

Original Research Article

Total Phenols Content and Antioxidant Power of Manuka Honey Is Related to 24hr Cytotoxicity Towards MCF-7 Breast Cancer Cells

ABSTRACT

Aims: To investigate the relations between total polyphenols content, antioxidant power and Manuka honey cytotoxicity towards MCF-7 cells.

Study design: *In vitro* study.

Place and Duration of Study: Department of Chemistry, University of Crete in partnership with the School of Biomedical Sciences, Ulster University, 09/ 2014 – 09/ 2015.

Methodology: Manuka honey (UMF 5+,10+, 15+ and 18+) were examined for total phenols content using the Folin-Ciocalteu method with results expressed as mg-gallic acid equivalents per kg honey (mg-GAE/kg). Antioxidant power was evaluated using the Ferric Reducing Antioxidant Power “FRAP” method and expressed as mg-GAE/kg. Honey cytotoxicity was examined with MCF-7 breast cancer cells cultured with RPMI 1640 supplemented with charcoals stripped serum and viability was monitored using the MTT assay.

Results: The total phenols content for Manuka honey ranged from 1367±152 mg-GAE/kg for UMF5+ honey to 2358 ±79 mg-GAE/ kg for UMF18+ honey. The antioxidant power for Manuka honey ranged from 170±22 mg-GAE/kg for UMF5+ honey rising to 266±21 mg-GAE/kg for UMF18+ honey. Manuka honey showed dose-dependent cytotoxicity towards MCF-7 cells after 24 hrs treatment. The concentration of honey which produces 50% inhibitory activity (IC₅₀) ranged from 4.7% (w/v) for UMF5+ honey to 2.2% (w/v) for UMF18+ honey. The cytotoxicity of Manuka honey was highly correlated with, values for the total phenols content ($R^2=0.99$) and antioxidant power ($R^2=0.95$) of Manuka

Conclusion: Manuka honey is cytotoxic to MCF-7 breast cancer cells *in vitro* and the effects are correlated with the total phenols content and antioxidant power.

Keywords: Manuka honey, MCF-7, antioxidant power, anticancer action, polyphenols

1. INTRODUCTION

There is renewed interest in honey owing to its antioxidant and anti-inflammatory potential, emerging role as functional food [1], possible use against drug resistant bacterial [2], and applications for cancer therapy [3]. Honey polyphenols produce antioxidant and anti-inflammatory action by scavenging reactive nitrogen and oxygen species [4]. Polyphenols also down-regulate cyclooxygenase-2 and inducible nitric oxide synthase [5] and may hinder cell mutation by inhibiting cytochrome P450 family and inducing phase II detoxification enzymes [6]. The mechanisms proposed for honey anticancer activity include, induction of cell apoptosis via caspase-8/9 dependent pathways, cell cycle blockage at the G₀/G₁ phase, regulation of Tumor-Necrosis Factor (TNF) family proteins or anti-estrogenic activity [3,4].

Breast cancer is the most important gender-specific cancer in women with 1.7 million cases in 2012 [7]. Current research into the effect of honey on breast cancer cells is limited. Three studies focused on Tualang honey [8, 9, 10], one considered Manuka honey [11] whilst two studies examined the effect of honey extracts [12, 13]. Thyme and pine fir honey extracts showed no inhibition of MCF-7, but instead showed antiestrogen activity [12, 13]. Tualang honey was cytotoxic to the MCF-7 and MDA-MB-31 cells and protective with normal breast epithelial cells. Tualang honey and tamoxifen combinations produced synergistic interactions [8, 9, 10]. There was significant cytotoxicity when MCF-7 cells were exposed to honey with “Unique Manuka Factor” (UMF) rating 10+ but no other UMF ratings were examined [11].

Manuka honey exhibits non-peroxide antibacterial activity attributed to polyphenols and methylglyoxal. Indeed, the levels of polyphenols, methylglyoxal or methyl-syringate [14] are considered quality

31 markers for Manuka honey, indicative of geographic origin and harvesting season [15]. Polyphenols
32 identified in Manuka honey include phenolic acids, gallic acid [1 & 3] methyl-syringate or leptosperin
33 [14] and phenylacetic acid. The main flavonoids in Manuka were found to be chrysin, galangin,
34 pinocembrin and pinobanskin are from Manuka honey [16]. We reported a strong correlation between
35 total phenols content and ferric reducing antioxidant power (FRAP) and honey UMF rating 5+, 10+,
36 15+ and 18+ [17]. Manuka honey also inhibited MDA-MB-231 cells (unpublished results). However,
37 the possible association of between total phenols content, antioxidant power and Manuka honey
38 cytotoxicity has not been explored. The aims of this study were, to investigate whether Manuka honey
39 total phenols content or antioxidant power are related to the cytotoxicity expressed towards MCF-7
40 breast cancer cells.

41 2. MATERIAL AND METHODS / EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS / METHODOLOGY

42 2.1. Manuka honey samples and reagents

43 Manuka honey samples rated "Unique Manuka Factor" (UMF) 5+, 10+, 15+, 18+ were purchased from
44 Comvita Ltd (UK). Thyme honey (30%) was purchased from a Cretan honey producer and was used
45 as control for total phenols assay and antioxidant power assay. The MCF-7 cells were a generous
46 offer of the Cancer Biology Lab, Department of Medicine, University of Crete. RPMI 1640 L-glutamine,
47 sodium bicarbonate, Charcoal stripped-Foetal Bovine Serum (CSFBS), 2,4,6-Tris(2-pyridyl)-s-triazine
48 ($\geq 99.0\%$) (TPTZ), gallic Acid (97.5-102.5%), sodium carbonate ($\geq 99.5\%$ purity) and Folin-Denis
49 reagent were all purchased from Sigma Aldrich Germany. Other laboratory reagents unless otherwise
50 stated were from Sigma Aldrich (UK), Fisher Scientific UK or GE Healthcare (UK).

51 2.2. Cell culture conditions

52 MCF-7 cells were cultured with RPMI640 (+L-glutamine) supplemented with 10% CSFBS and 1%
53 penicillin-streptomycin solution. Confluent cells (70%) were treated with trypsin-EDTA 0.25% solution
54 for detachment.

55 2.3. Folin-Ciocalteu assay for total phenols (total phenols content)

56 The total phenols content for honey was determined using the Folin-Ciocalteu method described by
57 Singleton et al. [18] with minor modifications for microplate analysis [19, 20]. Briefly, test samples
58 (50 μ L) were added to Eppendorf tubes, with 100 μ L Folin-Denis reagent and 850 μ L of sodium
59 carbonate (3.5% w/v) solution. The samples were vortexed briefly and incubated for 20min at 37-
60 40°C. The reacted samples (800 μ L) were transferred to cuvettes and absorbance was read at 760nm
61 using a Shimadzu UV-2700 UV-VIS spectrophotometer. Base-line measurements were carried out
62 using de-ionized water and blank values were deducted from all measurements. Calibrations were
63 produced using gallic acid 3mM (0-1000 μ M). Manuka samples (1:10 w/v diluted) were analysed as
64 above and values for total phenols content were expressed as mg-GAE /kg of Manuka honey. All
65 analyses were performed in triplicate and repeated on two independent days (n=6) datasets.

66 2.4. Determination of antioxidant power

67 Antioxidant power was measured using the ferric reducing antioxidant power (FRAP) assay as
68 described by Benzie and Strain [21] and adapted for microplate analysis [17]. Briefly, 75 μ L of test
69 sample were added to Eppendorf tubes followed by 1425 μ L of FRAP solution. The mixture was
70 vortexed briefly and incubated in 37°C water bath for 30min. Samples (200 μ L) were transferred to
71 96-wells microplate and absorbance was read at 593nm in the Synergy HT, Bio-TEK microplate
72 reader. Base line calibration was carried out using deionized water. Blank values were deducted from
73 all measurements. The FRAP analysis was calibrated using GA (0-500 μ M) and Thyme honey from
74 Crete was adopted as a "non-UMF" honey sample. The antioxidant power for samples was
75 expressed as mg-gallic acid equivalent antioxidant power (GAEAC) per kilogram of honey. All
76 analyses were performed in triplicate and repeated on two independent days.

77 2.6. Cytotoxicity and MTT assay

78 MCF-7 cells that were cultured in sterile T-75 flasks at 37°C and 3.5% CO₂ atmosphere until 70%
79 confluence, trypsinized and counted using a Neubauer chamber. Sterile 96-well micro-plates were
80 loaded with 10⁴/well and cells were allowed to attach for 24 hrs. Manuka honey samples were diluted
81 with culture media (10%, 8.5%, 5%, 3.33%, 2.5%, 2% and control (0%)), filter sterilized (0.2 μ m) and
82 applied to the plated cells. After 24h honey and media were removed from microplates, cells were
83 washed 2 xs with cold PBS and 20 μ L of MTT solution/well was added. Three hours after MTT
84 application DMSO 100 μ L was added to each well to dissolve the blue formazan crystals and optical
85 density (OD) was measured at 570nm two hours later using a Synergy HT, Bio-TEK microplate

86 reader. OD measurements were corrected for “assay” blanks. Results are presented as mean values
87 of eight samples of two different days/datasets.

88 2.6. Statistical Analysis

89 Correlations between Manuka honey components and UMF strength, MCF-7 percentage cell viability
90 and antioxidant power were calculated using MS-office excel 2010 (R^2 value). All measurements were
91 carried out in triplicates except the cell viability assay which were done in eight repeats. Mean values
92 and standard deviations (S.D.) are used in Tables and means and standard error of mean (S.E.M.) in
93 figures. Group means were analysed for statistically significant differences using one-way ANOVA
94 while followed by Tukey's HSD, or Dunnett's-T3 multiple comparisons *post-hoc* tests to locate
95 statistically significant differences between pairs of means. Prior to one-way ANOVA data were tested
96 for normality with the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and for homogeneity of variances with the Levine's
97 test. Where normality was violated replacement of the extreme values (>2 S.D. from the mean or in
98 one case of an outlier very close to 2 S.D. from the mean (total 8 cases out of 256 in MTT assay) with
99 the mean value was effected. Where variables had unequal variances the Dunnett's-T3 *post-hoc* test
100 was used for the separation of means replacing Tukey's test for homogenous variances. Statistical
101 significance was noted with p -value less than .05. All analyses were performed using IBM SPSS
102 Statistics v.22 for Windows, Chicago, IL, USA.

103 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

104 3.1. Total phenols and antioxidant power of honey samples

105 From Table (1), Manuka honey samples showed a total phenols content range of 1367-2357 mg-GAE
106 /kg honey. A one-way ANOVA test showed the total phenols content for all honeys were significantly
107 different ($P = 0.05$). Thyme honey had a lower mean total phenol content value compared to Manuka
108 honeys. Samples rated UMF5+ had almost double the total phenols content than thyme honey, and
109 UMF18+ had ~3.5 folds higher total phenols content. The total phenols content for honey was strongly
110 correlated with UMF rating (thyme was assigned with 0 value in UMF strength) for honey samples
111 ($R^2 = 0.9765$). Upon exclusion of thyme honey, the correlation between total phenols content and UMF
112 rating increased ($R^2 = 0.9908$).
113
114

115 **Table 1. Total phenols content and antioxidant power for Manuka honey (GAEAC mg/kg honey)**
116 **determined by the Folin Ciocalteu and FRAP assays**
117

Honey type	Total Phenols Content Mg-GAE/ kg (n=6)	Antioxidant Power mg-GAE / kg (n=6)
Thyme	692±65	58.8±8
UMF 5+	1367±152	170±22
UMF 10+	1747 ±52	206±25
UMF 15+	2042 ±49	248±8
UMF 18+	2358±79	266±21

118 *Notes. Values within 2nd and 3rd column are significantly different from each other ($P=0.05$). Assay
119 precision was 5.9% (Total phenols) and 9.9% (Antioxidant power) respectively
120

121 The antioxidant power of honey samples determined by the FRAP assay is listed in Table (1). A one-
122 way ANOVA test showed that the values for antioxidant power were significantly different for all
123 honeys ($P = 0.05$). The antioxidant power of Manuka honey UMF5+ was nearly 3-fold higher
124 compared to the value for thyme honey, whilst UMF 18+ Manuka had a 4.4-fold higher antioxidant
125 power compared to thyme honey. There was a positive correlation between antioxidant power and
126 UMF ratings for honey ($R^2 = 0.9252$), which improved when Manuka samples were regarded alone
127 ($R^2 = 0.9978$). Analysis of linear regression showed that the total phenols content and antioxidant
128 power were highly correlated ($R^2 = 0.977$) ($P=0.001$) and when thyme honey was excluded the change
129 of the regression coefficient was minor ($R^2 = 0.980$) ($P=0.01$).
130

131 3.2. Cell viability changes due to honey

132 Preliminary cytotoxicity tests for honey where performed using treatment durations of 24h and 48h.
133 One-way ANOVA showed there existed a statistically significant difference between the honey
134 treatments and media-only cell culture control ($F(4,35) = 32.809$, $P = .000$, eta squared=0.789) and
135 Dunnett's T3 *post-hoc* showed that all cytotoxicity values differed statistically significantly from the
136 control (5+,10+,15+ $P = .001$, 18+ $P = .003$) while between-UMF group comparisons revealed no

significant difference for honey at 8.5% dilution. Using a 48h treatment, one-way ANOVA found mean values of Manuka honeys and control groups differed significantly ($F(4,35) = 228.831$, $P = .000$, $\eta^2 = 0.963$). *Post-hoc* analysis revealed that all Manuka sample produced a statistically significant change in cell viability compared with the media-only control (all P -values = .000). There were also statistically significant differences between some comparisons of the means (UMF5+ vs. UMF10+ (P -value = .012), UMF10+ vs. UMF18+ (P -value = .039)). A time interval of 24h was chosen to further investigate cytotoxicity towards MCF-7 cells using a range 2-10% (w/v) of honey




Fig. 1. Effect of Manuka honey treatment on breast cancer MCF-7 cell viability
Cell were culture with RPMI 1640 with 10% Charcoal stripped FBS, 1% penstrep and assay using the MTT assay

Figure 1 shows changes of MCF-7 cell viability following 24h treatment with UMF 5+, UMF10+, UMF15+ and UMF18+ Manuka honey. Generally, MCF-7 viability declined at honey concentration of 2-10%. The half-maximal inhibitory concentrations (IC_{50}), determined using log linear excel dose-response curves, are shown in Fig. 2. For honey rated UMF 15+ and 18+ the IC_{50} values were virtually identical (2.1-2.2% honey).




Fig. 2. Effect of Manuka honey UMF rating on the inhibitory concentration (IC_{50}) for breast cancer MCF-7 cells

In Fig. (1) there was a significant difference in all group comparisons and a *post-hoc* analysis showed that all cell viability values decreased in comparison with the control except UMF5+ at 3.33%. For

UMF5+ to UMF15+ (Figure 2) there was a high degree of correlation between the IC50 value and UMF rating for honeys. Increasing UMF rating produced declining values for IC50. There was a correlation between IC50 values for honey and the total phenols content ($R^2 = 0.9895$) and also between IC50 and the antioxidant (FRAP) measurement ($R^2 = 0.9525$; Fig. 3).




Fig. 3. Relating MC7-7 cell inhibitory concentration (IC50) and honey characteristics.
Total phenols content (TPC) and antioxidant power (FRAP) for Manuka honey samples, UMF5+, UMF10+ and UMF15+

4. DISCUSSION

4.1. Total phenols content

The total phenolic content of Manuka honey is an indicator of its antioxidant power [17]. In this investigation there was an increase in the total phenols content for the Manuka honey series UMF5+ < UMF10+ < UMF15 < UMF18+ (Table 1). The total phenols values reported in this article (Table 1) are similar to reports for Manuka honey originating from the Northland region (903-2706mg/kg) of New Zealand [22]. The total phenols content for UMF5+ Manuka honey was 2-fold to 10-fold higher than values reported for other honeys in recent times (Table 2).

The total phenol content for honeys described in the literature were typically 500 mg-GAE/kg or lower [22-37]. A few honeys contain nearly 1000-mg GAE/kg including some from Argentina, Brazil, Italy and Burkina Faso (Table 2). Most honeys were from the honey bee (*Apis mellifera*). Interestingly, Kelulut honey from stingless bees (*Trigona spp*) possessed a higher total phenols content (791-1058 mgGAE/kg) compared to, values (510.4-589.2 mgGAE/kg) for Gelam, Borneo, Tualang and pineapple honey produced by Apis [23]. Overall, it seems that Manuka honey belongs to a rare grouping "super honey" types that contain at least 2000-mg GAE/kg. A few less well-known honeys from Sudan and Ethiopia were reported to have total phenols content similar or higher than Manuka honey but this data needs collaborating from other investigators (Table 2).

195 **Table 2: Total phenols content for select honeys from the literature and this study**

Honey	Total phenols mg-GAE/kg)*	Reference
Manuka honey	372-576	[17]
Manuka honey	1367-2358	This study
Manuka honey	903-2706	[22]
Malaysian honey (Kelulut honey)	791-1058	[23]
Turkish pine honey	156	[24]
Sourwood, Longan honeys	564-580	[25]
Cuban honey (v)	214-596	[26]
Saudi Arabia (v)	111-503	[27]
Ethiopian honey (v)	3300-6100	[28]
Sudanese Honeys (v)	794- 2327	[29]
Brazilian honey (v)	685-1085	[30]
Tualang honey, Malaysia	840	[31]
Argentina (v)	400-1930	[32]
Moroccan, citrus, thyme	164-924	[33]
Mexico (v)	510-1340	[34]
Italian (v)	605-2760	[35]
Obudu, Nigeria	1060-1300	[36]
Burkina Faso (v)	356-1148	[37]

196 **Total phenols content values are rounded up to nearest milligram, (v) several honeys were analysed*

197 **4.2. Antioxidant power**

198 Antioxidant power is one measure of the bioactivity from honey and other food [1, 3, 4]. Honey is
 199 derived from nectar and could potentially contain all classes of plant polyphenols, notably the phenolic
 200 acids being either hydroxy-benzoic acids (gallic, protocatechic, syringic, and vanillic acids) or
 201 hydroxycinnamic acids (p-coumaric, ferulic, sinapic and caffeic acids). The flavonoids are also
 202 represented, notably flavan-3-ols (catechins, galliccatechin, epicatechin) and flavanols (kaempferol,
 203 quercetin, myricetin) [36]. Specific polyphenols identified in Manuka honey include, gallic acid,
 204 methyl-syringate or leptosperin [1,3,14]. Flavonoids from Manuka honey (11 mg/kg) were principally
 205 pinobanksin, pinocembrin, luteolin and chrysin [16, 39]. Polyphenolic compounds are thought to
 206 contribute to the high antioxidant power of honey as measured by the FRAP assay [16].

207 Manuka honey showed increasing antioxidant power along with UMF rating; the order of decreasing
 208 antioxidant power was, UMF5+ < UMF10+ < UMF15+ < UMF18+ (Table 1). The differences in antioxidant
 209 power were statistically significant and ~ 4xs higher than values reported when the same samples
 210 were analysed earlier [17]. Interestingly, there were no differences in the antioxidant power for
 211 UMF15+ and UMF18+ Manuka honey samples though values of total phenols content were
 212 significantly different. Such results indicate either that polyphenols are not the only compounds
 213 contributing to the antioxidant power of Manuka honey samples, or that the FRAP and Folin assays
 214 for antioxidant power possess differences in sensitivity. The general correlation between total
 215 antioxidant power (FRAP) and total phenols content for honey has been reported previously [26] but
 216 other honey constituents (glucose oxidase, catalase, organic acids, amino acids and more) may
 217 contribute to the antioxidant power [1,3,4].

218 **4.4. Anticancer activity of Manuka honey with increasing UMF rating**

219 Despite modern scientific breakthroughs and discoveries, cancer mortality rates remain high [11]
 220 Chemotherapy, radiotherapy and surgery, all result in undesirable adverse health effects. The interest
 221 for alternative treatments has turned the focus to honey's anti-cancer potential. Investigations showed
 222 that Tualang honey was cytotoxic towards MCF-7 cells, and protective towards the MCF-10A non-
 223 cancerous cell line [8, 9, 10]. In previous studies, the MCF-7 cell lines was considered a good model
 224 for early stage hormone-sensitive cancer [8-11].
 225 The results from the current study agree with those reported from a previous investigation which
 226 showed that treating MCF-7 cells with UMF10+ Manuka honey produced a dose dependent decline in

cell viability [11] though the IC50 was >5% and 4% for 24hrs or 72 hrs exposure. By comparison, the IC50 for Manuka honey UMF10+ was 3% after 24 hrs in the present study. We found also that IC50 decreased with increasing UMF rating from UMF5+, UMF10+, to UMF15+ (Figure 2). In addition, results in Figure 3 showed that MCF-7 inhibition is strongly correlated with the total phenols content an antioxidant power for Manuka samples.


5. CONCLUSION

Manuka honey rated UMF 5+, 10+, 15+, and 18+ show total phenols content higher than most other honey. There was also a strong correlation between the total phenols content, antioxidant power, and UMF rating for honey samples. The current study demonstrates also that the cytotoxicity of Manuka honey towards breast cancer MCF-7 cells increases with rising UMF5+ to UMF15+ rating. Further research is in progress to understand the effect of Manuka honey on MCF-7 breast cancer cells.

REFERENCES

1. Alvarez-Suarez JM, Gasparrini M, Forbes-Hernández TY, Mazzoni L, Giampieri F. The composition and biological activity of honey: A focus on Manuka honey. *Foods* 2014;3(3):420-32. doi:10.3390/foods3030420.
2. Vandamme L, Heyneman A, Hoeksema H, Verbelen J & Monstrey S. Honey in modern wound care: A systematic review. *Burns* 2013; 39(8):1514-1525. doi: 10.1016/j.burns.06.014, PMID: 23896128
3. Jaganathan SK, and Murali M, Antiproliferative Effects of Honey and of Its polyphenols: A Review. *J Biomed Biotechnology* 2009;2009:1-13. http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2009/830616, PMID: 19636435
4. Erejuwa OO, Sulaiman SA, AB Wahab MS. Honey: a novel antioxidant. *Molecules* 2012; 17(4) 4400-4423. doi: 10.3390/molecules19022497, PMID: 24566317
5. Ahmed S, Ohtman NH. Honey as a potential natural anticancer agent: a review of its mechanisms. *Evid Based Complement Alternat Med* 2013; http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2013/829070, PMID: 24363771
6. Lam YS, Owusu-Apenten R. Enzyme induction and cytotoxicity of phenethyl isothiocyanate and its glutathione conjugate towards breast cancer cells. *Pure Appl Chem Sci.* 2013; 1.2: 63-73. http://dx.doi.org/10.12988/pacs.2013.3514
7. Torre LA, Bray F, Siegel RL, Ferlay J, Lortet-Tieulent J, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics, 2012. *CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians.* 2015;1;65(2):87-108. doi: 10.3322/caac.21262
8. Yaacob NS, Ismail NF. Comparison of cytotoxicity and genotoxicity of 4-hydroxytamoxifen in combination with Tualang honey in MCF-7 and MCF-10A cells. *BMC Complement Altern Med.* 2014; 14(1) 1. http://www.biomedcentral.com/1472-6882/14/106, PMID: 24646375
9. Fauzi AN, Norazmi MN, Yaacob NS. Tualang honey induces apoptosis and disrupts the mitochondrial membrane potential of human breast and cervical cancer cell lines. *Food Chem Toxicol.* 2011; 49(4) 871-878. doi:10.1016/j.fct.2010.12.010, PMID: 21167897
10. Yaacob NS, Nengsih A, Norazmi MN. Tualang honey promotes apoptotic cell death induced by tamoxifen in breast cancer cell lines. *Evid Based Complement Alternat Med* 2013; 2013. http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2013/989841, PMID: 23476711
11. Fernandez-Cabezudo MJ, El-Kharrag R, Torab F, Bashir G, George JA, El-Taji H, et al. Intravenous administration of Manuka honey inhibits tumor growth and improves host survival when used in combination with chemotherapy in a melanoma mouse model. *PLoS One.* 2013; 8(2) e55993. http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0055993, PMID: 23409104
12. Tsiapara AV, Jaakkola M, Chinou I, Graikou K, Tolonen T, Virtanen V, et al. Bioactivity of Greek honey extracts on breast cancer (MCF-7), prostate cancer (PC-3) and endometrial cancer (Ishikawa)

- 274 cells: Profile analysis of extracts. Food Chem. 2009; 116(3), 702-708.
275 [doi:10.1016/j.foodchem.2009.03.024](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2009.03.024)
- 276 13. Spilioti E, Jaakkola M, Tolonen T, Lipponen M, Virtanen V, Chinou I, et al. Phenolic acid
277 composition, antiatherogenic and anticancer potential of honeys derived from various regions in
278 Greece. PloS one. 2014; 9(4), e94860. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0094860>, PMID:
279 24752205
- 280 14. Kato Y, Fujinaka R, Ishisaka A, Nitta Y, Kitamoto N, & Takimoto Y. Plausible authentication of
281 Manuka honey and related products by measuring leptosperin with methyl syringate. J Agric Food
282 Chem. 2014; 62(27): 6400-7. [dx.doi.org/10.1021/jf501475h](https://doi.org/10.1021/jf501475h), PMID: 24941263
- 283 15. Kato Y, Umeda N, Maeda A, Matsumoto D, Kitamoto N, Kikuzaki H. Identification of a novel
284 glycoside, leptosin, as a chemical marker of Manuka honey. J Agric Food Chem. 2012; 60(13):3418-
285 23. [doi: 10.1021/jf300068w](https://doi.org/10.1021/jf300068w), PMID: 22409307.
- 286 16. Weston RJ, Mitchell KR, Allen KL. Antibacterial phenolic components of New Zealand Manuka
287 honey. Food Chem. 1999; 64(3): 295-301. [doi:10.1016/S0308-8146\(98\)00100-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0308-8146(98)00100-9).
- 288 17. Henderson T, Nigam PS, Owusu-Apenten RK. A universally calibrated microplate ferric reducing
289 antioxidant power (FRAP) assay for foods and applications to Manuka honey. Food Chem. 2015; 174:
290 119-123. PMID: 25529660.
- 291 18. Singleton VL, Orthofer R, Lamuela-Raventos RM. Analysis of total phenols and other
292 substrates and antioxidants by means of Folin-Ciocalteu reagent. [Methods in Enzymol.](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0076-6879(99)99017-1) 1999; 299:
293 152-178. [doi:10.1016/S0076-6879\(99\)99017-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0076-6879(99)99017-1).
- 294 19. Cheung T, Singh - Nee Nigam P, Owusu-Apenten R. Antioxidant Activity of Curcumin and Neem
295 (Azadirachta indica) Powders: Combination Studies with ALA Using MCF-7 Breast Cancer Cells. J
296 Appl Life Sci Int. 2016; 4 (3);1-12. [doi : 10.9734/jalsi/2016/22273](https://doi.org/10.9734/jalsi/2016/22273).
- 297 20. Yasir M, Sultana B, Nigam P, Owusu-Apenten R. Antioxidant and genoprotective activity of
298 selected cucurbitaceae seed extracts and LC–ESIMS/MS identification of phenolic components. Food
299 Chem.2016:199 307-313. PMID: 26775976
- 300 21. Benzie IF, Strain JJ. The ferric reducing ability of plasma (FRAP) as a measure of “antioxidant
301 power”: The FRAP assay. Anal Biochem. 1996;239(1):70-76. PMID: 8660627.
- 302 22. Stephens JM. Schlothauer RC, Morris BD, Yang D, Fearnley L, Greenwood DR, et al. Phenolic
303 compounds and methylglyoxal in some New Zealand Manuka and kanuka honeys. Food Chem. 2010;
304 120(1): 78-86. [doi:10.1016/j.foodchem.2009.09.074](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2009.09.074).
- 305 23. Kek SP, Chin NL, Yusof YA, Tan SW, Chua LS. Total phenolic contents and colour intensity
306 Malaysian honeys from the Apis spp. and Trigona spp. bees. [Agriculture and Agricultural Science
307 Procedia.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aaspro.2014.11.022) 2014; 2: 150-155. [doi:10.1016/j.aaspro.2014.11.022](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aaspro.2014.11.022).
- 308 24. Özkök A, D'arcy B, Sorkun K. Total phenolic acid and total flavonoid content of Turkish pine
309 honeydew honey. J ApiProd. ApiMedi. Sci. 2010;2:65–71, doi:10.3896/IBRA.4.02.2.01.
310 <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/250278968>
- 311 25. Moniruzzaman M, Sulaiman SA, Khalil MI, Gan SH. Evaluation of physicochemical and
312 antioxidant properties of sourwood and other Malaysian honeys: a comparison with Manuka honey.
313 Chem Cent J. 2013;7;138. [doi: 10.1186/1752-153X-7-138](https://doi.org/10.1186/1752-153X-7-138), PMID: 23938192
- 314 26. Alvarez-Suarez JM, Tulipani S, Díaz D, Estevez Y, Romandini S, Giampieri F, et. al. Antioxidant
315 and antimicrobial capacity of several monofloral Cuban honeys and their correlation with color,
316 polyphenol content and other chemical compounds. Food Chem Toxicol 2010; 48(8): 2490-2499.
317 [doi:10.1016/j.fct.2010.06.021](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fct.2010.06.021), PMID: 20558231

- 318 27. Alzahrani HA, Alsabehi R, Boukraâ L, Abdellah F, Bellik Y, Bakhotmah BA. Antibacterial and
319 antioxidant potency of floral honeys from different botanical and geographical origins. *Molecules*.
320 2012; 17(9): 10540-10549. [doi:10.3390/molecules170910540](https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules170910540), PMID: 22948516
- 321 28. Sime D, Atlabachew M, Abshiro MR, Zewde T. Total phenols and antioxidant activities of natural
322 honeys and propolis collected from different geographical regions of Ethiopia. *Bull. Chem. Soc.*
323 *Ethiop.* 2015;29(2);163-172. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/bcse.v29i2.1>
- 324 29. Tahir HE, Xiaobo Z, Zhihua L, Yaodi Z. Comprehensive evaluation of antioxidant properties and
325 volatile compounds of Sudanese honeys. *J Food Biochem.* 2015; 39(4): 349-359. [doi:](https://doi.org/10.1111/jfbc.12135)
326 [10.1111/jfbc.12135](https://doi.org/10.1111/jfbc.12135)
- 327 30. Liberato MDCTC, de Morais SM, Siqueira SMC, de Menezes JESA, Ramos DN, Machado LKA, et
328 al. Phenolic content and antioxidant and antiacetylcholinesterase properties of honeys from different
329 floral origins. *J Med Food.* 2011; 14(6): 658-663.
- 330 31. Kishore RK, Halim AS, Syazana MN, Sirajudeen KNS. Tualang honey has higher phenolic content
331 and greater radical scavenging activity compared with other honey sources. *Nutr Res.* 2011; 31(4):
332 322-325. [doi: 10.1016/j.nutres.2011.03.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nutres.2011.03.001), PMID: 21530807
- 333 32. Ciappini MC, Stoppani FS. Determination of antioxidant capacity, flavonoids, and total phenolic
334 content in eucalyptus and clover honeys. *J Apic Sci.* 2014; 58(1): 103-111. [doi: 10.2478/jas-2014-](https://doi.org/10.2478/jas-2014-0010)
335 [0010](https://doi.org/10.2478/jas-2014-0010).
- 336 33. Aazza S, Lyoussi B, Antunes D, Miguel MG. Physicochemical characterization and antioxidant
337 activity of 17 commercial Moroccan honeys. *Int J Food Sci Nutr* 2014; 65(4): 449-457. [doi:](https://doi.org/10.3109/09637486.2013.873888)
338 [10.3109/09637486.2013.873888](https://doi.org/10.3109/09637486.2013.873888), PMID: 24438231
- 339 34. Ruiz-Navajas Y, Viuda-Martos M, Fernandez-Lopez J, Zaldivar-Cruz JM, Kuri V, Pérez-Álvarez
340 JÁ. Antioxidant activity of artisanal honey from Tabasco, Mexico. *Int J Food Prop.* 2011; 14(2): 459-
341 470. [doi:10.1080/10942910903249480](https://doi.org/10.1080/10942910903249480)
- 342 35. Pichichero E, Canuti L, Canini A. Characterisation of the phenolic and flavonoid fractions and
343 antioxidant power of Italian honeys of different botanical origin. *J Sci Food Agri.* 2009; 89(4): 609-616.
344 [doi: 10.1002/jsfa.3484](https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.3484)
- 345 36. Alisi CS, Ojiako OA, Igwe CU, Ujowundu CO, Anugweje K, Okwu GN. Antioxidant content and
346 free radical scavenging activity of honeys of *Apis mellifera* of Obudu cattle ranch. *Int J Biochem Res*
347 *Rev.* 2012; 2(4): 164. [doi : 10.9734/ijbcr/2012/1581](https://doi.org/10.9734/ijbcr/2012/1581)
- 348 37. Meda A, Lamien CE, Romito M, Millogo J, Nacoulma OG. Determination of the total phenolic,
349 flavonoid and proline contents in Burkina Fasan honey, as well as their radical scavenging activity.
350 *Food Chem.* 2005; 91(3): 571-577. [doi:10.1016/j.foodchem.2004.10.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2004.10.006)
- 351 38. Pyrzynska K, Biesaga M. Analysis of phenolic acids and flavonoids in honey.  **TrAC Trends in**
352 Analytical Chemistry. 2009; 28(7): 893-902. [doi:10.1016/j.trac.2009.03.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2009.03.015).
- 353 39. Chan CW, Deadman BJ, Manley-Harris M, Wilkins AL, Alber DG, Harry E. Analysis of the
354 flavonoid component of bioactive New Zealand Manuka (*Leptospermum scoparium*) honey and the
355 isolation, characterization and synthesis of an unusual pyrrole. *Food Chem.* 2013; 141(3): 1772-1781.
356 [doi: 10.1016/j.foodchem.2013.04.092](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2013.04.092), PMID:23870890