quantization of some flavonoids and caffeic acid derivatives in pharmaceutical formulations. It is quickly gaining widespread acceptance in pharmaceutical analysis. This is due to simplicity, accuracy, cost effectiveness and possibility of simultaneous determination of a number of samples on a single TLC plate. HPTLC allows the identification and quantification of more than 20 samples in the same chromatographic process and requires more than 2 hours. Whereas TLC takes only 15-30 minutes because it does not require conditioning steps, such as in HPLC, and is cheaper.

A fingerprint chromatography was performed to describe components found in sinensetin & rosmarinic acid-rich extract using TLC densitometry according to the modified method of Hossain and Ismail (2016) as well as Hossain and Ismail (2009). Samples (96, 70 and 50% ethanol extracts of *Orthosiphon stamineus* Benth) and standard (sinensetin and rosmarinc acid) were explored on a silica gel GF 254 and developed with chloroform-ethyl acetate in a ratio of 6:4. under UV observation at 366 nm by TLC visualizer (Fig. 1). The advantage of using the TLC-visualizer method is easy, fast, accurate, inexpensive and most suitable for natural material analysis. A sample chromatogram showed the presence of spots of the same color and at the same Rf value as the standard (Fig.1). A single peak at Rf 0.49 was observed in the chromatogram of sinensetin standard and Rf 0.06 as rosmarinic acid standard. At 70% ethanol extract had more intensity spot because it contained higest rosmarinic acid compare than other extracts.



Sinensetin Ros Ac. 50% 50%70%70% 96%96%

Figure 1. The chromatograms of samples and standard without any spray reagent, in UV light at 366 nm

TLC analysis results showed bright blue fluorescent spots and the ultraviolet spectrophotometry showed the spectra images that were identical between samples with standards spectra. Two spectra are said to be identical if they have a MF (Match Factor) price > 95. In this study, the price of a match factor from the sample against sinensetin and rosmarinic acid standard obtained 0.99559 and 0.99985, respectively, so that they can be said to be identical (Fig. 2). The presence of sinensetin and rosmarinic acid in samples were proven by comparison of standards spectra with components that are separate from the samples UV-VIS spectra. Figure 2a showed the standard UV-VIS spectra of sinensetin (black) with samples, while in figure 2b was rosmarinic acid (pink) with samples. It can be observed the presence of sinensetin and rosmarinic acid peak in a sample at the same Rf value. It showed the similarity of spotting between sinensetin and rosmarinic acid standard in each sample. This data is supported by a standard spectrum profile of rosmarinic acid that has similarities with the spectrum of 96, 70 and 50% ethanol extracts of *Orthosiphon stamineus* Benth. Furthermore, a similar spectrum image was also obtained between sinensetin standard and them, but there was a slight shift in the sinensetin spectrum of 96% ethanol extract of *Orthosiphon stamineus* Benth (Fig.2).



Figure 2. The UV-VIS Spectra overlay results of sinensetin (a, black) and rosmarinic acid (b, pink), together with samples of 50 % ethanol extract (blue), 70% ethanol extract (green) and 96% ethanol extract (yellow).

Quantitative determination was done by TLC-densitometry using the calibration curve method. The calibration curve was performed by the winCATS software program. In table 2, the percentage data of each chromatogram area refered to the sinensetin and rosmarinic acid standard. The largest percentage of rosmarinic acid area was found on 70% ethanol extract (74.61±0.03), while the highest percentage of sinensetin was found on 50% ethanol extract

(32.97±0.06) of *Orthosiphon stamineus* Benth. So 70% ethanol is the best solvent system for extracting rosmarinic acid while 50% ethanol for sinensetin.

Table 2. Peak identification by TLC-densitometry

Samples	Start position	Start Height	Max position	Max Height	Max %	End Position	End Height	Area	% Area	Mean % area
50% EtOH Ex_1	0.06 Rf	0.4 AU	0.11 Rf	102.3 AU	72.22%	0.16 Rf	0.0 AU	1330.3 AU	65.85%	67.04±0.02
	0.48 Rf	4.3 AU	0.55 Rf	39.4 AU	27.78%	0.60 Rf	2.9 AU	689.9 AU	34.15%	32.97±0.06
50% EtOH Ex_2	0.06 Rf	0.6 AU	0.11 Rf	103.4 AU	73.36%	0.14 Rf	1.2 AU	1338.7 AU	68.22%	
	0.49 Rf	3.3 AU	0.55 Rf	37.6 AU	26.64%	0.59 Rf	3.2 AU	623.7 AU	31.78%	
70% EtOH Ex_1	0.06 Rf	1.0 AU	0.12 Rf	192.9 AU	80.66%	0.18 Rf	0.0 AU	2774.9 AU	76.45%	74.61±0.03
	0.49Rf	7.0AU	0.56 Rf	46.3 AU	19.34%	0.60 Rf	2.8 AU	855.0 AU	23.55%	22.15±0.47
70% EtOH Ex_2	0.06 Rf	0.2 AU	0.12 Rf	191.2 AU	76.66%	0.15 Rf	1.2 AU	2821.9 AU	72.77%	
	0.50 Rf	5.9 AU	0.56 Rf	46.0 AU	18.45%	0.61 Rf	0.3 AU	804.1 AU	20.74%	
96% EtOH Ex_1	0.07Rf	0.0AU	0.11 Rf	73.6 AU	72.24%	0.15 Rf	0.1 AU	892.7AU	70.10%	71.37±0.02
	0.54Rf	6.3 AU	0.57 Rf	28.3 AU	27.76%	0.61 Rf	2.7 AU	380.8 AU	29.90%	28.63±0.02
96% EtOH Ex_2	0.07Rf	0.3AU	0.12 Rf	75.4 AU	74.20%	0.18 Rf	0.0 AU	942.1 AU	72.64%	
	0.56Rf	4.6AU	0.60Rf	26.2 AU	25.80%	0.64 Rf	0.4 AU	354.9 AU	27.36%	

Anticancer activity

The anticancer properties of the ethanol extracts of 96, 70 and 50% of *Orthosiphon stamineus* Benth. were determined by MTT test. This test was chosen because it is reliable, simple, applies to a variety of cells, and can be done in microtiter plates. The test was based on the reaction of colorimetry of 3-(4,5-dimethylthiazol-2-yl)-2,5-diphenyltetrazolium bromide with the enzyme dehydrogenase in living cells to form a colored formazan corresponding to a viable cell numbers (McCauley et al., 2013).

Table 3. IC_{50} value of the samples on breast cancer activity

Sample	IC_{50} (ppm)
96% ethanol extract	259.016 ± 18.3
70% ethanol extract	390.521 ± 14.5
50% ethanol extract	159.049 ± 12.9
Doxorubicin	63.916 ± 5.5

In this study, the anticancer activities of the extracts were examined against human breast carcinoma cells (T47D). Based on the bioactivity results, the best IC_{50} value was obtained from 50% ethanol extract of *Orthosiphon stamineus* Benth. (table 3) and TLC-densitometry results also showed that this extract contains the higest sinensetin. Sinensetin was able to inhibit proliferation of gastric cancer cell, arterial blood gas (ABG) cancer cells by apoptosis mechanism through P53 and P21 regulation cell using Western Blot Technique (Dong *et al*., 2011). While rosmarinic acid had known to prevent cell damage caused by free

radicals, thereby reducing the risk of cancer and osteosclerosis (Fernando *et al.*, 2016) and is a major compound of polyphenol that can be used as a nutraceutical product that helps improve body immunity in cancer patients (Moore *et al*., 2016). Therefore, the 50% ethanol extract from this plant showed the highest cytotoxic activity against T47D breast cancer cells compared to other extracts and sinensetin has an important role for anticancer properties in the extracts.

CONCLUSION

The 50% ethanol extract from *Orthosiphon stamineus* Benth showed the highest cytotoxic activity against T47D breast cancer cells compared to other extracts. This extract contains highest of sinensetin (32.97±0.06) compared to other extracts. This compound may be responsible for anticancer properties in the extracts.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge Faculty of Pharmacy, Universitas Airlangga for providing the facilities to do the research and funding Penelitian Dosen Pemula (PDP) Project.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

REFERENCES

Ahmad, M. K., Ismail, Z., Aisheh, A. A., Majid, A. M. S. A., & Majid A. (2010). *Orthosiphon stamineus* leaf extract can prevent the development of colorectal and breast cancer in vivo. *Cancer Prevention Research*, *3*(12), A54.

Akowuah, A. G., Zhari, I., Norhayati, I., Sadikun, A., & Khamsah, S. (2004). Sinensetin, eupatorin, 3′-hydroxy-5, 6, 7, 4′-tetramethoxyflavone and rosmarinic acid contents and antioxidative effect of *Orthosiphon stamineus* from Malaysia. *Food Chemistry, 87*(4), 559-566.

Arifianti, L., Oktarina, R. D., & Kusumawati, I. (2014) Pengaruh jenis pelarut pengektraksi terhadap kadar sinensetin dalam ekstrak daun *Orthosiphon stamineus* Benth. *Planta Husada*, *2*(1), 1–4.

Ashley, K., Andrews, R. N., Cavazosa, L., & Demange, M. (2001). Ultrasonic extraction as a sample preparation technique for elemental analysis by atomic spectrometry. *Journal of Analytical Atomic Spectrometry*, *16*, 1147-1153.

Awale, S., Tezuka, Y., Banskota, A. H., Kouda, K., Tun, K. M., & Kadota, S. (2001). Five novel highly oxygenated diterpenes of *Orthosiphon stamineus* from Myanmar. *Journal Natural Product*, *64*(5), 592-596.

Boeing, J. S., Barizão, É. O., Silva, B. C., Montanher, P. F., Almeida, V. D. C., & Visentainer, J. V. (2014). Evaluation of solvent effect on the extraction of phenolic compounds and antioxidant capacities from the berries: application of principal component analysis. *Chemistry Central Journal*, *8*(1), 48.

Budynas, R. G., & Nisbett, J. K. (2008). *Shigley's mechanical engineering design* (8th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Do, Q. D., Angkawijaya, A. E., Tran-Nguyen, P. L., Huynh, L. H., Soetaredjo, F. E., Ismadji, S., & Ju, Y. (2014). Effect of extraction solvent on total phenol content, total flavonoid content, and antioxidant activity of *Limnophila aromatica*. *Journal of Food and Drug Analysis, 22*(3), 296-302.

Dong, Y., Ji, G., Cao, A., Shi, J., Shi, H., Xie, J., & Wu, D. (2011). Effects of sinensetin on proliferation and apoptosis of human gastric cancer AGS cells. *Zhongguo Zhong Yao, Za Zhi*, *36*(6), 790-794.

Fei, Y. M., Vuanghao, L., Muhammad, S. I., Ziad, A. O., Fung, A. L., Noersal, R., Fawzy, A. M., Zuhair, A. G., Rusliza, B., Amirin, S., & Zaini, A. M. (2010). HPLC and anti-inflammatory studies of the flavonoid rich chloroform extract fraction of *Orthosiphon Stamineus* leaves. *Molecules*, *15*, 4452-4466.

Fernando, P. M. D. J., Piao, M. J., Kang, K. A., Ryu, Y. S., Hewage, S. R. K. M., Chae, S. W., Hyun, J. W. (2016). Rosmarinic acid attenuates cell damage against UVB radiation-induced oxidative stress via enhancing antioxidant effects in human HaCaT cells. *Biomol Ther.*, *24*(1), 75-84.

Floros, J. D., & Liang, H. (1994). Acoustically, assisted diffusion through membranes and biomaterials. *Food Technology and Biotechnology*, *48*(12), 79-84.

Freshney, R.I., (2005). *Culture of animal cell: A manual of basic technique*. 5th Ed. John Wiley and Sons: New York; 2005. 120-135.

Hossaina, M. A., Ismail, Z., Rahman, A., & Kang, S. C., (2008). Chemical composition and anti-fungal properties of the essential oils and crude extracts of *Orthosiphon stamineus* Benth. *Industrial Crops and Products*, *27*(3), 328-334.

Hossain, M. A., & Ismail, Z. (2009). High performance thin layer chromatographic determination of caffeic acid and rosmarinic acid from the leaves of *Orthosiphon stamineus*. *Indo. J. Chem., 9*(1), 137-141.

Hossain, M. A., & Ismail, Z. (2016). Quantification and enrichment of sinensetin in the leaves of *Orthosiphon stamineus*. *Arabian Journal of Chemistry, 9*(2), S1338-S1341.

Hossain, M. A. & Rahman, S. M. M. (2015). Isolation and characterisation of flavonoids from the leaves of medicinal plant *Orthosiphon stamineus*. *Arabian Journal of Chemistry 8*, 218-221.

Juliana, S., Suciati, & Indrayanto, G. (2019). Sterol and triterpene profiles of the callus culture of *Solanum mammosum*. *Makara J. Sci., 23*(2), 72-78.

McCauley, J., Zivanovic, A., Skropeta, D. (2013). Bioassays for anticancer activities. *Methods Mol. Biol., 1055*, 191-205

Mohamed, E. A. H., Yam, M. F., Ang, L. F., Mohamed, A. J. & Asmawi, M. A. (2013). Antidiabetic properties and mechanism of action of *Orthosiphon stamineus* Benth bioactive sub-fraction in streptozotocin-induced diabetic rats. *Journal of Acupuncture and Meridian Studies*, *6*(1), 31-40.

Moore, J., Yousef, M., & Tsiani, E. (2016). Anticancer effects of rosemary (*Rosmarius officinalis* L.) extract and rosemary extract polyphenols. Nutrients, *8*(11), 731, 1-32.

Sahib, I., Ismail, Z., Othman, N. H., & Majib, A. (2009). *Orthosiphon stamineus* methanolic extract enhances the anti proliferative effect of tamoxifen on human hormone dependent breast cancer. *International Journal of Pharmacology, 5*(4), 273-276.

Saidan, N. H., Aisha, A. F., Hamil, M. S., Malik, A. M., & Ismail, Z. (2015a). A novel reverse phase high performance liquid chromatography method for standardization of *Orthosiphon stamineus* leaf extracts. *Pharmacognosy Research*, *7*(1), 23-31.

Saidan, N. H., Hamil, M. S. R., Memon, A. H., Abdelbari, M. M., Hamdan, M. R., Mohd, K. S., Majid, A. M. S. A., & Ismail, Z. (2015b), Selected metabolites profiling of *Orthosiphon stamineus* Benth leaves extracts combined with chemometrics analysis and correlation with biological activities, *BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine*, *15*(350), 1-12

Sato, T., & Buchner, R. (2004). Dielectric relaxation processes in ethanol/water mixtures. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, *108*(23), 5007-5015.

Siddiqui, M. J., Hafizoh, S. N., Ismail, Z., Sahib, H., Helal, M., & Majid, A. M. S. A. (2009) Analysis of total proteins, polysaccharides and glycosaponins contents of *Orthosiphon stamineus* Benth. in spray and freeze dried methanol:water (1:1) extract and its contribution to cytotoxic and antiangiogenic activities. *Pharmacognosy Research*, *1*(5), 320-326.

Singh, M. K., Gidwani, B., Gupta, A., Dhongade, H., Kaur, C. D., Kashyap, P. P. & Tripathi, D. K. (2015). A review of the medicinal plants of Genus *Orthosiphon* (*Lamiaceae*). *International Journal of Biological Chemistry,* 9(6), 318-331.

Stalikas, C. D. (2007). Extraction, separation, and detection methods for phenolic acids and flavonoids. *J. Sep Sci*., *30*, 3268-3295.

Sultana, B., Anwar, F., & Ashraf, M. (2009). Effect of extraction solvent/technique on the antioxidant activity of selected medicinal plant extracts. *Molecules, 14*, 2167-2180.

Sumaryono, W., Proksch, P., Wray, V., Witte, L., & Hartmann, T. (1991). Qualitative and quantitative analysis of the phenolic constituents from *Orthosiphon aristatus*. *Planta Medica*, *57*, 176-80.

Takeda, Y., Matsumoto, T., Terao, H., Shingu, T., Futatsuishi, Y., Nohara, T., & Kajimoto, T. (1993). Orthosiphol D and E, minor diterpenes from *Orthosiphon stamineus*. *Phytochemistry*, *33*(2), 411-415.

Tezuka, Y., Stampoulis, P., Banskota, A., Awale, S., Tran, K., & Saiki, I. (2000). Constituents of the Vietnamese medicinal plant *Orthosiphon stamineus*. *Chemical and Pharmaceutical Bulletin*, *48*, 1711-1719.

Yam, M. F., Mohamed, E. A. H., Ang, L. F., Pei, L., Darwis, Y., Mahmud, R., Asmawi, M. Z., Basir, R. & Ahmad, M. (2012). A simple isocratic HPLC method for the simultaneous determination of sinensetin, eupatorin, and 30-hydroxy-5,6,7,40-tetramethoxyflavone in *Orthosiphon stamineus* extracts. *Journal of Acupuncture and Meridian Studies*, *5*(4), 176-181.

Younis, L., Abu-Hassan, M. I., Zahar, F. F., & Husin, M. F., M. (2013). The use of *Orthosiphon stamineus* anticancer action against human oral squamous cell carcinoma. *The Open Conference Proceedings Journal*, *4*, 217.

Xiao, W., Han, L., & Shi, B. (2008). Microwave-assisted extraction of flavonoids from *Radix astragali*. *Separation and Purification Technology*, *62*(3), 614-618.

Zieliński, H., & Kozłowska, H. (2000). Antioxidant activity and total phenolics in selected cereal grains and their different morphological fractions. *J. Agric. Food Chem., 48*, 2008-2016.

rr retno widyowati <rr-retno-w@ff.unair.ac.id>

Fwd: proof of your manuscript

2 messages

FABAD Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences <fabadankara@gmail.com> Mon, Sep 21, 2020 at 4:17 PM
To: rr-retno-w@ff.unair.ac.id

---------- Forwarded message ---------
Gönderen: **FABAD Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences** <fabadankara@gmail.com>
Date: 17 Eyl 2020 Per, 14:42
Subject: proof of your manuscript
To: <rr-retno-w@ff.unair.ac.id>

Dear **Retno WIDYOWATI,**

You can find the attached proof of your accepted manuscript entitled " **Anticancer Property of Orthosiphon stamineus Benth. Extracts in Different Solvent Systems against T47D Human Breast Cancer Cell Lines (Code: A-602)**" and acceptance letter for FABAD Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences. Please check the proof and make your corrections on pdf file. We will be greatfull if you could send us corrected proof in 5 days. Please make your correction on pdf file. It is very important not to change anything in the content. If you do, you should be aware that your review would need to go under second evaluation.

P.S. Please check the format of your manuscript including references, key word numbers, titles (Turkish and English), ORCID IDs according to author's instructions. Unfited manuscripts will not be published.

If it is also related to your work, please send the ethical statements of your study via email.

Acceptance letter of your manuscript is also attached.

Thank you very much for your kind interest.

Sincerely Yours,
Nesrin Gökhan Kelekçi

2 attachments

A-602.pdf
269K

A602-acceptance.pdf
557K

rr retno widyowati <rr-retno-w@ff.unair.ac.id> Tue, Sep 22, 2020 at 9:06 AM
To: FABAD Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences <fabadankara@gmail.com>

Dear editorial team,

Thank you very much for accepting our article. After checking, thera were several typos in the script. They are:
1. Title: Benth is written in an upright form instead of italic
2. Summary: writing 50 on the IC50 using subscript form
3. The author's orcid ID of Retno Widyowati is wrong, the right one is https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0572-7551
4. Introduction: the writing of compounds is a lack of comma.
orthosiphol D, orthosiphol E (Takeda *et.al*, 1993), orthosiphol A, orthosiphol B, 3'- hydroxy-5,6,7,4'-tetramethoxyflavone, neoorthosiphol A, neoorthosiphol B, α-amyrin, β-amyrin, maslinic acid, urosolic acid, orthosiphonone A, orthosiphonone B, myoinositol, β-caryophyllene, caffeic acid, sinensetin, tetra-methyl scutellarein, eupatorin, cirsimaritin, acetovanillochromene, orthochromene A, methylripario chromene, agermacrene-D, β-selinen α-cadinol, choline, betaine, O-cyamenea-terpineol, lyrol, valencene, nephthalin, camphor, α-elemene

There are our corrections and apologize if there are still some writing errors.
Once again, thank you for the opportunity to be given to join your journal.

Best regards,

Retno Widyowati, PhD

[Quoted text hidden]

A-602-2 copy.pdf
2381K

handicaps of the methodology applied in the current study. These are questioned below:

Major issues:

How authors decided to use 96%, 70% or 50% ethanol (EtOH, 3 x 10 minutes) using ultrasonic?

Why not 80% or 20%? Is there any discussion about this situation

How the analysis time effect the concentration of the ingredients? Is there any experiment?

With or without samples for cell line means control and treated group.. so how the dosage for the extracts were selected? Have them ever tried different amount of the extracts against cell! This part is not clear.. and if they have not tried.. it must be given a reason inside the text

Have the authors tried “only ethanol” against cell lines? How they have decided if the effect caused by the extract or ethanol itself?

They have compared the activity of extracts with Dox.. (Table 3) However, as I have said above, the dosage is really important.. how they compare two different things within each other?

How long they kept the cell with treated extracts? 24 h, 48 h, 72 h.. it is really important to investigate the cell viability. If they have not tried any other condition, the authors must clearly indicate the reason

I have not understood how the authors found the %yield given in Table 1. It is really not clear and it needs some additional discussion

The conclusion is really poor to indicate the final results.

Minor issues

Proteins are not metabolites, please correct this phrase “metabolites such as protein, polysaccharides and saponins..”

The term “metabolite profiling” in the title must be changed. Metabolite profiling is a term to be used generally for untargeted studies. It does not indicate the analysis of two different compounds.

Reviewer 2.

1. Line spacing should be 1.5 according to the journal rules.

2. Similar studies are included in the literature, as the authors point out. Therefore, the superiority of the study should be explained in more detail.

3. Trademark and specification of used ethanol, TLC plates, and TLC system must be given. All trademarks must be given their country.

4. If the addition of water improved the extraction efficiency, why did not author try

the ethanol percentage less then 50?

5. According to the Fig 1, results of with 70% ethanol more brighten then others. More explanation is needed.

6. Fig 2 has two spectra. The author have to explain detail.

2 attachments

A-602 Revision .docx
20K

FABAD A-602 Manuscript.docx
247K

rr retno widyowati <rr-retno-w@ff.unair.ac.id> Sat, Apr 25, 2020 at 8:21 PM
To: FABAD Ankara <fabadankara@gmail.com>

Dear Editor FABAD Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences,

Thank you very much for your reviews on my article (A-602).
Herewith I send revisions and answers from the reviewer comments.
It is an honor for us to be able to contribute in this journal, so we hope our articles can be accepted.
Thank you very much.

Best regards,

Retno Widyowati, Phd.
[Quoted text hidden]

2 attachments

paper fabad-rev.docx
341K

A-602 Revision .docx
28K

FABAD
FARMASOTİK BİLİMLER ANKARA DERNEĞİ

09/17/2020

Dear Retno WIDYOWATI,

I am pleased to inform you that your article entitled "Anticancer Property of Orthosiphon stamineus Benth. Extracts in Different Solvent Systems against T47D Human Breast Cancer Cell Lines (Code: A-602)" has been accepted as of 05/02/2020 for publication in FABAD Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences, 45(3);2020.

We wish to thank you for submission of the manuscript to FABAD Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences and look forward to a continued collaboration in the future.

Thank you very much for your kind interest.

Best regards,

Prof. Dr. Nesrin Gökhan Kelekçi
FABAD Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences
Editör



Hacettepe Üniversitesi-Eczacılık Fakültesi-Farmasötik Kİmya Anabilim Dalı, 06100-Sıhhiye, Ankara.
Hacettepe University-Faculty of Pharmacy-Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry, 06100-Sihhiye, Ankara-TURKEY

Tel: +90 (312) 305 18 72 - (312) 324 03 33; E-mail: fabadankara@gmail.com