Supercritical fluid extraction, Hydrodistillation and Soxhlet extraction of the aerial part of winter savory. Comparative evaluation of the extraction method on the chemical composition Proceedings of European Congress of Chemical Engineering (ECCE-6)
Copenhagen, 16-20 September 2007

# Supercritical fluid extraction, Hydrodistillation and Soxhlet extraction of the aerial part of winter savory. Comparative evaluation of the extraction method on the chemical composition

C. Grosso, M. A. Tavares Cardoso, A. C. Figueiredo, M. Moldão-Martins, J. Burillo, J. S. Urieta, J. G. Barroso, J. A. Coelho, A. M. Palavra

#### **Abstract**

Supercritical fluid extraction of the volatile oil of the aerial part of the winter savory was carried out in different conditions of pressure, temperature, mean particle size and CO<sub>2</sub> flow rate and the results were compared with those obtaining by hydrodistillation with a Clevenger-type apparatus. The non-volatile components were extracted by SFE at higher pressures and by soxhlet extraction with different solvent mixtures. Concerning the volatile components, although the extraction yields of SFE and HD are quite similar, SFE extracts are richer in thymoquinone, a component with interest to the pharmaceutical industry due to is anti-cancer, antioxidant and anti-inflammatory properties.

Keywords: supercritical fluid extraction, hydrodistillation, soxhlet extraction, antioxidants

## 1. Introduction

Winter savory (Satureja montana L.) is an aromatic herb frequently used in food industry and in traditional medicine due to its antimicrobial activities (antibacterial and antifungal), as well as the antioxidant, digestive, laxative, expectorant and sedative properties [1].

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Departamento de Engenharia Química e Biológica, IST, Av. Rovisco Pais, 1, 1049-001 Lisboa, Portugal

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup> DBV, Centro de Biotecnologia Vegetal, C2,Faculdade de Ciências, Universidade de Lisboa, Campo Grande, 1749-016 Lisboa, Portugal

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>c</sup> Centro de Microbiologia e Indústrias Agrícolas, DAIAT, ISA, Tapada da Ajuda, 1349-017, Lisboa, Portugal

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>d</sup> Centro de Investigación y Tecnología Agroalimentaria, Departamento de Ciencia, Tecnología y Universidad, Gobierno de Aragón, Apdo. 727, 50080 Zaragoza, Spain

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>e</sup> Química orgánica y química física, Universidad Zaragoza, Pedro Cerbuna, 12, 50009Zaragoza, Spain

Spain f CIEQB/DEQ, ISEL, Rua Conselheiro Emídio Navarro, 1950-062 Lisboa, Portugal e-mail: antonio.palavra@ist.utl.pt; Fax: +351218464455

Hydrodistillation (HD) and solvent extraction (SE) are the common methods to isolate volatile and non-volatile components from aromatic plants, although these two methods present some problems, namely thermal degradation and solvent contamination, respectively. On the other hand, supercritical fluid extraction (SFE) prevents these limitations, since the process is carried out at a temperature lower than that of HD and the extract is solvent free by decompression. Additionally, the manipulation of parameters as temperature and pressure results in different selectivity and, consequently, in the extraction of different components. This behaviour can be useful when a particular component is desired [2, 3].

In the present work, SFE of the volatile oil was carried out with a flow apparatus using a two stage fractional separation technique, which is described elsewhere [4]. Different conditions of pressure (90 and 100 bar), temperature (40 and 50°C), mean particle size (0.4, 0.6, 0.8 mm) and CO<sub>2</sub> flow rate (0.8, 1.1, 1.3 kg/h) were studied to understand the influence of these parameters on the composition and yield of the volatile oil extraction. HD was performed on a Clevenger-type apparatus, for 4 hours, using the same mean particle diameters, as for the SFE, in order to compare both methods.

After the extraction of the volatile and the essential oils, the same plant material was subject to the extraction of the non-volatile fraction by SFE and SE (pentane and acetone), respectively.

#### 2. Results and discussion

The volatile and the essential oils obtained by the different extraction procedures were analysed by GC (HP 5890 serie II-GC equipped with a DB-5 column) and GC-MS (Perkin Elmer Autosystem XL GC equipped with DB-1 column interfaced with Perkin Elmer Turbomass mass spectrometer (software version 4.1)). The main compounds are p-Cymene (6-18%),  $\gamma$ -Terpinene (2-9%), Thymol (8-11%), Carvacrol (41-64%) and  $\beta$ -Bisabolene (2-4%) (Tables 1-3).

**Table 1:** Yield and composition of the volatile oil extracted at different conditions of pressure (90 and 100 bar) and temperature (40 and 50°C).

Components		90bar	100bar	
	RI	40°C	40°C	50°C
p -Cymene	1117	10.14	8.89	17.77
γ-Terpinene	1158	4.26	3.12	5.95
Thymoquinone	1371	2.92	2.89	2.45
Thymol	1419	10.94	11.34	9.11
Carvacrol	1431	52.65	52.83	41.72
β-Bisabolene	1636	2.45	2.21	3.45
Yield % (w/w)		1.38	1.75	0.85

RI - Retention index relative to C9-C<sub>16</sub> *n*-alkanes on the DB-5 column.

**Table 2:** Yield and composition of the essential and the volatile oils extracted using different particles sizes (0.4, 0.6 and 0.8 mm). SFE was performed at 90 bar and 40°C.

Components		0.4mm		0.6mm		0.8mm	
	RI	HD	SFE	HD	SFE	HD	SFE
p -Cymene	1117	6.87	6.04	12.75	10.14	11.93	10.92
γ-Terpinene	1158	6.42	2.34	8.85	4.26	9.40	4.95
Thymoquinone	1371	0.18	2.95	0.21	2.92	0.17	3.07
Thymol	1419	9.74	9.42	10.99	10.94	8.61	9.82
Carvacrol	1431	62.04	64.04	52.18	52.65	53.76	53.57
β-Bisabolene	1636	2.65	3.01	1.98	2.45	2.15	2.63
Yield % (w/w)		1.60	1.64	1.47	1.38	1.11	1.16

RI - Retention index relative to C9-C<sub>16</sub> *n*-alkanes on the DB-5 column.

**Table 3:** Yield and composition of the volatile oil extracted at different CO<sub>2</sub> flow rates (0.8, 1.1 and 1.3kg/h) using a pressure of 90 bar, a temperature of 40°C and a mean particle size of 0.6 mm.

Components	RI	0.8kg/h	1.1kg/h	1.3kg/h
p -Cymene	1117	7.15	10.14	9.37
γ-Terpinene	1158	3.93	4.26	5.52
Thymoquinone	1371	2.47	2.92	1.64
Thymol	1419	6.04	10.94	7.66
Carvacrol	1431	64.52	52.65	59.10
β-Bisabolene	1636	2.79	2.45	2.63
Yield % (w/w)		1.45	1.38	1.37

RI - Retention index relative to C9-C<sub>16</sub> *n*-alkanes on the DB-5 column.

The major difference between these two techniques (SFE and HD) is the relative percentage of thymoquinone, an oxygen-containing monoterpene. This compound is 10 times more concentrated in the SFE extract than in the HD one (Table 2), which is an advantage to the pharmaceutical industry, due to its anti-cancer, antioxidant and anti-inflammatory properties, as well as the neuroprotective effect against forebrain ischemia and alzheimer disease [5, 6, 7].

The non-volatile fraction was isolated after deodorization by SFE at 250 bar and 40°C and by SE with pentane or acetone for 5 hours. The correspondent extraction yields are presented in table 4.

**Table 4:** Extraction yield of the non-volatile components (S1- first separator; S2-second separator).

Method	Yield % (w/w)
SFE, S1	0.16
SFE, S2	0.81
SE (pentane)	4.88
SE (acetone)	7.03

At the end of 5 hours, the solvent extraction was more efficient than the supercritical fluid extraction, indicating that a higher pressure was needed.

#### 3. Conclusions

Different methodologies were used to study the volatile and the non-volatile fractions of the aerial part of winter savory. Concerning the volatile components, although the extraction yields of SFE and HD are quite similar, SFE extracts are richer in thymoquinone content. This may be an advantage, as its biological activity has been proved and a synergistic effect may exist between thymol, carvacrol and thymoquinone.

However, for the non-volatile fraction, SE extraction presents higher yields than SFE. Future studies with these extracts will be carried out in order to achieve the best compromise between yield and biological activity. The antioxidant activity will be also studied using DPPH method.

# Acknowledgements

C. Grosso and M.A. Tavares Cardoso thank FCT (Portugal) for the research grants (ref. SFRH/BD/22237/2005 and SFRH/BD /18154/ 2004, respectively).

### References

- [1] Skočibušić, M. and Bezić, N., (2004) Phytotherapy Research, 18, 967-970.
- [2] Reverchon, E., (1997) Journal of Supercritical Fluids, 10, 1-37.
- [3] Reverchon, E. and De Marco, I., (2006) *Journal of Supercritical Fluids*, 38, 146-166.
- [4] Reis-Vasco, E.M.C., Coelho, J.P. and Palavra A.F. (1999) Flavour and Fragrance

- Supercritical fluid extraction, Hydrodistillation and Soxhlet extraction of the aerial part of winter savory. Comparative evaluation of the extraction method on the chemical composition. 5

  Journal, 14, 156-160.
- [5] Jukic, M., Politeo, O., Maksimovic, M., Milos, M. And Milos, M., (2006) *Phytotherapy Research*, 21, 259-261.
- [6] Gali-Muhtasib, H., Roessner, A. and Shneider-Stock, R., (2006) *The International Journal of Biochemistry & Cell Biology*, 38, 1249-1253.
- [7] Al-Majed, A. A., Al-Omar, F. A. and Nagi, M. N., (2006) European Journal of Pharmacology, 543, 40-47.