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## ABSTRACT

Garcinia species have been reported to possess compounds with antibacterial, antioxidant, apoptotic, hepatoprotective and others biological effects. The Garcinia xanthochymus Hook. f. (Clusiaceae) is a native plant from some Asian countries and is the most cultivated species in Brazil. Also, has been described to possess some in vitro anti carcinogenic compounds. Because of these characteristics, in the present study it was assessed the ability of extracts, fractions and a biflavonoidmorelloflavone, obtained by bio guided assay from G. xanthochymus, in their chemo-preventive role by quinona reductase 1 (QR1) induction and genotoxic/antigenotóxic damage. To evaluate the chemo-preventive profile of compounds extracted from G. xanthochymus, the quinone reductase assay and Comet assay were performed. It was observed a doubling of the quinone reductase enzyme activity by ethyl acetate and butanolic fractions, and morelloflavone ( $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ ). However, by the Comet assay was observed the genotoxicity of morellofavone, ethyl acetate and butanolic fractions. Regarding anti-genotoxicity, the same fractions and morelloflavone caused DNA damage in post-treatment. Our results suggest that although there is induction of quinone reductase enzyme from morelloflavone, ethyl acetate and butanolic fractions isolated from G. xanthochymus, these have genotoxic profile in some concentrations, showing that the widespread use of the plant could bring harm. Additional tests are needed to evaluate the toxicity power of the $G$. xanthochymus.
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## INTRODUCTION

Garcinia xanthochymus Hook. f. (Clusiaceae) is a medicinal plant native to the some Asian countries. ${ }^{1,2}$ Currently, is cultivated in some tropical countries of Africa, South America and Australia. The trees have large shiny dark green leaves and edible acidic yellow fruits which have been used widely as a traditional medicine for diarrhea and dysentery. ${ }^{3,4}$ Previous investigations based phytochemical studies of leaves, fruits, seeds, bark and stems on $G$. xanthochymus have resulted in the isolation of benzophenones, flavonoids, triterpene, xanthones, ester and bioflavonoids, ${ }^{4-6}$ with some of these with biological activities. Garcinia species have been reported to possess compounds with antibacterial, ${ }^{7}$ antioxidant, ${ }^{8}$ apoptotic, ${ }^{9}$ hepatoprotective, ${ }^{10}$ and antiviral activity. ${ }^{11}$ Further, it was demonstrated the ability to inhibit aromatase, ${ }^{12} \alpha$-glucosidase, ${ }^{13}$ and pro-inflammatory mediators synthesis via interruption of NF-кB and MAPK pathways ${ }^{14}$ and promote the cancer chemoprevention. ${ }^{7,15}$ Originally proposed by Sporn et al., ${ }^{16}$ the classical definition of cancer chemoprevention is the use of natural, synthetic or biological chemical agents to reverse, suppress or prevent either the initial phase of carcinogenesis or the progression of neoplastic cells to cancer. As a whole, cancer chemoprevention definition is the use of pharmacological interventions to treat or reduce the risk of developing cancer. ${ }^{17}$ Considering cancer as the end stage of a chronic disease process called carcinogenesis, it is of extreme interest to find natural compounds that could intervene on the carcinogenesis progress and causes none or minimum damage to healthy cells. Thus, the present study assesses the potential chemopreventive activity from the leaves and fruits of G. xanthochymus, by bio guided study.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

## Isolation and purification

Dried powdered leaves and fruits were extracted by maceration using n-hexane ( $1.8 \mathrm{~L} \times 3$ ) and ethanol ( $2.7 \mathrm{~L} \times 3$ ) at room temperature. The extract was filtered and the hexane and ethanol solvents were evaporated under vacuum to yield residues 8.0 g and 90.0 g , respectively. The concentrated ethanol extract ( EtOHe ) was solubilized with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}: \mathrm{MeOH}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}: \mathrm{MeOH} f\right)(6: 4)$, EtOAc and n butanol which were then concentrated under reduced pressure to yield the EtOAc fraction (EtOAcf) $(24.6 \mathrm{~g})$ and BuOH fraction ( BuOHf ) $(15.1 \mathrm{~g})$. The EtOAcf ( 1.5 g ) was chromatographed by gel permeation over Sephadex LH-20 column eluted with methanol to afford 45 fractions, which were combined after comparison of their TLC profile [Silica gel 60, PF254, EtOAc: $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}: \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{H}: \mathrm{HCO}_{2} \mathrm{H}$ (100:27:11:11)] in sixteen (A1-A16) fractions. The fraction A15 $(269.3 \mathrm{mg})$ was purified by prep. RP-HPLC $\left[\mathrm{MeOH}: \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}: \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{H}\right.$ (75:24.5:0.5), UV detection at 254 nm ; flow rate $10 \mathrm{ml} / \mathrm{min}$ ] to afford morelloflavone ( 100 mg ).

## Cell culture and treatments

Murine hepatoma cells Hepa-1c1c7 (ATCC ${ }^{\circledR}$ CRL-2026 ${ }^{\text {TM }}$, Rockville, MD) were maintained in Minimum essential medium, alpha ( $\alpha$-MEM), (Sigma, MO, USA) supplemented with $10 \%$ heat inactivated fetal bovine serum (FBS) (Cultilab; Brazil) and 100 $\mathrm{U} / \mathrm{ml}$ penicillin, and $0.1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{ml}$ streptomycin (Invitrogen, CA, USA). Human Hep G2 cells (ATCC ${ }^{\circledR} \mathrm{HB}-8065^{\mathrm{TM}}$, Rockville, MD were grown in Dulbecco's modified Eagle's medium (DMEM) supplemented with $10 \%$ FBS, and $100 \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{mL}$ penicillin, $100 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$
streptomycin, $600 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ l-glutamine (In vitro gen, CA, USA). Bovine serum albumin (BSA), flavin adenine dinucleotide (FAD), glucose-6-phosphate (G6P), $\quad \beta$-nicotine amide dinucleotide phosphate (NADP), thiazolyl blue tetrazolium bromide (MTT), glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase (G6PD), menadione, Tween20 , dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO), Tris- HCl and $\beta$-naphthoflavone ( $\beta$ NF ) were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (St. Louis, MO, USA). The cells were maintained in humidified $5 \% \mathrm{CO}_{2}$ at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and subcultured every three or four days. The cells were plated in 96 and 24 -well culture plate at $1 \times 10^{4}$ and $1 \times 10^{5}$ cells/well for NAD(P)H:quinone reductase 1 (QR1) and Comet assay, respectively. Aftercell attachment, approximately 24 hours, the tests compounds extracted from the G. xanthochymus $(1.0-120.0 \mu \mathrm{M})$ were added with fresh media and the cells were incubated for 48 hours. G. xanthochymus compounds were dissolved in DMSO, the final concentration of DMSO to cells was no more than $0.5 \%$. Also, the cells were washed twice with phosphate-buffered solution (PBS) before being subjected to QR1 and Comet assay.

## NAD(P)H:quinone reductase 1 activity in Hepa-1c1c7 cell culture

NAD(P)H:quinone reductase 1 activity was evaluated as described previously, with some modifications. ${ }^{18}$ Briefly, Hepa-1c1c7 cells were treated with tests compounds extracted from the $G$. xanthochymus. 4'-bromoflavone ( $4^{\prime} \mathrm{BF}$ ) was reported to be strong QR1 inducer ${ }^{19}$ and was adopted as positive control. DMSO was used as solvent control. After removal medium with PBS, the cells were per-meabilised with $0.8 \%$ digitonin in 2 mM EDTA at pH 7.6 . For measurement of QR1 activity, the assay solution ( $25 \mathrm{mMTris-}$ $\mathrm{HCl}, \mathrm{pH} 7.4,1 \mathrm{mMG} 6 \mathrm{PD}$, $50 \mathrm{mMmenadione}$,30 mM NADP, 5 mM FAD, 0.07 \% ( $\mathrm{w} / \mathrm{v}$ ) BSA, 0.03 \% ( $\mathrm{w} / \mathrm{v}$ ) MTT, 0.01 \% (v/v) Tween20, and 1 unit $/ \mathrm{mL}$ of yeast glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase) was added to each well. QR1 activity was measured as the reduction of menadione to menadiol, this being coupled to the non-enzymatic reduction of MTT by a blue formazan. The reaction generated to a blue color, which was measured after 5 minutes incubation at room temperature on orbital shaker. Readings were made at 595 nm using iMark Micro plate Reader (Bio-Rad Laboratories, Hercules, CA, EUA). Simultaneously to the QR1 assay, the protein was measured by crystal violet staining of an identical set of test plates. The cultured medium was removed and adherent cells were stained with 0.2 \% crystal violet dissolved in $2 \%$ ethanol solution. The absorption was measured at 595 nm , and the $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values were determined. The results are expressed as means $\pm$ standard error from triplicate bioassays for each test isolate.

## Single cell gel electrophoresis assay (Comet assay)

The Hep G2 treatment protocol assay was performed by following the protocol of Scolastici et al. ${ }^{20}$ Briefly, in the pre-treatment, after seeding and cell adhesion the medium was removed and cells were treated for 1 h with extracts, fractions and morelloflavone at different concentrations (according to QR1 assay results). Cells were then washed with PBS and treated with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}(0.1 \mathrm{mM})$ for 10 minutes. After treatments with the compounds and mutagen, the cells were washed with PBS, trypsinized, centrifuged at 180 g for 3 minutes and re-suspended into fresh medium. Regarding the posttreatment, after seeding and cell adhesion the medium was removed and cells treated with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}(0.1 \mathrm{mM})$ for 10 minutes. Cells were then washed with PBS, and compounds were added in medium for 1 h at $37{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After this period, cells were washed with PBS, trypsinized, centrifuged at 180 g for 3 minutes, and re-suspended into fresh medium. Comet assay of Hep G2 cells was performed under alkaline condition following method of Singh et al. ${ }^{21}$ with some modifications. After the both treatments, cells were collected separately and washed with PBS by centrifuging at 180 g for 5 minutes in cold centrifuge at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Slides were initially coated with a
layer of normal melting point agarose ( $0.75 \%$ in PBS). After, cells were mixed with $1 \%$ low melting point agarose and layered in slides. The cells were immediately covered with cover glass and the slides submitted at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 minutes to allow solidification of the agarose. The cover glass was removed and the slides were immersed in lysis buffer ( $2.5 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaCl}, 100 \mathrm{mM}$ EDTA, $10 \mathrm{mMTris}, 1 \%$ Triton X-100, $10 \%$ DMSO, pH 10 ) at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for an hour in the dark. After lysis, the slides were placed in the alkaline buffer ( 300 mM $\mathrm{NaOH}, 1 \mathrm{mM}$ EDTA pH 13 ) in an electrophoretic chamber for 30 minutes to allow DNA unwinding. The electrophoresis was carried out under 25 V and approximately 300 mA for 20 minutes at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. All of the steps described were conducted under the dark to prevent additional DNA damage. Subsequently, the slides were immersed in neutralization buffer ( 0.4 M Tris- HCl pH 7.5 ) for 5 minutes, dried, fixed in $100 \%$ ethanol for 10 minutes, and stored at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ until analysis. Slides were stained with ethidium bromide; the slides were analyzed at $400 \times$ magnification using a fluorescence microscope (ZEISS ${ }^{\circledR}$, Germany) equipped with a $515-560-\mathrm{nm}$ excitation filter and a $590-\mathrm{nm}$ barrier filter. Image of 100 randomly selected cells was analyzed from each sample. All experiments were repeated in an independent test. Measurement was made by image analysis TriTek CometScore ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ version 1.5, determining the mean tail moment (product of tail DNA/total DNA by the tail center, in arbitrary units).

## Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis was carried out using Graph Pad Prism® Version 5.01 (Graph Pad Software, San Diego, CA, USA). All data were expressed as mean $\pm$ SEM and generated from three independent experiments. Groups of data were compared with the analysis of variance (ANOVA) followed by Tukey's multiple comparison tests and Kruskal Wallis followed by Dunn's pos test. Values of $P<0.05$ were regarded as significant.

## RESULTS

## $\mathrm{NAD}(\mathrm{P}) \mathrm{H}$ :quinone reductase 1 induction in $G$. xantochymus compounds

In the effort to search a novel chemopreventive agents, the QR1 assay was used to identify detoxification enzyme inducers from the G. xantochymus compounds. Regarding the treatment of Hepa1c1c7 cell line with EtOAcf isolated from G. xanthochymus leaves and fruits, it was observed that there was potential induction of the enzyme quinone reductase 1 at $20 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ (Table 1). The treatments with higher concentrations showed no increase in the potential induction of EtOAcf, and a significant increase in cytotoxicity (data not shown). The treatment of Hepa-1clc7 cell line with The BuOHf and morelloflavone from leaves suggesting that both has some chemopreventive activity and not cytotoxic (Table 1). There was no significant induction of QR1 at to $20 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ with the other extracts and fractions from leaves or fruits of G. xanthochymus. In Table 1, we can observe the levels of enzyme induction and cell viability of the obtained compounds from G. xanthochymus leaves and fruits in the range from 1.25 to $20 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$.

## Aspects genotoxic and antigenotoxic from Garcinia xanthochymus compounds

The Comet assay was performed in order to characterize the genotoxic potential of compounds obtained from G. xanthochymus as well as the potential antigenotoxic, as proposed by Scolastici et $a l .{ }^{20}$ Evaluation of the genotoxicity/antigenotoxicity was performed on human hepatocarcinoma cell line (Hep G2) and the concentrations used in the assay were pre-established according to the QR1 induction test, taking into consideration the cell viability. Results obtained by Comet assay are presented in Table 2 and Table

3, showing the DNA damage (tail moment) in Hep G2. It was observed that after treatment with EtOAcf from the leaves, It was capable of cause DNA damage at concentrations from 5 to 30 $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{mL}$ (Table 2). EtOAcf and BuOHf obtained from the fruits of $G$. xanthochymus were also genotoxic at $5 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$. The morelloflavone was genotoxic from 1.25 to $5 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$, including the inducer concentration of QR1 (Table 2). The protective effect of Garcinia $s p$. compounds against $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}$-induced DNA damage was also evaluated using the alkaline single cell electrophoresis assay (Comet). Evaluation of antigenotoxicity was performed in Hep G2 and treatments were performed from non-genotoxic concentrations obtained by the Comet assay genotoxicity protocol. The EtOAcf from the leaves of $G$. xanthochymus demonstrated in pre-treatment that concentrations from 0.156 to $0.625 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ presented an intensification of DNA damage compared to the positive control. In the post-treatment, only the tested concentration of $0.625 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ showed significant difference compared to the positive control
(Table 3). The EtOAcf and BuOHf from fruits, showed in the pretreatment, intensified DNA damage (Table 3). In the post-treatment, the EtOAcf showed that in concentrations from $2.5 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ to 0.625 $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{mL}$ was observed a significant difference when compared to the positive control (Table 3). In the analysis of post-treatment with BuOHf, was observed no statistical significance in relation to the positive control at concentrations of 1.25 and $0.625 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$, and significant difference when compared to positive control at a concentration of $0.312 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ (Table 3). In evaluating antigenotoxicity of morelloflavone, it was observed in pre-treatment that the concentration of $0.312 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ there was no statistically significant difference from the positive control. In the posttreatment, it was observed that at concentrations of 0.15 and 0.075 $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{mL}$ no significant difference were observed when compared to the positive control, demonstrating that these concentrations may have to morelloflavone repair capacity.

Table 1: Quinone reductase 1 induction ratio value of extracts, fractions and morelloflavone obtained from leaves and fruits of Garcinia xanthochymus in Hepa-1c1c7 cell line

|  | Garcinia xanthochymus | Quinone-reductase <br> IR | 1 induction <br> CV $\mathbf{( \% )}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Leaves |  | $2.5 \pm 0.0028$ | $101 \pm 7.49$ |
|  | Morelloflavone | $1.8 \pm 0.1247$ | $85.0 \pm 4.33$ |
|  | EtOHe | $1.5 \pm 0.0577$ | $59.4 \pm 12.23$ |
|  | Hexe | $2.3 \pm 0.404$ | $87.6 \pm 5.01$ |
|  | EtOAcf | $0.5 \pm 0.0666$ | $75.0 \pm 6.94$ |
| Fruits | $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}: \mathrm{MeOHf}$ | $2.2 \pm 0.0866$ | $71.4 \pm 7.06$ |
|  | BuOHf | $1.8 \pm 0.0882$ | $91.6 \pm 1.4$ |
|  | EtOHe | $2.4 \pm 0.079$ | $62.1 \pm 4.32$ |
|  | EtOAcf | $1.2 \pm 0.0960$ | $79.2 \pm 8.0$ |
|  | $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}: \mathrm{MeOHf}$ | $1.3 \pm 0.0296$ | $81.6 \pm 4.12$ |
| 4'-bromoflavone | BuOHf | $2.9 \pm 0.218$ | $125 \pm 5.6$ |

IR: Induction ratio of quinone reductase 1 (QR1); CV: Cell viability, percentage of live cells at the highest concentration tested ( $20 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ ), $4^{\prime}$-bromoflavone (positive control)

Table 2: Genotoxicity presented by Garcinia xanthochymus fractions and morelloflavone

|  | Controls | Morelloflavone | EtOAcf- leaves | EtOAcf- fruits | BuOHf- fruits |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { TM } \\ \pm \text { SEM } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { TM } \\ \pm \text { SEM } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { TM } \\ \pm \text { SEM } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { TM } \\ \pm \text { SEM } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { TM } \\ \pm \text { SEM } \end{gathered}$ |
| Untreatedcells | $10.60 \pm 1.61$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ | $66.92 \pm 6.28 * * *$ |  |  |  |  |
| DMSO | $11.40 \pm 2.78$ |  |  |  |  |
| $0.312 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ |  | $11.56 \pm 2.53$ | $14.12 \pm 1.87$ | $16.53 \pm 1.80$ | $13.84 \pm 2.69$ |
| $0.625 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ |  | $7.89 \pm 2.31^{* *}$ | $20.44 \pm 2.67^{* * *}$ | $14.24 \pm 2.16$ | $12.09 \pm 1.87$ |
| $1.25 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ |  | $16.13 \pm 1.19 *$ | $22.18 \pm 3.56$ *** | $24.13 \pm 3.59^{* * *}$ | $17.68 \pm 2.72^{*}$ |
| $2.5 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ |  | $16.05 \pm 1.69^{*}$ | $21.94 \pm 3.24 * * *$ | $20.58 \pm 3.17^{* * *}$ | $16.54 \pm 3.10^{*}$ |
| $5 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ |  | $26.87 \pm 3^{* * *}$ | $29.56 \pm 2.98^{* * *}$ | $29.62 \pm 2.86^{* * *}$ | $22.44 \pm 2.26^{* * *}$ |
| $10 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ |  | - | $28.28 \pm 3.70^{* * *}$ | 9 | $26.30 \pm 3.43^{* * *}$ |
| $20 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ |  | 9 | $21.01 \pm 3.47^{* *}$ | 9 | $40.38 \pm 4.74 * * *$ |
| $30 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ |  | 9 | $47.80 \pm 5.19 * * *$ | 9 | - |

TM: Tail Moment; Kruskal Wallis analysis with post-test Dunn $\left({ }^{*}\right) \mathrm{p}<0.05,\left({ }^{* *}\right) \mathrm{p}<0.01,\left({ }^{* * *}\right) \mathrm{p}<0.001$. $\|$ Untested concentrations
Table 3: Antigenotoxicity presented by Garcinia xanthochymus fractions and morelloflavone

|  | Controls | Morelloflavone |  | BuOHf- fruits |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | TM $\pm$ SEM |  | TM $\pm$ SEM |  |
|  |  | Pre-treatment | Post-treatment | Pre-treatment | Post-treatment |
| Untreatedcells | $8,70 \pm 1,35$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ | $66,92 \pm 6,28^{* * *}$ |  |  |  |  |
| DMSO | $11,40 \pm 2,78$ |  |  |  |  |
| $0,075 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ |  | $155.22 \pm 8.34^{* * *}$ | $49.24 \pm 6.91$ ** | 9 |  |
| $0.156 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ |  | $100.24 \pm 7.25 * *$ | $37.25 \pm 6.32 * * *$ | $\underline{1}$ |  |
| $0.312 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ |  | $86.60 \pm 6.76$ | $55.48 \pm 6.35$ | $\underline{1}$ |  |
| $0.625 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ |  |  |  | $137.12 \pm 8.32^{* * *}$ | $18.72 \pm 4.7^{* *}$ |
| $1.25 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ |  |  |  | $139.67 \pm 7.94 * * *$ | $40.72 \pm 5.2^{* * *}$ |
| $2.5 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ |  |  |  | $116.8 \pm 8.78^{* * *}$ | $58.18 \pm 9.2^{* * *}$ |

TM: Tail Moment; Kruskal Wallis analysis with post-test Dunn $\left({ }^{*}\right) \mathrm{p}<0.05,\left({ }^{* *}\right) \mathrm{p}<0.01,\left({ }^{* * *}\right) \mathrm{p}<0.001$. $\boldsymbol{q}$ Untested concentrations

Table 3 (Continuation): Antigenotoxicity presented by Garcinia xanthochymus fractions and morelloflavone
Controls
EtOAcf- leaves EtOAcf- fruits

|  | TM $\pm$ SEM |  | TM $\pm$ SEM |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pre-treatment | Post-treatment | Pre-treatment | Post-treatment |
| Untreated cells |  |  |  |  |
| H2O2 |  |  |  |  |
| DMSO |  |  |  |  |
| 0,075 $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{mL}$ | 9 |  | 9 |  |
| $0.156 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ | $184.72 \pm 4.88^{* * *}$ | $92.21 \pm 8.2$ |  | - |
| $0.312 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ | $156.3 \pm 6.20^{* * *}$ | $80.56 \pm 7.5$ |  | 9 |
| $0.625 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ | $120.32 \pm 4.45^{* * *}$ | $57.05 \pm 9.1^{* * *}$ | $145.8 \pm 7.67^{* * *}$ | $143.17 \pm 8.4^{* * *}$ |
| $1.25 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ | 9 |  | $137.43 \pm 8.23{ }^{* * *}$ | $53.67 \pm 7.9^{* * *}$ |
| $2.5 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ | 9 |  | $119.38 \pm 6.49^{* * *}$ | $31.40 \pm 4.6^{* * *}$ |

TM: Tail Moment; Kruskal Wallis analysis with post-test Dunn $\left({ }^{*}\right) \mathrm{p}<0.05,\left({ }^{* *}\right) \mathrm{p}<0.01,\left({ }^{* * *}\right) \mathrm{p}<0.001$. $\boldsymbol{q}$ Untested concentrations

## DISCUSSION

Several studies in vitro and in vivo indicate that the reduction of quinones by electrophilic QR1 is an important detoxification pathway in which quinones are converted into hydroquinones, demonstrating that the enzyme QR1 is a potential biomarker for the detection of chemo-preventive agents against the initial phase of cancer. ${ }^{22,23}$ The induction of QR1 can help in chemoprevention against cancer and chemical toxicity with natural or synthetic compounds. ${ }^{24}$ The various properties of flavonoids as antioxidant, metal binding capacity, ability to affect the endocrine system and the ability to prevent enzymatic activation of carcinogens, are consistent with a protective role against malignant disease. The requirements for structure/activity to the antioxidant properties of the flavonoid aglycones have been studied in detail using a variety of assay systems. ${ }^{25}$ We found no previous studies involving the chemoprevention potential by $\mathrm{NAD}(\mathrm{P}) \mathrm{H}: q u i n o n e-r e d u c t a s e ~ 1$ activity in Hepa 1c1c7 cell culture from the G. xanthochymus fractions or morelloflavone after literature review. Nevertheless, in the present study, we found in this study promising results about induction of QR1 by the morelloflavonebiflavonoid. This substance is described in the literature to possess some in vitro anticarcinogenic activity. ${ }^{26}$
Rice-Evan et al. ${ }^{27}$ showed in a study of structure-activity the importance of $3^{\prime}, 4$ '-dihidroxil in B ring and a double linkage 2,3 in C ring, as a major determinants of antioxidant activity. Thus, the structure of morelloflavone could favor its antioxidant activity. It is known that the flavonolquercetin is an inducer of phase II enzymes and detoxification of carcinogens. ${ }^{28,29}$ Prestera et al. ${ }^{30}$ proposed that anti-carcinogenic diet can inhibit cancer initiation acting on the balance between activation of phase I enzymes (such as cytochrome P450) and phase II (detoxification enzymes such as GST, QR1 and UDP-glucuronyltransferase). Factors that suppress or inhibit phase I enzymes or induce phase II enzymes are likely to have a protective role against cellular damage. A biflavonoid from Garcinia sp., the kolaviron, have been established as an inducer of phase II detoxification enzymes and inhibition of stress response proteins ${ }^{15}$, suggesting that morelloflavone can act the same way. Although the studies about the biflavonoids are rare when it is the role of induction of detoxification enzymes, the role of flavonoids in inducing QR1 is strongly reported ${ }^{31}$. It has been reported that apigenin flavonoid, a flavone as the luteolin unit from morelloflavone, is capable of inducing QR1 1.6 times ${ }^{25}$. The taxifolin, flavanonol which differs from flavanone by the presence of a hydroxyl group in the C ring, it is also capable of inducing QR1. ${ }^{32}$ The effect of supplemental feeding of naringenin in rats demonstrated through QR1 assays that the flavanone can promote QR1 activity in the liver from these animals under oxidative stress conditions. ${ }^{33}$ In our study, we observed similarity to the data presented in the literature review, where the induction QR1 by morelloflavone was 2 times higher in concentration ( $2.5 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ ),
with no cell death at this concentration by crystal violet, showing the importance of their role in the chemoprevention. Similarly in the context of cytotoxity, Lin et al. ${ }^{34}$ describe the morelloflavone showed moderate activity with $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ to 82 uM , while volkensiflavona (naringenin I-3-II-8 apigenin) showed a weak activity with inhibition at 200 uM in HIV-1 infected PBMC. In the study, the authors describe the biflavonoids constructed units linked flavanone, flavone I-3 II-8, as in the case of morelloflavone which presents moderate to weak cytotoxicity activity against PBMC HIV-1 positive. Other biflavonoids linked by I-3 II-8 as GB1a and GB2a, are moderately active, while biflavanones linked by A ring from two units of naringenin (rhusflavanone and succedaneaflavanone) were inactive. The study strongly suggests that the hydroxyl groups and at least one unit of the flavones in the biflavonoids are required for inhibitory activity of HIV-1 infected PBMC. A connection I-3 II-8 is required to display the biflavanones activity, and active compounds become inactive when hydroxyl groups are methylated. The biflavonoid, $3^{\prime \prime}, 4^{\prime}, 4^{\prime \prime \prime}, 5,5^{\prime \prime}, 7,7^{\prime \prime}$-heptahydroxy-3,8-biflavanone, known as $\mathrm{GB} 1^{35}$ was also shown not to be toxic (at $50 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ ) against some tumor cell lines. ${ }^{36}$ Importantly, the concentrations tested in different studies cited above were higher than those tested by our group ( $2.5 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ ), suggesting that the morelloflavone concentration tested, not have any cytotoxic profile. The profile induction of QR1 from extracts and fractions of Garcinia sp. not exists, and in this work they did not show the ability to duplicate the activity of the enzyme. In the context of non-tumor lines, Matsuo et al. ${ }^{37}$ reported the cytotoxicity of the units forming the morelloflavone separately, namely the flavonoid naringenin, teolin in human cells line, TIG-1 e HUVEC. Data showed a high variation between the $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ cell lines, and also among other flavonoids studied. ${ }^{37}$ These data suggest that the structure-activity relationship of flavonoids and biflavonoids with human and murine cells is still unclear, and its toxicity differs depending on the cell type. Protection against DNA damage is an important chemo-preventive property which can prevent the initiation phase of cancer. Flavonoids having antioxidant activity and anti-radicals are capable of quenching free radicals, which can promote DNA damage and mutations. The alkaline Comet technique allows identifying the presence of breaks in single strands of DNA and is used to verify ownership chemo-preventive protection against certain DNA damage. ${ }^{38}$ The chemo-preventive activity or lack of protective action and DNA damage can also be assessed, respectively, by antigenotoxicity and genotoxicitytests using the Comet assay ${ }^{21}$. Studies conducted in HepG2 cell line with the objective of evaluating the protective effect of $\alpha$-hederine isolated from plants (saponintriterpenic) against DNA damage caused by $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}$, the authors observed that the compound showed no protective action (antigenotoxic). In vivo studies demonstrated that ascorbic acid (vitamin present in many types of fruits and vegetables) have a protective action against the DNA damage induced by ethanol in embryonic cells of rat hippocampus, and in glial cells from human
brain. ${ }^{39}$ The kolaviron obtained from G. kola at concentrations $30-$ $90 \mu \mathrm{M}$ decreased DNA breakage induced by $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ in human lymphocytes and mouse liver cells ${ }^{7}$. The structure of kolaviron shows the existence of a hydroxyl radical in the C ring, which possible drives its antioxidant to the chemo-preventive activity. We found no previous studies involving the chemoprevention potential of the G. xanthochymus compounds after literature review. Nevertheless, studies about the protective effects of the plant should be intensively evaluated, since this can induce the activity of the enzyme quinone-reductase 1 .

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Financial support was provided by the FAPESP - Fundação de Apoio à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (09/52716-4) and CNPqConselho National de desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq) for TGAS fellowship (140022/2010-4). Thanks to L.M.W. Tirtaprawita; F.O. Sousa; D.H.S. Silva. Plant material: The leaves and fruits of Garcinia xanthochymus were collected in May 2008 (Jaboticabal, SP, Brazil) and a vouchers specimens (ESA88276) has been authenticated by Antonio Baldo G. Martins.

## REFERENCES

1. Whitmore TC. Garcinia. In: Whitmore TC, editors. Tree flora of Malaya: A Manual for Foresters. London: Longman; 1973. p. 196-225.
2. Chen Y, Zhong F, He H, Hu Y, Zhu D, Yang G. Structure elucidation and NMR spectral assignment of five new xanthones from the bark of Garcinia xanthochymus. Magn Reson Chem 2008; 46(12): 1180-4. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/mrc. 2317
3. Ambasta SP. The useful plants of India.Council of Scientific and Industrial Research. (CIRS) New Delhi: Publications and Information Directorate; 1986.
4. Baggett S, Protiva P, Mazzola EP, Yang H, Ressler ET, Basile MJ et al. Bioactive Benzophenones from Garcinia xanthochymus Fruits. J Nat Prod 2005; 68(3): 354-60. http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/np0497595
5. Baslas R and Kumar P. Chemical examination of the fruits of Garcinia xanthochymus. Curr Sci 1979; 48: 814-15.
6. Singh MP, Parveen N, Khan NU, Achari B, Dutta PK. Constituents of Garcinia xanthochymus. Fitoterapia 1991; 62: 286-9.
7. Farombi E, Hansen M, Ravn Haren G, Møller P, Dragsted L. Commonly consumed and naturally occurring dietary substances affect biomarkers of oxidative stress and DNA damage in healthy rats. Food Chem Toxicol 2004; 42(8): 1315-22. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.fct.2004.03.009
8. Thamizh Selvam N, Anjusha P, Sanjaya Kumar YR, Salini Chandran K, Venugopalan TN. Hofmann T. Antioxidant activity of Garcinia gummi gutta (Linn) in paracetamol intoxicated wistar albino rats. Int. Res. J. Pharm 2011; 11: 116-18.
9. Wang JJ, Sanderson BJ, Zhang W. Cytotoxic effect of xanthones from pericarp of the tropical fruit mangosteen (Garcinia mangostana Linn.) on human melanoma cells. Food Chem Toxicol 2011; 49(9): 2385-91. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.fct.2011.06.051
10. Nwokocha C, Owu D, Ufearo C, Iwuala M. Comparative study on the efficacy of Garcinia kola in reducing some heavy metal accumulation in liver of Wistar rats. J Ethnopharmacol 2011; 135(2): 488-91. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jep.2011.03.049
11. Gustafson KR, Blunt JW, Munro MH, Fuller RW, McKee TC, Cardellina JH et al. The guttiferones, HIV-inhibitory benzophenones from Symphonia globulifera, Garcinia livingstonei, Garcinia ovalifolia and Clusia rosea. Tetrahedron 1992; 48: 10093-102. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0040-4020(01)89039-6
12. Balunas MJ, Su B, Brueggemeier RW, Kinghorn AD. Xanthones
from the Botanical Dietary Supplement Mangosteen (Garcinia mangostana) with Aromatase Inhibitory Activity. J Nat Prod 2008; 71(7): 1161-6. http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/np8000255
13. Ryu HW, Cho JK, Curtis Long MJ, Yuk HJ, Kim YS, Jung S et al. $\alpha$-Glucosidase inhibition and anti-hyperglycemic activity of prenylatedxanthones from Garcinia mangostana. Phytochemistry 2011; 72: 2148-54. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/ j.phytochem.2011.08.007
14. Israf D, Tham C, Syahida A, Lajis N, Sulaiman M, Mohamad A et al. Atrovirinone inhibits pro-inflammatory mediator synthesis through disruption of NF-kappaB nuclear translocation and MAPK phosphorylation in the murine monocytic macrophage RAW 264.7. Phytomedicine 2010; 17(10): 732-9. http://dx.doi. org/10.1016/j.phymed.2010.02.006
15. Farombi EO and Owoeye O. Anti-oxidative and Chemopreventive Properties of Vernonia amygdalina and Garcinia biflavonoid. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2011; 8(6): 253355. http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ijerph8062533
16. Sporn MB and Newton DL. Chemoprevention of cancer with retinoids. Fed Proc 1979; 38(11): 2528-34.
17. Kelloff GJ, Lippman SM, Dannenberg AJ, Sigman CC, Pearce HL, Reid BJ et al. Progress in Chemo-prevention Drug Development: The Promise of Molecular Biomarkers for Prevention of Intraepithelial Neoplasia and Cancer - A Plan to Move Forward. Clin Cancer Res 2006; 12(12): 3661-97. http://dx.doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-06-1104
18. Prochaska HJ, Santamaria AB. Direct measurement of NAD(P)H:quinone reductase from cells cultured in micro titer wells: A screening assay for anti-carcinogenic enzyme inducers. Anal Biochem 1988; 169(2): 328-36. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1016/0003-2697(88)90292-8
19. Song LL, Kosmeder JW, Lee SK, Gerhäuser C, Lantvit D, Moon RC et al. Cancer chemo-preventive activity mediated by 4'bromoflavone, a potent inducer of phase II detoxification enzymes. Cancer Res 1999; 59(3): 578-85.
20. Scolastici C, Alves de Lima RO, Barbisan LF, Ferreira AL, Ribeiro DA, Salvadori DM. Anti-genotoxicity and antimutagenicity of lycopene in HepG2 cell line evaluated by the Comet assay and micronucleus test. Toxicol In vitro 2008; 22: 510-14. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tiv.2007.11.002
21. Singh NP, Mc Coy MT, Tice RR, Schneider EL. A simple technique for quantitation of low levels of DNA damage in individual cells. Exp Cell Res 1988; 175(1): 184-91. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0014-4827(88)90265-0
22. Kang YH and Pezzuto JM. Induction of Quinone Reductase as a Primary Screen for Natural Product Anti-carcinogens. In: Helmut S and Lester P , editors. Quinones and Quinone Enzymes. Academic Press; 2004. p. 380-414. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0076-6879(04)82021-4
23. Cuendet M, Oteham CP, Moon RC, Pezzuto JM. Quinone Reductase Induction as a Biomarker for Cancer Chemoprevention. J Nat Prod 2006; 69(3): 460-3. http://dx.doi .org/10.1021/np050362q
24. Froyen D, Van Atteveldt N, Blomert L. Exploring the role of low level visual processing in letter-speech sound integration: a visual MMN study. Front Integr Neurosci 2010; 4: 9. http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fnint.2010.00009
25. Uda Y, Price KR, Williamson G, Rhodes MJ. Induction of the anti-carcinogenic marker enzyme, quinone reductase, in murine hepatoma cells in vitro by flavonoids. Cancer let 1997; 120(2): 213-6. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3835(97)00311-X
26. Pang X, Yi T, Yi Z, Cho SG, Qu W, Pinkaew D, et al. Morelloflavone, a biflavonoid, inhibits tumor angiogenesis by targeting rho GTPases and extracellular signal-regulated kinase signaling pathways. Cancer Res 2009; 69(2): 518-25. http://dx.doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-08-2531
27. Rice Evans CA, Miller NJ, Paganga G. Structure-antioxidant activity relationships of flavonoids and phenolic acids. Free

Radic Biol Med 1996; 20(7): 933-56. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016 /0891-5849(95)02227-9
28. Gandhi RK Khanduja KL. Impact of Quercetin Consumption on Phase-I and Phase-II Drug-Metabolizing Enzymes in Mice. J Clin Biochem Nutr 1993; 14: 107-112. http://dx.doi.org/10.3164 /jcbn. 14.107
29. Gulick AM and Fahl WE. Forced evolution of glutathione Stransferase to create a more efficient drug detoxication enzyme. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 1995; 92(18): 8140-4. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1073/pnas.92.18.8140
30. Prestera T, Zhang Y, Spencer SR, Wilczak CA, Talalay P. The electrophile counter attack response: Protection against neoplasia and toxicity. Ad Enzyme Regul 1993; 33: 281-96. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0065-2571(93)90024-8
31. Moon YJ, Wang X, Morris ME. Dietary flavonoids: Effects on xenobiotic and carcinogen metabolism. Toxicol In Vitro 2006; 20(2): 187-210. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tiv.2005.06.048
32. Lee SB, Cha KH, Selenge D, Solongo A, Nho CW. The chemopreventive effect of taxifolin is exerted through ARE-dependent gene regulation. Biol Pharm Bull 2007; 30(6): 1074-9. http://dx.doi.org/10.1248/bpb.30.1074
33. Andrade JE and Burgess JR. Effect of the citrus flavanone naringenin on oxidative stress in rats. J Agric Food Chem 2007; 55(6): 2142-8. http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/jf061714h
34. Lin YM, Anderson H, Flavin MT, Pai YH, Mata Greenwood E, Pengsuparp T, et al. In vitro anti-HIV activity of biflavonoids isolated from Rhus succedanea and Garcinia multiflora. J Nat

Prod 1997; 60(9): 884-8. http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/np9700275
35. Iwu M and Igboko O. Flavonoids of Garcinia kola seeds. J Nat Prod 1982; 45: 650-1. http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/np50023a026
36. Antia B, Pansanit A, Ekpa O, Ekpe U, Mahidol C, Kittakoop P. Alfa-Glucosidase Inhibitory, Aromatase Inhibitory, and Antiplasmodial Activities of a Biflavonoid GB1 from Garcinia kola Stem Bark. Planta Med 2010; 76(3): 276-7. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1055/s-0029-1186081
37. Matsuo M, Sasaki N, Saga K, Kaneko T. Cytotoxicity of Flavonoids toward cultured normal human cells. Biol Pharm Bull 2005; 28(2): 253-9. http://dx.doi.org/10.1248/bpb.28.253
38. Leung CT and Brugge JS. Outgrowth of single oncogeneexpressing cells from suppressive epithelial environments. Nature 2012; 482: 410-3. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature10826
39. Guo L, Wang LH, Sun B, Yang JY, Zhao YQ, Dong YX, Spranger MI, Wu CF. Direct in vivo evidence of protective effects of grape seed procyanidin fractions and other antioxidants against ethanol-induced oxidative DNA damage in mouse brain cells. J Agric Food Chem 2007; 55(14): 5881-91. http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/jf070440a

## Cite this article as:

Tarsia Giabardo Alves Silva, Daniele Agustoni, Daniara Cristina Fernandes, Mauro César Cafundó de Morais, Christiane Pienna Soares. Preliminary investigation on the chemopreventive profile of Garcinia xanthochymus. Int. Res. J. Pharm. 2015; 6(3):173-178 http://dx.doi.org/10.7897/2230-8407.06338

