In vitro inhibitory activities of sugarcane extract on avian Eimeria sporozoites

Ali Daneshmand, Petrina Young, Bronwyn Campbell, Sarbast K. Kheravii, Nishchal K. Sharma, Roya Afshari, Daniel A. Dias, Matthew Flavel, Barry Kitchen, Shu-Biao Wu

PII: S2211-3207(21)00032-4

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpddr.2021.07.001

Reference: IJPDDR 418

- To appear in: International Journal for Parasitology: Drugs and Drug Resistance
- Received Date: 21 February 2021

Revised Date: 2 July 2021

Accepted Date: 5 July 2021

Please cite this article as: Daneshmand, A., Young, P., Campbell, B., Kheravii, S.K., Sharma, N.K., Afshari, R., Dias, D.A., Flavel, M., Kitchen, B., Wu, S.-B., *In vitro* inhibitory activities of sugarcane extract on avian *Eimeria* sporozoites, *International Journal for Parasitology: Drugs and Drug Resistance* (2021), doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpddr.2021.07.001.

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2021 Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of Australian Society for Parasitology.





1	
2	
3	In vitro inhibitory activities of sugarcane extract on avian Eimeria
4	sporozoites
5	
6	
7	Ali Daneshmand ¹ , Petrina Young ² , Bronwyn Campbell ³ , Sarbast K Kheravii ¹ , Nishchal K Sharma ¹ ,
8	Roya Afshari ⁴ , Daniel A Dias ⁴ , Matthew Flavel ^{5,6} , Barry Kitchen ^{5,6} , Shu-Biao Wu ^{1,*}
9	
10	
11	¹ School of Environmental and Rural Science, University of New England, Armidale, NSW 2351
12	Australia:
13	² Eimeria Pty Ltd, Ringwood, VIC 3134, Australia;
14	³ Department of Biosciences and Food Technology, RMIT University, Bundoora, VIC 3083,
15	Australia;
16	⁴ School of Health and Biomedical Sciences, RMIT University, Bundoora, VIC 3083, Australia
17	⁵ The Product Makers (TPM) Pty. Ltd., Keysborough, VIC 3173, Australia.
18	⁶ School of Life Sciences, La Trobe University, Bundoora, VIC 3083, Australia.
19	
20	
21	
22	* Corresponding author:
23	Shu-Biao Wu
24	Phone: +61 2 6773 2238
25	Facsimile: +61 2 6773 3814
26	Email: <u>shubiao.wu@une.edu.au</u>

27 Abstract

28 The current *in vitro* study aimed to investigate the effects of a processed sugarcane extract on the viability of avian Eimeria sporozoites. Treatments were applied to hatched sporozoites: 1) without 29 additives (no-treatment control); 2) with ethanol; 3) with salinomycin; 4) with PolygainTM. All 30 treatments were incubated in RPMI media containing live sporozoites at 37°C for 14 hrs and then the 31 number of viable sporozoites were counted. Compared to the no-treatment control, Polygain[™] 32 decreased (P < 0.001) the counts of E. maxima, E. acervulina, E. bruneti, and E. mitis sporozoites to 33 a level similar to salinomycin (P > 0.05). In conclusion, PolygainTM could be a potential candidate as 34 an anticoccidial agent. 35

36

Keywords: Sugarcane extract, avian coccidiosis, sporozoites, *in vitro* excystation, anticoccidial
agents, *Eimeria* species.

39 Introduction

40 Coccidiosis is an enteric poultry disease induced by protozoan parasites of the apicomplexan genus 41 *Eimeria* (Chapman, 2014). The disease imposes more than \$3 billion in annual losses on the global poultry industry (Dalloul and Lillehoj, 2006). At the beginning of the *Eimeria* life cycle in chickens, 42 sporulated oocysts are ingested from litter, feed, drinker, and then undergo mechanical (gizzard) and 43 44 biochemical (enzymes) changes passing through the gastrointestinal tract to release sporozoites 45 (Conway et al., 1993). The motile sporozoites can invade the epithelial cells as part of sexual and 46 asexual replication and destroy the mucosal layer and underlying tissues resulting in hemorrhagic 47 lesions and bloody diarrhea (Blake and Tomley, 2014; Chapman, 2014). The lesions can directly decrease nutrient absorption, weight gain, and subsequently feed efficiency (Chapman, 2014), and 48 indirectly perturb the intestinal microbiome and predispose the intestinal environment for the 49 50 proliferation of pathogenic bacteria such as *Clostridium perfringens* leading to necrotic enteritis (Arakawa et al., 1981). The common methods in preventing and controlling coccidiosis comprise 51 anticoccidial ionophorous antibiotics and vaccination (De Gussem, 2007). The emergence of 52 antibiotic-resistant Eimeria (Abbas et al., 2011) and public concerns about antibiotic residues in 53 54 poultry products led to the poultry producers to use live vaccination against coccidiosis. However, 55 alternative methods are also sought to combat coccidiosis in combination with vaccination. Therefore, 56 various additives such as prebiotics, probiotics, essential oils, and plant extracts have been introduced 57 to the poultry industry in attempts to minimize the negative effects of coccidiosis. Several studies 58 demonstrated that plant extracts have biologically active compounds (natural products) such as 59 flavonoids which can play a prophylactic role as anticoccidial agents and activate the host-immune system to protect the intestinal layers from pathogenic invasion (Abbas et al., 2012; Wunderlich et 60 61 al., 2014).

Sugarcane (*Saccharum officinarum* L.) is a perennial tropical plant used to produce sugar, wax, and
other valuable products (Singh et al., 2015). The ability of a sugarcane extract to inhibit *Eimeria*

64 species and thus prevent the chickens from coccidiosis has been demonstrated in previous research (El-Abasy et al., 2003; Akhtar et al., 2008; Awais et al., 2011). It has been demonstrated that 65 66 sugarcane extracts can activate the immune response against *Eimeria* spp., possibly through 67 increasing the antibody production by polysaccharides components of the extract in broilers challenged with coccidiosis (El-Abasy et al., 2003; Akhtar et al., 2008). While previous studies 68 showed the beneficial effects of sugarcane extracts in controlling coccidiosis in broilers, to the best 69 70 of our knowledge, no reports have examined the inhibitory effects of the extract on *Eimeria* sporozoites of a wide range of species in vitro. Therefore, the current study aimed to evaluate the 71 72 inhibitory effects of processed sugarcane extracts on avian Eimeria sporozoites under in vitro conditions. The hypothesis was that processed sugarcane extracts could reduce the number of viable 73 sporozoites in the growth medium. 74

75 Materials and methods

To determine the bioactive compounds of sugarcane extract, metabolites were extracted from a 30 76 mg Polygain[™] sample in a tube containing 500 µL of MeOH/H₂O/CHCl₃ (3:1:1, *v:v:v*). The mixture 77 was homogenized using a MP homogeniser (FastPrep®) (1 min, 4.5 m/s) and vortexed and incubated 78 (70 °C for 15 min) in a thermomixer at 850 rpm. Then, the mixture was centrifuged (Heraeus[™]) 79 80 PicoTM 21 Microcentrifuge, Thermo Scientific, MA, USA) at 15700 \times g for 15 min. The supernatant 81 was transferred to a new Eppendorf tube, and 500 µL of MeOH/H₂O/CHCl₃ was added into the first 82 lysing tube containing the previously freeze-dried sample. The samples were again vortexed and centrifuged at 15700 \times g for 15 min. The resulting supernatant was then transferred into the tube 83 containing the original supernatant from the previous centrifugation. Pooled samples were then 84 85 vortexed for 30 s and 20 µL aliquots of supernatant were transferred into separate glass inserts and dried in vacuo for subsequent trimethylsilyl (TMS) polar metabolite derivatisation using GC-MS 86 analysis as previously described by Afshari et al. (2020). One microliter of each derivatized sample 87

was injected into a GC-MS (Agilent, Santa Clara, USA) using either split (1:20 split ratio) or splitless
mode.

90 Oocysts of E. acervulina, E. maxima, E. brunetti, E. tenella, E. necatrix, and E. mitis used in the current study were provided by Eimeria Pty Ltd (Ringwood, VIC, Australia). The excystation was 91 92 performed as described by Tomley (1997) with some modifications. A volume of 500 µL of each 93 *Eimeria* sporulated oocysts was pipetted into 2 ml Eppendorf tubes, an equal weight of 0.5 mm glass 94 beads were added to the same tube, and the mixture was vortexed for about 1 min to mechanically discharge sporocysts from oocysts. The released sporocysts were centrifuged (Eppendorf centrifuge 95 96 5819R, Hamburg, Germany) twice at 1800 ×g for 10 min in phosphate buffered saline plus 1% 97 glucose at pH 8 (mPBS) to wash the sporocysts. The washed sporocysts were incubated in hatching solution (Hank's Buffered Salt Solution, 1% taurocholic acid, 0.25% trypsin, 1M magnesium chloride 98 99 solution, and adjusted to pH 8.0) at 41°C for 2 hrs with 100 rpm (Shaker-Incubator, Paton Scientific 100 Pty. Ltd., SA, Australia). Following hatching, the sporozoites were purified using Amicon stirred cell (Merck, Germany) with 5 µm filter membrane (Durapore[®], Merck, Ireland). The excysted sporozoites 101 were suspended in mPBS and centrifuged twice at 1800 ×g for 10 min to remove any debris of 102 103 excystation and also to bring the pH back to around 8 as the media becomes quite acidic during 104 hatching. The cleaned pellet of *Eimeria* sporozoites was suspended in 12 mL RPMI medium (Gibco®, 105 Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA). A total amount of 1980 µL medium containing sporozoites was 106 aliquoted into 2 ml Eppendorf tubes, and then, 20 µL mPBS or respective experimental additives 107 were added to the media and incubated at 37°C for 14 hrs. In the current study, the processed form of the sugarcane extract under the commercial name of Polygain[™] was tested. Polygain[™] is a 108 109 commercially available sugarcane extract that is prepared via a patented filtration procedure (Patent 110 number: WO2019213703A1). Treatments were as follows: 1) No-treatment control; 2) Ethanol 111 control containing absolute ethanol to kill Eimeria; 3) Salinomycin (60 ppm) as a coccidiostat treatment; 4) Polygain[™] (1%). After incubation for 14 hrs, the sporozoite mixtures were diluted ten 112

113 times, and a volume of 30 μ L were filled in a Fuchs-Rosenthal chamber. The number of alive sporozoites were counted based on the method described by Jaskiewicz et al. (2018) and Yang et al. 114 115 (2019). In brief, the viability of sporozoites was assessed through the motility of sporozoites under 116 microscope with a ×40 objective lens (Nikon Eclipse Ci-l, Tokyo, Japan). The microscope was equipped with a camera connected to a computer operated by the software NIS-Elements 117 Documentation (Nikon, Tokyo, Japan). Five fields of the chamber were counted and averaged for 118 119 each sample, and four samples were measured as replicates. The means of the treatment were used for statistical analysis. All data were analysed in a completely randomized design by ANOVA using 120 121 JMP 14.0 (SAS Institute, USA). Mean values were compared among the treatments with Tukey's test and probability values < 0.05 were considered to be statistically significant. 122

Gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC-MS) untargeted profiling revealed a total of 102 metabolites in the Polygain® extract (Figure 1); of these, 68 were identified unambiguously and included 14 amino acids, 34 organic acids, 11 sugars, 5 sugar alcohols, one sugar phosphate and three other compounds (Table 1). The most abundant metabolites detected, in splitless mode, were *trans*-4-hydroxycinnamic acid, pyroglutamate and vanillic acid. However, the least abundant metabolites were gluconate, butanoic acid and glycine. Similarly, in split mode, sugars such as fructose, sorbose and glucose were highly abundant in the Polygain® extract.

130 Results and Discussion

Results showed that no-treatment and ethanol treated controls respectively had the highest and the lowest live counts (P < 0.001) of all *Eimeria* sporozoites among treatments (Table 2). Salinomycin significantly reduced the counts compared to no-treatment control but was higher than ethanol control (P < 0.001). PolygainTM decreased (P < 0.001) the sporozoites of *E. maxima*, *E. acervulina*, *E. brunetti*, and *E. mitis* compared to no-treatment control and to the level no different (P > 0.05) to salinomycin.

Adding PolygainTM to the medium of *E. tenella* and *E. necatrix* decreased (P < 0.001) the counts of sporozoites compared to no-treatment control but were higher (P < 0.001) than salinomycin.

The results of the current study demonstrated that Polygain[™] had similar inhibitory effects to 138 139 salinomycin on the most *Eimeria* sporozoites. In agreement with the current results, Abbas et al. 140 (2015) reported that sugarcane extract destroyed the morphology and shape of oocysts in the medium 141 resulting in lower oocysts sporulation and consequently inactivated the *Eimeria* species. Several 142 studies evaluated the effects of sugarcane extracts against coccidiosis in broilers and related the 143 beneficial effects of this extract to its biologically and immunologically active ingredients like polysaccharides, polyphenols, flavonoids, and phenolic acids (El-Abasy et al., 2003; Akhtar et al., 144 145 2008; Awais et al., 2011). Eimeria oocysts are protected from environmental conditions by the thick wall layers, while these layers rupture through the process of excystation and the released sporozoites 146 147 are susceptible to the surrounding biochemical agents (Belli et al., 2006; Mai et al., 2009). The 148 anticoccidial effects of plant extracts have been proven in Eimeria species previously. It was 149 demonstrated that polysaccharides, polyphenols, flavonoids and other biologically active natural 150 products present from plants could impair the balance of oxidants and antioxidants on both sides of 151 oocyst membranes, induce oxidative stress, penetrate the oocyst cytoplasm, and interfere with the cell 152 cycle, hindering *Eimeria* replication (El-Abasy et al., 2003; Molan et al., 2009; Molan and Faraj, 2015). Therefore, it could be postulated that Polygain[™], having a complex cocktail of bioactive 153 154 compounds (such as polysaccharides and phenolic compounds) with synergistic biological action, 155 might exert an antioxidant imbalance on the sporozoite membrane, disturb internal hemostasis, and 156 subsequently sporozoites collapsed. The exact mechanism is yet to be elucidated.

157 Conclusion

Based on the results of the current in vitro study, it can be concluded that the sugarcane extract
enriched with various bioactives (PolygainTM) inhibited avian *Eimeria* spp. at the stage of sporozoites

164	Acknowledgments
163	to salinomycin at other stages of the Eimeria life cycle.
162	and trophozoites, it will be interesting to examine whether Polygain has similar inhibitory capacity
161	salinomycin is able to inhibit the Eimeria cycle at different stages such as sporozoites, merozoites,
160	and consequently Polygain [™] can be a potential alternative for anticoccidial antibiotics. As

- 164
- The authors would like to thank Ms. Sarah Bowers in Parasitology Lab (GYST) at Department of 165
- Animal Science, University of New England for her technical assistance. 166

Funding 167

- This work was funded by The Product Makers (TPM) Pty. Ltd., Keysborough, VIC, Australia. The 168
- funder had no roles in study design, in the collection, analysis and interpretation of data, and in the 169
- 170 writing of the report. The funder agreed for the study to be submitted for publication.

Declarations of interest 171

- Matthew Flavel and Barry Kitchen are employees of The Product Makers (TPM) Pty. Ltd., 172
- Keysborough, VIC, Australia, the manufacture of Polygain[™]. 173

174

References 175

- Abbas, R.Z., Iqbal, Z., Blake, D., Khan, M.N., Saleemi, M.K., 2011. Anticoccidial drug resistance in 176 177 fowl coccidia: the state of play revisited. World's Poult. Sci. J. 67, 337-350. https://doi.org/ 10.1017/S004393391100033X 178
- Abbas, R.Z., Colwell, D.D., Gilleard, J., 2012. Botanicals: An alternative approach for the control of 179 coccidiosis. 180 avian World's Poult. Sci. J. 68, 203-215. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0043933912000268 181
- Abbas, A., Iqbal, Z., Abbas, R.Z., Khan, M.K., Khan, J.A., 2015. In-vitro anticoccidial potential of 182 Saccharum officinarum extract against Eimeria oocysts. Bol. Latinoam. Caribe. Plant. Med. 183 Aromat. 14, 456 – 461. 184

- Afshari, R., Pillidge, C.J., Read, E., Rochfort, S., Dias, D.A., Osborn, A.M., Gill, H., 2020. New
 insights into cheddar cheese microbiota-metabolome relationships revealed by integrative analysis
 of multi-omics data. Sci. Rep. 10, 1-13. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-59617-9</u>
- Akhtar, M., Hafeez, M.A., Muhammad, F., Haq, A.U., Anwar, M.I., 2008. Immunomodulatory and
 protective effects of sugar cane juice in chickens against *Eimeria* infection. Turk. J. Vet. Anim.
 Sci. 32, 463–467.
- Arakawa, A., Baba, E., Fukata, T., 1981. *Eimeria tenella* infection enhances *Salmonella typhimurium* infection in chickens. Poult. Sci. 60, 2203–9. <u>https://doi.org/10.3382/ps.0602203</u>
- Awais, M.M., Akhtar, M., Muhammad, F., Haq, A., Anwar, M.A., 2011. Immunotherapeutic effects
 of some sugar cane (*Saccharum officinarum L.*) extracts against coccidiosis in industrial broiler
 chickens. Experim. Parasitol. 128, 104–110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exppara.2011.02.024
- Belli, S.I., Smith, N.C., Ferguson, D.J., 2006. The coccidian oocyst: a tough nut to crack! Trends
 Parasitol. 22, 416-423. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pt.2006.07.004</u>
- Blake, D.P., Tomley, F.M., 2014. Securing poultry production from the ever-present *Eimeria* challenge. Trends Parasitol. 30, 12-19. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pt.2013.10.003</u>
- Chapman, H.D., 2014. Milestones in avian coccidiosis research: a review. Poult. Sci. 93, 501-511.
 282. <u>https://doi.org/10.3382/ps.2013-03634</u>
- Chapman, H.D., Cherry, T.E., Danforth, H.D., Richards, G., Shirley, M.W., Williams, R.B., 2002.
 Sustainable coccidiosis control in poultry production: the role of live vaccines. Int. J. Parasitol. 32, 617-629. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/s0020-7519(01)00362-9</u>
- Conway, D.P., Sasai, K., Gaafar, S.M., Smothers, C.D., 1993. Effects of different levels of oocyst
 inocula of *Eimeria acervulina*, *E. tenella*, and *E. maxima* on plasma constituents, packed cell
 volume, lesion scores, and performance in chickens. Avian Dis. 37, 118-123.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.2307/1591464</u>
- Dalloul, R.A., Lillehoj, H.S., 2005. Recent advances in immunomodulation and vaccination strategies
 against coccidiosis. Avian Dis. 49, 1-8. <u>https://doi.org/10.1637/7306-11150R</u>
- De Gussem, M. 2007. Coccidiosis in poultry: Review on diagnosis, control, prevention and
 interaction with overall gut health Proc. 16th Eur. Symp. on Poult. Nutr., World's Poultry Science
 Association, Beekbergen, The Netherlands, pp. 253-261.
- El-Abasy, M., Motobu, M., Na, K.J., Shimura, K., Nakamura, K., Koge, K., Onodera, T., Hirota, Y.,
 2003. Protective effects of sugar cane extracts (SCE) on *Eimeria tenella* infection in chickens. J.
 Vet. Med. Sci. 65, 865–871. https://doi.org/10.1292/jvms.65.865
- Jaskiewicz, J.J., Sandlin, R.D., Swei, A.A., Widmer, G., Toner, M., Tzipori, S., 2018.
 Cryopreservation of infectious *Cryptosporidium parvum* oocysts. Nat. Commun. 9, 2883.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-05240-2</u>
- Lee, J.T., Eckert, N.H., Ameiss, K.A., Stevens, S.M., Anderson, P.N., Anderson, S.M., Barri, A.,
 McElroy, A.P., Danforth, H.D., Caldwell, D.J., 2011. The effect of dietary protein level on
 performance characteristics of coccidiosis vaccinated and nonvaccinated broilers following

- mixed-species *Eimeria* challenge. Poult. Sci. 90, 1916-1925. <u>https://doi.org/10.3382/ps.2011-</u>
 01362
- Mai, K., Sharman, P.A., Walker, R.A., Katrib, M., De Souza, D., McConville, M.J., Wallach, M.G.,
 Belli, S.I., Ferguson, D.J. P., Smith, N.C., 2009. Oocyst wall formation and composition in
 coccidian parasites. Mem. Inst. Oswaldo Cruz. 104, 281-289. <u>https://doi.org/10.1590/s0074-</u>
 02762009000200022
- Molan, A.L., Liu, Z., De, S., 2009. Effect of pine bark (*Pinus radiata*) extracts on sporulation of
 coccidian oocysts. Folia Parasitologica. 56, 1–5. <u>https://doi.org/10.14411/fp.2009.001</u>
- Molan A.-L., Faraj A. M. 2015. Effect of selenium-rich green tea extract on the course of sporulation
 of *Eimeria* oocysts. J. Dental Med. Sci., 14:68–74. <u>https://doi.org/10.9790/0853-14436874</u>
- Singh, A., Lal, U.R., Mukhtar, H.M., Singh, P.S., Shah, G., Dhawan, R.K., 2015. Phytochemical
 profile of sugarcane and its potential health aspects. Pharmacogen. Rev. 9, 45-54.
 https://doi.org/10.4103/0973-7847.156340
- Tomley, F., 1997. Techniques for isolation and characterization of apical organelles from *Eimeria tenella* sporozoites. Methods. 13, 171-176. <u>https://doi.org/10.1006/meth.1997.0509</u>
- Wunderlich, F., Al-Quraishy, S., Steinbrenner, H., Sies, H., Dkhil, M.A., 2014. Towards identifying
 novel anti-*Eimeria* agents: trace elements, vitamins, and plant-based natural products. Parasitol.
 Res. 113, 3547–3556. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s00436-014-4101-8</u>
- Yang, W., Yang, C., Liang, Y., Yang, C., Li, W., Chung, C., Yang, M., Kuo, T., Lin, C., Liang C.,
 Chang, C., 2019. Anticoccidial properties and mechanisms of an edible herb, *Bidens pilosa*, and
 its active compounds for coccidiosis. Sci. Rep. 9, 2896. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-</u>
 39194-2







Compound	Response area (%)	EI-MS unique fragment ion (<i>m/z</i>)	Retention time (min)
Amino acids			
Valine	0.613	144	9.60
Isoleucine	0.396	158	11.06
Proline	0.196	142	11.19
Serine	0.169	204	12.27
Threonine	0.043	218	12.73
Aspartate	0.542	232	15.15
Pyroglutamate	4.806	156	15.28
Phenylalanine	0.593	192	11.53
Asparagine	0.082	231	17.68
Tyrosine	0.376	218	21.78
Alanine	0.019	190	7.59
Beta alanine	0.008	218	9.29
Glycine	0.006	204	7.94
Homoserine	0.029	218	13.89
Organic acids			
Glycolic acid	0.085	205	7.65
Glyceric acid	0.238	189	11.7
Fumarate	0.442	245	12.17
Pipecolate	0.077	230	12.43
Malate	0.631	245	1.31
Erythronate	0.065	292	15.47
Threonate	0.035	292	15.78
Benzoic acid 4-hydroxy	2 298	282	17.06
Trihydroxypentanoic acid	0.063	245	17.23
Keto-L gluconic acid	0.114	292	19.01
4-hydroxyphenyl propionic acid	0.053	310	19.17
Ribonic acid	0.013	292	19.18
Vanillic acid	3 914	297	19.22
Shikimic acid	1.086	255	19.8
Glucaric acid	0.039	333	19.86
trans- 4-Hydroxycinnamic acid	7 579	293	21.88
Galactonic acid	0.092	319	22.38
Hexadecanoic acid	0.502	328	23.26
Lactic acid [*]	0.502	191	6.6
3-Hydroxypropanoic acid [*]	0.275	219	8.17
Succinic acid	0.045	247	11.45
cis-Aconitic acid	0.703	285	18.92
Quinic acid [*]	1 590	345	20.43
Nicotinic acid	0.054	232	11.26
Malonic acid	0.009	233	9.43
Benzoate	0.009	135	10.37
Itaconic acid	0.046	215	12.01

Table 1. GC-MS untarget	ed profile	of the Polyga	in [™] extract.
-------------------------	------------	---------------	--------------------------

Salicylate	0.778	267	15.04
2,3-Dihydroxybutanedioic acid	0.024	219	16.43
trans-3-caffeoyl-Quinic acid	0.973	345	34.81
Butanoic acid	0.006	219	13.21
3-hydroxy-3-Methylglutaric acid	0.179	342	16.54
Citric acid	0.042	257	19.91
trans-Ferulic acid	1.338	338	23.92
Sugars			
Trehalose	0.475	191	31.17
Raffinose	0.043	204	36.99
Benzyl glucopyranoside	1.428	217	27.45
Fructose [*]	21.664	307	20.63
Mannose [*]	11.062	160	21.02
Maltose [*]	12.484	204	31.08
Sorbose [*]	17.191	20.67	20.67
Glucose [*]	15.555	160	20.96
Gluconate	0.006	292	22.44
Sucrose [*]	1.80	361	30.02
Cellobiose	0.009	480	30.77
Sugar alcohols			
Ribitol	0.194	319	18.35
Mannitol	2.567	319	14.06
Arabitol	0.270	307	18.33
Inositol [*]	0.804	305	23.68
Threitol	0.024	205	14.73
Sugar phosphate			
Glycerol-3P	0.138	205	10.71
Others			
Urea	0.034	189	10.20
Uracil	0.020	241	11.93
Thymine	0.043	270	13.07

UN SUG= unknown sugar; UN= an unknown compound with a specific ion qualifier and a retention time.

*The response area (%) of these metabolites were determined from the Polygain's GC-MS (split) injection due to the high concentration of these metabolites present in the product.

250

Table 2	Leffects of	processed	sugarcane e	extracts on a	avian <i>Eimer</i>	ia sporozoites	: counts after	14 hours i	ncubation at	37° C in	RPMI
medium	1										

Live counts												
	E .maxima		E. acervulina		E. brunetti		E. tenella		E. necatrix		E. mitis	
Treatments	Ave. No. ¹	IR(%)	Ave. No.	IR(%)								
No-treatment control ²	68.90 ^a	-	52.75 ^a	-	64.50 ^a	(69.45 ^a	-	60.50 ^a	-	86.55ª	-
Ethanol control ³	4.40 ^c	93.6	2.05 ^c	96.1	2.20 ^c	96.6	3.40 ^d	95.1	1.80 ^d	97.0	4.80 ^c	94.5
Salinomycin ⁴	37.65 ^b	45.4	8.65 ^b	83.6	11.35 ^b	82.4	32.45°	53.3	6.45°	89.3	17.70 ^b	79.6
Polygain ⁵	38.15 ^b	44.6	9.30 ^b	82.4	12.10 ^b	81.3	34.75 ^b	50.0	7.75 ^b	87.2	19.90 ^b	77.0
SEM ⁶	0.929	-	0.489	-	0.572	-	0.485	-	0.281	-	1.082	-
P-value ⁷	< 0.0001	-	< 0.0001	-	< 0.0001	-	< 0.0001	-	< 0.0001	-	< 0.0001	-

1. Ave. No: to count sporozoites (5 fields/sample; 4 samples/treatment), the sample was diluted 10 fold, and then the average number of live sporozoites was calculated. IR%: inhibition rate.

2. containing 1980µl RPMI medium+sporozoites+20µl phosphate buffer saline (PBS)

3. containing 1000µl RPMI medium+sporozoites+1000µl absolute Ethanol

4. containing 1980µl RPMI medium+sporozoites+20µl Salinomycin (60 ppm) 5. containing 1980µl RPMI medium+sporozoites+20µl Polygain[™]

6. standard error of means

7. ^{a-d} values within a column with different letters differ significantly (P < 0.05).

Conflict of Interest

Matthew Flavel and Barry Kitchen are employees of The Product Makers (TPM) Pty. Ltd., Keysborough, VIC, Australia, the manufacture of Polygain[™].

ournal Prevension