RESEARCH





Screening antibiofilm activity of invasive plants growing at the Slope Merapi Mountain, Central Java, against *Candida albicans*

Sufi Desrini^{1,2,3}, Marion Girardot³, Christine Imbert³, Mustofa Mustofa^{4,5} and Titik Nuryastuti^{5,6*}

Abstract

Background *Candida albicans* causes high-mortality candidiasis. Antifungal drug resistance demands the development of virulence factor-targeting drugs, particularly antibiofilm. This study screened the effects of five invasive plants growing in Indonesia (*Mimosa pudica, Lantana camara, Acacia mangium, Ageratina riparia,* and *Mikania micrantha*) against *C. albicans* biofilms. Antifungal activity, antiphospholipase activity, biofilm morphology of *C. albicans,* and cytotoxic capacity were also evaluated.

Methods Maceration was used to extract the plants, and the most active extract inhibiting the biofilms was fractionated using liquid–liquid fractionation. Antibiofilm activity was determined by a colorimetric assay, MTT. Antifungal activity was tested using the broth microdilution method. A phospholipase assay was performed using the egg-yolk agar method. Influence on the *C. albicans* morphology was assessed using scanning electron microscopy (SEM). The cytotoxic effect was carried out against Vero and HeLa cell lines.

Results *M. pudica* extracts showed the most potent antifungal efficacy with minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) of 15.62 µg/mL and 7.81 µg/mL for aerial parts and roots, respectively. At high concentrations (500 µg/mL and 250 µg/mL), ethanol extract of *M. pudica* aerial parts strongly inhibited the phospholipase activity. Ethyl-acetate fraction of *M. pudica* aerial parts demonstrated the most potent antibiofilm activity against 24 h old biofilm of *C. albicans* with an inhibitory concentration (53.89%) of 62.5 µg/mL showed no cytotoxicity in both Vero and HeLa cells. This fraction affected the morphology of *C. albicans* and contained promising compounds for inhibiting the 24 h old biofilm of *C. albicans*.

Conclusions Invasive *M. pudica* plant inhibited the growth of planktonic *C. albicans* cells and its ethyl acetate fraction decreased the metabolic activity of *C. albicans* biofilms. This result demonstrates the potential of invasive *M. pudica* plant to reduce biofilm-associated candida infection.

Keywords Invasive plants, Candida albicans, Antifungal, Antibiofilm, Mimosa pudica

*Correspondence: Titik Nuryastuti t.nuryastuti@ugm.ac.id Full list of author information is available at the end of the article



© The Author(s) 2023. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated in a credit line to the data.

Background

Candida albicans is the yeast that usually can be detected in healthy humans without causing health issues. However, when the immune system is compromised (e.g., long-term exposure to antibiotics, utilization of indwelling medical devices, and post-surgery), this yeast can penetrate the natural host barriers, invade the bloodstream, and intensely attack various organs, leading to invasive candidiasis (bloodstream infection/candidemia) and deep-seated infection with or without candidemia) that seriously threaten life [1, 2]. Indeed, the global burden of invasive candidiasis remains high, with candidemia-causing C. albicans being the most prevalent, either in the general population or in hospitals [3]. In Indonesia, approximately 7.7 million people have a serious fungal infection each year with the assumption of the candidemia incidence (the common invasive infection) was 10/100,000 [4]. In Europe, the number of candidemia between January 2000 and February 2019 was approximately 79 cases per day, with the fatal cases being around 29 patients on day thirty [5]. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) surveillance data, the mortality of candidemia in hospitals is around 25% [6].

The pathogenicity of C. albicans depends on some virulence factors such as biofilm formation, and secretion of extracellular enzymes [2]. Concerning biofilm formation, unicellular C. albicans cells must adhere to indwelling medical devices before infection, for then accumulate with other cells to form basal layers. Following initial adherence, most of the adherent yeast cells switch to the hyphal form, secrete extracellular polymeric substances, and get encapsulated in a layer of hydrogel, namely extracellular matrix, forming a physical barrier between the community and the extracellular environment. This process continues to thick and grows into a mature biofilm with a three-dimensional structure [7, 8]. Regarding phospholipase (one of the extracellular hydrolytic enzymes), it facilitates the adherence and invasion of C. albicans cells to the host epithelium by hydrolyzing phospholipids and peptide bonds, which play and regulate an essential role in multiple physiological processes on the human body such as immune system and stress tolerance [9–12].

The presence of virulence factors, especially biofilm formation, is associated with *C. albicans* resistant to the majority of antifungal drugs. Although biofilm resistance is multifactorial and mechanistically complex, the role of the extracellular matrix as a physical barrier may account for the high levels of resistance displayed by *C. albicans* biofilms [13, 14]. Al-Fattani and Douglas (2006) identified a correlation between matrix abundance and levels of fluconazole and amphotericin B resistance [15]. Moreover, the newest class of antifungal drugs, echinocandin, revealed the reduction susceptibility (resistance) against clinical and laboratory strains of *Candida albicans* [16, 17]. In the context of phospholipase enzyme, Ying and Chunyang, 2011 reported that there was a correlation between high phospholipase activity and resistance to antifungal drugs by increasing the expression of phospholipase B1 mRNA and protein [18]. Another study showed that some antifungal agents such as nystatin, fluconazole, and micafungin had a low reduction (approximately under 5%) of phospholipase activity [19].

Taken together, the high morbidity and mortality of invasive candidiasis and the great capability of C. albicans to resist antifungal agents demand the discovery of new drugs to protect humans against Candida infections, especially those associated with a biofilm. By incorporating traditional knowledge of plants as remedies into the drug discovery process, natural products can serve as a source of new drugs or active pharmaceutical ingredients. Indeed, the use of plants as medicine has a lengthy history, and remarkably, many drugs have already been derived from plants. However, global demand for medicinal plants has endangered native plants, contributing to biodiversity loss and depletion of natural resources critical to human health [20]. Moreover, the situation is worsened by the presence of invasive plants which entered and established in the new environment from outside of their natural habitat and caused environmental, economic, and/or human harm [21]. One of the most serious threats posed by invasive plants to the environment is the disruption of entire ecosystems. According to the United Nations (UN) Intergovernmental Platform for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), the impacts of invasive plants are often severe for native species and especially for endemic species. Native species are estimated to have lost at least 20% of their original abundance, and even more in hotspots of endemic species [22]. Meanwhile, Indonesia, one of the world's richest nations in terms of biodiversity, with around 30,000 plant species and 9,600 medicinal plants [23], is known for the high rates of loss of diversity in the world that are caused by the introduction and spread of invasive plants in various Indonesian ecosystems [24]. Nevertheless, despite the negative effects caused by invasive plants, there are positive aspects, especially in the health sector. Numerous studies have documented the use of invasive plants in traditional medicine. For example, Mimosa pudica leaves (native of tropical America) are used to treat toothache and low libido in men, respectively, on Rodrigues Island of the Indian Ocean and Kurukshetra District, India [25, 26]. The leaves of Lantana camara (native to tropical America) have been reported to treat many diseases such as tuberculosis in South-Western Uganda, ulcers,

swelling, and microbial infections in India [27-29]. Furthermore, Máximo et al., 2020 demonstrated the pharmaceutical potential of invasive plants that have produced compounds. They described the potential of invasive plants such as Carpobrotus edulis, Hakea salicifolia, Hakea sericea, Oxalis pes-caprae, Phytolacca americana, and Ageratina adenophora as sources of bioactive metabolites ranging from antioxidant, antimicrobial, and anticholinesterase to neuroprotective and antiproliferative [30]. Taking those matters into account, the authors put those main ideas of drug development into practice by utilizing five invasive plants growing in Indonesia and screening their antibiofilm activity against C. albicans. In addition, this study also screened for antifungal and antiphospholipase activity. Notably, these five plants are listed by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry as invasive plants which might become big threats to agriculture, forests, and other resources in Indonesia [31]. To the best of our knowledge, this study is the first to evaluate the efficacy of Indonesian invasive plants in inhibiting C. albicans virulence factors.

Materials and methods

Plant materials

M. pudica aerial parts (=M. pudica's structures above ground, including leaves, flowers, and stem), M. pudica roots, L. camara leaves, A. mangium leaves, A. riparia leaves, and M. micrantha leaves were used in this study and collected from the slopes of Merapi mountain, Indonesia (GPS positioning: between -7.5719346390002675, 110.43219680357387 and 7.5719346390002675, 110.43219680357387). The identification of plants was conducted by Dr. Djoko Santosa (Department of Biological Pharmacy, Faculty of Pharmacy, Universitas Gadjah Mada) and by Anggityas Puspita Suci, S. Farm, Apt. (Merapi Farma Herbal) (identification number: 13.17.09). The voucher specimens of A. riparia, M. micrantha, A. mangium, M. pudica, and L. camara were 43AR-1, 43MM-2, 43AM-4, 43MP-5, and 43LC-6, respectively, and were deposited at the Department of Biology Pharmacy, Faculty of Pharmacy, Universitas Gadjah Mada.

Extraction of plant materials

The plants were shade-dried for seven days and powdered using a grinder. Afterward, the powder of each plant was processed for the preparation of ethanol (Merck, Darmstadt, Germany) or methanol extract (Merck, Darmstadt, Germany) by the maceration process as described previously with modification [32]. For this purpose, 100 g of plant powder were macerated in 500 mL of ethanol or methanol for three days with regular shaking. After filtration using the Buchner funnel, the residues were re-macerated using fresh solvents for three days. All filtrates obtained with the same solvent were pooled, filtered through filter papers (Whatman filter paper no. 1) in the Buchner funnel, and dried using a rotary evaporator (Heidolph, Schwabach, Germany). Samples were stored in a refrigerator at -20 °C until further experiments.

Liquid-liquid fractionation (LLF)

The extract with the highly active extract was subjected to liquid-liquid fractionation (LLF) according to the method as described previously with modifications [33]. For this purpose, the organic solvents (analytical grade, Merck, Darmstadt, Germany), in order of increasing polarity, were n-hexane, chloroform, ethyl-acetate, n-butanol, and double-distilled water (ddH20). Before partition, 5 g of extracts were solubilized in 10 mL of ethanol (Merck, Darmstadt, Germany) and 90 mL of ddH₂0. The solubilized extract was then partitioned with 100 mL of n-hexane, shaken, and then the n-hexane layer was separated. This process was carried out three times. Chloroform, ethyl-acetate, and n-butanol were processed following the same method. Each partition was performed three times, and the same eluents were pooled and dried using a rotary evaporator. Each obtained fraction was recorded as the total yield.

Phytochemical profiling

Liquid Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry (LC-MS)

The chemical composition of the best active extract was qualitatively screened and analyzed by Liquid Chromatography-Electrospray Ionization-Mass Spectrometry (LC-MS-ESI-MS) using Acquity UPLC I-Class coupled with XEVO G2-XS QTOF (Waters, MA, USA) mass spectrometer. The column was ACQUITY UPLC® BEH C8, 1.7 μ m, 2.1 × 100 mm. The mobile phase was composed of solvent A: water with 0.1% formic acid, and solvent B: acetonitrile containing 0.1% formic acid. The flow rate was set at 0.3 mL/min with a 1 μ L injection volume. The parameters of MS/MS were optimized as follows: ionization type: ESI; Start Mass: 50.00 m/z; End Mass: 1200.00 m/z; Polarity: Positive. The screening process for constituents was performed with the UNIFI software, which contains a mass spectrum library of natural chemical constituents from the waters database [34].

High-Resolution Mass Spectrometer (HRMS)

Thermo ScientificTM DionexTM Ultimate 3000 RSLCnano UHPLC (ultra-high-performance liquid chromatography) and Q ExactiveTM High-Resolution Mass Spectrometer (ThermoFisher, MA, USA) were used to screen and discover non-targeted chemical compounds from the fraction showing the best antibiofilm activity. The mobile phase was composed of solvent A (water with 0.1% formic acid) and solvent B (acetonitrile with 0.1% formic acid). The programming for the gradient mode was as follows: at t=0-15 min, B 5%; at t=16-20 min, B 90%; at t=21-25 min, B 90%. The analytical column used was Phenyl-Hexyl 100×2.1 mm with a flow of 0.20 mL/ min and an injection volume of 5 µl. MS1 was rendered at 70,000 FWHM, whereas MS2 was rendered at 17,500 FWHM. This experiment utilized Heated Electrospray Ionization (H-ESI) in both positive and negative modes. The spray voltage used was 3.8 kV. The flow rates for Sheath gas and Aux gas were 15 and 7, respectively. The capillary temperature was 250 °C. The mass range used was between 50 and 750 m/z. Thermo Scientific TM Compound Discoverer Software was used for identifying the compounds.

Strains and growth conditions

C. albicans ATCC 10231 was used as a reference strain, and two isolates, CI-SPTM and CI-CVX which were recovered, respectively, from sputum isolated from pulmonary disease and from cervical swab specimens of vulvovaginal candidiasis patients at two different hospitals in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, were kindly provided by the Microbiology Department, Faculty of Medicine at Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia. *C. albicans* were grown in Sabouraud dextrose agar (SDA) (Himedia, Maharashtra, India) at 37 °C for 24 h.

Antifungal susceptibility test

As per the M27-A3 protocol of the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI), the broth microdilution method was used to evaluate the minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) of the samples against C. albicans [35]. Each reference or clinical isolate of *C. albicans* was streaked on SDA plate. The plates were incubated for 24 h at 37 °C. Then several colonies from these cultures were picked up, and five colonies of around 1 mm diameter were suspended in sterile saline solution (0.85% NaCl) and adjusted to 0.5 McFarland standard (equivalent to $1-5 \times 10^{6}$ cells/mL) and then diluted at 1:50, followed by a 1:20 dilution in Roswell Park Memorial Institute medium (RPMI) (Himedia AT180, Maharashtra, India), which contained 0.165 M l⁻¹ 3-(N-morpholino)propanesulfonic acid (MOPS) buffer to obtain a suspension of approximately $1-5 \times 10^3$ cells/mL. The sample stocks (20 mg/mL) were prepared by weighing 20 mg of extract in a sterile Eppendorf tube and diluting it in 1 mL of 25% dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO). The 100 µL of working yeast suspension was then added to wells of 96-well microtiter plates (Corning[®], NY, USA) containing 100 µL of a serial twofold dilution in RPMI 1640-MOPS medium of extracts. The final concentrations obtained ranged between 1000 and 3.9 μ g / mL. Some wells were preserved for controls: non-treated yeasts (negative control), yeasts treated by fluconazole (positive control) (Sigma St. Louis, MO, USA), and yeasts treated by DMSO 2% (DMSO control). The test was run in triplicate and repeated at least twice. The determination of MIC was conducted according to the CLSI procedure: each well was assigned a numeric rating of 0 (visually clear), 1 (a rather foggy), 2 (significant decrease in visible growth), 3 (slight decrease in visible growth), or 4 (zero reduction in visible growth). Based on numerical scales, the lowest concentration that significantly inhibited visible growth was designated as the MIC₅₀ (scale of 2) [35].

By subculturing one loopful (10 μ L) of the solution from the wells without turbidity on SDA, the minimum fungicidal concentration (MFC) was ascertained. After an incubation period of 24 h, the minimal fungicidal concentration (MFC) was determined to be the lowest concentration that resulted in no growth or maximum three colonies growth (>99.9%) on the subculture.

Antibiofilm assay

Colorimetric assays are tools that are reasonably simple to perform, very useful for determining yeast viability, and reveal a great association between cellular density and metabolic activity, allowing for semiquantitative evaluation of biofilm formation [36]. Therefore, to evaluate the metabolic activity of mature C. albicans biofilm, the colorimetric assay (MTT) was carried out according to the method of Prazynska and Gospodarek, 2014 with a few modifications [37]. For this purpose, yeast was first cultured on the SDA agar plate for 48 h. Thereafter, four loopfuls of this culture were transferred to 30 mL of Yeast Extract-Peptone-Dextrose (YPD) medium (Difco, Detroit, MI, USA) and cultured at 37 °C without shaking overnight. This culture was then centrifuged at 3000 g for 10 min, rinsed twice in 0.1 M phosphate-buffered saline (PBS, pH 7.2, GIBCO, New York, United States), standardized to $0.5OD_{600}$ (equivalent to 3×10^7 CFU/mL), and diluted to get a final concentration of 1×10^6 CFU/mL. The 100 µL of yeast suspension was transferred into a sterile, untreated 96-well polystyrene plate (Costar, Corning, USA), incubated for 24 h at 37 °C. Then, after 24 h of incubation, the non-adherent yeasts were removed by washing them twice with 0.2 mL sterile PBS. Two-fold serial dilutions of the extracts/fractions (between 1000 and 3.9 μ g mL⁻¹) prepared in YPD (DifcoTM YPD Broth, USA) medium were added to each well-containing biofilm, and the microplates were incubated at 37 °C for 24 h. Further, the wells were washed twice with 0.2 mL PBS after 24 h incubation at 37 °C. Then, the wells were filled with 100 µL of MTT solution (5 mg/mL in PBS) and left at 37 °C for 90 min. Then, the solution was taken out of the incubation chamber, and the formed formazan was dissolved in 100 µL of isopropanol-HCl solution.

Solubilized formazan color was measured using a microplate reader at a wavelength of 550 nm. The inhibition percentage for each concentration of the samples was calculated according to the following formula:

 $100 - [(100 \times \overline{X} \text{ absorbance of the treated cells}) / \overline{X} \text{ absorbance of cells control}]$

This study denoted a high or poor activity for above or under 50%, respectively. Inhibition percentages were calculated based on a minimum of two independent experiments with three replicates.

Qualitative analysis-scanning electron microscopy (SEM)

C. albicans ATCC 10231 biofilms (control and treated cells), as described previously in the antibiofilm assay section, were prepared on ThermanoxTM polystyrene coverslips (NuncTM ThermanoxTM). Briefly, after 24 h, the coverslips of control and treated biofilms were washed twice with PBS and fixed with glutaraldehyde and 0.1 N PBS for 1 h at room temperature. The coverslips were washed with PBS and dehydrated in ethanol solutions (50, 70, and 90% for 10 min). After that, coverslips were airdried overnight in a desiccator before gold sputter coating. With a scanning electron microscope (JSM-6510LA, JEOL-USA), the morphology of *C. albicans* biofilms was examined. This procedure was modified from Pereira et al. 2016 [38].

Phospholipase assay

A phospholipase assay was performed using the egg-yolk agar method [39]. The egg-yolk agar medium contained 13 g of SDA, 11.7 g of NaCl, 0.11 g of CaCl₂, and 8% of sterile egg-yolk emulsion (Merck, Darmstadt, Germany) in 184 mL of distilled water. After *C. albicans* ATCC 10231 was subcultured in SDA agar for 24 h, the cells (2×10^6) were cultured in YPD medium using the tested extract (treated cells) for 24 h at 37 °C. The cell control (not treated) was included in this assay. In a petri dish with a 90 mm diameter, a 5 µL suspension containing 10^6 yeast cells (treated and control cells) was plated on the surface of an egg-yolk medium and left to dry at room temperature. Afterward, the plates were incubated for

All experiments were performed in duplicate, twice on different days.

Cytotoxicity assay

The fraction displaying the most potent antibiofilm activity was studied to evaluate its cytotoxicity via 3-(4,5-dimethylthiazol-2-yl)-2,5-diphenyltetrazolium bromide (MTT assay). For this purpose, the protocol of the cytotoxicity assay was modified from Nugroho et al., 2013 [40]. The Vero and HeLa cell lines were used in this assay to assess whether the fraction is more selective for antibiofilm activity or more toxic for both cells (normal and cancer cells). The Vero and HeLa cell lines were obtained from the Department of Parasitology, Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia. The Vero and HeLa cells were grown in Dulbecco's Modified Eagle's Medium (Gibco, NY, USA) with 2 mM glutamine, containing 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS) (Gibco, NY, USA) and RPMI 1640 (Merck, Darmstadt, Germany) with 10% FBS (Gibco, NY, USA), respectively. Briefly, the cells were plated in 96-well microplate wells (2.0E+04 cells per well) and incubated for 24 h (5% CO₂; 37 °C). The two-fold serial dilutions of the studied fraction were added into each well (except for medium and control wells), with concentrations ranging between 500–7.8 μ g/ mL. After 24 h of incubation, the culture medium was removed, washed using PBS, and incubated (4 h; 37 °C; 5% CO₂) with 20 μ l MTT solution (5 mg/mL). Then, the MTT reaction was stopped by 10% Sodium Dodecyl Sulfate in 0.1 N HCL. Following overnight incubation in a dark environment with a plate covered with aluminum foil, the absorbance was measured using a microplate reader at a wavelength of 595 nm after 10 min of shaking. Three replicates were prepared for each of the three experimental sessions. The following formula calculated the cell viability:

% Viable cells = ((treatment group - medium group) / (Control group - medium group))*100

seven days at 37 °C. When a precipitation zone (production of phospholipases) was visible around the *C. albicans* colony area, the phospholipase activity (Pz index) was established, and the formula employed to calculate the phospholipase production was: Pz = Diameter of the colony / (Diameter of the colony + precipitation zone).

Statistical analysis

All values were reported as the standard error of the mean (SEM) for all studies, which were conducted in a minimum of two independent experiments with three biological replicates. The Kruskal–Wallis and post hoc Dunn's multiple comparison tests were used to determine difference between mean of the control and treated samples (antibiofilm and antiphospholipase tests). The statistical analyses were performed using GraphPad Prism8 software (GraphPad Software, Inc., La Jolla, CA, USA), and a *p*-value ≤ 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

The yields of plants extracts and fractions

The extraction yield reflects the efficiency of the solvent in extracting components from the original matter, a plant powder. Table 1 shows the methanol extract of A. mangium leaves with the highest yield at 18.35% and the ethanol extract of M. pudica roots with the lowest yield at 7.10%. Furthermore, the ethanol extract of M. pudica aerial parts was the most active extract against C. albicans biofilm. The ethanol extract (5 g) of M. pudica aerial parts was subjected to fractionation by a liquid-liquid partition. We obtained 4.40 g of n-hexane phase (88%), 0.16 g of chloroform phase (3.2%), 0.41 g of ethyl acetate phase (8.2%), 1.39 g of n-butanol phase (27.8%), and 1.26 g of ddH₂O phase (25.2%). Among these fractions, the lowest yield was observed with the chloroform fraction, whereas the highest was associated with the n-hexane fraction.

Effects of studied invasive plant extracts against *C. albicans* planktonic cells

Table 2 shows the antifungal activity of the studied plant extracts against *C. albicans* ATCC 10231 and the clinical isolates (CI) SPTM and CVX. The ethanol extract of *M. pudica* roots displayed the highest activity against the *C. albicans* ATCC 10231 (MIC₅₀ of 7.81 µg/ mL) and clinical isolates (MIC₅₀ of 15.62—31.25 µg/ mL). The ethanol extract of *M. pudica* aerial parts and methanol extract of *A. mangium* leaves showed intermediate activity with MIC₅₀ between 15.62 and 62.5 µg/ mL. There was no activity of other extracts observed in the present study.

Effects of the studied invasive plant extracts against C. *albicans* biofilms

All the studied extracts were tested against 24 h old C. *albicans* biofilm. The ethanol extract of *M. pudica* aerial parts was the most active, with 51.11% inhibition at 125 µg mL⁻¹ (p < 0.05) (Fig. 1). The inhibition of more than 50% was additionally demonstrated by the extract of *L. camara* leaves, however, this was only the case at the highest concentrations ($\geq 250 \mu g/mL$). The spectrum activity of a promising extract of *M. pudica* aerial

Table 1 Percentage yields of plant extracts

Samples	Part of plants	Solvents	Powder weight (g)	Extracts weight (g)	Yields (%, w/w)
Ageratina riparia	Leaf	Ethanol	100	10.02	10.02
Mimosa pudica	Aerial parts	Ethanol	100	7.36	7.36
Mimosa pudica	Root	Ethanol	100	7.10	7.10
Lantana camara	Leaf	Methanol	100	13.79	13.79
Mikania micrantha	Leaf	Methanol	100	15.85	15.85
Acacia mangium	Leaf	Methanol	100	18.35	18.35

Table 2 Susceptibility of C. albicans to the studied invasive plant extracts and to fluconazole (MIC and MFC in µg/mL)

Extracts	Pathogens								
	C. albicans AT	C. albicans ATCC 10231		I-SPTM	C. albicans CI-CVX				
	MIC ₅₀	MFC	MIC ₅₀	MFC	MIC ₅₀	MFC			
A. mangium leaves	62.5	> 1000	31.25	>1000	125	>1000			
A. riparia leaves	>1000	NT	NA	NT	>1000	NT			
M. pudica aerial parts	15.62	250	62.5	250	62.5	1000			
M. pudica roots	7.81	125	15.62	125	31.25	250			
L. camara leaves	> 1000	NT	NA	NT	>1000	NT			
M. micrantha leaves	>1000	NT	NA	NT	>1000	NT			
Fluconazol	0.78	100	1.56	>200	3.12	>200			
NA No Activity, NT Not Teste	d								



Fig. 1 Heat map of the inhibition percentages of the studied extracts against 24 h old biofilm of *C. albicans* ATCC 10231. Mp-A (*M. pudica* aerial parts); Mp-R (*M. pudica* roots); Lc-L (*L. camara* leaves); Am-L (*A. mangium* leaves); Mm-L (*M. micrantha* leaves); Ar-L (*A. riparia* leaves)

parts was also evaluated against two clinical isolates, CI-SPTM and CI-CVX, and revealed inhibition activity of 53.83% at 125 μ g mL⁻¹ (p \leq 0.05) and 50.81% at 250 μ g mL⁻¹, respectively. (see Additional file 1).

Effects of fractions of *M. pudica* aerial parts against 24 h old biofilm of *C. albicans*

The five obtained fractions from the aerial parts of *M. pudica* were then evaluated against 24 h old biofilm of *C. albicans* ATCC 10231. The results showed that



Fig. 2 Heat map of the inhibition percentage of all fractions of *M. pudica* aerial parts against 24 h old biofilm of *C. albicans* ATCC 10231. FNH-MP (n-hexane fraction of *M. pudica*); FETOAC-MP (ethyl acetate fraction of *M. pudica*); FCH-MP (chloroform fraction of *M. pudica*); FNB-MP (n-butanol fraction of *M. pudica*); FH₂O-MP (ddH₂O fraction of *M. pudica*)

the ethyl acetate fraction of *M. pudica* had the highest activity and inhibited the preformed *C. albicans* biofilms as much as 53.89% at 62.5 µg/mL ($p \le 0.05$) (Fig. 2). At the highest concentration (1000 µg/mL), the ethyl acetate fraction inhibited biofilms by over 70%. The hexane fraction inhibited the biofilm cells at a higher concentration than ethyl acetate fraction, by 50.57% at 250 µg/mL. Whereas n-butanol and aqueous fractions showed inhibition of 64.33% and 57.94%, respectively, at the highest concentration (1000 µg/mL), and this activity decreased along with a decrease in the concentration of fractions.

The antibiofilm activity of ethyl acetate fraction of *M. pudica* aerial parts was also evaluated against mature

biofilm of two clinical isolates: CI-SPTM and CI-CVX. The percentage inhibition on both clinical isolates was approximately 50% at different concentrations (125 vs 250 μ g/mL), with CI-SPTM being the most susceptible isolate when treated with ethyl acetate fraction (Fig. 3). The antibiofilm activity is therefore retained in the clinical isolates, but for slightly higher concentrations than in the reference strain.

Alongside antibiofilm activity, we also evaluated the antifungal activity of ethyl acetate fraction of *M. pudica* aerial parts, and we found that the MIC_{50} and MFC were at 31.25 µg/mL and 250 µg/mL against *C. albicans* ATCC 10231, 62.5 µg/mL and 1000 µg/mL against both clinical isolates, respectively.



Fig. 3 Metabolic activity (MTT assay) of ethyl acetate fraction of *M. pudica* aerial parts against 24 h old clinical isolates (CI-SPTM and C-CVX) biofilms. Asterisks denote statistically significant differences of treated biofilm versus non-treated (NT) biofilm. * $p \le 0.05$ was calculated by Kruskal–Wallis test, followed by Dunn's multiple comparisons test

Table 3 Mass spectrometric analysis c	of ethanol extract of	M. pudica root
---	-----------------------	----------------

Component name	Observed m/z	Neutral mass (Da)	Retention time (min)
Pseudotropidine	142.12	141.11	1.09
Cyclo(Ala-Ala)	143.08	142.07	1.12
Epigallocatechin(4β,8)-gallocatechin	611.14	610.13	1.25
Candidate Mass C ₁₃ H ₂₁ NO ₃	240.16	239.15	4.03
Meteloidine	256.15	255.15	4.41
Candidate Mass C ₁₈ H ₂₇ NO ₆	354.19	353.18	4.51
3α-(Tigloyloxy)tropane	224.16	223.16	4.61
Gallocatechin	329.06	306.07	5.29
3,5,6-Trihydroxy-4',7-dimethoxyflavone	331.08	330.07	5.57
Candidate Mass C ₁₈ H ₂₅ NO ₄	320.19	319.18	6.26
Candidate Mass C ₁₈ H ₂₅ NO ₅	336.18	335.17	6.33

Demonstrating the most potent antifungal activity, the ethanol extract of M. pudica roots was processed for identification and screening of bioactive compounds using LC-MS. Table 3 displays the list of the compounds from the ethanol extract of M. pudica roots that have been potentially identified, together with m/z, neutral mass, and retention time. The highest peak was detected at 4.61 retention time and corresponded to the alkaloid compound, 3α -(tigloyloxy) tropane (see Additional file 2). Then, the other ten peaks were chosen for the analysis. However, due to the limitation of the database library (UNIFI software) in the Advanced Characterization Laboratories Serpong, National Research and Innovation Institute (BRIN), some compounds could not be determined (denoted as Candidate mass).

Ethyl-acetate fraction of M. pudica aerial parts

The most potent antibiofilm activity of ethyl-acetate fraction of *M. pudica* aerial parts was analyzed for its chemical contents using HRMS. Twenty-three and fiftythree compounds were found using HRMS in the negative (Table 4) and positive modes, respectively (Table 5). Because catechin and adenine exhibited the highest peak areas in the negative and positive ionization modes, they were chosen as reference peak areas for calculating relative abundance percentages (RA) [41]. The following prominent compounds in the negative mode were quercetin-3 β -D-glucoside (82.17%), (1 ξ)-1,5-anhydro-1-[2-(3,4-dihydroxyphenyl)-5,7-dihydroxy-4-oxo-4Hchromen-8-yl]-D-galactitol (52.48%), luteolin (44.24%), and quercetin (24.27%). While in the positive mode were avicularin (47.45%), (1ξ)-1,5-anhydro-1-[2-(3,4-dihydroxyphenyl)-5,7-dihydroxy-4-oxo-4H-chromen-8-yl]-D-galactitol (46.24%), and kaempferol (44.50%).

Table 4 Mass spectrometric analysis of ethyl-acetate fraction of *M. pudica* aerial parts using HRMS in negative mode

No	Name	Formula	Calculated Molecular Weight (MW)	RT [min]	Peak Area (Max.)	% RA	mzCloud Best Match
1	Chlorogenic acid	C ₁₆ H ₁₈ O ₉	354.095	4.284	10,131,770.68	1.65	99.5
2	Catechin	C ₁₅ H ₁₄ O ₆	290.079	4.359	613,553,783.2*	100.00	98
3	(1{)-1,5-Anhydro-1-[2-(3,4-dihydroxyphenyl)-5,7-dihydroxy- 4-oxo-4H-chromen-8-yl]-D-galactitol	$C_{21} H_{20} O_{11}$	448.100	4.545	321,967,998.3	52.48	98
4	(1S,3R,4R,5R)-1,3,4-trihydroxy-5-[[(2E)-3-(4-hydroxy-3-meth- oxyphenyl)prop-2-enoyl]oxy}cyclohexane-1-carboxylic acid	$\rm C_{17}H_{20}O_{9}$	368.110	5.22	8,509,566.354	1.39	97.6
5	Quercetin-3β-D-glucoside	C ₂₁ H ₂₀ O ₁₂	464.095	5.373	504,131,364.8	82.17	98.4
6	Rutin	C ₂₇ H ₃₀ O ₁₆	610.153	5.467	32,821,476.28	5.35	98.8
7	Syringic acid	C ₉ H ₁₀ O ₅	198.052	5.673	28,560,131.71	4.65	84.3
8	4,5-Dicaffeoylquinic acid	C ₂₅ H ₂₄ O ₁₂	516.126	6.347	12,801,957.73	2.09	93.5
9	Apigetrin	C ₂₁ H ₂₀ O ₁₀	432.105	6.439	17,355,630.28	2.83	85.4
10	Genistein	C ₁₅ H ₁₀ O ₅	270.053	6.517	3,237,563.774	0.53	89
11	4-(3,4-dihydroxyphenyl)-7-hydroxy-5-{[(25,3R,45,55,6R)-3,4,5-trihydroxy-6-(hydroxymethyl) oxan-2-yl]oxy}-2H-chromen-2-one	C ₂₁ H ₂₀ O ₁₁	448.100	6.571	9,208,855.303	1.50	98.4
12	Juglalin	C ₂₀ H ₁₈ O ₁₀	418.090	6.589	27,689,699.26	4.51	93.1
13	NP-015559	C ₁₇ H ₁₄ O ₇	330.074	6.869	59,518,391.27	9.70	93.9
14	2,4,6-Trihydroxy-2-(4-hydroxybenzyl)-1-benzofuran-3(2H)- one	$\rm C_{15}H_{12}O_{6}$	288.063	6.971	7,881,929.5	1.28	92.4
15	Luteolin	C ₁₅ H ₁₀ O ₆	286.047	7.355	271,424,429.2	44.24	92.4
16	3-tert-Butyladipic acid	C ₁₀ H ₁₈ O ₄	202.120	7.609	6,456,519.47	1.05	80.4
17	Quercetin	C ₁₅ H ₁₀ O ₇	302.042	7.654	148,931,203.7	24.27	97.6
18	Eriodictyol	C ₁₅ H ₁₂ O ₆	288.063	7.746	10,578,247.87	1.72	73.1
19	3-Methoxy-5,7,3',4'-tetrahydroxy-flavone	C ₁₆ H ₁₂ O ₇	316.058	8.023	47,968,532.18	7.82	99.1
20	NP-019001	C ₁₈ H ₁₂ O ₇	340.058	8.286	39,751,166.39	6.48	76.1
21	Corchorifatty acid F	C ₁₈ H ₃₂ O ₅	328.225	8.355	80,920,096.63	13.19	97.1
22	(15Z)-9,12,13-Trihydroxy-15-octadecenoic acid	C ₁₈ H ₃₄ O ₅	330.240	8.775	30,194,667.16	4.92	85.2
23	2,2'-Methylenebis(4-methyl-6-tert-butylphenol)	${\rm C}_{23}{\rm H}_{32}{\rm O}_2$	340.240	16.552	22,234,098.55	3.62	96.3

Relative percentage abundance (% RA) was measured by the ratio RA of the given peak area to RA of the *reference peak

Table 5 Mass spectrometric analysis of the ethyl-acetate fraction of *M. pudica* aerial parts using high-resolution mass spectrometry in positive mode

Image: https://www.science.org/lines/scien	No	Name	Formula	Calc. MW	RT [min]	Area (Max.)	% RA	mzCloud Best
1 Chelne CH 11300 1030999 0.963 309087.40 5.70 95.2 3 Adenna C, H, NQ 150544 1.018 0.984.0559 2.9 92.2 4 NP019911 C, H, NQ 150544 1.0137 237023365 3645 95.4 7 Topine Call INNO 111.0122 1.047 43.24569022 81.9 95 8 3Hydroxpyridine CSH INNO 111.0122 1.047 43.2456402 81.9 95 1 Isolocane CBH INNO 1600237 1.139 43.252,474.87 7.40 94.9 1 Isolocane CBH INNO 1600237 1.139 43.254,474.87 7.40 95.4 1 Isolocane CBH INNO 120.927.77 1.39 43.254,744.87 7.40 95.4 1 Isolocane CBH INNO 120.927.77 1.39 43.254,74.37 40.9 95.4 1 Isolocane CH INNO 120.927.77 3.129								Match
2 D-4-Profile C3 H9N 02 115063 1016 T98/H5053 291 922 4 MPO10811 C4, H, MO, 125.0144 1032 244.000.00 944 6 Pyrrole-2-carboxylic acid C3 H5N 00 111.0322 1.017 54.258.960.28 7.89 95 7 Tropine C3 H5N 00 111.0322 1.047 54.258.970.28 8.81 95 8 34.Hydroxypyridine C3 H5N 00 16.007.37 1.139 24.522.474.57 3.58 95 1 L-sclaautine C4 H14 NO 160.0737 1.139 24.522.474.57 3.58 95 1 L-sclaautine C4 H14 NO 131.094 1.63.02 4.904.91.01.1 1.39 94.4 1 Notomicaid C6 H6 N2O 12.294 1.61 2.10.81.75.83 4.80 5 1 Notomicaid C3 H80.04 166.0422 4.504 2.62.92.97.77 1.80 7.2 1 Notomicaid C11.19.010 17.80.05	1	Choline	C5 H13 N O	103.0999	0.963	38,986,744.01	5.70	95.7
λ Adenne C, H, M, O 13.0.43 1.0.28 69.44, 88.47 100.00 99.44 A NPO10811 C, H, M, O 125.047 13.223 237.023,365 656 55. F Tropine C8 H5 NO 2 111.0322 1.047 54.288.60.28 7.93 95 S Strytoropyridine C8 H5 NO 2 111.0322 1.047 54.288.60.27 7.18 94.4 Notorins CB H1 NO 3 160.0737 1.12 48.87.294.47 7.18 94.4 Notorins caid CB H1 NO 3 160.073 1.12 48.87.17.24 3.88 91 Notorins caid CB H1 NO 2 131.094 1.502 99.98.91.012 3.89 91 Notorins caid CB H1 NO 2 130.097 1.80 77.2 77.2 13.150.07.107 4.58 86.7 Socolein CB H8 NO 8 169.04 178.0265 5.05 14.215.99.18 2.08 2.99.2 Socolein C9 H60.4 178.0265 5.05 14.215.99.18	2	D-(+)-Proline	C5 H9 N O2	115.0634	1.016	19,894,456.59	2.91	92.2
M.NO19611 C.H., NO2 IZ30477 IZ337 ZAZ3305 ZAZ505 ZZ505 ZZ5055 ZZ5055 <thz5055< th=""> <t< td=""><td>3</td><td>Adenine</td><td>$C_5 H_5 N_5$</td><td>135.0543</td><td>1.028</td><td>684,067,887*</td><td>100.00</td><td>99.4</td></t<></thz5055<>	3	Adenine	$C_5 H_5 N_5$	135.0543	1.028	684,067,887*	100.00	99.4
6 Pyrole-2-carboxylic acid C5 H5 N C2 11.0322 1.047 45285.90.28 7.89 95 8 3-Hydroxypyridine C3 H15 N O 95.037.63 1.064 14285.90.25 8.81 90.5 9 Pyrloxine C3 H11 N O3 160.073 1.112 4847.52.44.87 7.85 95.5 11 L-belocucine C6 H15 N O2 12.03 1.616 23.08.176.84 3.88 91 12 Nicotinaride C6 H5 N O2 12.032 1.616 23.08.176.84 3.88 91 13 Nicotinaride C6 H5 N O2 12.032 1.616 23.08.176.84 3.88 91 14 Nicotinaride C6 H5 N O2 12.030 4.601 2.04.27.27 4.80 9.7 15 Nicotinaride C6 H5 N O2 12.090 1.80 7.2 9.7 16 Scharboxysalleylic acid C101840 192.0422 5.051 1.42.59.57.81 2.08 9.9 17 Scopolin C101840 192.05<	4	NP-019811	$C_6 H_7 N O_2$	125.0477	1.037	237,023,365	34.65	95.4
7 Topine CH HS NO H11153 L056 D029 J849000000 9 Pylidoxine CH HS NO 9603737 1.112 48.975,824.48 7.14 9.94 10 NPO0358 CB H11 NO3 1690737 1.12 48.975,824.48 7.14 9.94 11 Licolacuine CB H11 NO3 16.902 23.043,975.37 4.80 9.5 12 Nicotrini adi CB H11 NO 12.032 1.618 23.045,375.37 4.80 9.5 13 Nicotrini adi CB H11 NO 12.032 1.618 23.045,375.37 4.80 9.5 14 Nicotrini adi CB H10 NO 14.115 1.680 23.032,171.88 8.67 15 Nichtrikyanine CB H10 NO 14.8097 4.60 316.295,296.2 46.24 9.25 16 Sinchrikyanine CB H10 NO 14.846,997 1.80 7.2 17 Socopoletin CB H10 NO 14.846,975 1.80 7.2 18 Sinchr	6	Pyrrole-2-carboxylic acid	C5 H5 N O2	111.0322	1.047	54,258,960.28	7.93	95
8 3-Hydroxypyrtdine C5 H5 NO 9503736 1064 172293,7005 26.06 100 9 Pyrdoxome C8 H11 NOS 1000375 1112 4837832444 7.14 994 10 NP-000358 C15 H14 O7 306.0737 1.130 24,522,474.57 3.58 995 11 I-beloxcine C6 H18 NO 121.092 1.616 32,083,735.37 4.80 85 12 Nicotonic add C6 H5 NO 12.002 3.01 3153,0071.07 4.58 86.7 15 Nichonice-Aglito-Igla-diflydroxy-henyl-5,7-diflydroxy-4-oxo-H1 C1110001 448.097 5.00 135,0071.07 4.58 86.7 16 Svethonice-Aglito-Igla-diflydroxy-henyl-5,7-diflydroxy-4-oxo-H1 C1140001 448.097 5.20 12.209,077.7 1.80 7.72 16 Svethonice-Aglitydria-12-C13-diflydroxy-henyl-5,7-diflydroxy-4-oxo-H1 C1140001 448.075 5.88 12.209,57.77 1.80 7.2 17 Scopoletin C1140001 488.075 5.88 12.215,95.18	7	Tropine	C8 H15 N O	141.1153	1.056	60,269,180.57	8.81	99.5
9 Pyrdoxine C8 H1 N V03 1990/37 11.1 4887/5824/48 7.14 994 11 Lisoleucine C6 H13 N V2 131.094 1562 9498,791.612 1.39 94. 12 Nicotinamide C6 H5 N V2 131.094 1.56 23.08,758.4 3.88 91 13 Nicotinacid C6 H5 N V2 122.048 1.616 23.08,758.4 3.88 91 14 Nicotinacid C6 H5 N V2 122.048 1.618 23.08,753.7 4.80 95 15 (15.1,5-Arhydro-12-(3.4-dhydroxypheny)-5,7-dhydro-xy-4-ox0-4H C1 H20 O1 480.097 5.105 14.251.095.18 2.08 89 15 scopelatin C1 H80 O4 180.025 5.105 14.251.095.18 2.08 89 16 scopelatin C1 H80 O4 180.025 5.105 14.251.095.18 2.08 89 17 Scopolatin C3 H80 O4 180.025 5.105 14.251.095.18 2.08 89 15 Scopolatin	8	3-Hydroxypyridine	C5 H5 N O	95.03736	1.064	178,293,700.5	26.06	100
10 NP200358 C15 H14 O7 306.07.37 11.38 24,52.2474.57 35.8 95.5 11 Lisolucine C6 H15 NO2 131.0946 15.62 4948.791.62 13.9 04 13 Nicotinic acid C6 H15 NO2 123.032 1.618 32,453.75.37 4.80 95 14 Ni.NDimethylamiline C6 H5 NO2 123.032 1.618 31,450.07.07 4.50 95 15 Michonyalovical-12-(3,4-dihydroxyhenyl)-5,7-dihydroxy-4-ox-4H C11.001 48.092 4.732 12,29007.79 1.80 77.2 16 S-Methoxyalovicalcid C18 H3 O4 168.042 4.732 12,29007.79 1.80 77.2 17 Scopoletin C10 H8 O4 192.022 5.09 2.362.87.38 9.9 2.352.87.37 1.78 9.9 10 Granoside C11 H8 O4 126.023 5.48 12,352.57.9 7.89 9.9 11 Morotinearcide C12 H18 O4 261.023 5.44 12,352.57.9 7.89 9.5 <td>9</td> <td>Pyridoxine</td> <td>C8 H11 N O3</td> <td>169.0737</td> <td>1.112</td> <td>48,875,824.48</td> <td>7.14</td> <td>99.4</td>	9	Pyridoxine	C8 H11 N O3	169.0737	1.112	48,875,824.48	7.14	99.4
11 Leloeucine C6 H13 NO2 131094 152 9498,791.612 139 904 12 Nicotinanide C6 H5 NO2 1320.30 1618 23498,175.37 4.80 95 13 Nicotinacid C6 H5 NO2 120.302 1.818 23495,375.37 4.80 95 15 ICh15-Andyndro1-12-3A-dihydroxyphenylb-57-dihydroxy-4-oxo4H C1 H10 N 121.0822 3.70 135.007107 458 86.7 16 MAchydro1-12-3A-dihydroxyphenylb-57-dihydroxy-4-oxo4H C1 H80 H 120.82 5.405 12.290.077.9 108 97 17 Scopoleria C1 H40 H 178.025 5.105 14.215.495.18 2.08 89 10 Synanside Codeoxy-0-L-mannopyranosylh-1557- C1 H20 OH 480.997 5.84 12.233.337 4.8 98 12 No21018 C1 H20 OH 481.092 5.441 4.415.04.37 6.52 71.5 13 Mod201-157.7 C12 H18 OH 25.155 5.471 4.415.04.37 6.52 71.5	10	NP-000358	C15 H14 O7	306.0737	1.139	24,522,474.57	3.58	99.5
12NicotanamideC6 H6 N2 O12.0481.61623.108,17.683.889113Nicotanic acidC6 H5 N2 O12.0301.61832.485,375.374.809514N.N-DimethylanilneC6 H1 N12.03021.61832.485,375.374.809515(17)-15-Anhydro-1-J2.34-dihydroxyheny)-5.7-dihydroxy-4-oxo-4HC1 H2 OU1480.9974.60131.6295,296246.2496.716S-Methoxysalicylic acidC1 H8 O419.04225.40970.363,873.887.99517ScopoletinC1 H8 O419.04225.40970.363,873.887.98918ExculetinC1 H8 O419.04225.40970.363,873.887.98919OyarosideC21 H2 OU1480.9975.8812.295,537917.88999110StandardC1 H8 O419.04225.44822.312,28.073.57.98112JarosideC1 H2 O1480.9975.44822.312,28.073.57.98112NP-021018C1 H2 H3 O4261.1025.44822.312,28.073.57.98112NP-021018C1 H1 H3 O4261.1025.44827.315,35.551.598.67.112Notoric acidC1 H1 H3 O420.11525.4117.451,563.139.87.912Quercetin 3β-D-glucosideC1 H1 H3 O131.0255.6117.437,553.559.87.913Maroni GC1 H2	11	L-Isoleucine	C6 H13 N O2	131.0946	1.562	9,498,791.612	1.39	90.4
13 Niconinic acid C6 HS N Q 12.032 1.61 32.845.37.3 4.80 95 14 N.P.Dimethylaniline CB H11 N 12.0892 3.791 31.350.071.07 4.58 86.7 15 (R)-1.5Anhydrol-1-2.3A-dihydroxy-hexot-4H C114001 48.0422 5.40 12.290.077.97 1.80 7.2 16 S-Methoxysalicylic acid C8.H8 O4 180.4022 5.40 12.290.077.97 1.80 9.2 17 Scopoletin C10.H8 O4 180.4022 5.40 12.290.57.97 1.78 9.9 10 Oxaroside C1142001 440.097 5.248 12.229.53.75 1.78 9.9 11 NPO21018 C12.140.01 7.140.01 5.458 4.0180.31.267 5.87 7.3 21 Nethind-15.7-dihydroxy-3-(4-hydroxy-f-k-more-6-yl-D-gluctoid C12.140.01 3.12.5 5.614 1.73.555.5 1.87 9.8 23 Nethind-15.7-dihydroxy-3-(4-hydroxy-3-(4-hydroxy-3-(4-hydroxy-3-(4-hydroxy-3-(4-hydroxy-3-(4-hydroxy-3-(4-hydroxy-3-(4-hydroxy-3-(4-hydroxy-3-(4-hydroxy-4-hydroxy-3-(4-hydroxy-3-(4-hy	12	Nicotinamide	C6 H6 N2 O	122.048	1.616	23,108,176.84	3.38	91
14N.N.DimethylanlineCB H1 N12 10892379131,330,0714.5886715N.N.DimethylanlineC1 H20014809976.0131,330,071.04.5886716S-Methoxysalicylic acidCB HB O4165.0424.7212,290,077.71.807217ScopletinC10H8 O4192.0425.01514,215,495.182.0889918ExcuencinC11H8 O4192.0425.01514,215,495.182.0889919OyarosideC21 H20011480.9975.28812,225,57.917.889710S115,15-Anhydro-2-Of-6-deoxy-o-1-mannoytranosyl-1-[5,7- dihydroxy-2-(4-hydroxyphenyl)-4-oxo-4H-chromen-6-yl-D-glucton12,112 NO2.21575.4412,231,282.03.677312NP021018C12 H18 O42.211022.41812,173,533.551.87739812NP021018C12 H18 O42.011265.0215.41812,073,533.551.879812Matrine A-glubactographenyl-4-oxo-4H-C12 H20 O132,1055.4112,435,613.0447.97213NP018720Ourcetin-3B-D-gluccosideC12 H20 O132,1055.4112,456,41.84989814Matrine A-glubactographenyl-4-oxo-4H-C12 H20 O132,036.2474.94999414Matrine A-glubactographenyl-4-oxo-4H-C12 H20 O132,036.245.41494.5515Matrine A-glubactographenyl-4-oxo-4H-C12 H20 O132	13	Nicotinic acid	C6 H5 N O2	123.032	1.618	32,845,375.37	4.80	95
15 (1): 1,5: Anhydro-1,2: 6,4-dihydroxyphenyl)-5;7-dihydroxy-4-oxo-4H C11 448.097 46.01 316.295,292 46.2 96.7 16 5-Methoxysalicylic acid CB H8 O4 168.042 47.32 12,200,077.79 1.80 77.2 17 Scopoletin C10H8 O4 192.042 5.04 2,208,273.88 2.98 18 Esculatin C9 H6 O4 178.0265 5.05 14,215,495.18 2.08 9.9 10 Oranoside C21H20 O1 448.097 5.88 12,2295,375.9 1.78 9.9 10 NP-02108 C12H18 O4 261.102 5.448 2,212,285.7 7.87 7.9 12 NP-02108 C12H18 O4 201.124 5.88 5.90,384.20 0.87 7.1 12 Tolprolo1 C12H18 O4 201.125 5.81 12,045.04.37 5.9 7.1 12 Tolprolo1 C12H18 O4 201.125 5.81 12,045.16.30 4.94 9.0 12 Quereetin C11H2 O4	14	N, N-Dimethylaniline	C8 H11 N	121.0892	3.791	31,350,071.07	4.58	86.7
165-Methoxysalicylic acidCB HBQ4168042473212,290,777,91,807217ScopoletinC10H8 C4192,0425.0420,328,7388,909218EsclutinC14H304178,0055.2812,229,537,917.89710CynarosideC212001448,0975.2822,295,379,717.89712Shyb-s-Anhydro-2-O-6-decay-o-t-mannopyranosyl-1-f5.7C17H30 C4571.035.482,312,282,075.877.1812NetroC12H18 C4261.035.454,018,012.675.877.189812NetroC12H18 C4261.035.454,018,012.677.189812NetroC12H18 C4261.035.4612,753.551.679.8813NetroC12H18 C421.1025.8712,043.17.639.879.8714Marina c4C21H200A12115.8712,043.17.839.879.8715Marina c4C21H200A12155.8712,043.17.839.879.8716Queretin-3P-OglucosideC11H2021,120.1032,0155.3716,304.839.8717Marina c4C21H200A1219A13324,51.014.949.718Molaria C4C11H10C11H10C11H10C11H1021,41.111.149.719Marina C4C11H10C11H10C11H10C11H1021,41.111.149.719Ma	15	(1{)-1,5-Anhydro-1-[2-(3,4-dihydroxyphenyl)-5,7-dihydroxy-4-oxo-4H- chromen-8-yl]-D-galactitol	C21 H20 O11	448.0997	4.601	316,295,296.2	46.24	96.7
17 Scopoletin Cl0 H8 O4 192.042 5.049 20.362,87.388 2.98 92.5 18 Esculetin C9 H6 O4 178.026 5.105 14.215,495.188 20.8 89.9 10 Cynaroside C21 H20 O11 488.097 5.288 22.312,220.7 3.26 93.5 21 NP-021018 C21 H30 O11 578.163 5.455 40,180,312.67 5.87 73.9 23 Toliporlo C13 H21 NO2 22.31.57 5.471 44.615.504.37 6.52 7.15 24 Jamonic acid C12 H18 O1 21.125 5.587 590.3842.09 0.80 7.31 25 Ja-schhydro-15/5-dihydroxy-3-(4-hydroxyphenyl-4-oxo-4H- C12 H12 O10 432.105 5.61 17.0435.17.63 2.91 92.0 26 Quercetin-3B-D-glucoside C12 H20 O10 432.055 5.737 163.746.61.81 2.93 92.0 27 Quercetin-3B-D-glucoside C11 H20 O12 46.001.9 5.751 165.098.283 0.90 92.1 92.1 <td>16</td> <td>5-Methoxysalicylic acid</td> <td>C8 H8 O4</td> <td>168.0422</td> <td>4.732</td> <td>12,290,077.79</td> <td>1.80</td> <td>77.2</td>	16	5-Methoxysalicylic acid	C8 H8 O4	168.0422	4.732	12,290,077.79	1.80	77.2
18 Esculetin C9 H6 O4 178.026 51.05 14.215.495.18 20.8 89.9 19 Cynaroside C21 H20 O11 448.097 5.288 12.2295.357.9 17.8 99 10 S1.5-Anhydro-2-O-6-deoxy-a-L-mannopyranosyl-1-[5.7] C21 H20 O14 5.488 2.312.282.07 3.8 73.9 12 NP-021018 C12 H18 O4 2.61.203 5.457 40.180.312.67 5.87 73.93 73.9 12 Np-021018 C12 H18 O4 2.01.203 5.461 12.735.53.55 1.62 7.5 13 Rutin C12 H18 O4 2.01.205 5.471 4.640.55.04.37 6.27 7.5 7.5 7.5 7.535.35 1.62 7.5 <td>17</td> <td>Scopoletin</td> <td>C10 H8 O4</td> <td>192.0422</td> <td>5.049</td> <td>20,362,873.88</td> <td>2.98</td> <td>92.5</td>	17	Scopoletin	C10 H8 O4	192.0422	5.049	20,362,873.88	2.98	92.5
19 Cynaroside C21 H20011 448.0997 5.288 122.295.357.9 17.88 99 10 IC5)-1.5-Anhydro-2-O.(6-deoxy-o-L-mannopymosyl)-1-[5.7- dihydroxy-2(4-hydroxyphenyl)-4-oxo-4H-chromen-6-yl)-D.glucid C12 H18 O4 261203 5.454 2.2312.282.07 3.20 93.7 12 NP-021018 C12 H18 O4 261203 5.455 40180.312.67 5.87 7.39 12 Toliprolo1 C12 H18 O4 261203 5.451 446.155.04.37 6.52 7.39 12 Toliprolo1 C12 H18 O2 23157 5.471 446.155.04.37 6.52 7.39 12 Jamonic acid C12 H18 O2 23157 5.614 12/7.455.16.3 8.99 9.6 12 Js-Anhydro-1-[5,7-dihydroxy-3-(4-hydroxyphenyl)-4-oxo-4H- chrome-8-yllbexitol C21 H20 O1 432.05 5.614 12/7.455.16.3 8.99 9.6 2 Quercetin-3β-Diguoside C119000 2112001 432.05 5.614 5.614.14 8.7 2 Quercetin-3β-Diguoside C119100 200.52 5.6	18	Esculetin	C9 H6 O4	178.0265	5.105	14,215,495.18	2.08	89.9
20 (15)-15-Anhydro-2-O-(6-decxy-a-L-mannopyranosyl)-1-[57- ditydroxy-2-(4-hydroxyphenyl)-4-oxo-4H-chromen-6-yl)-D-glucibl C2 H30 OI 5/81632 5.448 22,312,282.07 3.26 9.35 21 NP-021018 C12 H18 O2 22,1157 5.471 44,615,504.37 6.52 7.15 23 Rutin C12 H18 O3 2101254 5.87 5,903,842.209 0.86 7.31 24 Jasmonic acid C12 H18 O3 2101254 5.87 5,903,842.209 0.86 7.31 25 Quercetin-36-D-glucoside C12 H18 O3 2101254 5.87 5,903,842.209 0.86 7.31 26 Quercetin-36-D-glucoside C12 H12 O1 424.005 5.737 163,476,631.8 2.39 9.6 27 Ouercetin-36-D-glucoside C11 H10 O7 20242 5.711 165,098,283.2 4.13 9.8 28 NPO1872O Ouercetin-36-D-glucoside C11 H10 O 200423 5.711 163,476,631.8 2.39 9.0 29 Avicularin C12 H18 O1 141001 30	19	Cynaroside	C21 H20 O11	448.0997	5.288	122,295,357.9	17.88	99
11NP-021018C12 H18 AU226.1035.455AU,80,312.675.797.3912TolprololC13 H21 NO2223.1575.4714.4615,504.376.527.1512RutinC27 H30 OI210.1525.8411.2773,5531.879.8812JamonicacidC12 H18 OI21.1625.875.903,84.2200.807.3112JaronicacidC12 H18 OI32.1055.711.6347,663.182.9.99.612Quercetin-3β-DeglucosideC12 H20 OI608.1375.966.274,504.299.612Quercetin-3β-DeglucosideC12 H20 OI608.1375.966.274,504.299.612Miclarin G1C20 H18 OI1.314.0636.1324.561.61047.499.713Affatoxin G1C14 H20 OI20.807.86.14720.501.817.29.189.614Miclarin G1C14 H20 OI30.0736.240.141.99.79.615Miclarin G1C14 H20 OI21.0536.1424.564.325.27.516Miclarin G1C14 H20 OI31.0736.346.455.289.751.49.717Miclarin G1C14 H20 OI31.0736.346.456.452.71.49.718Miclarin G1C14 H20 OI31.0736.346.456.452.71.49.719Miclarin G1C14 H20 OI31.0736.841.697.232.11.79.710Miclarin G1C14 H10 OI	20	(1S)-1,5-Anhydro-2-O-(6-deoxy-α-L-mannopyranosyl)-1-[5,7- dihydroxy-2-(4-hydroxyphenyl)-4-oxo-4H-chromen-6-yl]-D-glucitol	C27 H30 O14	578.1632	5.448	22,312,282.07	3.26	93.5
22 Toliprolol C13 H21 NO2 23.157 5.471 44.615,504.37 6.52 71.5 23 Rutin C27 H30 OI6 610.1529 5.481 12,773,553.55 1.87 9.88 24 Jasmonic acid C12 H18 O3 210.1254 5.587 5,903,842.20 0.80 7.31 25 Ouercetin-3β-D-glucoside C11 H20 O1 32.1053 5.614 17.045,631.8 2.90 9.60 26 Quercetin G19 H20 O1 52.751 165,098,282 2.413 9.85 27 Quercetin G19 H20 O1 62.01 H20 O1 340.843 6.11 324.561,610.4 47.45 9.71 28 NPO1872O C2.0 H18 O11 340.843 6.13 324.551,610.4 47.45 9.71 29 Avicularin G1 C11 H14 O1 30.073 6.32 7.167,811.31 10.48 87 30 P16 S559 C17 H14 O7 330.0734 6.34 6.1595.289.75 9.00 9.75 31 NPO15559 C	21	NP-021018	C12 H18 O4	226.1203	5.455	40,180,312.67	5.87	73.9
23 Rutin C2 7 H30 Cli 610.1529 5.481 12,773,533.55 1.87 9.88 24 Jasmonic acid C12 H1803 210.1254 5.587 5.903,842.209 0.86 7.11 25 1;5-Anhydro-1-[5,7-dihydroxy-3-(4-hydroxyphenyl)-4-oxo-4H C21 H20 Ol2 432.1053 5.614 17.0435,1763 24.91 7.29 26 Quercetin-3β-D-glucoside C1 H20 Ol2 464.095 5.737 163,476,631.8 20.99 9.6 27 Quercetin C15 H10 OT 302.0422 5.751 165,098,283.2 24.13 98.5 28 NP-018720 C27 H28 Ol6 681.373 5.966 6.274,504.294 0.92 9.7 29 Aricularin C20 H18 Ol1 434.0843 6.131 324,561.6104 47.49 9.7 30 Aflatoxin G1 C20 H18 Ol1 434.0843 6.131 324,561.412 43.19 9.7 31 Dissmetin C16 H12 O6 300.053 6.202 71,678,113.21 10.48 8.7 32 Accoumaric acid C17 H14 O7 30.073 6.344 6,4595,563	22	Toliprolol	C13 H21 N O2	223.157	5.471	44,615,504.37	6.52	71.5
24 Jasmonic acid C12 H1803 210.1254 5.587 5,903,842.209 0.86 7.11 25 J.5-Anhydro-1-[5,7-dihydroxy-3-(4-hydroxyphenyl)-4-oxo-4H- chromen-8-yl]hexitol C21 H20 01 432.1053 5.614 170,435,1763 24.91 92.0 26 Quercetin-3β-D-glucoside C21 H20 01 464.095 5.737 163,766318 23.09 98.5 27 Quercetin-3β-D-glucoside C15 H10 07 302.0422 5.751 165,098,2832 24.13 98.5 28 NP-018720 C27 H28 016 608.137 5.986 6.274,504.294 9.02 97 29 Aricularin C20 H18 01 434.083 6.131 324,561.6104 47.49 97 20 Aricularin C17 H12 07 328.0578 6.187 200,501,817.2 29.31 86 31 Dissmetin C16 H12 06 300.053 6.206 71,678,113.21 10.48 76.5 32 4-Coumaric acid C17 H14 07 330.0734 6.384 6.425,664.32 5.32 76.5 33 BAPo15559 C11 H1400 340.073 6.443	23	Rutin	C27 H30 O16	610.1529	5.481	12,773,553.55	1.87	98.8
25 λ.5-Anhydron-1-[5,7-dihydroxy-3-(4-hydroxyphenyl)-4-oxo-4H- chromen-8-yt]hexitol C21 H20 O10 432.1053 5.614 170,435,176.3 24.9 9.6 26 Quercetin-3β-D-glucoside C1 H20 O10 302.0422 5.751 163,476,631.8 23.09 9.6 27 Quercetin C1 H20 O10 302.0422 5.751 165,098,283.2 24.13 98.5 28 NP-018720 C27 H28 O16 681,373 5.986 6,274,504,294 0.92 97 29 Avicularin C20,0 H18 O11 343.083 6.131 324,561,604.4 47.45 97.7 30 Aflatoxin G1 C11 C16 H12 O5 300.053 6.206 71,678,113.21 10.48 87 31 Disometin C16 H12 O5 300.053 6.206 71,678,113.21 10.48 87 32 4-Coumaric acid C9 H8 O3 164.0473 6.213 23,41,562.64 341 91.5 33 NP-015559 C17 H14 O7 300.734 6.343 36425,664.32 5.32 76.5 34 Vitexin C15 H10 O5 270.052	24	Jasmonic acid	C12 H18 O3	210.1254	5.587	5,903,842.209	0.86	73.1
AQuercetin-Sb-glucosideC21 H20 O12464.0955.737163,476,631.82.3.9099.627QuercetinC15 H10 O7302.04225.751165,098,283.224.1398.528NP-018720C27 H28 O16608.13735.9866,274,504.2940.929729AvicularinC ₂₀ H ₁₈ O ₁₁ 434.08436.131324,561,610.447.4599.730Aflatoxin G1C ₁₇ H ₁₂ O ₇ 328.05786.187200,501,817.229.318631DissmetinC16 H12 O6300.0636.20671,678,113.2110.4887324-Coumaric acidC9 H8 O3164.04736.21323,341,562.643.4191.533NP-015559C17 H14 O7330.07346.38461,595,289.759.009034VitexinC10 H12 O6300.0636.7844,74,062.3270.7087.435GalanginC16 H12 O5284.06826.83811,697,238.211.7498.736S-O-MethylgenisteinC16 H12 O5284.06826.83811,697,238.211.7498.737IsokaempferideC16 H12 O5284.06826.83811,697,238.211.7498.737IsokaempferideC16 H12 O5284.06826.83811,697,238.211.7498.738S-O-MethylgenisteinC16 H12 O5284.06826.83811,697,238.211.7498.739NP-003294C18 H16 O7344.08936.85	25	1,5-Anhydro-1-[5,7-dihydroxy-3-(4-hydroxyphenyl)-4-oxo-4H- chromen-8-vl]hexitol	C21 H20 O10	432.1053	5.614	170,435,176.3	24.91	72.9
27QuercetinC15 H10 O7302.04225.751155.08.283.224.1398.528NP-018720C27 H28 O16608.13735.9866.274,504.2940.929729Avicularin C_{20} H ₁₈ O ₁₁ 434.08436.131324,561,610.447.4599.730Aflatoxin G1 C_{17} H ₁₂ O ₇ 328.05786.187200,501,817.229.318631DiosmetinC16 H12 O6300.0636.20671,678,113.2110.4887324-Coumaric acidC9 H8 O3164.04736.21323,341,562.643.4191.533NP-015559C17 H14 O7330.07346.38461,595,289.759.009034VitexinC21 H20 O10432.10536.44336,425,664.325.3276.535GalanginC15 H10 O5270.05256.5319,846,563.5761.4498.7365,7-Dihydroxy-2-(4-hydroxyphenyl)-4-oxo-4H-chromen-3-yl β-L- xylofuranosideC16 H12 O6300.0636.7844,774,062.3270.7087.437IsokaempferideC16 H12 O5284.06826.83811,697,238.211.7198.739NP-003294C18 H16 O7344.08936.8596,715,576.3130.9883.141(-)Caryophyllene oxideC15 H10 Q220.18267.15125,344,135.443.7083.242ChrysinC15 H10 Q220.18267.15125,344,135.443.7083.243Kaempferol<	26	Quercetin-3β-D-alucoside	C21 H20 O12	464.095	5.737	163,476,631.8	23.90	99.6
28 NP-018720 C27 H28 O16 608.1373 5.986 6.274,504.294 0.92 97 29 Avicularin C ₂₀ H ₁₈ O ₁₁ 434.0843 6.131 324,561,6104 47.45 99.7 30 Aflatoxin G1 C ₁₇ H ₁₂ O ₇ 328.0578 6.187 200,501,817.2 29.31 86 31 Diosmetin C16 H12 O6 300.063 6.206 71,678,113.21 10.48 87 32 4-Coumaric acid C9 H8 O3 164.0473 6.213 23,341,562.64 3.41 91.5 33 NP-015559 C17 H14 O7 330.0734 6.384 61,595,289.75 9.00 90 34 Vitexin C21 H20 O10 432.1053 6.443 36,425,664.32 5.32 76.5 35 Galangin C15 H10 O5 270.0525 6.531 9,846,563.576 1.44 98.7 36 5,7-Dihydroxy-2-(4-hydroxyphenyl)-4-oxo-4H-chromen-3-yl β-L- xylofuranoside C16 H12 O6 300.063 6.784 4,774,062.327 0.70 87.4 37 Isokaempferide C16 H12 O5 284.0682 6.838 <td< td=""><td>27</td><td>Ouercetin</td><td>C15 H10 O7</td><td>302.0422</td><td>5.751</td><td>165.098.283.2</td><td>24.13</td><td>98.5</td></td<>	27	Ouercetin	C15 H10 O7	302.0422	5.751	165.098.283.2	24.13	98.5
29Avicularin $C_{20} H_{18} O_{11}$ 434.08436.131324,561,61.0447.4599.730Aflatoxin G1 $C_{17} H_{12} O_7$ 328.05786.187200,501,817.229.318631DiosmetinC16 H12 O6300.0636.20671,678,113.2110.4887324-Coumaric acidC9 H8 O3164.04736.21323,341,562.643.4191.533NP-015559C17 H14 O7330.07346.38461,595,289.759.009034VitexinC21 H20 O10432.10536.44336,425,664.325.3276.535GalanginC15 H10 O5270.05256.5319,846,563.5761.4498.7365,7-Dihydroxy-2-(4-hydroxyphenyl)-4-oxo-4H-chromen-3-yl β-L- xylofuranosideC16 H12 O6300.0636.7844,774,062.3270.7087.4385-O-MethylgenisteinC16 H12 O5284.06826.83811,697,238.211.7198.739NP-003294C18 H16 O7344.08936.8596,715,576.3130.9883.140NP-000465C17 H14 O6314.07876.94130,654,410.594.4890.741(-)-Caryophyllene oxideC15 H10 O4254.05777.24111,993,651.121.7598.543KaempferolC15 H10 O4254.05777.24111,993,651.121.7598.544NP-021018C15 H10 O4254.05777.24111,993,651.121.7598.545<	28	NP-018720	C27 H28 O16	608.1373	5.986	6.274.504.294	0.92	97
$120 \ HB OT 10$ 120	29	Avicularin	C20 H10 O11	434.0843	6.131	324.561.610.4	47.45	99.7
31DiosmetinC16 H12 O6300.0636.20671,678,113.2110.4887324-Coumaric acidC9 H8 O3164.04736.21323,341,562.643.4191.533NP-015559C17 H14 O7330.07346.38461,595,289.759.009034VitexinC21 H20 O10432.10536.44336,425,664.325.3276.535GalanginC15 H10 O5270.05256.5319,846,563.5761.4498.7365,7-Dihydroxy-2-(4-hydroxyphenyl)-4-oxo-4H-chromen-3-yl β-L- xylofuranosideC16 H12 O6300.0636.7844,774,062.3270.7087.4385-O-MethylgenisteinC16 H12 O5284.06826.83811,697,238.211.7198.739NP-003294C18 H16 O7344.08936.8596,715,576.3130.9883.140NP-00465C17 H14 O6314.07876.94130,654,410.594.4890.741(-)-Caryophyllene oxideC15 H10 O4254.05777.24111,993,651.121.7598.543KaempferolC15 H10 O6286.04747.341304,396,847.344.5094.444NP-021018C12 H18 O4226.12037.3613,126,756.271.9276.945Aflatoxin G2C17 H14 O7330.07347.3655,843,945.0450.8581.8	30	Aflatoxin G1	C17 H12 O7	328.0578	6187	200 501 817 2	29.31	86
324-Coumaric acidC9 H8 O3164.04736.21323,341,562.643.4191.533NP-015559C17 H14 O7330.07346.38461,595,289.759.009034VitexinC21 H20 O10432.10536.44336,425,664.325.3276.535GalanginC15 H10 O5270.05256.5319,846,563.5761.4498.7365,7-Dihydroxy-2-(4-hydroxyphenyl)-4-oxo-4H-chromen-3-yl β-L- xylofuranosideC16 H12 O6300.0636.7844,774,062.3270.7087.4385-O-MethylgenisteinC16 H12 O5284.06826.83811,697,238.211.7198.739NP-003294C18 H16 O7344.08936.8596,715,576.3130.9883.140NP-00465C15 H10 O4214.0730,654,410.594.4890.741(-)-Caryophyllene oxideC15 H10 O4254.05777.24111,993,651.121.7598.543KaempferolC15 H10 O6286.04747.341304,396,847.344.5099.444NP-021018C12 H18 O4226.12037.3613,126,756.271.9276.945Aflatoxin G2C17 H14 O7330,07347.3655.843,945.0450.8581.8	31	Diosmetin	C16 H12 O6	300.063	6.206	71.678.113.21	10.48	87
33NP-015559C17 H14 O7330.07346.38461,595,289.759.009034VitexinC21 H20 O10432.10536.44336,425,664.325.3276.535GalanginC15 H10 O5270.05256.5319,846,563.5761.4498.7365,7-Dihydroxy-2-(4-hydroxyphenyl)-4-oxo-4H-chromen-3-yl β-L- xylofuranosideC16 H12 O6300.0636.7844,774,062.3270.7087.437IsokaempferideC16 H12 O5284.06826.83811,697,238.211.7198.739NP-003294C18 H16 O7344.08936.8596,715,576.3130.9883.140NP-000465C15 H10 O4220.18267.15325,344,135.343.7083.241(-)-Caryophyllene oxideC15 H10 O4254.05777.24111,993,651.121.7598.543KaempferolC1 ₅ H10 O6286.04747.341304,396,847.344.5099.444NP-021018C12 H18 O4226.12037.3613,126,756.271.9276.945Aflatoxin G2C17 H14 O7330.07347.3655.843,945.0450.8581.8	32	4-Coumaric acid	C9 H8 O3	164 0473	6.213	23 341 562 64	3 4 1	91.5
34VitexinC21 H20 O10432.10536.44336,425,664.325.3276.535GalanginC15 H10 O5270.05256.5319,846,563.5761.4498.7365,7-Dihydroxy-2-(4-hydroxyphenyl)-4-oxo-4H-chromen-3-yl β-L- xylofuranosideC20 H18 O10418.08956.60228,743,146.44.2094.537IsokaempferideC16 H12 O6300.0636.7844,774,062.3270.7087.4385-O-MethylgenisteinC16 H12 O5284.06826.83811,697,238.211.7198.739NP-003294C18 H16 O7344.08936.8596,715,576.3130.9883.140NP-000465C15 H24 O220.18267.15325,344,135.343.7083.241(-)-Caryophyllene oxideC15 H10 O4254.05777.24111,993,651.121.7598.543KaempferolC1 ₅ H10 O6286.04747.341304,396,847.344.5099.444NP-021018C12 H18 O4226.12037.3613,126,756.271.9276.945Aflatoxin G2C17 H14 O7330,07347.3655.843,945.0450.8581.8	33	NP-015559	C17 H14 O7	330.0734	6 384	61 595 289 75	9.00	90
31InterviewClinics	34	Vitexin	C21 H20 O10	432 1053	6 4 4 3	36 425 664 32	5 32	76 5
365,7-Dihydroxy-2-(4-hydroxyphenyl)-4-oxo-4H-chromen-3-yl β-L- xylofuranosideC20 H18 O10418.08956.60228,743,146.44.2094.537IsokaempferideC16 H12 O6300.0636.7844,774,062.3270.7087.4385-O-MethylgenisteinC16 H12 O5284.06826.83811,697,238.211.7198.739NP-003294C18 H16 O7344.08936.8596,715,576.3130.9883.140NP-000465C17 H14 O6314.07876.94130,654,410.594.4890.741(-)-Caryophyllene oxideC15 H24 O220.18267.15325,344,135.343.7083.242ChrysinC15 H10 O4254.05777.24111,993,651.121.7598.543KaempferolC12 H18 O4226.12037.3613,126,756.271.9276.944NP-021018C12 H18 O4226.12037.3613,126,756.271.9276.945Aflatoxin G2C17 H14 O7330,07347.3655.843,945,0450.8581.8	35	Galangin	C15 H10 O5	270.0525	6 5 3 1	9 846 563 576	1 44	98.7
37 Isokaempferide C16 H12 O6 300.063 6.784 4,774,062.327 0.70 87.4 38 5-O-Methylgenistein C16 H12 O5 284.0682 6.838 11,697,238.21 1.71 98.7 39 NP-003294 C18 H16 O7 344.0893 6.859 6,715,576.313 0.98 83.1 40 NP-000465 C17 H14 O6 314.0787 6.941 30,654,410.59 4.48 90.7 41 (-)-Caryophyllene oxide C15 H24 O 220.1826 7.153 25,344,135.34 3.70 83.2 42 Chrysin C15 H10 O4 254.0577 7.241 11,993,651.12 1.75 98.5 43 Kaempferol C1 ₂ H1 ₁₀ O ₆ 286.0474 7.341 304,396,847.3 44.50 99.4 44 NP-021018 C12 H18 O4 226.1203 7.36 13,126,756.27 1.92 76.9 45 Aflatoxin G2 C17 H14 O7 330,0734 7.365 5.843,945,045 0.85 81.8	36	5,7-Dihydroxy-2-(4-hydroxyphenyl)-4-oxo-4H-chromen-3-yl β-L- xylofuranoside	C20 H18 O10	418.0895	6.602	28,743,146.4	4.20	94.5
38 5-O-Methylgenistein C16 H12 O5 284.0682 6.838 11,697,238.21 1.71 98.7 39 NP-003294 C18 H16 O7 344.0893 6.859 6,715,576.313 0.98 83.1 40 NP-000465 C17 H14 O6 314.0787 6.941 30,654,410.59 4.48 90.7 41 (-)-Caryophyllene oxide C15 H24 O 220.1826 7.153 25,344,135.34 3.70 83.2 42 Chrysin C15 H10 O4 254.0577 7.241 11,993,651.12 1.75 98.5 43 Kaempferol C1 ₂ H1 ₁₀ O ₆ 286.0474 7.341 304,396,847.3 44.50 99.4 44 NP-021018 C12 H18 O4 226.1203 7.36 13,126,756.27 1.92 76.9 45 Aflatoxin G2 C17 H14 Q7 330,0734 7.365 5.843,945,045 0.85 81.8	37	Isokaempferide	C16 H12 O6	300.063	6.784	4.774.062.327	0.70	87.4
39 NP-003294 C18 H16 O7 344.0893 6.859 6,715,576.313 0.98 83.1 40 NP-000465 C17 H14 O6 314.0787 6.941 30,654,410.59 4.48 90.7 41 (-)-Caryophyllene oxide C15 H24 O 220.1826 7.153 25,344,135.34 3.70 83.2 42 Chrysin C15 H10 O4 254.0577 7.241 11,993,651.12 1.75 98.5 43 Kaempferol C1 ₂ H1 ₁₀ O ₆ 286.0474 7.341 304,396,847.3 44.50 99.4 44 NP-021018 C12 H18 O4 226.1203 7.36 13,126,756.27 1.92 76.9 45 Aflatoxin G2 C17 H14 Q7 330,0734 7.365 5.843,945,045 0.85 81.8	38	5-0-Methylaenistein	C16 H12 O5	284.0682	6.838	11 697 238 21	1 71	98.7
40 NP-000465 C17 H14 O6 314.0787 6.941 30,654,410.59 4.48 90.7 41 (-)-Caryophyllene oxide C15 H24 O 220.1826 7.153 25,344,135.34 3.70 83.2 42 Chrysin C15 H10 O4 254.0577 7.241 11,993,651.12 1.75 98.5 43 Kaempferol C1 ₂ H1 ₁₀ O ₆ 286.0474 7.341 304,396,847.3 44.50 99.4 44 NP-021018 C12 H18 O4 226.1203 7.36 13,126,756.27 1.92 76.9 45 Aflatoxin G2 C17 H14 Q7 330,0734 7.365 5.843,945,045 0.85 81.8	39	NP-003294	C18 H16 O7	344,0893	6.859	6.715.576 313	0.98	83.1
1.1 C17 C	40	NP-000465	C17 H14 O6	314 0787	6.941	30 654 410 59	4 4 8	90.7
42 Chrysin C15 H10 O4 254.0577 7.241 11,993,651.12 1.75 98.5 43 Kaempferol C15 H10 O4 286.0474 7.341 304,396,847.3 44.50 99.4 44 NP-021018 C12 H18 O4 226.1203 7.36 13,126,756.27 1.92 76.9 45 Aflatoxin G2 C17 H14 O7 330,0734 7.365 5.843,945,045 0.85 81.8	41	(-)-Carvophyllene oxide	C15 H24 O	220 1826	7 1 5 3	25 344 135 34	3 70	83.2
43 Kaempferol C15 H10 G4 254,0577 7,241 11,75 90.5 43 Kaempferol C15 H10 G6 286.0474 7.341 304,396,847.3 44.50 99.4 44 NP-021018 C12 H18 O4 226.1203 7.36 13,126,756.27 1.92 76.9 45 Aflatoxin G2 C17 H14 O7 330,0734 7.365 5.843,945,045 0.85 81.8	42	Chrysin	C15 H10 O4	254 0577	7 241	11 993 651 12	1 75	98.5
44 NP-021018 C12 H18 O4 226.1203 7.36 13,126,756.27 1.92 76.9 45 Aflatoxin G2 C17 H14 O7 330.0734 7.365 5.843.945.045 0.85 81.8	43	Kaempferol	(H., O	286.0474	7 3/1	304 396 847 3	44 50	99.J
45 Aflatoxin G2 (17 H14 O7 330.0734 7 365 5 843 945 045 0.85 81.8	Δ <u>Λ</u>	NP-021018	C12 H18 OA	200.0474	736	13 126 756 27	1 07	76.9
	45	Aflatoxin G2	C17 H14 O7	330.0734	7 365	5 843 945 045	0.85	81.8

Table 5 (c	ontinued)
------------	-----------

No	Name	Formula	Calc. MW	RT [min]	Area (Max.)	% RA	mzCloud Best Match
46	N-(2,4-Dimethylphenyl) formamide	C9 H11 N O	149.084	7.814	44,191,081.65	6.46	93.3
47	3-Methoxy-5,7,3',4'-tetrahydroxy-flavone	C16 H12 O7	316.0581	8.042	32,003,335.9	4.68	99
48	9S,13R-12-Oxophytodienoic acid	C18 H28 O3	292.2035	8.326	18,388,834.54	2.69	85.9
49	Apigenin	C15 H10 O5	270.0525	8.45	53,092,646.63	7.76	99.8
50	a-Pyrrolidinopropiophenone	C13 H17 N O	203.1311	13.213	9,792,651.46	1.43	92.7
51	Stearamide	C18 H37 N O	283.2875	16.424	15,774,788.86	2.31	97.4
52	Hexadecanamide	C16 H33 N O	255.2561	14.821	8,241,911.601	1.20	86.5
53	Oleamide	C18 H35 N O	281.2717	15.321	8,537,558.88	1.25	96

Effects of the ethanol extract of *M. pudica* aerial parts against phospholipase activity

When *C. albicans* cells (control group) were cultured on the surface of egg-yolk emulsion agar (phospholipase induction), the average value of the phospholipases was 0.69 ± 0.013 , demonstrating that the control group released many phospholipases. The mean extracellular phospholipases activity (Pz index) in the cells treated with the ethanol extracts of *M. pudica* aerial parts at 500 µg/mL and 250 µg/mL, were 0.94 ± 0.002 and 0.90 ± 0.012 , respectively (Fig. 4). The extract decreased phospholipase activity significantly at these concentrations. At lower concentrations (125 µg/mL to 7.81 µg/mL), the reduction

of phospholipase activity was statistically insignificant (p > 0.05).

Scanning electron microscopy observations of the effects of the ethyl-acetate fraction of *M. pudica* aerial parts on *C. albicans* biofilm

This current work employed scanning electron microscopy (SEM) to investigate the effect of the ethyl acetate fraction of *M. pudica* aerial parts on the surface morphology of 24 h old *C. albicans* biofilm. The control cells (without fraction) showed a smooth, regular colony cell shape and a distinct bud morphology, as seen in Fig. 5 from A to *C.* In contrast to the untreated cells, those treated by the fraction showed an irregular cell shape, rough surface collapses, and disrupted hyphae (Fig. 5D–I).



Fig. 4 The effect of ethanol extract of *M. pudica* aerial parts on the production of phospholipases secreted by *C. albicans* ATCC 10231. * $p \le 0.05$ and ns (not significant) were calculated by the Kruskal–Wallis test, followed by Dunn's multiple comparison test



Fig. 5 Scanning electron microscopy of *C. albicans* ATCC 10231 24 h old biofilm with or without treatment with ethyl-acetate fractions of *M. pudica* aerial parts. The control group (**A-B-C**) was treated with 62.5 µg/mL (**D-E–F**) and 125 µg/mL (**G-H-I**). The arrows pointed to some surface morphological changes

Cytotoxic activity of ethyl-acetate fraction of *M. pudica* aerial parts

It was evaluated that the ethyl acetate fraction of *M. pudica* aerial parts was not cytotoxic when tested at the concentration corresponding to its biofilm inhibitory concentration (Fig. 6). Result indicates that at the biofilm inhibitory concentration (50%), 96.77% of Vero cells and 89.91% of HeLa cells were viable. While at the greatest concentration, 500 μ g/mL, the viability of Vero and HeLa cells was 61.86% and 85.66%, respectively.

Discussion

The ability of *C. albicans* to grow as a community of adherent cells encapsulated by extracellular matrix puts well-known antifungal drugs at risk of resistance, growing interest of drug discovery by utilizing plants that have existed for millions of years. Plants synthesize

secondary metabolites or natural products that are generally divided into three classes, including phenolics, terpenoids, and alkaloids. Numerous studies employed natural products from native plants to combat biofiminduced fungal resistance [42–45]. However, exploring natural products from invasive plants as antibiofilm candidate drugs is still limited.

In this study, we used five invasive plants that were extracted by a maceration method using methanol or ethanol solvents. Furthermore, the most active extract was separated by the LLF method, and solvents were selected based on their degree of polarity. According to the results of the extraction method, methanol provided a greater yield contribution than ethanol. Even though we did not extract every studied plant with a variety of polar solvents, it is possible to hypothesize that increasing the polarity of the solvents might



Fig. 6 Effect of ethyl acetate fraction of *M. pudica* aerial parts on the metabolic activity (MTT) of Vero (**A**) and HeLa (**B**) cells after 24 h treatment. Error bars indicate the standard error of the mean of three independent experiments performed in triplicate. *p < 0.05 calculated by Kruskal Wallis, followed by Dunn's multiple comparison test

enhance the extraction yields. It means that in this study, methanol was more efficient at extracting phytochemicals of plants than ethanol. This is consistent with what was reported in previous research, which demonstrated that the yield of some plants, such as A. mangium leaf extract, M. pudica aerial parts, and Vernonia auriculifera Hiern leaves, was the greatest when it was extracted in a polar solvent [46-48]. However, the result of the fractionation yield of M. pudica in this study revealed that even though n-hexane is the lowest polarity solvent, it was associated with the highest yield. This finding indicates that most of the substances in M. pudica extract were non-polar substances. It needs to be emphasized, the differences in the extraction/fractionation yield are influenced by several factors, including not only by solvent polarity or typet, but also by extraction or fractionation method, the size of material, extraction time, and temperature [47, 49].

According to our results, the ethanol extracts of M. *pudica* (aerial parts and roots) exhibited great power of antifungal activity against *C. albicans* ATCC 10231 with MIC₅₀ of 15.62 µg/mL and 7.81 µg/mL, respectively. Even though the MIC₅₀ was 10–20 fold higher than that of fluconazole, both extracts exhibited comparable fungistatic rather than fungicidal properties to fluconazole. In previous studies, *M. pudica* extracts showed antifungal activity with various activity levels. It was reported that methanol extract from the leaves of invasive *M. pudica* growing in India showed an antifungal effect against *C. albicans* with MIC ranging between 0.394 and 0.398 mg/mL [50]. Two other studies evaluated the *M. pudica* antifungal activity by an agar disk diffusion method: the first one reported that ethanol extract of *M. pudica* leaves was effective against *C. albicans* at 30 mg/mL with a zone of inhibition of 17 mm [51] and the second study reported that *M. pudica* fractions and its diterpenoids, named 19-O-transferuloyl-labd-8(17)-en-15,19-diol and 19-O-[(E)-3,4'-dimethoxy cinnamoyl]-labd-8(17)-en15,19-diol, inhibited *C. albicans* with an inhibition zone ranging from 9–15 mm [52]. Overall, the MICs of *M. pudica* extracts in our study against *C. albicans* were lower than those reported in the literature. It is noteworthy that it is difficult to compare our results with the reported literature because of the variations in the utilization of solvent, extraction/fractionation process, and antifungal method. In addition, it is conceivable that the chemical content of invasive *M. pudica* plants cultivated in Indonesia differs from those grown in other countries.

The antifungal activity of the root extract of *M. pudica* was mainly influenced by the bioactive compounds that either function independently, in synergy, or antagonistically with the other compounds. The LC-MS/ MS analyses suggested that alkaloids are secondary plant metabolites that might be responsible for antifungal activity. However, we cannot disallow the possibility that existing flavonoids in the extract might also have this effect. To our best knowledge, no literature has yet reported these compounds present in the extract from the root of M. pudica. However, some compounds of tropane alkaloid were found in Datura stramonium, and particularly, 3α -tigloyloxytropane has been found in the variant *D. Stramonium* grown in Egypt [53]. But, no literature reported the antifungal activity of a 3α -tigloyloxytropane against *C. albicans*. The compounds (epigallocatechin(4β ,8)-gallocatechin, of polyphenols and gallocatechin) and flavonoid (3,5,6-trihydroxy-4,7dimethoxyflavone) which present in our study, might be

contributing to the antifungal activity against *C. albicans*. The anti-*Candida* properties of polyphenol compounds have been reported in the literature: Evensen and Braun, 2009 demonstrated that phenolic compounds in green tea extracts reduced by 43% the growth of *C. albicans* when used at 5 mg/mL [54]. Other studies reported that proanthocyanidins (oligomeric flavonoids composed by derivatives of catechin and epicatechin and their gallic acid esters) polymer-rich fractions from the stem bark of *Stryphnodendron adstringens* revealed antifungal activity against *C. albicans* with MIC values of 15.6 µg/mL [55]. Finally, the mixture of epigallocatechin, gallocatechin, and epigallocatechin-($4\beta \rightarrow 8$)-gallocatechin in the sub-fractions from the stem bark of *Stryphnodendron obova*-

tractions from the stem bark of *Stryphnoaenaron obovatum Benth* showed antifungal activity against *C. albicans* and *C. parapsilosis* with MIC ranging from 31.5 μ g/mL to 125 μ g/mL [56]. The ethyl acetate fraction obtained from the aerial

The entry actuate fraction obtained from the aerial parts of *M. pudica* had good activity against planktonic cells of *C. albicans* ATCC 10231. The HR-MS analyses of this fraction revealed the presence of several kinds of compounds and, in particular, flavonoids such as avicularin, quercetin, luteolin, rutin, kaempferol, catechin, quercetin-3 β -D-glucoside, and 1 ξ -1,5-anhydro-1-[2-(3,4dihydroxyphenyl)-5,7-dihydroxy-4-oxo-4H-chromen-8-yl]-D-galactitol. It is known that flavonoids have an intermediate polarity, making them extractable with ethyl-acetate [57]. They are also linked to multiple antifungal pathways, including disturbance of the plasma membrane, stimulation of mitochondrial malfunction, suppression of cell structural work, cell division, RNA and protein synthesis, and efflux mediated pumping systems [58, 59].

Several studies demonstrated the presence of flavonoids in invasive *M. pudica* plant: Sapkota et al. reported that an ethyl-acetate fraction of *M. pudica* growing in Nepal contained quercetin, catechin, and avicularin [60]; Yusof et al.determined orientin, kaempferol 7-rutinoside, and kaempferol 3-glucoside-7-rhamnoside in *M. pudica* aerial parts [61]; and Lobstein et al. isolated myricetin and two C-glycosylflavones, 4"-hydroxymaysin and cassiaoccidentalin B, from *M. pudica* aerial parts [62].

Literature reported that avicularin, kaempferol, luteolin, and quercetin inhibited the growth of planktonic *Candida* species [63–66]. Furthermore, it has been established that quercetin inhibited fatty acid synthase, an enzyme essential for endogenous fatty acid production in the fungal membrane, as part of its antifungal action [42]. In addition, quercetin induced apoptosis of *C. albicans* by increasing intracellular Mg2+, mitochondrial Ca2+, and mitochondrial dysfunction, which triggers the decline in mitochondrial redox levels and disruption in the mitochondrial antioxidant system [67].

Concerning the antibiofilm activity, the ethyl-acetate fraction of *M. pudica* aerial parts inhibited the metabolic activity of 24 h old biofilms of C. albicans. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study describing the antibiofilm activity of M. pudica. The ability of M. pudica to inhibit biofilm formation was previously described only against a single-species bacterial biofilm, Streptococcus mutans biofilm [68]. Related to the effects of flavonoids against Candida biofilms, it has been reported that kaempferol inhibited C. albicans biofilm by reducing the hyphal formation and hydrophobicity of the fungal cell surface [43]. Another study showed that kaempferol and quercetin diminished the biomass of C. orthopsilosis and C. metapsilosis and the metabolic activity and biomass of developing biofilms of the C. parapsilosis complex [65]. Also, cathechin inhibited the biofilm formation of C. albicans involving proteasomal enzyme activity leading to metabolic instability and membrane cell disruption [54]. Concerning luteolin, this flavonoid doesn't seem like a good antibiofilm candidate, as a high concentration (625–5000 μ g/mL) was required to prevent the formation of *C. albicans* biofilms [66]. Based on the literature, it was speculated that the activity of studied M. pudica against 24 h old C. albicans biofilm was due to the presence of flavonoids. However, the possible implications of other existing components in the present study are still required to determine the activity. For example, the presence of terpenes or terpenoids in our studied plant might play a role in the antibiofilm activity. Several studies have reported that terpenes showed antifungal [69] and antibiofilm activity [44, 70]. Indeed, work of Spengler et al., 2022 demonstrated the antibiofilm mechanism via efflux pump inhibitory on some bacteria [44].

Regarding the biofilm structure, SEM observations showed that the ethyl-acetate fraction of M. pudica aerial parts (at 62.5 and 125 μ g/mL) influenced the surface morphology of C. albicans cells, and notably, no cytotoxic effect on the Hela and Vero cells evaluated at these concentrations. This finding demonstrated a qualitative correlation between the biofilm observed by microscopy and metabolic activity. After observing the effects of *M. pudica* on the growth of *C. albicans* cells in planktonic and biofilm modes, the possible action of the extract of *M. pudica* aerial parts in inhibiting the secretion of phospholipase enzyme was evaluated. The production of phospholipase enzyme is a fundamental event in the pathogenesis of C. albicans during the adhesion and invasion stages by damaging and penetrating host cell membranes, promoting blastospore hyphal development, etc.. [11, 71]. Our results showed that M. pudica aerial parts reduced phospholipase secretion, but it was only significant at high concentrations. To the best of our knowledge, this was the first study to report the effects of ethanol extract *M. pudica* on phospholipase enzyme.

Conclusions and future directions

The screening of the activity of five invasive plant extracts grown in Indonesia against C. albicans biofilms highlighted the interest in the ethyl acetate fraction of *M. pudica* aerial parts. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to investigate the effects of *M. pudica* on virulence factors, particularly against C. albicans biofilm. Even though ethanol extracts of M. pudica aerial parts and roots showed good antifungal activity, since the main objective of this work was to find antibiofilm compounds, we did not deeply investigate the antifungal potential of those extracts. However, this promising activity encourages further study, starting with testing it on other clinical strains and fungal species of Candida to clarify its spectrum of antifungal activity. Meanwhile, even though flavonoids in the ethyl acetate fraction of M. pudica aerial parts might exert antibiofilm activity, other components cannot be ignored. Thus, some steps can be taken, including 1} chemical characterization should be applied along with the evaluation of antibiofilm activity (bioassay-guided isolation). Therefore, the active pure compound can be determined. Another fast track to determining active pure compound is by 2} using bio-chemometric study, an interdisciplinary research field involving multivariate statistics, mathematical modeling, and computing, and is particularly applied to understanding chemical data, specifically in this term for the antibiofilm activity of bioactive compounds.

Supplementary Information

The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi. org/10.1186/s12906-023-04044-2.

Additional file 1.	
Additional file 2.	

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the facilities, scientific and technical support of the Advanced Characterization Laboratories Serpong, National Research, and Innovation Institute through E- Layanan Sains, Badan Riset dan Inovasi Nasional and Laboratorium Penelitian dan Pengujian Terpadu (LPPT)-Universitas Gadjah Mada. The authors thank Rumbiwati from the Parasitology Department of Universitas Gadjah Mada for her assistance in performing cytotoxic assays.

Authors' contribution

SD performed the experiments; *SD, MM, TN* conceived and designed the experiments; *SD* wrote the articles; *MG, CI, MM, TN* contributed materials tools; *SD, MG, CI, MM, TN* analyzed data. All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Funding

The authors thank the Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education (LPDP, Lembaga Pengelola Dana Pendidikan) and the Final Project Recognition Grant Universitas Gadjah Mada Number 5075/UN1.PII/Dit-Lit/PT.01.01/2023 for financial support.

Availability of data and materials

The data used to support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon request.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The study complies with relevant institutional, national, and international guidelines and legislation for plant ethics. Indeed, this study received approval from Medical and Health Research Ethics Commitee (MHREC)) of the Faculty of Medicine, Publich Health and Nursing, Universitas Gadjah Mada with number reference: KE/FK/0243/EC/2021.

Consent for application

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors have no competing financial interests or close personal ties that might influence the research described in this publication.

Author details

¹Department of Pharmacology, Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Islam Indonesia, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. ²Doctoral Program of Faculty Medicine, Public Health, and Nursing, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. ³Laboratoire Ecologie Et Biologie Des Interactions - UMR CNRS 7267, Université de Poitiers, Poitiers, France. ⁴Department of Pharmacology and Therapy, Faculty of Medicine, Public Health, and Nursing, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. ⁵Indonesia Biofilm Research Collaboration Center UGM-BRIN, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. ⁶Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Medicine, Public Health, and Nursing, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia.

Received: 16 February 2023 Accepted: 18 June 2023 Published online: 12 July 2023

References

- Arshad H, Garcia S, Khaja M. Case report of invasive, disseminated candidiasis with peripheral nodular cavitary lesions in the lung. Respir Med Case Reports. 2017;20:34–7.
- Pappas PG, Lionakis MS, Arendrup MC, Ostrosky-Zeichner L, Kullberg BJ. Invasive candidiasis. Nat Rev Dis Prim. 2018;4(May):1–20. https://doi.org/ 10.1038/nrdp.2018.26.
- Tan BH, Chakrabarti A, Li RY, Patel AK, Watcharananan SP, Liu Z, et al. Incidence and species distribution of candidaemia in Asia: A laboratorybased surveillance study. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2015;21(10):946–53.
- Wahyuningsih R, Adawiyah R, Sjam R, Prihartono J, Ayu Tri Wulandari E, Rozaliyani A, et al. Serious fungal disease incidence and prevalence in Indonesia. Mycoses. 2021;64(10):1203–12.
- Koehler P, Stecher M, Cornely OA, Koehler D, Vehreschild MJGT, Bohlius J, et al. Morbidity and mortality of candidaemia in Europe: an epidemiologic meta-analysis. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2019;25(10):1200–12. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2019.04.024.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Invasive Candidiasis Statistics. 2021 [cited 2022 Feb 17]. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/fungal/ diseases/candidiasis/invasive/statistics.html.
- Chandra J, Kuhn DM, Mukherjee PK, Hoyer LL, McCormick T, Ghannoum MA. Biofilm formation by the fungal pathogen Candida albicans: Development, architecture, and drug resistance. J Bacteriol. 2001;183(18):5385–94.
- Pierce CG, Vila T, Romo JA, Montelongo-Jauregui D, Wall G, Ramasubramanian A, et al. The Candida albicans biofilm matrix: Composition, structure and function. J Fungi. 2017;3(1).
- Hong Y, Zhao J, Guo L, Kim SC, Deng X, Wang G, et al. Plant phospholipases D and C and their diverse functions in stress responses. Prog Lipid Res. 2016;62:55–74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plipres.2016.01.002.
- Udayalaxmi J, Shenoy N. Comparison between biofilm production, phospholipase and haemolytic activity of different species of candida isolated from dental caries lesions in children. J Clin Diagnostic Res. 2016;10(4):DC21-3.

- 11. Ghannoum MA. Potential role of phospholipases in virulence and fungal pathogenesis. Clin Microbiol Rev. 2000;13(1):122–43.
- Barman A, Gohain D, Bora U, Tamuli R. Phospholipases play multiple cellular roles including growth, stress tolerance, sexual development, and virulence in fungi. Microbiol Res. 2018;209(August 2017):55–69. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.micres.2017.12.012.
- Mitchell KF, Zarnowski R, Sanchez H, Edward JA, Reinicke EL, Nett JE, et al. Community participation in biofilm matrix assembly and function. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2015;112(13):4092–7.
- 14. Singh R, Kumari A, Kaur K, Sethi P, Chakrabarti A. Relevance of antifungal penetration in biofilm-associated resistance of Candida albicans and non-albicans Candida species. J Med Microbiol. 2018;67(7):922–6.
- Al-Fattani MA, Douglas LJ. Biofilm matrix of Candida albicans and Candida tropicalis: Chemical composition and role in drug resistance. J Med Microbiol. 2006;55(8):999–1008.
- Balashov SV, Park S, Perlin DS. Assessing resistance to the echinocandin antifungal drug caspofungin in Candida albicans by profiling mutations in FKS1. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2006;50(6):2058–63.
- Park S, Kelly R, Kahn JN, Robles J, Hsu MJ, et al. Specific substitutions in the echinocandin target Fks1p account for reduced susceptibility of rare laboratory and clinical Candida sp. isolates. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2005;49(8):3264–73.
- Ying S, Chunyang L. Correlation between phospholipase of Candida albicans and resistance to fluconazole. Mycoses. 2012;55(1):50–5.
- El-Houssaini HH, Elnabawy OM, Nasser HA, Elkhatib WF. Influence of subinhibitory antifungal concentrations on extracellular hydrolases and biofilm production by Candida albicans recovered from Egyptian patients. BMC Infect Dis. 2019;19(1):1–9.
- Howes MJR, Quave CL, Collemare J, Tatsis EC, Twilley D, Lulekal E, et al. Molecules from nature: Reconciling biodiversity conservation and global healthcare imperatives for sustainable use of medicinal plants and fungi. Plants People Planet. 2020;2(5):463–81.
- 21. Lannone III B V, Bell EC, Carnevale S, Hill JE, Mcconnell J, Main M, et al. Standardized Invasive Species Terminology for Effective Outreach Education 1 Educating Stakeholders about Invasive Species : A Need for Standardized Terms Seven Terms to Use : A Standard Set of Terms to Communicate About Invasive Species across All. 2021;1–8.
- 22. IPBES 2019. IPBES (2019): Summary for policymakers of the global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. Díaz S, Settele J, Brondízio ES, Ngo HT, Guèze M, Agard J, et al., editors. Bonn, Germany: IPBES secretariat; 2019. Available from: https:// ipbes.net/global-assessment
- Menteri Kesehatan RI 2007. Keputusan Menteri Kesehatan Republik Indonesia No : 381/MenKes/SK/III/2007. 2007.
- 24. KLHK. Strategi Nasional dan Arahan Rencana Aksi Pengelolaan Jenis Asing Invasif di Indonesia. 2015. 55 p.
- Samoisy AK, Mahomoodally MF. Ethnopharmacological analysis of medicinal plants used against non-communicable diseases in Rodrigues Island. Indian Ocean J Ethnopharmacol. 2015;173:20–38.
- 26. Ahmad H, Sehgal S, Mishra A, Gupta R. Mimosa pudica L. (Laajvanti): An overview. Pharmacogn Rev. 2012;6(12):115–24.
- Kirimuhuzya C, Waako P, Joloba M, Odyek O. The anti-mycobacterial activity of Lantana camara a plant traditionally used to treat symptoms of tuberculosis in South-western Uganda. Afr Health Sci. 2009;9(1):40–5.
- Deena MJ, Thoppil JE. Antimicrobial activity of the essential oil of Lantana camara. Fitoterapia. 2000;71(4):453–5.
- 29. Verma RK, Verma SK. Phytochemical and termiticidal study of Lantana camara var. aculeata leaves. Fitoterapia. 2006;77(6):466–8.
- Máximo P, Ferreira LM, Branco PS, Lourenço A. Invasive plants: Turning enemies into value. Molecules. 2020;25(15).
- 31. Setyawati T, Narulita S, Bahri IP, Raharjo GT. A Guide Book to Invasive Plant Species in Indonesiae. 2015. 1–440 p.
- Abubakar, Abdullahi R. Haque M. Preparation of Medicinal Plants: Basic Extraction and Fractionation Procedures for Experimental Purposes. J Pharm Bioallied Sci. 2020;12(1):1–10. Available from: https://www.ncbi. nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7398001/
- Ngouana V, Zeuko'O Menkem E, Youmbi DY, Yimgang LV, Toghueo RMK, Boyom FF. Serial Exhaustive Extraction Revealed Antimicrobial and Antioxidant Properties of Platycerium stemaria (Beauv) Desv. Biomed Res Int. 2021;2021.

- Maryuni DR, Prameswari DA, Astari SD, Sari SP, Putri DN. Identification of active compounds in red onion (Allium ascalonicum) peel extract by LC-ESI-QTOF-MS/MS and determination of its antioxidant activity. J Teknol Has Pertan. 2022;15(1):20.
- CLSI. Reference method for broth dilution antifungal susceptibility testing of yeasts: approved standard - third edition. Vol. 28, CLSI document M27-A3. 2008. 1–25 p.
- Premamalini T, Anitha S, Mohanapriya K. Evaluation of 3-(4,5-dimethylthiazol2-yl)-2,5-diphenyl tetrazolium bromide method for assessing biofilm formation in vitro by Trichosporon spp. J Lab Physicians. 2018;10:380–6.
- Prażyńska M, Gospodarek E. In Vitro Effect of Amphotericin B on Candida albicans, Candida glabrata and Candida parapsilosis Biofilm Formation. Mycopathologia. 2014;177(1–2):19–27.
- Pereira JV, Freires IA, Castilho AR, da Cunha MG, Alves H da S, Rosalen PL. Antifungal potential of Sideroxylon obtusifolium and Syzygium cumini and their mode of action against Candida albicans. Pharm Biol. 2016;54(10):2312–9.
- Li X, Yu C, Huang X, Sun S. Synergistic effects and mechanisms of budesonide in combination with fluconazole against resistant candida albicans. PLoS ONE. 2016;11(12):1–20.
- Nugroho AE, Hermawan A, Putri DDP, Novika A, Meiyanto E. Combinational effects of hexane insoluble fraction of Ficus septica Burm. F. and doxorubicin chemotherapy on T47D breast cancer cells. Asian Pac J Trop Biomed. 2013;3(4):297–302.
- Karatt TK, Nalakath J, Perwad Z, Albert PH, Abdul Khader KK, Syed Ali Padusha M, et al. Mass spectrometric method for distinguishing isomers of dexamethasone via fragment mass ratio: An HRMS approach. J Mass Spectrom. 2018;53(11):1046–58.
- 42. Bitencourt TA, Komoto TT, Massaroto BG, Miranda CES, Beleboni RO, Marins M, et al. Trans-chalcone and quercetin down-regulate fatty acid synthase gene expression and reduce ergosterol content in the human pathogenic dermatophyte Trichophyton rubrum. BMC Complement Altern Med. 2013;13.
- Chen L, Shen J, Yan W, Fan L, Cao Y. Study on the antibiofilm activity of kaempferol in Candida albicans. J Pharm Pract. 2020;6:413–7.
- 44. Spengler G, Gajdács M, Donadu MG, Usai M, Marchetti M, Ferrari M, et al. Evaluation of the Antimicrobial and Antivirulent Potential of Essential Oils Isolated from Juniperus oxycedrus L. ssp. macrocarpa Aerial Parts. Microorganisms. 2022;10(4):1–19.
- Li H, Kong Y, Hu W, Zhang S, Wang W, Yang M, et al. Litsea cubeba Essential Oil: Component Analysis, Anti-Candida albicans Activity and Mechanism Based on Molecular Docking. J Oleo Sci. 2022;71(8):1221–8.
- Shafiei SNS, Ahmad K, Fatin Mohd Ikhsan N, Izera Ismail S, Sijam K. Antibacterial Activity of Acacia spp. Leaves Extracts against Xanthomonas oryzae pv. oryzae and Screening for Active Phytochemical Contents. 2017;10(11):49–60.
- 47. Baharuddin NS, Roslan MAM, Bawzer MAM, Mohamad Azzeme A, Rahman ZA, Khayat ME, et al. Response surface optimization of extraction conditions and in vitro antioxidant and antidiabetic evaluation of an under-valued medicinal weed, Mimosa pudica. Plants. 2021;10(8).
- Wado TE, Suleman S, Mohammed T. Antimicrobial Evaluation of Sequentially extracted Leaf of Vernonia auriculifera Hiern (Rejicho). BMC Complement Med Ther. 2022;22(1):1–10.
- Cunha IBS, Sawaya ACHF, Caetano FM, Shimizu MT, Marcucci MC, Drezza FT, et al. Factors that influence the yield and composition of Brazilian propolis extracts. J Braz Chem Soc. 2004;15(6):964–70.
- Mohan G, Doss A, Anand S. Efficacy of Aqueous and Methanol extracts of Caesalpinia sappan L. and Mimosa pudica L. for their potential Antimicrobial activity. South As J Biol Sci. 2011;1(2):48–57.
- Kaur P, Kumar N, Shivananda TN, Kaur G. Phytochemical screening and antibacterial activity of Mimosa pudica L. and Mimosa invisa L. against selected microbes. J Med Plants Res. 2011;5(22):5356–9.
- 52. Shu W-J, Ho J-C. Two New Antimicrobial Diterpenoids from the Roots of Mimosa pudica. Chin Med J (Engl). 2013;24(2):223–9.
- Berkov S, Zayed R, Doncheva T. Alkaloid patterns in some varieties of Datura stramonium. Fitoterapia. 2006;77(3):179–82.
- Evensen NA, Braun PC. The effects of tea polyphenols on Candida albicans: Inhibition of biofilm formation and proteasome inactivation. Can J Microbiol. 2009;55(9):1033–9.

- Luiz RLF, Vila TVM, de Mello JCP, Nakamura CV, Rozental S, Ishida K. Proanthocyanidins polymeric tannin from Stryphnodendron adstringens are active against Candida albicans biofilms. BMC Complement Altern Med. 2015;15(1):1–11.
- Sanches ACC, Lopes GC, Nakamura CV, Dias Filho BP, De Mello JCP. Antioxidant and antifungal activities of extracts and condensed tannins from Stryphnodendron obovatum Benth. Rev Bras Ciencias Farm J Pharm Sci. 2005;41(1):101–7.
- de Morais CB, Scopel M, Pedrazza GPR, da Silva FK, Dalla Lana DF, Tonello ML, et al. Anti-dermatophyte activity of Leguminosae plants from Southern Brazil with emphasis on Mimosa pigra (Leguminosae). J Mycol Med. 2017;27(4):530–8. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.mycmed.2017.07.006
- 58. Panche AN, Diwan AD, Chandra SR. Flavonoids: An overview. J Nutr Sci. 2016;5.
- Yun J, Lee H, Ko HJ, Woo ER, Lee DG. Fungicidal effect of isoquercitrin via inducing membrane disturbance. Biochim Biophys Acta - Biomemb. 2015;1848(2):695–701. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbamem.2014.11.019.
- Sapkota BK, Khadayat K, Aryal B, Bashyal J, Jaisi S, Parajuli N. LC-HRMS-Based Profiling: Antibacterial and Lipase Inhibitory Activities of Some Medicinal Plants for the Remedy of Obesity. Sci Pharm. 2022;90(3):55.
- Yusof UK, Abdullah F, Abdullah N, Itam K, Bakar B, Sukari M. Chemotaxonomic survey of Malaysian Mimosa species. Sains Malaysiana. 2003;32:121–9.
- Lobstein A, Weniger B, Um BH, Steinmetz M, Declercq L, Anton R. 4"-Hydroxymaysin and cassiaoccidentalin B, two unusual C-glycosylflavones from Mimosa pudica (Mimosaceae). Biochem Syst Ecol. 2002;30(4):375–7.
- Özçelik B, Kartal M, Orhan I. Cytotoxicity, antiviral and antimicrobial activities of alkaloids, flavonoids, and phenolic acids. Pharm Biol. 2011;49(4):396–402.
- Da Silva Sa FA, De Paula JAM, Dos Santos PA, Oliveira LDAR, Oliveira GDAR, Liao LM, et al. Phytochemical analysis and antimicrobial activity of Myrcia tomentosa (Aubl.) DC. leaves. Molecules. 2017;22(7):1–10.
- Rocha MFG, Sales JA, da Rocha MG, Galdino LM, de Aguiar L, Pereira-Neto WA, et al. Antifungal effects of the flavonoids kaempferol and quercetin: a possible alternative for the control of fungal biofilms. Biofouling. 2019;35(3):320–8. https://doi.org/10.1080/08927014.2019.1604948.
- 66. Ivanov M, Kannan A, Stojković DS, Glamočlija J, Calhelha RC, Ferreira ICFR, et al. Flavones, flavonols, and glycosylated derivatives—impact on candida albicans growth and virulence, expression of cdr1 and erg11, cytotoxicity. Pharmaceuticals. 2021;14(1):1–12.
- Kwun MS, Lee DG. Quercetin-induced yeast apoptosis through mitochondrial dysfunction under the accumulation of magnesium in Candida albicans. Fungal Biol. 2020;124(2):83–90. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.funbio. 2019.11.009.
- Kavya B, Nagaraj NJ, Madhubala MM, Mahalaxmi S. Antibiofilm Efficacy of Mimosa pudica against Clinical Isolates of Streptococcus mutans as a Mouthrinse. World J Dent. 2022;13(6):582–6.
- Cavaleiro C, Pinto E, Gonçalves MJ, Salgueiro L. Antifungal activity of Juniperus essential oils against dermatophyte, Aspergillus and Candida strains. J Appl Microbiol. 2006;100(6):1333–8.
- Lemos ASO, Florêncio JR, Pinto NCC, Campos LM, Silva TP, Grazul RM, et al. Antifungal Activity of the Natural Coumarin Scopoletin Against Planktonic Cells and Biofilms From a Multidrug-Resistant Candida tropicalis Strain. Front Microbiol. 2020;11(July):1–11.
- Dalle F, Wächtler B, L'Ollivier C, Holland G, Bannert N, Wilson D, et al. Cellular interactions of Candida albicans with human oral epithelial cells and enterocytes. Cell Microbiol. 2010;12(2):248–71.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Ready to submit your research? Choose BMC and benefit from:

- fast, convenient online submission
- thorough peer review by experienced researchers in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- support for research data, including large and complex data types
- gold Open Access which fosters wider collaboration and increased citations
- maximum visibility for your research: over 100M website views per year

At BMC, research is always in progress.

Learn more biomedcentral.com/submissions

