**PHARMACOGNOSTIC STANDARDIZATION AND CHEMICAL STUDY OF *Euphorbia nutans* LAG. Euphorbiaceae**

.

ABSTRACT

|  |
| --- |
| **Aims**: This study was designed to set macro/micro morphological standards, phytochemical and physicochemical parameters for the identification of *E. nutans*, a traditional remedy for the management of many disesases.  **Study Design**: To establish pharmacognostic standards for proper identification of *E. nutans* and also study its phytochemicals using Gas Chromatography coupled to Mass Spectrometry (GC-MS).  **Place and Duration**: This work was undertaken at the Department of Pharmacognosy and Natural Medicine, Faculty of Pharmacy, University of Uyo, Uyo, Nigeria for three month spanning from April through June, 2022.    **Methodology:** Examination of microscopic characters, venation, chemomicroscopy, micromeritic properties, fluorescence analysis and phytochemical profiling using Gas Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry (GC-MS) were carried out.  **Results**: Epidermal cell shapes were irregular with undulate-sinuous anticlinal walls. Stomatal distribution was amphistomatic with anisocytic and anomocytic stomata on both surfaces. Areolation was quadrangular, linear and biforked vein termination. The fluorescence characteristics showed the presence of different colours supporting the presence of various phytoconstituents for both leaf and stem. The flow properties for both leaf and stem were poor while GC-MS analysis of the dichloromethane extracts revealed the presence of array of constituents for the leaf and stem, respectively.  **Conclusion:** The results of the study could be useful for correct identification, standardization and preparation of monograph. |
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1. INTRODUCTION

*Euphorbia* is the third largest genus in the flowering plants after Fabaceae and Rubiaceae with about 2000 species distributed worldwide. It has been widely reported for its ethnomedicinal uses for the treatment of diseases ranging from respiratory infections, body and skin irritations, digestion complaints, inflammatory infections, body pains, microbial illness, snake/scorpion bite, endocrine and sensory disorders. Studies showed the purgative and emetic effects of *Euphorbia* species [1, 2] They are also implicated in the treatment of skin diseases most such as warts, sores, carbuncles, boils, dermatitis, calluses, hair loss, irritation, psoriasis, pustules, sunburn and eczema [3]. The milky sap or latex of spurges is used to have a protective and defensive role in healing wounds [4]. In the category of respiratory system disorders, *Euphorbia* was described to treat asthma and cough, but also included descriptions of treatment for bronchial complaints, breathlessness, pneumonia and use as and expectorant [5].

Plants in herbal medicine have become a basic interest for research as the major source of herbs for local people and the herbal drug industry is the wild source. Adulteration is often found in the raw materials when purchased from the market [6]. It is also reported that herbal industry and local residents face the problems of adulteration and substitution at a raw material stage [7]. Quality control of crude drugs and herbal formulation is of vital importance in justifying their acceptability in modern medicine. One of the main obstacles to the acceptance of traditional medicine in developed countries is lack of documentation and stringent quality control [8]. However, standardization of medicinal herbs includes proper identification, quality control and quality assurance.

Therefore, the evaluation of standards can be done by assessing the organoleptic (colour, odour, taste) macroscopic, microscopic and physicochemical parameters [9]. With the numerous uses of *Euphorbia* species, *Euphorbia* *nutans,* commonly known as nodding spurge*,* spotted sand mat*,* eye bane*,* spotted spurge, an important member of this genus, has not been explored of its taxonomic and chemical profiling hence this study. This study was designed to investigate the pharmacognostic/taxonomic parameters and also study the chemical constituents using GC-MS to aid in its identification for safe use.



**Figure 1: *Euphorbia nutans* in a natural environment.**

2. material and methods

**2.1 Collection and Identification of Plants Materials**

Fresh samples of *Euphorbia nutans* were collected in August 2022 from a botanical garden and preserved in FAA (Formalin Acetic Acid). The plant was identified by Dr. Imoh I. Johnny, a taxonomist and voucher specimen (UUPH 31(e)) deposited in a herbarium. The collected leaves and stems were washed under running tap water, rinsed with distilled water, chopped into pieces, dried under shade at room temperature. The dried leaves and stems were powdered using electric blender, sift through 350 microns sieve size and stored in airtight bottles to avoid moisture and humidity prior to use

**2.2 Microscopic Leaf Evaluation**

**2.2.1 Qualitative microscopic Study**

For anatomical studies, the standard median portion of the well expanded matured leaf was obtained. Epidermal peels of both adaxial and abaxial surfaces were made by placing the leaf on a clean glass slide with the surface to be studied facing down. The specimens were irrigated with water holding it downward from one end and then the epidermis above the desired surface was scrapped off carefully with sharp razor blade. The loose cells were then washed off with water and the epidermis was stained in 1 % aqueous solution of safranin-O for 2-3 minutes and washed again in water to remove excess stain and mounted in 10 % glycerol on a glass slide and covered with a glass cover slip before viewing with an Olympus CX21 binocular microscope. Photomicrographs were taken from good preparations using the Olympus CX21 binocular microscope fitted with an MD500 Amscope microscope eyepiece camera. Measurements were done at ×10 while ×40 for photomicrographs [9].

**2.2.2 Quantitative Microscopic Study**

Quantitative microscopic parameters such as leaf constant studies viz. stomatal length and width, guard cell length and width, stomatal number, stomatal index, epidermal cell length and width, epidermal cell number, vein termination number, areole length and width were carried out using standard procedures [11]. All measurements were made using a calibrated ocular micrometer and thirty (30) microscopic fields chosen at random were used and data presented as mean ± Standard Error of Mean (SEM). The stomatal index (S.I) was determined according to the formula: Stomatal Index (S.I) = S/E +S x 100, where S = number of stomata per unit area and E = number of epidermal cells in the same area [10]. The stomata index (S.I) was determined using the formula: Stomatal Index (SI) = S/E +S x 100 Where: S = number of stomata per unit area E = number of epidermal cells in the same area [9].

**2.2.3 Evaluation of Leaf and Stem Powders**

Chemomicroscopic studies of the coarse powders of both the leaf and stem were undertaken to study o microscopical characters as well as chemomicroscopic properties such as cellulose, mucilage, lignin, starch, protein, oils and calcium oxalate crystals [12, 13]. The fluorescent analysis of *E. nutans* dried leaf and stem powders was carried out using the standard methods [14, 15] The micromeritic characteristics of leaf and stem powder to study the bulk density, tap density, angle of repose, Hausner’s ratio, Carr’s index and pH were determined according to earlier reported methods [16].

**2.2.3 Chemical Study with GC/MS Analysis**

Thirty (30) grams of each of leaf and stem powder was marcerated in 100 mL of dichloromethane (analytical grade) for 48 hrs, filtered and concentrated using a rotary evaporator. The resultant lipophilic extracts were subjected to GC-MS analysis at Shimadzu Training Centre for Analytical Instruments (STC, Lagos, Nigeria) using standard experimental protocol [17].

3. results and discussion

**3.1 Qualitative and Quantitative Microscopic Studies**

The results of the micro-morphological evaluation of leaf and stem of *E. nutans* are summarized in Figure 2, Figure 3 and Table 1 while the results of micromeritic, chemomicroscopic and fluorescence studies are captured in Tables 2, 3 and 4. Tables 5 and 6 captured the GC-MS phytochemical profiling of the dichloromethane fractions of both the leaf and stem of *E. nutans*.

**Table 1. Qualitative and Quantitative micro-morphological characters of *E. nutans***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Abaxial** | **Adaxial** |
| Stomata type | Anomocytic and Anisocytic stomata with T-pieces | Anomocytic and Anisocytic stomata with T-pieces |
| Anticlinal Wall Pattern | Sinous | Undulate |
| Stomata distribution | Amphistomatic | Amphistomatic |
| Stomata pore length | 8.78(10.43±1.225)12.26 | 7.08(8.9±1.428)10.90 |
| Stomata pore width | 1.73(2.74±0.676)3.65 | 2.02(2.62±0.567 )3.52 |
| Stomata width | 6.15(8.59±1.488)10.09 | 6.22(8.64±1.444)10.81 |
| Stomata length | 17.09(19.93±1.827)22.90 | 11.42(13.04±1.210)14.85 |
| Stomata number  (for area view) | 40(42.6±2.011)46 | 59(65.6±4.993)72 |
| Epidermal wall pattern | Irregular | Irregular |
| Epidermal layer number | 167(222.2±34.656)276 | 241(279.7±22.39)300 |
| Epidermal cell length (m) | 31.82(39.16±6.748)53.17 | 32.05(38.84±5.50)47.90 |
| Epidermal cell width (m) | 23.67(27.59±2.915)32.64 | 13.02(17.51±3.559)22.28 |
| Vein termination type | Linear and Biforked termination | Linear and Biforked termination |
| Vein termination number | 3(3.8±1.229)7 | 9(12.3±1.636)14 |
| Areole type | Quadrangular | Quadrandular |
| Width of areole | 38.51(40.95±1.618)43.73 | 47.50(49.28±0.983)50.17 |
| Length of areole | 102.7(108.30±3.758)113.62 | 117.5(121.12±2.288)124.11 |
| Length of Guard cell | 10.51(12.71±1.330)14.29 | 13.05(13.71±0.192)14.51 |
| Width of Guard cell | 3.25(3.73±0.617)4.51 | 3.25(3.73±0.617)4.51 |
| Stomatal Index | 16.09% | 21.40% |

Values are represented as: Lowest (Mean± Standard Error of Mean) Highest of ten (10) replicates

**Figure 2: (A): Abnormal stomata (AB), Anomocytic (AnoS) and Anisocytic (AnS) stomata ×1(B): Anomocytic stomata (AnoS)** × Abaxial surface **(C): Irregular epidermal cell (IE), Sinuous anticlinal wall pattern (SAWP) Aba**xial surface × 40

Figure. 3 (A): Anomocytic (AnoS) stomata adaxial × 40; Irregular epidermal cell (IR) ×40,

(B): Linear vein termination (LVt), Bi-forked vein termination (BFK) ×10(VI) and Quadrangular areole (QArL) × 40

**Table 2: Micromeritic evaluation of powdered leaf and stem of *E. nutans***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Micromeritic parameters** | **Leaf powder** | **Stem powder** |
| Bulk volume (mL) | 36.6±0.62 | 49.33±0.57 |
| Tapped volume (mL) | 28±1.00 | 32.33±2.309 |
| Bulk density (g/mL) | 0.275±0.00 | 0.203±0.00 |
| Tapped density (g/mL) | 0.357±0.01 | 0.311±0.02 |
| Flow rate (g/s) | 0.499±0.07 | 0.063±0.00 |
| Angle of repose (º) | 33.77±2.57 | 37.18±0.78 |
| Carr’s index (%) | 22.90±3.04 | 34.53±5.11 |
| Hausner’s ratio | 1.298±0.05 | 1.533±0.12 |

Result presented as mean ± SEM of three (3) replicates.

**Table 3: Chemomicroscopic evaluation of the leaf and stem of *Euphorbia nutans***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Constituents** | **Leaf** | **Stem** |
| Mucilage | + | + |
| Lignin | + | + |
| Starch | + | + |
| Cellulose | + | + |
| Oils | + | + |
| Proteins | - | - |

+ = present and - =absent

**Table 4: Fluorescence analysis of *Euphorbia nutans* Leaf and Stem Powders**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Extracts** | **Physical observation**  **LEAF** | **Physical observation**  **STEM** | **365 (nm) colour**  **LEAF** | **365 (nm) colour**  **STEM** |
| Methanol | Pale green | Light brown | Brownish red | Greyish pink |
| DCM | Green | Light Green | Red | Pink |
| n. hexane | Yellowish green | Grey | Light red | Light pink |
| Ethylacetate | Light Green | Light brown | Red | Pink |

**Table 5: Phytochemical composition of dichloromethane leaf extract of *E. nutans* by GC-MS analysis**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S/N** | **Retention**  **Time** | **Compound Name** | **Molecular**  **Formula** | **Molecular**  **Weight** | **Area %** |
| 1 | 11.467 | Bicyclo[4.4.0]dec-5-en-4-one-1-carboxylic acid | C11H14O3 | 194 | 0.04 |
| 2 | 11.767 | 2(4H)-Benzofuranone, 5,6,7,7a-tetrahydro-4,4,7a-trimethyl- | C11H16O2 | 180 | 0.04 |
| 3 | 12.970 | 2-Cyclohexen-1-one, 4-(3-hydroxy-1-butenyl)-3,5,5-trimethyl- | C13H20O2 | 208 | 0.04 |
| 4 | 14.168 | 2-Cyclohexen-1-one, 4-hydroxy-3,5,5-trimethyl-4-(3-oxo-1-butenyl)- | C13H18O3 | 222 | 0.32 |
| 5 | 14.244 | 2,3-Bis (1-methylallyl) pyrrolidine | C12H21N | 179 | 0.72 |
| 6 | 14.867 | 2-Pentadecanone, 6,10,14-trimethyl- | C18H36O | 268 | 0.15 |
| 7 | 14.914 | Phytol, acetate | C22H42O2 | 338 | 0.58 |
| 8 | 15.111 | 3.14 5-Nonadecen-1-ol | C19H38O | 282 | 0.18 |
| 9 | 15.272 | 3,7,11,15-Tetramethyl-2-hexadecen-1-ol | C20H40O | 298 | 0.16 |
| 10 | 15.923 | n-Hexadecanoic acid | C16H32O2 | 256 | 1.55 |
| 11 | 16.376 | 4-Oxazolecarboxylic acid, 4,5-dihydro-2-phenyl-, 1-methylethyl ester | C13H15NO3 | 233 | 0.18 |
| 12 | 17.186 | Phytol | C20H40O | 296 | 1.64 |
| 13 | 17.499 | 9,12,15-Octadecatrienoic acid, (Z,Z,Z)- | C18H30O2 | 278 | 3.33 |
| 14 | 17.693 | Octadecanoic acid | C18H36O2 | 284 | 0.29 |
| 15 | 19.050 | cis-Vaccenic acid | C18H34O2 | 282 | 0.17 |
| 16 | 19.309 | 2-Methyl-7-nonadecene | C20H40 | 280 | 0.13 |
| 17 | 19.454 | 4,8,12,16-Tetramethylheptadecan-4-olide | C21H40O2 | 324 | 0.06 |
| 18 | 20.765 | Decane, 1,9-bis[(trimethylsilyl)oxy]- | C16H38O2Si2 | 318 | 0.12 |
| 19 | 21.083 | Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate | C24H38O4 | 390 | 0.14 |
| 20 | 21.316 | Campesterol | C28H48O | 400 | 1.29 |
| 21 | 21.982 | Stigmasterol | C29H48O | 412 | 4.16 |
| 22 | 22.185 | 2,5-Octadecadiynoic acid, methyl ester | C19H30O2 | 290 | 0.78 |
| 23 | 22.561 | 2-methylhexacosane | ­­­ C27H56 | 380 | 0.34 |
| 24 | 23.018 | beta.-Sitosterol | C29H50O | 414 | 2.55 |
| 26 | 23.226 | Tetracosyl trifluoroacetate | C26H49F3O2 | 450 | 0.35 |
| 27 | 23.277 | . beta.-Alanine, n-pentafluoropropionyl-, hexadecyl ester | C22H38F5NO3 | 459 | 0.52 |
| ­­28 | 23.391 | Squalene | C30H50 | 410 | 0.45 |
| 29 | 23.540 | Lup-20(29)-en-3-one | C30H48O | 424 | 2.27 |
| 32 | 24.037 | 2-methylhexacosane | C27H56 | 380 | 9.37 |
| 33 | 24.654 | Lupeol | C30H50O | 426 | 64.05 |
| 34 | 24.762 | Docosanedioic acid, dimethyl ester | C24H46O4 | 398 | 0.40 |

**Table 6: Phytochemical composition of dichloromethane stem extract of *E. nutans* by GC-MS analysis**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S/N** | **Retention**  **Time** | **Compound Name** | **Molecular**  **Formular** | **Molecular**  **Weight** | **Area %** |
| 1 | 8.885 | 2-Tridecenal, (E)- | C13H24O | 196 | 0.23 |
| 2 | 10.561 | 5-Hydroxymethyl-1,1,4a-trimethyl-6-methylenedecahydronaphthalen-2-ol | C15H26O2 | 238 | 0.21 |
| 3 | 10.903 | 1H-3a,7-Methanoazulene, 2,3,4,7,8,8a-hexahydro-3,6,8,8-tetramethyl-, [3R-(3.alpha.,3a.beta.,7.beta.,8a.alpha.)]- | C15H24 | 204 | 0.05 |
| 4 | 11.373 | 2-Cyclopentene-1-butanal, .gamma.,.gamma.,2,3-tetramethyl- | C13H22O | 194 | 0.30 |
| 5 | 11.671 | Phenol, 2,4-bis(1,1-dimethylethyl)- | C14H22O | 206 | 0.17 |
| 6 | 11.767 | 2'-Acetonaphthone, 1',2'.alpha.,3',4',4'a,5',6',7',8',8'a.alpha.-decahydro-5'.beta.-hydroxy-4'a.beta.,8'.beta.-dimethyl-, (.+-.)- | C14H24O2 | 224 | 0.22 |
| 7 | 12.257 | Dodecanoic acid | C12H24O2 | 200 | 0.18 |
| 8 | 12.551 | Caryophyllene oxide | C15H24O | 220 | 0.40 |
| 9 | 13.660 | Octadecanal | C18H36O | 268 | 0.21 |
| 10 | 13.958 | 1-Heptadec-1-ynyl-cyclopentanol | C22H40O | 320 | 0.43 |
| 11 | 14.130 | Tetradecanoic acid | C14H28O2 | 228 | 0.68 |
| 12 | 14.258 | Bicyclo[2.2.1]heptan-2-one, 5-hydroxy-4,7,7-trimethyl- | C10H16O2 | 168 | 0.21 |
| 13 | 14.865 | 2-Pentadecanone, 6,10,14-trimethyl- | C18H36O | 268 | 0.63 |
| 14 | 14.910 | Phytol, acetate | C22H42O2 | 338 | 1.04 |
| 15 | 14.992 | Pentadecanoic acid | C15H30O2 | 242 | 0.39 |
| 16 | 15.108 | 3,7,11,15-Tetramethyl-2-hexadecen-1-ol | C20H40O | 296 | 0.23 |
| 17 | 15.158 | Cyclohexadecane | C16H32 | 224 | 0.38 |
| 18 | 15.268 | 3,7,11,15-Tetramethyl-2-hexadecen-1-ol | C20H40O | 296 | 0.30 |
| 19 | 15.527 | 3-Cyclopentylpropionic acid, 6-ethyl-3-octyl ester | C18H34O2 | 282 | 0.23 |
| 20 | 15.648 | Dibutyl phthalate | C16H22O4 | 278 | 0.66 |
| 21 | 15.753 | 2-Butyloxycarbonyloxy-1,1,10-trimethyl-6,9-epidioxydecalin | C18H30O5 | 326 | 0.19 |
| 22 | 15.975 | n-Hexadecanoic acid | C16H32O2 | 256 | 8.93 |
| 23 | 16.083 | Hexadecanoic acid, ethyl ester | C18H36O2 | 284 | 0.24 |
| 24 | 16.358 | 4-Oxazolecarboxylic acid, 4,5-dihydro-2-phenyl-, 1-methylethyl ester | C13H15NO3 | 233 | 3.34 |
| 25 | 16.480 | Eicosanoic acid | C20H40O2 | 312 | 0.24 |
| 26 | 16.768 | Kaur-16-ene | C20H32 | 272 | 0.24 |
| 27 | 16.881 | n-Nonadecanol-1 | C19H40O | 284 | 1.09 |
| 28 | 17.049 | 2-Nonadecanone | C19H38O | 282 | 0.46 |
| 29 | 17.183 | Phytol | C20H40O | 296 | 0.92 |
| 30 | 17.424 | 9,12-Octadecadienoic acid (Z,Z)- | C18H32O2 | 280 | 4.20 |
| 31 | 17.483 | 9-Octadecenoic acid, (E)- | C18H34O2 | 282 | 2.04 |
| 32 | 17.592 | 1,16-Hexadecanediol | C16H34O2 | 258 | 0.66 |
| 33 | 17.706 | Bicyclo[4.1.0]heptan-3-ol, 4,7,7-trimethyl-, [1R-(1.alpha.,3.beta.,4.alpha.,6.alpha.)]- | C10H18O | 154 | 1.76 |
| 34 | 17.773 | 2-Nonadecanone | C19H38O | 282 | 0.50 |
| 35 | 18.074 | Tricosyl acetate | C25H50O2 | 382 | 0.34 |
| 36 | 18.133 | Heneicosane | C21H44 | 296 | 1.02 |
| 37 | 18.397 | Vitamin E | C29H50O2 | 430 | 1.05 |
| 38 | 18.475 | Bicyclo[12.4.0]octadec-1(14)-ene, 16,17-diethyl-, (Z)- | C22H40 | 304 | 0.46 |
| 39 | 18.899 | n-Nonadecanol-1 | C19H40O | 284 | 0.35 |
| 40 | 19.091 | 2-Nonadecanone | C19H38O | 282 | 1.98 |
| 41 | 19.451 | 4,8,12,16-Tetramethylheptadecan-4-olide | C21H40O2 | 324 | 0.81 |
| 42 | 19.977 | 1,16-Hexadecanediol | C16H34O2 | 258 | 0.37 |
| 43 | 20.050 | Cyclopentadecanone | C15H28O | 224 | 0.42 |
| 44 | 20.100 | Nonadecane | C19H40 | 268 | 0.19 |
| 45 | 20.780 | Hexanoic acid, heptadecyl ester | C23H46O2 | 354 | 1.10 |
| 46 | 20.955 | 2-Pentacosanone | C25H50O | 366 | 2.14 |
| 47 | 21.093 | Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate | C24H38O4 | 390 | 1.97 |
| 48 | 21.298 | Campesterol | C28H48O | 400 | 0.67 |
| 49 | 21.568 | 2-Pentacosanone | C25H50O | 366 | 0.29 |
| 50 | 21.704 | Z-14-Octadecen-1-ol acetate | C20H38O2 | 310 | 0.49 |
| 51 | 21.796 | 2-methylhexacosane | C27H56 | 380 | 0.19 |
| 52 | 21.926 | Stigmasterol | C29H48O | 412 | 2.15 |
| 53 | 22.417 | Hexanoic acid, octadecyl ester | C24H48O2 | 368 | 1.41 |
| 54 | 22.565 | 2-Pentacosanone | C25H50O | 366 | 2.20 |
| 55 | 22.700 | Heneicosane, 11-decyl- | C31H64 | 436 | 2.58 |
| 56 | 22.758 | 1,3-Benzenedicarboxylic acid, bis(2-ethylhexyl) ester | C24H38O4 | 390 | 0.98 |
| 57 | 22.931 | .beta.-Sitosterol | C29H50O | 414 | 6.22 |
| 58 | 23.033 | Cyclononasiloxane, octadecamethyl- | C18H54O9Si9 | 666 | 1.02 |
| 60 | 23.283 | 1,3-Dioxolane, 2-heptyl-4-octadecyloxymethy | C29H58O3 | 454 | 3.31 |
| 62 | 23.377 | Lanosterol | C30H50O | 426 | 2.47 |
| 63 | 23.525 | Lup-20(29)-en-3-one | C30H48O | 424 | 3.42 |
| 64 | 23.679 | 9,19-Cyclolanost-23-ene-3,25-diol, (3.beta.,23E)- | C30H50O2 | 442 | 1.37 |
| 65 | 23.749 | Heptadecafluorononanoic acid, undecyl ester | C20H23F17O2 | 618 | 0.92 |
| 66 | 23.808 | Ergosterol | C28H44O | 396 | 0.53 |
| 67 | 23.986 | Lupeol | C30H50O | 426 | 9.85 |
| 68 | 24.056 | Tetratetracontane | C44H90 | 618 | 5.86 |
| 69 | 24.328 | Cholest-4-ene | C27H46 | 370 | 0.42 |
| 70 | 24.456 | Cholane-24-thioic acid, 3,12-bis(acetyloxy)-, S-ethyl ester, (3.beta.,5.beta.,12.alpha.)- | C30H48O5S | 520 | 4.37 |
| 71 | 24.569 | 7.alpha.-Methylthiotestosterone acetate | C22H32O3S | 376 | 0.23 |
| 72 | 24.783 | Nonadecanoic acid, 2,2,2- trifluoroethyl ester | C21H39F3O2 | 380 | 1.31 |
| 73 | 24.845 | Heneicosane | C21H44 | 296 | 0.43 |

In the results obtained from microscopy of *E. nutans,* the plant was found to be amphistomatic, no trichomes were found on both abaxial and adaxial surfaces. The epidermal wall pattern was found to be irregular for both surfaces. The stomatal index of the abaxial surface was 16.09% and that of the adaxial surface was 21.40% as shown in Table 1. Also, the results of leaf microscopy in Table 1 revealed that the plant has more stomata on the adaxial surface than on the abaxial surface. Every plant possesses characteristic tissue features which can be identified by microscopy of leaf and stem powder analysis and used for identification and detection of adulteration. The microscopic study also showed anisocytic and anomocytic stomata types on both the abaxial and adaxial surface with t-pieces on the stomata (Figure 2 and 3, respectively). It also showed an undulate anticlinal wall pattern for the adaxial surface and a sinuous anticlinal wall pattern for the abaxial surface with knots on the sinuous cell wall. The areole were quadrangular on both surfaces. The results of microscopy evaluation of *E. nutans* leaf and stem furnished diagnostic features for judging the authenticity, quality, purity and differentiate the drug from its closely related species and also detect adulterant. Anatomic characters was used as a taxonomic tool for the identification of *Cola millenii* [18] hence the applicability of this study.

For the flow rate, the angle of repose in Table 2 for the leaf and stem were 33.770 and 37.180, respectively which showed a poor flow. The value of Hausner’s ratio as seen in Table 2 for the leaf and stem powders were 1.298 and 1.533, respectively showing a poor flow. Hausner’s ratio values of less than 1.25 indicates good flow while those greater than 1.25 indicates poor flow. The micromeritics properties help to characterize and standardize the pre-formulation properties of herbal drug powder in order to determine its suitability for formulation into solid dosage form [16].

Chemomicroscopic analysis in Table 3 revealed the presence of mucilage, cellulose, lignin, oil and starch in both stem and leaf powders of the *E. nutans* and absence of protein in both leaf and stem of the plant. Most of the cell wall materials such as cellulose, lignin, etc. perform the functions of protection, strengthening, insulation and reinforcing vascular plants without which they topple over [19].

Flouorescence analysis of the leaf and stem on *E. nutans* as seen in Table 4. Different colors were observed when viewed in visible light and under UV light of wavelength 365nm. These colors were distinctive and reproducible revealing the solvent properties to the phytoconstituents. The various colours in *Chrysanthemum indicum* flowers were reported using florescence analysis [20].

The Gas Chromatography-Mass Spectroscopy is a vital tool due to its potential to supply suggested qualitative and quantitative information on constituents based on their structural compositions which may serve as chemotaxomomic markers in plant identification [16]. The GC-MS analysis showed the presence of 34 phytochemical constituents (Table 5 and Figure 4) for the leaf and 73 phytochemical constituents (Table 6 and Figure 5) for the stem. Lupeol (64.05%), 2-methylhexacosane (9.37%), stigmasterol (4.16%) and campesterol (1.29%) were recorded as major components in the leaf while campesterol (0.67%), stigmasterol (2.15 %), beta.-sitosterol (6.22%), lupeol (9.85%) and vitamin E (1.05%) were recorded in the stem extract. These phytochemical constituents may function as chemotaxonomic markers, an important taxonomic tool in the identification of *E. nutans*. The phytochemical, lupeol is reported to act as anti-inflammatory, cancer preventive, hepatoprotective, and antiprotozoal agent [21, 22]. N-Hexadecanoic acid and hexadecanoic acid, both fatty acids are reported as antioxidant and anti-inflammatory agents [22, 23] likewise phytol, an antioxidant and chemopreventive agent [24].

4. Conclusion

The pharmacognostic standards established in this study coupled with the GC-MS chemical analysis of *E. nutans* can adequately provide data for the identification of *E. nutans*.
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