Selection of nerolidol among a series of terpenic and phenolic compounds for its potent activity against *Lactobacillus fermentum* ATCC 9338

Elissa Ephrem, Amal Najjar, Catherine Charcosset, Hélène Greige-Gerges

► To cite this version:

Elissa Ephrem, Amal Najjar, Catherine Charcosset, Hélène Greige-Gerges. Selection of nerolidol among a series of terpenic and phenolic compounds for its potent activity against *Lactobacillus fermentum* ATCC 9338. *Process Biochemistry*, 2019, 80, pp.146-156. 10.1016/j.procbio.2019.02.015 . hal-03033836

HAL Id: hal-03033836

<https://hal.science/hal-03033836>

Submitted on 8 Dec 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Selection of nerolidol among a series of terpenic and phenolic compounds for its potent activity against *Lactobacillus fermentum* ATCC 9338

Elissa Ephrem^{a,b}, Amal Najjar^a, Catherine Charcosset^b, Hélène Greige-Gerges^{a,*}

^a Bioactive Molecules Research Laboratory, Faculty of Sciences, Lebanese University, B.P. 90656 Jdaidet El-Matn, Lebanon.

^b Laboratoire d'Automatique et de Génie des Procédés, Université Claude Bernard Lyon I, France, 43 Boulevard du 11 Novembre 1918, Bâtiment CPE 69 622, Villeurbanne Cedex, France.

*Corresponding author: Faculty of Sciences, Bioactive Molecules Research Laboratory, Lebanese University, B.P. 90656 Jdaidet El-Matn, Lebanon.

Tel.: +961 3 341011; Fax: +961 1 689647

E-mail addresses: greigegeorges@yahoo.com, hgreige@ul.edu.lb (Hélène Greige-Gerges).

21

22 **Abstract**

23 Essential oil components are widely used for their antibacterial activity against spoilage
24 microorganisms in food. *Lactobacillus fermentum* is a Gram-positive lactic acid bacteria
25 responsible for the deterioration of various food products, including beverages and dairy
26 products. In this study, 17 terpenic and 11 phenolic compounds were screened against the food
27 spoilage microorganism *Lactobacillus fermentum* ATCC 9338. The antibacterial activity of the
28 tested compounds was dependent on hydrophobicity and particular chemical features. Nerolidol
29 solubilized in dimethylsulfoxide exhibited the highest antibacterial activity and showed low
30 minimal inhibitory (MIC: 25 μ M) and minimal bactericidal (MBC: 50 μ M) concentrations.
31 Moreover, no viable cells were detected within 16 h of incubation at 50 μ M. The important
32 antibacterial activity of nerolidol against *L. fermentum* is probably related to the high
33 hydrophobicity, the aliphatic chain length, and the presence of the hydroxyl group.
34 Hydroxypropyl- β -cyclodextrin/nerolidol inclusion complex showed MIC and MBC values of
35 100 and 200 μ M, respectively. The total bacterial kill was observed after 12 h of incubation. The
36 results obtained with the inclusion complex are probably due to the time required to allow
37 nerolidol to be released from the inclusion complex.

38 **Keywords:** Cyclodextrins; *Lactobacillus fermentum*; nerolidol; phenolic compounds; terpenes.

39 **List of abbreviations:** CFU: colony forming unit; DMSO: dimethylsulfoxide; HP- β -CD:
40 hydroxypropyl- β -cyclodextrin; HPLC: high performance liquid chromatography; LAB: lactic
41 acid bacteria; MBC: minimal bactericidal concentration; MIC: minimal inhibitory concentration;
42 Ner: nerolidol.

44 1. Introduction

45 *Lactobacillus fermentum* is an ubiquitous Gram-positive, rod-shaped, anaerobic, thermo-
46 acidophilic lactic acid bacteria (LAB), which can originate from plants, animals, meat, dairies,
47 fruits, and cereals. *L. fermentum* is an obligate heterofermentative bacteria which ferments
48 various types of sugars (lactose, fructose, maltose, sucrose) under anaerobic conditions. In
49 addition to lactic acid, *L. fermentum* produces acetic acid, ethanol, carbon dioxide, and minor by-
50 products, such as diacetyl, hydrogen peroxide, and different alcohols (e.g. 3-methylbutanol),
51 esters (e.g. ethyl acetate), and carbonyls (e.g. nonanal) compounds. *L. fermentum* is not harmful
52 to humans and its presence is necessary for the fermentation of different food products, including
53 sourdough, cocoa, and certain beverages. Certain *L. fermentum* strains are probiotic agents and
54 express outstanding health-promoting characteristics when consumed [1]. Nonstarter lactic acid
55 bacteria, including *L. fermentum*, cause defects in certain food products, such as slits or cracks in
56 hard cheeses, lack of flavors, or bloated packaging in dairy products [2–4]. *L. fermentum* also
57 spoils various types of beverages and can grow in fruit juice, leading to the production of
58 undesirable compounds [5–9]. It is one of the LABs responsible for the desired malolactic
59 fermentation in wine, resulting in the conversion of malic acid into lactic acid, acetate, succinate,
60 and carbon dioxide [10]. However, the presence of LABs could lead to wine spoilage as the
61 control of bacterial growth and malolactic fermentation is difficult to achieve, thus altering the
62 wine organoleptic properties [10–12]. The growth of heterofermentative LABs (such as *L.*
63 *fermentum*) in wine causes an increased acidity, cloudiness, and mousy odor [13]. On the other
64 hand, *L. fermentum* can grow in beer, as it is resistant to hop-compounds [14], leading to beer
65 spoilage [14,15] and aroma alteration [14].

66 Different strategies have been adopted to overcome the microbial spoilage of food, including the
67 addition of chemical additives and physical treatments. Physical treatments include various
68 preservation techniques, such as thermal, ultraviolet light, ultrasound, pulsed electric field, and
69 high hydrostatic pressure technologies [16]. However, the application of these treatments is
70 limited due to changes in the organoleptic properties of the food product [17–19] and sometimes
71 due to high cost [20]. On the other hand, chemical preservatives used against food microbial
72 spoilage, including benzoates, sorbates, propionates, nitrates, and nitrites, can cause allergic
73 responses and could be converted to potential carcinogens [21]. The high demand of fresh and
74 “safe” food, free of synthetic additives and contaminants, have increased the interest of using
75 natural products for food preservation. Natural antimicrobials may derive from plants, animals,
76 and microorganisms. Plant essential oils are largely exploited due to their wide spectrum of
77 antimicrobial activity against spoilage bacteria and food-borne pathogens [22]. Plant
78 antimicrobials include different chemical classes, among which are saponins, tannins, flavonoids,
79 terpenes, simple phenols, and phenolic acids [23,24].

80 The majority of natural antimicrobials are hydrophobic and poorly stable, which limit their use in
81 aqueous media. Solvents, such as dimethylsulfoxide (DMSO) [25], dimethylformamide [26], and
82 ethanol [27, 28], are used to dissolve hydrophobic compounds in aqueous solutions. However,
83 the use of organic solvents in food products is not desirable. Various encapsulation systems
84 (nanoemulsions, liposomes, nanoparticles, solid lipid nanoparticles, cyclodextrins, etc.) were
85 introduced to the food industry as a novel strategy to overcome the poor water solubility of food
86 antimicrobials and to enhance their stability in food matrices [29,30]. Cyclodextrins are natural
87 oligosaccharides widely used in food products for their safety and their ability to deliver
88 hydrophobic compounds (e.g. antioxidants, antimicrobials, etc.) [31]. Moreover, different

derivatives of cyclodextrin have been synthesized to enhance the aqueous solubility of native cyclodextrins [32].

The objective of this study is to select a natural potent antibacterial agent against *L. fermentum*.

The selected antibacterial is then complexed with hydroxypropyl- β -cyclodextrin (HP- β -CD) and the obtained inclusion complex is tested against the chosen bacterium in culture medium.

Therefore, a wide range of terpenic and phenolic phytochemicals was screened against the bacterium, under its optimal growth conditions. The tested compounds belong to different subclasses and possess variable structures. Seventeen terpenes were tested, among which eight monoterpene hydrocarbons (camphene, *p*-cymene, limonene, α -phellandrene, α -pinene, β -pinene, α -terpinene, γ -terpinene), a sesquiterpene hydrocarbon (β -caryophyllene), four monoterpene alcohols (borneol, geraniol, linalool, menthol), a sesquiterpene alcohol (nerolidol), two monoterpene esters (bornyl acetate, linalyl acetate), and a monoterpene ketone (camphor) (Fig. 1). In addition, eleven phenols were tested, among which four phenylpropenes (*trans*-anethole, eugenol, isoeugenol, estragole), a phenylpropene ester (eugenyl acetate), two hydroxycinnamic acids (*p*-coumaric acid, *trans*-ferulic acid), a phenol ether (anisole), a methylphenol (*o*-cresol), a flavonoid (quercetin), and a stilbenoid (resveratrol) (Fig. 2).

Nerolidol (Ner) showed the most potent antibacterial activity against *L. fermentum* among the 28 tested compounds. The potency of nerolidol solubilized in DMSO and hydroxypropyl- β -cyclodextrin/nerolidol (HP- β -CD/Ner) complex was assessed against *L. fermentum* by determining the minimal inhibitory concentration (MIC) and the minimal bactericidal concentration (MBC) values under the optimal conditions for *L. fermentum* growth. The time required for both forms of nerolidol to cause a total bacterial kill was determined by time-kill analysis.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Materials

β -Caryophyllene, geraniol, isoeugenol (98% mixture *cis* and *trans*), nerolidol (98%, mixture of *cis* (40%) and *trans* (60%) isomers), (-)- β -pinene, ethanol, and DMSO were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (Missouri, United States). *trans*-Anethole (99%) and linalyl acetate were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (Madrid, Spain). Anisole, camphene, *o*-cresol, eugenol, eugenyl acetate, (-)-menthol, and α -phellandrene were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (Schnelldorf, Germany). (-)-Borneol, (-)-bornyl acetate, *p*-cymene, (R)-(t)-limonene, linalool, (+)- α -pinene, α -terpinene, and γ -terpinene were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (Buchs, Switzerland). ($\pm$)-Camphor and *trans*-ferulic acid were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (Hong Kong, China). Quercetin was purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (Haryana, India). *p*-Coumaric acid was purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (Irvine, United kingdom). Hydroxypropyl- β -cyclodextrin was purchased from Wacker-Chemie (Lyon, France). De Man, Rogosa, and Sharpe (MRS) broth and MRS agar were purchased from Laboratorios Conda (Madrid, Spain).

2.2. Bacterial strain and culture

L. fermentum ATCC 9338 was purchased from American Type Culture Collection (Manassas, Virginia, USA). *L. fermentum* cultures were routinely maintained at 4 °C on MRS agar. Before each antimicrobial assay, fresh cultures were prepared in sterile MRS broth and incubated at 37 °C for 22 h under anaerobic conditions. A bacterial suspension was prepared by diluting the bacterial culture in MRS broth to a final concentration of 25×10^5 colony forming unit (CFU)/ml.

2.3. Screening of natural terpenic and phenolic compounds for antibacterial activity

2.3.1. Screening rounds

Twenty-eight natural terpenic and phenolic compounds were screened for their antibacterial activity against *L. fermentum* at 3500, 500, 250, and 100 μ M. The tested molecules were dissolved in DMSO, except β -caryophyllene and camphene which were dissolved in ethanol, and the obtained solutions were homogenized by hand agitation prior to each test. Antibacterial agent solutions (25 μ l) were mixed with MRS broth (4.8 ml) in glass culture tubes (20 x 100 mm). The tubes were then inoculated with 200 μ l of a diluted *L. fermentum* suspension (25×10^5 CFU/ml) to yield a bacterial concentration of 10^5 CFU/ml at baseline. Bacterial cultures (5 ml) exempt of any agent, or containing 25 μ l of DMSO or ethanol, served as controls. All cultures were incubated at 37 °C for 22 h under anaerobic conditions. Screening rounds were conducted with bioactive compounds at 3500, 500, and 250 μ M, successively. After each screening round, molecules demonstrating an anti-proliferative activity against *L. fermentum* at a given concentration were identified. Whereas, compounds demonstrating a bactericidal effect against *L. fermentum* were selected for another screening round at a lower concentration. The compounds exhibiting a total bactericidal activity or a total anti-proliferative activity against *L. fermentum* at 250 μ M were screened at 100 μ M. Each test was performed in triplicate and under sterile conditions.

2.3.2. Determination of the anti-proliferative activity of molecules

The anti-proliferative activity of the molecules against *L. fermentum* was assessed by UV-visible spectroscopy at 660 nm using Uviline 9100-9400 spectrophotometer (GmbH, Germany). The optical density of each tube was measured and compared to the control. The percentage of bacterial proliferation inhibition was calculated as follows:

$$\text{Bacterial proliferation inhibition (\%)} = 100 \times \left[1 - \frac{OD_{660m}}{OD_{660c}} \right],$$

where OD_{660m} and OD_{660c} are the optical densities of the tubes containing the molecule and the control tube, respectively. Each test was done in triplicate.

2.3.3. Determination of the bactericidal activity of the natural molecules

Cultures showing a total inhibition of bacterial proliferation were analyzed in duplicate by spreading an aliquot of 100 μ l on MRS agar. The bacterial concentration in the control was determined by enumeration. The bactericidal capacity was then evaluated according to the decrease in the initial bacterial concentration and calculated as follows:

$$\text{Bacterial kill (\%)} = 100 \times \left[1 - \frac{[bac]_m}{[bac]_c} \right],$$

where $[bac]_m$ and $[bac]_c$ are the bacterial concentrations in the tube containing the molecule and the control tube, respectively.

2.4. Preparation of HP- β -CD/Ner inclusion complex

HP- β -CD/Ner inclusion complex was prepared by freeze-drying, as previously described by Azzi et al. [33]. Briefly, an aqueous solution of HP- β -CD (25 mM) containing an excess of nerolidol was kept under magnetic stirring at 300 rpm for 24 h at room temperature. The suspension was then filtered (0.45 μ m, cellulose acetate membrane) to remove the excess of nerolidol. The filtrate was frozen at -80 °C, and lyophilized. HP- β -CD/Ner complex in powder form was stored at 4 °C until usage. The amount of nerolidol encapsulated in the cyclodextrin cavity was determined by HPLC as described previously by Azzi et al. [33], and the result was expressed as mass of nerolidol (μ g) per mg of powder (μ g_{Ner}/mg_{powder}).

2.5. Study of the antibacterial activity of nerolidol and HP- β -CD/Ner complex

2.5.1. Determination of MIC and MBC values

Bacterial cultures were prepared as previously described in section 2.3.1, in presence of nerolidol dissolved in DMSO, and added at a final concentration ranging from 0.1 to 3500 μ M. The MIC was determined as the minimal concentration at which no bacterial growth was observed in MRS broth, whereas the MBC was determined as the minimal concentration at which no bacterial growth was observed on agar. Each experiment was performed in triplicate and under sterile conditions. On the other hand, HP- β -CD was investigated for its capacity to replace DMSO for nerolidol solubilization in aqueous solution. The inclusion complex was tested at a final concentrations of nerolidol ranging between 50 and 4000 μ M. Bacterial cultures (5 ml) exempt of any agent, or containing DMSO (25 μ l) or blank HP- β -CD added in similar amounts to that of the inclusion complex, served as controls.

2.5.2. Time-kill analysis

Time-kill assay was performed in triplicate on nerolidol and HP- β -CD/Ner complex. Cultures were prepared as described in section 2.3.1. Nerolidol solubilized in DMSO and the complex were added to cultures at their respective MBC values. Starting from an initial bacterial concentration of 10^5 CFU/ml (5 log CFU/ml), bacterial growth was followed during 22 h in cultures maintained at 37 °C under anaerobic conditions. The viable plate count was determined at different time intervals using the spread plate method [34]. Therefore, 100 μ l of samples with appropriate dilutions was spread on MRS agar. The plates were incubated under *L. fermentum* optimal growth conditions for 22 h. The colonies were then counted and the bacterial concentration was determined.

2.6. Statistical Analysis

Statistical analysis was performed using the Student T test. *P* values equal or less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

3. Results

3.1. Antibacterial activity of terpenic and phenolic compounds

Terpenic compounds exhibited a significantly higher antibacterial activity against *L. fermentum* compared to phenolic compounds, with α -terpinene being the only exception. In fact at 3500 μ M, 16 among the 17 tested terpenes were bactericidal, whereas α -terpinene strongly inhibited the proliferation of *L. fermentum* (89.1%) (Table 1). Eugenol and its ester derivative eugenyl acetate were the only phenolic compounds exhibiting a strong bactericidal activity against *L. fermentum* at 3500 μ M. Indeed, eugenol and eugenyl acetate exhibited a bactericidal activity of 100% and 95%, respectively, within 22 h of incubation at 37 °C under anaerobic conditions (Table 2). Among the phenolic compounds, *trans*-anethole, estragole, and isoeugenol showed a significant anti-proliferative activity against *L. fermentum* at the highest concentration (3500 μ M), where bacterial growth inhibition was higher than 88% (Table 2). At this concentration, *p*-coumaric acid, *trans*-ferulic acid, and anisole showed a weak bacterial growth inhibition of 21.9, 17.3, and 16.1%, respectively (Table 2). Whereas, quercetin, *o*-cresol, and resveratrol possessed no antibacterial activity against *L. fermentum* (Table 2). In fact, quercetin and resveratrol were insoluble in MRS at this concentration, which was marked by their strong precipitation.

The stronger antibacterial property of terpenes compared to phenolic compounds was highlighted by the strong bactericidal and anti-proliferative effect of different studied terpenes at 500 μ M. Indeed, at this concentration, the two phenolic compounds, eugenol and eugenyl acetate, showed no antibacterial activity against *L. fermentum* (Table 2). On the other hand, β -pinene, bornyl

acetate, linalyl acetate, and nerolidol exhibited a total bactericidal activity at 500 μ M (Table 1). Camphene, *p*-cymene, limonene, α -phellandrene, α -pinene, and γ -terpinene showed a total inhibition of *L. fermentum* proliferation but were not bactericidal (Table 1). Furthermore, β -caryophyllene, geraniol, and menthol showed a bacterial inhibition percentage higher than 75%, compared to control, whereas borneol demonstrated a weak anti-proliferative activity (28.5%) (Table 1). However, linalool and camphor, which exhibited a bactericidal activity against *L. fermentum* at 3500 μ M, showed no antibacterial activity at 500 μ M (Table 1).

When β -pinene, bornyl acetate, linalyl acetate, and nerolidol were tested at 250 μ M, nerolidol was the only compound exhibiting a bactericidal activity (100%) (Table 1). Whereas, β -pinene, bornyl acetate, and linalyl acetate showed a strong anti-proliferative activity against *L. fermentum* at 250 μ M, as no bacterial growth was observed in MRS broth within 22 h of incubation (Table 1). Nerolidol maintained a strong bactericidal activity (100%) against *L. fermentum* at 100 μ M, whereas, β -pinene strongly inhibited bacterial proliferation (~91%), and bornyl acetate and linalyl acetate showed no antibacterial activity (Table 1). Thus, among the 28 tested compounds, nerolidol was retained for further studies as it was the most effective studied compound against *L. fermentum*.

3.2. Antibacterial activity of nerolidol

Nerolidol was the only molecule that exhibits a bactericidal activity against *L. fermentum* at a low concentration (100 μ M) (Tables 1 and 2). Therefore, the study was taken further to determine the MIC and MBC values of nerolidol. Nerolidol exhibited a strong antibacterial activity against *L. fermentum* with low MIC (25 μ M; 5.56 mg/l) and MBC (50 μ M; 11.12 mg/l) values. Moreover, *L. fermentum* survival was approximately 1% at a nerolidol concentration of

35 μ M. However, the adopted MBC was 50 μ M, as no bacterial growth was observed at this concentration.

The antibacterial activity profile (bactericidal or bacteriostatic) of nerolidol was evaluated using the MBC to MIC ratio. The *in vitro* antimicrobial activity of nerolidol can be described as bactericidal as the MBC to MIC ratio (MBC/MIC= 2) is lower than 4 [35].

3.3. Antibacterial activity of HP- β -CD/Ner complex

The amount of nerolidol in the freeze-dried inclusion complex, determined by HPLC, was 40 μ g_{Ner}/mg_{powder}. The antibacterial activity of HP- β -CD/Ner complex was investigated for the first time against *L. fermentum* in culture medium under the optimal conditions for bacterial growth. HP- β -CD without nerolidol had no effect on the bacterial growth (data not shown). The MIC and MBC values of HP- β -CD/Ner against *L. fermentum* were 100 and 200 μ M, respectively. At 50 μ M, a 4 log increment was observed in the bacterial concentration within 22 h of incubation (data not shown).

3.4. Nerolidol and HP- β -CD/Ner complex time-kill analysis

A time-kill analysis was conducted to determine the time required to achieve a total bacterial kill in presence of nerolidol solubilized in DMSO at 50 μ M and HP- β -CD/Nero complex at 200 μ M (MBC). Free nerolidol exhibited a bactericidal activity against *L. fermentum* within the first few hours of incubation (Fig. 3). Indeed, a 1.44 log reduction of *L. fermentum* concentration was observed within 4 h of incubation. The bacterial concentration continued to decrease over time, as a 2.82 log reduction was obtained after 10 h. At 16 h of incubation, no viable cells were observed.

In presence of HP- β -CD/Ner complex (200 μ M), the bacterial concentration decreased by 1.22 log and 2.44 log after 4 and 10 h, respectively, and a total bacterial death was obtained within 12 h (Fig. 3).

4. Discussion

4.1. Antibacterial efficiency of nerolidol

Plants produce a wide range of antimicrobial agents highly desired by consumers due to their natural origin. However, many of these antimicrobials are only effective at high concentrations (for example at millimolar range), thus exhibiting a weak activity compared to common antibiotics [36]. In this study, nerolidol exhibited the highest antibacterial activity among the 28 tested terpenic and phenolic compounds. The outstanding antibacterial potency of nerolidol against *L. fermentum* was marked by the low MIC (25 μ M; 5.56 mg/l) and MBC (50 μ M; 11.12 mg/l) values, as well as the rapid bactericidal activity (Fig. 3). This compound acts by disrupting and by damaging the bacterial cell membrane, and by interfering with genes responsible for the microbe pathogenicity [37]. Besides, Brehm-Stecher and Johnson [27] demonstrated the permeabilizing effect of nerolidol on *L. fermentum* membrane. The permeabilization of the bacterial membrane leads to the leakage of the cytoplasmic molecules, thus causing cell lysis [38]. Also, the disruption of the bacterial membrane would allow the permeation of exogenous molecules into the bacterial cytoplasm [27]. Moreover, Brehm-Stecher and Johnson [27] suggested that the permeabilizing activity of nerolidol may be due to its structural resemblance to the lipids of the bacterial membrane. This was previously highlighted by Cornwell and Barry [39] which attributed the enhancement of skin penetration by nerolidol to its long hydrocarbon tail which promotes the interaction of the molecule with the interior of the cell bilayer.

Nerolidol is a sesquiterpene alcohol widely used in the food industry as a flavoring agent. It demonstrated a potent antimicrobial activity against some fungi, in addition to different Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacterial strains, such as *Staphylococcus aureus* (MIC: 3.9 mg/l; 50 mg/l) [26,40,41], *Streptococcus mutans*, *Propionibacterium acnes* (MIC: 25 mg/l) [26], *Salmonella enterica* (MIC: 15.6 mg/l) [41], *Trichophyton mentagrophytes* (MIC: 12.5 mg/l) [26], and *Aspergillus niger* (15.6 mg/l) [41]. On the other hand, nerolidol was able to enhance the susceptibility of *S. aureus* and *Escherichia coli* to antibiotics, including ciprofloxacin, erythromycin, gentamicin, vancomycin [42], and amoxicilline/clavulanic acid [43]. In this study, nerolidol antibacterial potency against *L. fermentum* (MIC: 25 μ M; 5.56 mg/l) was weaker than that of gentamicin [44] and chloramphenicol [45], and close to that of novobiocin [46] and N-alkyldimethylbenzyl ammonium chloride [47] (Table 3). On the other hand, *L. fermentum* strains were less sensitive to well-known antibiotics including vancomycin [45,48], teicoplanin [45], streptomycin [44,45,48], erythromycin, tobramycin, clindamycin, kanamycin, polymixin B [44,46,48], metronidazole, and nitrofurantoin [49] (Table 3).

4.2. Antibacterial assay of HP- β -CD/Ner complex

Cyclodextrin inclusion complexes have been widely studied for their capacity to enhance the stability and solubility of antimicrobials [28,50,51].

Some studies reported similar antibacterial activities of free and complexed antimicrobials (e.g. clarithromycin, chlorogenic acid, peptide CM4) [28,50,52], while others proved modifications of the potency of the antimicrobial agent following complexation with cyclodextrins. Compared to the free form, the inclusion complex of *Hyptis martiusii* essential oil [53] and coriander essential oil [51] showed a lower antimicrobial activity, whereas that of carvacrol showed a higher antimicrobial activity [54].

The incorporation of nerolidol into HP- β -CD inclusion complex increased the MIC and MBC values by 4 fold. Azzi et al. [33] studied the release of nerolidol from the inclusion complex in water and at room temperature by dialysis. Around 45% of nerolidol were released from HP- β -CD/Ner complex within 8 h, followed by a slow release rate over 7 days [33]. In fact, when HP- β -CD/Ner complex is added at 50 μ M, the actual concentration of nerolidol interacting with *L. fermentum* in MRS is significantly lower than 50 μ M during the whole experiment, thus explaining the ability of the inoculated bacteria to proliferate (data not shown). However, at 200 μ M the concentration of nerolidol in the culture medium should be approximately 100 μ M after 8 to 10 h of incubation, which could explain the rapid drop in the bacterial concentration (Fig. 3). The slow release and the photo-protection of nerolidol provided by the encapsulation systems [33] would prevent and limit the proliferation of spoilage bacteria in food products.

4.3. Relationship between the antibacterial activity of terpenic and phenolic compounds and their structural and physicochemical parameters

Various parameters may modulate the activity of antibacterial agents, including the drug hydrophobicity, the presence of functional groups, the bacterial cell envelope characteristics, and the incubation conditions (for instance, aeration).

4.3.1. The influence of hydrophobicity on the antibacterial activity of molecules

It has been reported that molecules with high hydrophobicity exhibit a high affinity to the lipophilic structures in the target microorganisms, such as the bacterial membrane [55]. Therefore, they may disrupt the membrane integrity, thus affecting membrane permeability and enzymes activity [55]. However, many exceptions could be revealed from this work, which suggests that the hydrophobicity is not always the key parameter governing the antibacterial

activity; and some structural features could be taken into consideration when analyzing the structure-antibacterial activity relationship.

Nerolidol, which has shown the strongest antibacterial activity against *L. fermentum*, has a LogP value (5.33-5.36) considerably higher than that of the other tested molecules, except β -caryophyllene (6.87) (Table 1). The latter, showed a modest antibacterial activity against *L. fermentum* as it lost its bactericidal potential at 500 μ M (Table 1). In fact, β -caryophyllene have been found to exhibit a weak antibacterial activity against different Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria [56].

On the other hand, the antibacterial potency of the compounds exhibiting an antibacterial activity at a concentration lower than 500 μ M was influenced by hydrophobicity (Table 1). Indeed, β -pinene showed a higher antibacterial activity than the less hydrophobic molecules, bornyl acetate and linalyl acetate (Table 1). The acetylation of linalool and borneol increased their hydrophobicity and their antibacterial activity (Table 1). Indeed, bornyl acetate and linalyl acetate retained their total anti-proliferative activity at 250 μ M, whereas borneol and linalool lost partially and totally the activity at 500 μ M, respectively (Table 1). Similarly, Knobloch et al. [57] reported a higher inhibition of H^+ -translocation by linalyl acetate, compared to linalool. Also, Dorman and Deans [58] observed a higher antibacterial activity of bornyl acetate compared to borneol against a wide range of bacterial strains, among which *Lactobacillus plantarum*. Moreover, phenolic compounds with LogP values close to or lower than 2, such as anisole (2.11) and *o*-cresol (1.95-1.98), showed no or a weak antibacterial activity against *L. fermentum* (Table 2).

Acyclic monoterpenoids showed an increased antibacterial activity with the increment of their LogP value. Indeed, linalyl acetate showed a higher antibacterial activity than geraniol, which

was more potent than linalool (Table 1). This was also observed for bicyclic monoterpenes, as borneol and camphor had the lowest LogP values, and showed the weakest antibacterial activities (Table 1). However, despite β -pinene not being the most hydrophobic compound in the bicyclic monoterpenes chemical class, it exhibited the strongest antibacterial activity (Table 1).

For monocyclic monoterpenes, limonene, α -phelladrene, and γ -terpinene, having higher LogP values than menthol, showed a stronger antibacterial activity (Table 1). α -Terpinene was found to be an exception as it showed the weakest antibacterial potency, despite a high LogP value (Table 1).

4.3.2. Structure-activity analysis of terpenic compounds

Different studies have demonstrated the role of terpenoid functional groups in the antimicrobial activity. Carvacrol showed a better antimicrobial activity compared to its derivatives, carvacrol methyl ether and *p*-cymene, which lack the hydroxyl group [58]. On the other hand, Kotan et al. [59] reported a better antibacterial activity for alcohol derivatives of oxygenated monoterpenes, when compared to ketone and acetate derivatives.

The weak antibacterial activity of β -caryophyllene, despite its high hydrophobicity, may be due to the absence of a hydrophilic functional group in the chemical structure of the molecule. The combination of a lipophilic character of the skeleton and the presence of a hydrophilic functional group was found to be important for the antimicrobial activity of essential oils components [60].

The structural features of nerolidol are in line with the previous findings. Indeed, the antibacterial activity of aliphatic terpene alcohols was demonstrated to be dependent on the hydrophobic chain length starting from the carbon connected to the hydroxyl group [38,61]. In fact, farnesol (C_{12}) exhibited a stronger antibacterial activity than nerolidol (C_{10}) followed by geraniol (C_8), whereas linalool (C_6) showed no antibacterial activity against *Staphylococcus*

aureus [61]. Similarly, Togashi et al. [38] reported a very weak antibacterial activity of geraniol and linalool against *S. aureus*. Additionally, farnesol (C₁₂), nerolidol (C₁₀), and plaunotol (C₁₁), showed a strong antibacterial activity against *S. aureus*, in that order [38,62]. Also, no or weak antibacterial activity against *S. aureus* was reported for alcohols with chains containing more than 12 carbon atoms like farnesylacetol (C₁₄) [61], geranylgeraniol, and phytol (C₁₆) [38]. Therefore, to exhibit a potent antibacterial effect, the authors suggested that the chain, starting from the hydroxyl group, should contain from 10 to 12 carbon atoms [38], or less than 12 carbon atoms but as close to 12 as possible [61]. Although the previous studies were conducted on *S. aureus*, our study supports the pattern of the antibacterial activity of terpene alcohols against *L. fermentum*. Indeed, nerolidol (C₁₀; sesquiterpene) exhibited a stronger antibacterial activity than geraniol (C₈; monoterpene), the latter being more potent than linalool (C₆; monoterpene) (Table 1).

4.3.3. Structure-activity analysis of phenolic compounds

The importance of the propenyl side chain was noted among the tested phenolic compounds, as eugenol, *trans*-anethole, isoeugenol, and estragole, showed a significantly higher antibacterial activity against *L. fermentum* compared to anisole (Table 2). The propenyl side chain is absent in anisole compared to eugenol, *trans*-anethole, isoeugenol, and estragole (Fig. 2), which could be the reason for the weaker antibacterial activity of anisole.

On the other hand, eugenol showed the highest antibacterial activity among the tested phenolic compounds against the Gram-positive bacterium *L. fermentum*. However, Gharib et al. [63] reported a higher antibacterial activity for anethole and estragole compared to eugenol, against the Gram-negative bacterium *Escherichi coli*. Indeed, the hydrophobicity of the compound seemed to play a role in the potency of the antibacterial activity against *E. coli*, as anethole and

estragole have a higher hydrophobicity than eugenol [63] (Table 2). Whereas, the hydrophobicity of phenylpropenes did not seem to influence their antibacterial activity against the Gram-positive bacterium, *L. fermentum*. Therefore, our results strongly suggest the presence of other factors that modulate the antibacterial activity of phenylpropenes against *L. fermentum*. The higher antibacterial activity of eugenol compared to its ester, eugenyl acetate (Table 2), highlights the importance of the hydroxyl group in the phenolic structure (Fig. 2). Additionally, the absence of the hydroxyl group in *trans*-anethole and estragole structure (Fig. 2) could explain the lower antibacterial activity against *L. fermentum*, compared to eugenol (Table 2). Indeed, the hydroxyl group of eugenol and isoeugenol has been found to reinforce the lipid membrane-fluidizing effect, compared to anethole and estragole [63]. Also, the bacterial membrane characteristics play a crucial role in the differential bacterial susceptibility to a given antibacterial agent [64–66]. In fact, eugenol has previously shown lower MIC values against the Gram-positive bacteria *Staphylococcus aureus* (MIC= 2.5 mg/l) and *Bacillus subtilis* (MIC= 1.25 mg/l), compared to *E. coli* (MIC= 5 mg/l) [67].

Both ferulic acid and *p*-coumaric acid exhibited a weak anti-proliferative activity against *L. fermentum* in MRS broth (pH ~6.2) (Table 2). The antibacterial activity of hydroxycinnamic acids depends on pH, which controls the concentration of their undissociated form. The undissociated form can easily penetrate the cytoplasmic membrane of the bacterium [68]. The pKa values of ferulic acid and *p*-coumaric acid are between 4 and 5, thus a greater proportion of their dissociated forms is found at the pH of the culture medium (~6.2). In fact, the antibacterial activity of ferulic acid and *p*-coumaric acid was found to increase in culture media at pH values below 6 [69]. Moreover, *L. fermentum* is able to metabolize ferulic acid and coumaric acid into

less potent metabolites, such as phloretic acid, p-vinyl phenol, or dihydroferulic acid [69]. This also may explain the weak antibacterial activity of both acids against *L. fermentum*.

5. Conclusion

In this study, 28 terpenic and phenolic compounds were screened against *L. fermentum*, an ubiquitously present bacterium which could cause spoilage of different food products. Among the tested compounds, nerolidol exhibited the strongest antibacterial activity marked by the low MIC and MBC values. Moreover, a total bacterial kill was obtained within 16 h in presence of nerolidol (50 μ M). The antibacterial activity of nerolidol was dependent on different factors, including the hydrophobicity of the compound, as well as the position of the hydroxyl group. Compared to nerolidol solubilized in DMSO, HP- β -CD/Ner inclusion complex exhibited 4 fold higher MIC and MBC values and a more rapid bactericidal activity. Indeed, HP- β -CD/Ner inclusion complex was proven effective against *L. fermentum* in culture medium. The high demand for the replacement of synthetic food additives by natural molecules encourages the application of nerolidol in food. Moreover, due to the physico-chemical limitations of the application of natural bioactive components in food, the use of encapsulation systems has recently become a widely investigated novel approach for the delivery of bioactive compounds in food products. Therefore, further studies could be realized to investigate the antibacterial activity of free and encapsulated nerolidol in different food products including fruit juices, alcoholic beverages, and milk products. This evaluation would lead to a better understanding of the antibacterial potency of natural molecules such as nerolidol, under their free and complexed form, in various types of food matrices and under various conditions.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank the Research Funding Program at the Lebanese for supporting this project.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] C. Lacerda, L. Thorsen, R. Freitas, L. Jespersen, Strain-specific probiotics properties of *Lactobacillus fermentum*, *Lactobacillus plantarum* and *Lactobacillus brevis* isolates from Brazilian food products, *Food Microbiol.* 36 (2013) 22–29. doi:10.1016/j.fm.2013.03.010.
- [2] L.H. Ledenbach, R. T. Marshall, Microbiological spoilage of dairy products, in: W.H. Sperber, M.P. Doyle (Eds.), *Compendium of the Microbiological Spoilage of Foods and Beverages*, Springer, New York, USA, 2009, pp. 41–67. doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-0826-1_2.
- [3] K.R. Nath, B.J. Kostak, Etiology of white spot defect in swiss cheese made from pasteurized milk, *J. Food Prot.* 49 (1986) 718–723.
- [4] J.A. Kurmann, Studies of the defect excessive development of eyes in Gruyere cheese, *Dtsch. Molkereiztg.* 84 (1963) 1364–1366.
- [5] B.J. Juven, Identification of chemical constituents of tomato juice which affect the heat resistance of *Lactobacillus fermentum*, *J. of Appl. Bacteriol.* 54 (1983) 335–338. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2672.1983.tb02625.x>

- [6] M. Parish, D. Higgins, Isolation and identification of lactic acid bacteria from samples of citrus Molasses and unpasteurized orange juice, *J. Food Sci.* 53 (1988) 645–646. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2621.1988.tb07775.x>
- [7] A.E.H. Shearer, A.S. Mazzotta, R. Chuyate, D.E. Gombas, Heat resistance of juice spoilage microorganisms, *J. Food Prot.* 65 (2002) 1271–1275.
- [8] B. Ray, *Fundamental food microbiology*, Third ed., CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, 2005.
- [9] R. Robinson, C. Batt, *Encyclopedia of Food Microbiology*, second ed., Elsevier Science, 2014.
- [10] A. Matthews, A. Grimaldi, M. Walker, E. Bartowsky, P. Grbin, V. Jiranek, Lactic acid bacteria as a potential source of enzymes for use in vinification, *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 70 (2004) 5715–5731. doi:10.1128/AEM.70.10.5715–5731.2004.
- [11] C.G. Edwards, K.M. Haag, M.D. Collins, R.A. Hutson, Y.C. Huang, *Lactobacillus kunkeei* sp. nov.: a spoilage organism associated with grape juice fermentations, *J. Appl. Microbiol.* 84 (1998) 698–702.
- [12] E.J. Bartowsky, Bacterial spoilage of wine and approaches to minimize it, *Lett. Appl. Microbiol.* 48 (2009) 149–156. doi:10.1111/j.1472-765X.2008.02505.x.
- [13] O. Erkmen, T.F. Bozoglu, *Food Microbiology: Principles Into Practice*, 2 Volume Set, John Wiley & Sons, 2016.
- [14] N.A. Bokulich, C.W. Bamforth, N.A. Bokulich, W. Bamforth, The microbiology of malting and brewing, *Microbiol. Mol. Biol. Rev.* 77 (2013) 157–172. doi:10.1128/MMBR.00060-12.

- 486 [15] L. Dolezil, B.H. Kirsop, Variations amongst beers and lactic acid bacteria relating to beer
 487 spoilage, *J. Inst. Brew.* 86 (1980) 122–124. [https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2050-](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2050-0416.1980.tb03969.x)
 488 0416.1980.tb03969.x
- 489 [16] K.R. Aneja, R. Dhiman, N.K. Aggarwal, A. Aneja, Emerging preservation techniques for
 490 controlling spoilage and pathogenic microorganisms in fruit juices, *Int. J. Microbiol.* (2014).
 491 doi:10.1155/2014/758942.
- 492 [17] A. Mayer, E. Harel, Phenoloxidase and their significance in fruit and vegetables, in: P.F.
 493 Fox (Ed.), *Food Enzymology*, Elsevier applied science, London, UK, 1991, pp. 373–398.
- 494 [18] W. Messens, J. Van Camp, A. Huyghebaert, The use of high pressure to modify the
 495 functionality of food proteins, *Trends Food Sci. Technol.* 8 (1997) 107–112.
 496 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0924-2244\(97\)01015-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0924-2244(97)01015-7)
- 497 [19] A.I. V Ross, M.W. Griffiths, G.S. Mittal, H.C. Deeth, Combining nonthermal technologies
 498 to control foodborne microorganisms, *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* 89 (2003) 125–138.
 499 doi:10.1016/S0168-1605(03)00161-2.
- 500 [20] J. Raso, R. Paga, S. Condon, F.J. Sala, Influence of temperature and pressure on the lethality
 501 of ultrasound, *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 64 (1998) 465–471.
- 502 [21] S.P. Anand, N. Sati, Artificial preservatives and their harmful effects: looking toward nature
 503 for safer alternatives, *Int. J. Pharm. Sci. Res.* 4 (2013) 2496–2501.
 504 doi:10.13040/IJPSR.0975-8232.4(7).24960-01
- 505 [22] J. Gutierrez, G. Rodriguez, C. Barry-Ryan, P. Bourke, Efficacy of plant essential oils
 506 against foodborne pathogens and spoilage bacteria associated with ready-to-eat vegetables:
 507 antimicrobial and sensory screening, *J. Food Prot.* 71 (2008) 1846–1854.

- [23] M.M. Cowan, Plant products as antimicrobial agents, *Clin. Microbiol. Rev.* 12 (1999) 564–582. doi:10.1016/j.tibtech.2009.09.002.
- [24] M. Gutiérrez-larraínzar, J. Rúa, I. Caro, C. De Castro, D. De Arriaga, M.R. García-armesto, P. del Valle, Evaluation of antimicrobial and antioxidant activities of natural phenolic compounds against foodborne pathogens and spoilage bacteria, *Food Control*. 26 (2012) 555–563. doi:10.1016/j.foodcont.2012.02.025.
- [25] S.J. Lee, J.I. Han, G.S. Lee, M.J. Park, I.G. Choi, K.J. Na, E.B. Jeung, Antifungal effect of eugenol and nerolidol against *Microsporum gypseum* in a guinea pig model, *Biol. Pharm. Bull.* 30 (2007) 184–188. <https://doi.org/10.1248/bpb.30.184>
- [26] I. Kubo, H. Muroi, M. Himejima, Antimicrobial activity of green tea flavor components and their combination effects, *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 40 (1992) 245–248. doi:10.1021/jf00014a015.
- [27] B.F. Brehm-Stecher, E.A. Johnson, Sensitization of *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Escherichia coli* to antibiotics by the sesquiterpenoids nerolidol, farnesol, bisabolol, and apritone, *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* 47 (2003) 3357–3360. doi:10.1128/AAC.47.10.3357-3360.2003
- [28] M. Zhao, H. Wang, B. Yang, H. Tao, Identification of cyclodextrin inclusion complex of chlorogenic acid and its antimicrobial activity, *Food Chem.* 120 (2010) 1138–1142. doi:10.1016/j.foodchem.2009.11.044.
- [29] A. Blanco-Padilla, K.M. Soto, M. Hernández Iturriaga, S. Mendoza, Food antimicrobials nanocarriers, *Sci. World J.* 2014 (2014) 1–11. doi:10.1155/2014/837215.
- [30] J. Weiss, S. Gaysinsky, M. Davidson, J. McClements, Nanostructured Encapsulation Systems: Food Antimicrobials, in: E. by, G. Barbosa-Cánovas, A. Mortimer, D. Lineback,

W. Spiess, K. Buckle, P. Colonna (Eds.), *Global Issues in Food Science and Technology*, Academic Press, San Diego, 2009, pp. 425–479. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-374124-0.00024-7.

[31] G. Astray, C. Gonzalez-Barreiro, J.C. Mejuto, R. Rial-Otero, J. Simal-Gándara, A review on the use of cyclodextrins in foods, *Food Hydrocoll.* 23 (2009) 1631–1640. doi:10.1016/j.foodhyd.2009.01.001.

[32] E.M.M. Del Valle, Cyclodextrins and their uses: a review, *Process Biochem.* 39 (2004) 1033–1046. doi:10.1016/S0032-9592(03)00258-9.

[33] J. Azzi, L. Auezova, P.E. Danjou, S. Fourmentin, H. Greige-Gerges, First evaluation of drug-in-cyclodextrin-in-liposomes as an encapsulating system for nerolidol, *Food Chem.* 255 (2018) 399–404. doi:10.1016/j.foodchem.2018.02.055.

[34] E.R. Sanders, Aseptic Laboratory Techniques : Plating Methods 2. Streak Plate Procedure : Isolation of bacterial colonies using the quadrant method, *J. Vis. Exp.* 63 (2012) 1–18. doi:10.3791/3064.

[35] E.R.S. Nkanwen, D. Gatsing, D. Ngamga, S.P.C. Fodouop, P. Tane, Antibacterial agents from the leaves of *Crinum purpurascens* herb (Amaryllidaceae), *Afr. Health Sci.* 9 (2009) 264–269.

[36] K. Lewis, F.M. Ausubel, Prospects for plant-derived antibacterials, *Nat Biotech.* 24 (2006) 1504–1507. doi:10.1038/nbt1206-1504

[37] W.K. Chan, L.T.H. Tan, K.G. Chan, L.H. Lee, B.H. Goh, Nerolidol: A sesquiterpene alcohol with multi-faceted pharmacological and biological activities, *Molecules.* 21 (2016) 529. doi:10.3390/molecules21050529.

- [38] N. Togashi, H. Hamashima, A. Shiraishi, Y. Inoue, A. Takano, Antibacterial activities against *Staphylococcus aureus* of terpene alcohols with aliphatic carbon chains, *J. Essent. Oil Res.* 22 (2010) 263–269. doi:10.1080/10412905.2010.9700321.
- [39] P.A. Cornwell, B.W. Barry, Sesquiterpene components of volatile oils as skin penetration enhancers for the hydrophilic permeant 5-fluorouracil, *J. Pharm. Pharmacol.* 46 (1994) 261–269.
- [40] T. Hada, A. Shiraishi, S. Furuse, Y. Inoue, Y. Hamashima, H. Matsumoto, K. Masuda, K. Shiojima, J. Shimada, Inhibitory effects of terpenes on the growth of *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Nat. Med.* 57 (2003) 64–67.
- [41] R. Tao, C.Z. Wang, Z.W. Kong, Antibacterial/antifungal activity and synergistic interactions between polyprenols and other lipids isolated from *Ginkgo Biloba* L. leaves, *Molecules.* 18 (2013) 2166–2182. doi:10.3390/molecules18022166.
- [42] aM. Simoes, S. Rocha, M. Coimbra, M. Vieira, Enhancement of *Escherichia coli* and *Staphylococcus aureus* antibiotic susceptibility using sesquiterpenoids, *Med. Chem.* 4 (2008) 616–623. doi:10.2174/157340608786242016.
- [43] O. Gonçalves, R. Pereira, F. Gonçalves, S. Mendo, M.A. Coimbra, S.M. Rocha, Evaluation of the mutagenicity of sesquiterpenic compounds and their influence on the susceptibility towards antibiotics of two clinically relevant bacterial strains, *Mutat. Res.* 723 (2011) 18–25. doi:10.1016/j.mrgentox.2011.03.010.
- [44] M. Egervärn, M. Danielsen, S. Roos, H. Lindmark, S. Lindgren, Antibiotic susceptibility profiles of *Lactobacillus reuteri* and *Lactobacillus fermentum*, *J. Food Prot.* 70 (2007) 412–418.

- [45] I. Klare, C. Konstabel, G. Werner, G. Huys, V. Vankerckhoven, G. Kahlmeter, B. Hildebrandt, S. Müller-Bertling, W. Witte, H. Goossens, Antimicrobial susceptibilities of *Lactobacillus*, *Pediococcus* and *Lactococcus* human isolates and cultures intended for probiotic or nutritional use, *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* 59 (2007) 900–912. doi:10.1093/jac/dkm035.
- [46] K.Y. Gfeller, M. Roth, L. Meile, M. Teuber, Sequence and genetic organization of the 19.3-kb erythromycin- and dalfopristin-resistance plasmid pLME300 from *Lactobacillus fermentum* ROT1, *Plasmid.* 50 (2003) 190–201. doi:10.1016/j.plasmid.2003.08.001.
- [47] P. De Oliva-Neto, F. Yokoya, Susceptibility of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and lactic acid bacteria from the alcohol industry to several antimicrobial compounds, *Braz. J. Microbiol.* 32 (2001) 10–14. doi:10.1590/S1517-83822001000100003.
- [48] A.B. Florez, M.S. Ammor, B. Mayo, A.H.A.M. van Hoek, H.J.M. Aarts, G. Huys, Antimicrobial susceptibility profiles of 32 type strains of *Lactobacillus*, *Bifidobacterium*, *Lactococcus* and *Streptococcus* spp., *Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents.* 31 (2008) 484–504. doi:10.1016/0002-9610(92)90118-B.
- [49] O. Neto, P. De, F.A. de Lima, K.C. da Silva, D.F. da Silva, A.F.A. Carvalho, C. dos Santos, Chemical inhibition of the contaminant *Lactobacillus fermentum* from distilleries producing fuel bioethanol, *Braz. Arch. Biol. Technol.* 57 (2014) 441–447. doi:10.1590/S1516-8913201401214.
- [50] J.F. Li, J.X. Zhang, Z.G. Wang, Y.J. Yao, X. Han, Y.L. Zhao, J.P. Liu, S.Q. Zhang, Identification of a cyclodextrin inclusion complex of antimicrobial peptide CM4 and its antimicrobial activity, *Food Chem.* 221 (2017) 296–301. doi:10.1016/j.foodchem.2016.10.040.

- 599 [51] C. Dima, M. Cotarlet, tiberius Balaes, G. Bahrim, P. Alexe, S. Dima, Encapsulation of
600 Coriander essential oil in beta-cyclodextrin: Antioxidant and antimicrobial properties
601 evaluation, Rom. Biotechnol. Lett. 19 (2014) 9128–9140.
- 602 [52] I.I. Salem, N. Düzgünes, Efficacies of cyclodextrin-complexed and liposome-encapsulated
603 clarithromycin against Mycobacterium avium complex infection in human macrophages,
604 Int. J. Pharm. 250 (2003) 403–414. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-5173\(02\)00552-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-5173(02)00552-5)
- 605 [53] T.A. Andrade, T.S. Freitas, F.O. Araújo, P.P. Menezes, G.A.A. Dória, A.S. Rabelo, L.J.
606 Quintans-Júnior, M.R.V. Santos, D.P. Bezerra, M.R. Serafini, I.R.A. Menezes, P.S. Nunes,
607 A.A.S. Araújo, M.S. Costa, F.F. Campina, A.T.L. Santos, A.R.P. Silva, H.D.M. Coutinho,
608 Physico-chemical characterization and antibacterial activity of inclusion complexes of
609 Hyptis martiusii Benth essential oil in β -cyclodextrin, Biomed. Pharmacother. 89 (2017)
610 201–207. doi:10.1016/j.biopha.2017.01.158.
- 611 [54] E.H. Santos, J.A. Kamimura, L.E. Hill, C.L. Gomes, Characterization of carvacrol beta-
612 cyclodextrin inclusion complexes as delivery systems for antibacterial and antioxidant
613 applications, LWT - Food Sci. Technol. 60 (2015) 583–592. doi:10.1016/j.lwt.2014.08.046.
- 614 [55] J. Sikkema, J.A. de Bont, B. Poolman, Mechanisms of membrane toxicity of hydrocarbons,
615 Microbiol. Rev. 59 (1995) 201–222. doi:0146-0749/95/\$04.00+0.
- 616 [56] M.C. Selestino Neta, C. Vittorazzi, A.C. Guimarães, J.D.L. Martins, M. Fronza, D.C.
617 Endringer, R. Scherer, Effects of β -caryophyllene and *Murraya paniculata* essential oil in
618 the murine hepatoma cells and in the bacteria and fungi 24-h time–kill curve studies,
619 Pharmaceut. Biol. 55 (2017) 190–197. doi:10.1080/13880209.2016.1254251.

- [57] K. Knobloch, A. Pauli, B. Iberl, H. Weigand, N. Weis, Antibacterial and antifungal properties of essential oil components, *J. Essent. Oil Res.* 1 (1989) 119–128. doi:10.1080/10412905.1989.9697767.
- [58] H. Dorman, S. Deans, Antimicrobial agents from plants: antibacterial activity of plant volatile oils, *J. Appl. Microbiol.* 88 (2000) 308–316.
- [59] R. Kotan, S. Kordali, A. Cakir, Screening of Antibacterial activities of twenty-one oxygenated monoterpenes, *Z. Naturforsch. C.* 62 (2007) 507–513.
- [60] D. Kalembe, A. Kunicka, Antibacterial and antifungal properties of essential oils, *Curr. Med. Chem.* 10 (2003) 813–829.
- [61] I. Kubo, H. Muroi, M. Himejima, A. Kubo, Antibacterial activity of long-chain alcohols: The role of hydrophobic alkyl groups, *Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett.* 3 (1993) 1305–1308. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-894X\(00\)80336-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-894X(00)80336-4)
- [62] Y. Inoue, A. Shiraishi, T. Hada, K. Hirose, H. Hamashima, J. Shimada, The antibacterial effects of terpene alcohols on *Staphylococcus aureus* and their mode of action, *FEMS Microbiol. Lett.* 237 (2004) 325–331. doi:10.1016/j.femsle.2004.06.049.
- [63] R. Gharib, A. Najjar, L. Auezova, C. Charcosset, Interaction of selected phenylpropenes with dipalmitoylphosphatidylcholine membrane and their relevance to antibacterial activity, *J. Membr. Biol.* 250 (2017) 259–271. doi:10.1007/s00232-017-9957-y.
- [64] S. Shrivastava, T. Bera, A. Roy, G. Singh, P. Ramachandrarao, D. Dash, Characterization of enhanced antibacterial effects of novel silver nanoparticles, *Nanotechnol.* 18 (2007) 225103. doi:10.1088/0957-4484/18/22/225103.

- [65] D.P. Tamboli, D.S. Lee, Mechanistic antimicrobial approach of extracellularly synthesized silver nanoparticles against gram positive and gram negative bacteria, *J. Hazard. Mater.* 260 (2013) 878–884. doi:10.1016/j.jhazmat.2013.06.003.
- [66] F. Nazzaro, F. Fratianni, L. De Martino, R. Coppola, V. De Feo, Effect of essential oils on pathogenic bacteria, *Pharmaceut.* 6 (2013) 1451–1474. doi:10.3390/ph6121451.
- [67] H. Liang, Q. Yuan, F. Vriesekoop, F. Lv, Effects of cyclodextrins on the antimicrobial activity of plant-derived essential oil compounds, *Food Chem.* 135 (2012) 1020–1027. doi:10.1016/j.foodchem.2012.05.054.
- [68] J.B. Russell, Another explanation for the toxicity of fermentation acids at low pH: anion accumulation versus uncoupling, *J. Appl. Bacteriol.* 73 (1992) 363–370. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2672.1992.tb04990.x.
- [69] A.F. Sánchez-Maldonado, A. Schieber, M.G. Gänzle, Structure-function relationships of the antibacterial activity of phenolic acids and their metabolism by lactic acid bacteria, *J. Appl. Microbiol.* 111 (2011) 1176–1184. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2672.2011.05141.x.
- [70] S. Griffin, S.G. Wyllie, J. Markham, Determination of octanol–water partition coefficient for terpenoids using reversed-phase high-performance liquid chromatography, *J. Chromatogr. A.* 864 (1999) 221–228. doi:10.1016/S0021-9673(99)01009-2.
- [71] S. Ohtsubo, T. Fujita, A. Matsushita, E. Kumamoto, Inhibition of the compound action potentials of frog sciatic nerves by aroma oil compounds having various chemical structures, *Pharmacol. Res. Perspect.* 3 (2015) e00127. doi:10.1002/prp2.127.
- [72] O. Sensch, W. Vierling, W. Brandt, M. Reiter, Effects of inhibition of calcium and potassium currents in guinea-pig cardiac contraction: comparison of β -caryophyllene oxide,

664 eugenol, and nifedipine, *Brit. J. Pharmacol.* 131 (2000) 1089–1096.
 665 doi:10.1038/sj.bjp.0703673.

666 [73] C. Hansch, A. Leo, D. Hoekman, *Exploring QSAR: Hydrophobic, electronic, and steric*
 667 *constants*, American Chemical Society, Washington DC, 1995.

668 [74] A.F. El-Kattan, C.S. Asbill, N. Kim, B.B. Michniak, The effects of terpene enhancers on the
 669 percutaneous permeation of drugs with different lipophilicities, *Int. J. Pharms.* 215 (2001)
 670 229–240. doi:10.1016/S0378-5173(00)00699-2.

671 [75] J. Li, E.M. Perdue, S.G. Pavlostathis, R. Araujo, Physicochemical properties of selected
 672 monoterpenes, *Environ. Int.* 24 (1998) 353–358. doi:10.1016/S0160-4120(98)00013-0.

673 [76] C. Schmid, R. Steinbrecher, H. Ziegler, Partition coefficients of plant cuticles for
 674 monoterpenes, *Trees.* 6 (1992) 32–36. doi:10.1007/BF00224496.

675 [77] H.S. Camargos, R.A. Moreira, S.A. Mendanha, K.S. Fernandes, M.L. Dorta, A. Alonso,
 676 Terpenes increase the lipid dynamics in the Leishmania plasma membrane at concentrations
 677 similar to their IC50 values, *PLOS ONE.* 9 (2014) e104429.
 678 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0104429.

679 [78] A. Ben Arfa, S. Combes, L. Preziosi-Belloy, N. Gontard, P. Chalier, Antimicrobial activity
 680 of carvacrol related to its chemical structure, *Lett. Appl. Microbiol.* 43 (2006) 149–154.
 681 doi:10.1111/j.1472-765X.2006.01938.x.

682 [79] A.A. Taherpour, H. Maroofi, O. Bajelani, K. Larijani, Chemical composition of the essential
 683 oil of *Valeriana alliariifolia* Adams of Iran, *Nat. Prod. Res.* 24 (2010) 973–978.
 684 doi:10.1080/14786410902900010.

685 [80] J.R. Clare, Automatic dishwashing compositions comprising diacyl peroxide bleach and
 686 blooming perfume, EP1360269B1, 2005.

- [81] R. Lun, D. Varhanickova, W.-Y. Shiu, D. Mackay, Aqueous solubilities and octanol–water partition coefficients of cymenes and chlorocymenes, *J. Chem. Eng. Data.* 42 (1997) 951–953. doi:10.1021/je970069v.
- [82] M. Kfoury, D. Landy, L. Auezova, H. Greige-Gerges, S. Fourmentin, Effect of cyclodextrin complexation on phenylpropanoids’ solubility and antioxidant activity, *Beilstein J. Org. Chem.* 10 (2014) 2322–2331. doi:10.3762/bjoc.10.241.
- [83] N.C. Dias, M.I. Nawas, C.F. Poole, Evaluation of a reversed-phase column (Supelcosil LC-ABZ) under isocratic and gradient elution conditions for estimating octanol–water partition coefficients, *Analyst.* 128 (2003) 427–433. doi:10.1039/B300574G.
- [84] J.A. Rothwell, A.J. Day, M.R.A. Morgan, Experimental determination of octanol–water partition coefficients of quercetin and related flavonoids, *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 53 (2005) 4355–4360. doi:10.1021/jf0483669.
- [85] M.E. Herbig, D.H. Evers, Correlation of hydrotropic solubilization by urea with logD of drug molecules and utilization of this effect for topical formulations, *Eur. J. Pharm. Biopharm.* 85 (2013) 158–160. doi:10.1016/j.ejpb.2013.06.022.
- [86] S. Ritter, W.H. Hauthal, G. Maurer, Partition coefficients of some environmentally important organic compounds between 1-octanol and water from reversed-phase high-performance liquid chromatography, *J. Chem. Eng. Data.* 39 (1994) 414–417. doi:10.1021/je00015a003.
- [87] G.N. Reiner, D.O. Labuckas, D.A. García, Lipophilicity of some GABAergic phenols and related compounds determined by HPLC and partition coefficients in different systems, *J. Pharm. Biomed. Anal.* 49 (2009) 686–691. doi:10.1016/j.jpba.2008.12.040.

[88] O. Wesołowska, M. Kuzdzał, J. Strancar, K. Michalak, Interaction of the chemopreventive agent resveratrol and its metabolite, piceatannol, with model membranes, *Biochim. Biophys. Acta.* 1788 (2009) 1851–1860. doi:10.1016/j.bbamem.2009.06.005.

Figure legends

Fig.1. Chemical structure of terpenic compounds.

Fig. 2. Chemical structure of phenolic compounds.

Fig. 3. Nerolidol (50 μ M) and HP- β -CD/Ner complex (200 μ M Ner) time-kill analysis against *L. fermentum* at 37 °C under anaerobic conditions.

729

730

731

732

733

734

735

736

737

738 **Table 1: Bactericidal and anti-proliferative activity of terpenes against *L. fermentum*.**

	Borneol	Bornyl acetate	Camphene	Camphor	β-Caryophyllene	p-Cymene	Geraniol	Limonene	Linalool	Linalyl acetate	Menthol	Nerolidol	α-Phellandrene	α-Pinene	β-Pinene	α-Terpinene	γ-Terpinene
LogP								4.58 [74]	2.97 [75]		3.4 [70]			4.83 [75]	4.16 [70]		4.5 [75]
	3.01 [70]		4.22 [70]					4.23 [77]			3.38 [78]	5.36 [74]		4.49 [76]	4.42 [76]		
		3.86 [71]		2.74 [70]	6.87 [72]	4.1 [73]	3.56 [70]	4.57 [75]		3.93 [70]			4.55 [76]	4.48 [70]		4.25 [70]	
								4.38 [70]	3.5 [70]								4.36 [70]
	2.85 [79]		4.56 [76]					4.83 [79]			3.3 [71]	5.33 [77]		4.27 [79]	4.35 [79]		
3500 μM Bacterial kill (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	0	100
Inhibition (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	89.1 ± 0.5	100
500 μM Bacterial kill (%)	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	100	0	0	100	ND	0

Inhibition (%)	28.5 ± 1.8	100	100	0	89 ± 2.4	100	80.9 ± 1.4	100	0	100	75.7 ± 4.4	100	100	100	100	ND	100
250 µM																	
Bacterial kill (%)	ND	0	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	0	ND	100	ND	ND	0	ND	ND
Inhibition (%)	ND	100	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	100	ND	100	ND	ND	100	ND	ND
100 µM																	
Bacterial kill (%)	ND	0	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	0	ND	100	ND	ND	0	ND	ND
Inhibition (%)	ND	0	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	0	ND	100	ND	ND	91.4 ± 0.8	ND	ND
739	ND: Not determined																
740																	
741																	
742																	
743																	

Table 2: Bactericidal and anti-proliferative activity of phenolic compounds against *L. fermentum*.

	<i>trans</i> -Anethole	Anisole	<i>p</i> -Coumaric acid	<i>o</i> -Cresol	Estragole	Eugenol	Eugenyl acetate	<i>trans</i> -Ferulic acid	Isoeugenol	Quercetin	Resveratrol
LogP	3.31[80]			1.95[73]	3.13[80]	2.40[83] 2.45[72]		1.51[73]			3.10[85]
	3.0961[82]	2.11[81]	1.43[82]	1.975[86]	2.818[82]	2.29[87] 2.73[78] 2.99[70]	2.9[72]	1.249[82]	3.04[70]	1.82[84]	3.06[88]
3500 μM											
Bacterial kill (%)	0	0	0	0	0	100	95 $\pm$ 0.47	0	0	0	0
Inhibition (%)	91.4 $\pm$ 1.80	16.1 $\pm$ 0.92	21.9 $\pm$ 0.94	0	84.4 $\pm$ 0.13	100	100	17.3 $\pm$ 0.14	89.3 $\pm$ 0.09	0	0
500 μM											
Bacterial kill (%)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	0	0	ND	ND	ND	ND
Inhibition (%)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	0	0	ND	ND	ND	ND

ND: Not determined

756 **Table 3: MIC values of common antibiotics against *L. fermentum*.**

Antibiotic	MIC (mg/l)	MIC (μ M)	Reference
Clindamycin	>64	>150.60	[46]
Chloramphenicol	4 ^a	12.38	[45]
Erythromycin	>128 - 256	>174.40 - 348.81	[46]
Gentamicin	4 - 8	8.38 - 16.75	[44]
Kanamycin	64	132.10	[48]
Metronidazole	>40	>233.7	[49]
N-alkyl dimethylbenzyl ammonium chloride	8	25.11	[47]
Nitrofurantoin	15	62.98	[49]
Novobiocin	>16	>26.12	[46]
Polymixin B	64	49.17	[48]
	16 ^a	27.51	[45]
Streptomycin	16	27.51	[48]
	8 - 128	13.76 - 220.09	[44]
	>128	>220.09	[46]
Teicoplanin	>256 ^a	>134.19-163.65	[45]
Tobramycin	>128	>273.79	[46]
Vancomycin	96	66.24	[48]
	>256 ^a	>176.64	[45]

757 ^aValues of MIC₉₀

758

Fig. 1

Fig. 2

Fig. 3