Comparison of L-Dopa content in three species of genus *Mucuna* by different techniques
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Abstract: In the present study, attempts are made to develop suitable method(s) for extraction of L-DOPA from the powdered seeds of 3 species of *Mucuna* using different solvents and conditions. The seed powder of both plants was subjected to 6 different extraction methods, with different solvent ratios. All the extracts were analyzed using RP-HPLC and were validated according to The International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use guidelines. The L-DOPA extraction was best with Methanol Water mixture in a cold maceration technique and overall gives good extraction efficiency in all the three plants giving concentrations of 5.03%, 13.36% and 16.78% of L-DOPA in *Mucuna gigantea*, *Mucuna pruriens* and *Mucuna monosperma*, respectively. The present investigation was done to study the extraction efficiency of various extraction methods of L-DOPA content in seed extracts of *Mucuna* and compare it.
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Introduction

L-(3,4-dihydroxyphenyl)-L-alanine(L-DOPA) is a precursor to many neurotransmitters like dopamine, noradrenaline, and adrenaline. L-DOPA crosses the Blood Brain Barrier whereas, dopamine cannot. In the Central Nervous System, L-DOPA converted into dopamine by the enzyme aromatic L-amino acid decarboxylase, also known as DOPA decarboxylase (DDC) (Simuni and Hurtig, 2008).

Various *Mucuna* species have been studied in developing countries as cover crops for food self-sufficiency development and soil fertility improvement; furthermore, their bioactive substances have been thoroughly evaluated, particularly L-DOPA (Tse et al., 2013). In contemporary medicine, *Mucuna* remains a genus of interest since its L-DOPA content and use in the treatment of Parkinson’s disease continues to be evaluated in biochemical research (Manyam et al., 2004).

*Mucuna pruriens* is commonly known as velvet bean, cowitch, cowhage, etc. *M. pruriens* has long been used in traditional Ayurvedic Indian medicine for many diseases (Katzenschlager et al., 2004). The seeds are noted to be a natural source of L-DOPA and are also used as a substitute for the synthetic L-DOPA (Ramya and Thakur, 2007). It is also known to show wonders as antiparkinson’s, aphrodisiac, antidiabetic, male infertility and neuroprotective activities (Vaidya et al., 1978; Sharma et al., 2000; Katzenschlager et al., 2004).

*Mucuna monosperma* is commonly known as Negrobean & periyattalgari (Poornachandra et al., 2005). Its seed materials have lately received more attention. Crude proteins, crude lipids, ash and nitrogen free extractives constituted 30.62%, 9.03%, 5.99% and 42.79%, respectively have been reported in the seeds. The seeds are also rich in minerals like potassium, calcium, magnesium and iron (Pugalenthhi et al., 2003). Anti-nutritional substances like total free phensols, tannins, and L-DOPA were also investigated (Arulmozhi and Janardhanan, 1992).

*Mucuna gigantea*, also known commonly as Seabean, or in Hawaiian as Kāe‘e, is indigenous to the Hawaiian Islands. Their pods show a range of color from green to brown and has hair-like structure called trichomes on it (Tse et al., 2013). These seeds have high amounts of crude protein, crude fat, total free phensols and tannins when compared to other legumes. Researchers have shown that the amount of L-DOPA could be reduced to a great extent just by cracking and rinsing the seeds under running water, proving that L-DOPA is very much present in the seeds (Tse et al., 2013).

Materials and Methods

Collection and Preparation of Sample: *M. gigantea* seeds were received from The Botanic Reserves of the Cairns Regional Council, Australia. *M. pruriens* pods were collected from Sanjay Gandhi National Park, Borivali; Mumbai, India on February 2015 and *M. monosperma* pods were collected from the forest.
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area of Ganeshgudi, Dandeli, Karnataka, India. The pods were dry roasted so as the burn the external itchy trichomes and it also facilitated in opening the pods with ease. The seeds were collected and were kept in a hot air oven at 40°C for checking its water loss. The Dried seeds were powdered using a grinder and passed through a sieve to achieve fine powder.

**Preparation of Standard**

99.9% pure L-DOPA standard was obtained from Pallav Chemicals and 1000 ppm standard stock was prepared (Rathod and Patel, 2014).

**Chromatographic conditions and instrumentation**

Chromatographic separation was performed with AGILENT HPLC (Model no. 1220 Infinity) equipped with binary pump and auto-injector (20μl). OpenLabCDS Version A.04.06 chromatographic software was used for data acquisition. Kromasil100–5 C18 (250mm × 4.6mm × 5μm); Part / Serial No: M05CLA25/E117509column was used for analysis. Mobile Phase used was water / Methanol / AcetoNitrile (100:60:40) (v/v) containing 0.2% Triethylamine, pH = 3.3 was filtered through 0.45 micron membrane filter (Millipore) and degassed by sonication; flow rate of 1 ml / min was maintained throughout the run. The column effluent was monitored at 280 nm with variable wavelength UV detector (Rathod and Patel, 2014).

**Method Validation**

Validation of the HPLC method was carried out as per ICH guidelines (ICH Guidelines). Parameters such as Linearity, Accuracy, Precision, LOD and LOQ were taken up as tests for analytical method validation and the values are listed in table 1.

**Preparation of the Plant Extracts**

Extracts were made using various techniques as listed below:

**Method 1** (Takashi et al., 2011):

This method was proposed by Takashi et al., 2011. The preparation of the sample remained the same and only the solvents used for the extraction have been changed so as to check the extraction efficiency of the same procedure with different concentration. The various solvent systems used were:

- Method 1.1: acetonitrile:water:formic acid (80:20:1)
- Method 1.2: acetonitrile:water (50:50)
- Method 1.3: acetonitrile:water:formic acid (50:50:1)
- Method 1.4: acetonitrile:acetic acid (100:1)
- Method 1.5: acetonitrile:water (80:20)

**Method 2** (Misra and Wagner, 2014):

1. The seed powder was defatted with acetone and then suspended in water: ethanol (1:1) with 0.1% ascorbic acid for 3 overnights. This was performed with regular change of solvents.
2. It was diluted 1:100 by using water: ethanol (1:1) with 0.1% ascorbic acid for HPLC analysis.

**Method 4** (Vachhani et al., 2011):

1. The seed powder was suspended in Water: Methanol (50:50) (v/v) and let it stand for 2 hrs unlike the original method.

**Method 5** (Raina and Khatri, 2011):

1. In this method, heat reflux was done for the seed powder using 0.1N HCl solution.

**Method 6** (Kasture et al., 2014):

1. The seed powder was treated with water: ethanol 30:70, kept in tightly closed container for 7 days.
2. The supernatant was separated.

**Results and Discussions**

The HPLC method discussed in the present work provides a convenient and accurate way for analysis of L-DOPA in three species of *Mucuna*. The retention time of standard L-DOPA is 2.363 mins as shown in Fig. 1. As shown in Fig. 2, 3 and 4, respectively, *M. pruriens* extract shows retention time of 2.333 mins, *M. monosperma* extract shows retention time at 2.350 mins and *M. gigantea* extract shows retention time 2.327 mins. The match in the retention time confirms the presence of L-DOPA in all three-selected species of *Mucuna*. For quantitation purposes all the plant extract was made in triplicates and tested by HPLC. The Area under the Curve/ peak area was considered and used for calculations.

**Table 1. Method validation parameters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linearity</td>
<td>100-700 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>0.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>98.83% recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Standard Addition Method)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intraday</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interday</td>
<td>0.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit of Detection (LOD)</td>
<td>2 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit of Quantitation (LOQ)</td>
<td>5 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Assay not decreased below 8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Mean Values of percent concentration of L-DOPA in the three selected species of Genus *Mucuna*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th><em>M. prureins</em> (%)</th>
<th><em>M. monosperma</em> (%)</th>
<th><em>M. gigantean</em> (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.257</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.157</td>
<td>4.088</td>
<td>2.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.806</td>
<td>6.545</td>
<td>3.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>1.234</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>9.333</td>
<td>4.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.362</td>
<td>16.78</td>
<td>5.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.722</td>
<td>9.084</td>
<td>4.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.134</td>
<td>2.337</td>
<td>1.772</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Chromatogram of the Standard
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Figure 2. Chromatogram of Method 4 for *M. prureins*
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Figure 3. Chromatogram of Method 4 for *M. monosperma*
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Figure 4. Chromatogram of Method 4 for *M. gigantea*
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In the proposed method, Linearity was observed in the concentration range of 100–700 ppm. The mean values of L-DOPA content in the seed powder extracted by each of these methods are compiled in Table 2 and Figure 5.

*M. gigantea* showed the relatively low concentration of L-DOPA in comparison with other two plants for all the methods. Method 2 and Method 4 were good methods regarding its extraction efficiency where all the three plants show approximately, 4%, 8% and 9% L-DOPA in *M. gigantea*, *M. pruriens* and *M. monosperma*, respectively. The L-DOPA extraction was best by Method 4 i.e. with Methanol Water mixture in a cold maceration technique and overall gives good extraction efficiency in all the three plants giving concentrations of 5.03%, 13.36% and 16.78% of L-DOPA in *M. gigantea*, *M. pruriens* and *M. monosperma*, respectively. Method 1.4 and 1.5 showed the least concentration of L-DOPA in all the three-selected species.

**Conclusion**

Use of suitable extraction methods will increase versatile utilization of these seeds with high levels of bioactive compounds for the management of chronic diseases like Parkinson’s. The present investigation suggests Water-Methanol system to remain the best solvent from all the solvents used for maximum extraction of L-DOPA for all the three species. According to literature much work is done on *M. pruriens* and its L-DOPA content; through this present study we can conclude *M. monosperma* to be a better source of L-DOPA. This will further help standardize procedures for extraction of L-DOPA from *Mucuna* plants and make a natural medicine against the symptoms of various diseases. However, for industrial application purposes, further investigations are required to develop a mathematical model to control and predict the optimization parameters of the extraction process.
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