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Abstract

Present study deals with the efficacy of nanoencapsulated *Homalomena aromatica* essential oil (HAEO) as a potent green preservative against toxigenic *Aspergillus flavus* strain (AF-LHP-NS 7), AFB$_1$ and free radical mediated deterioration of stored spices. GC-MS analysis revealed linalool (68.51%) as the major component of HAEO. HAEO was encapsulated into chitosan nanomatrix (CS-HAEO-Ne) and characterized through SEM, FTIR and XRD. CS-HAEO-Ne completely inhibited *A. flavus* growth and AFB$_1$ biosynthesis at 1.25 μL/mL and 1.0 μL/mL, respectively in comparison to unencapsulated HAEO (1.75 μL/mL and 1.25 μL/mL respectively). CS-HAEO-Ne exhibited superior antioxidant efficacy ($IC_{50}$ (DPPH) = 4.5 μL/mL) over unencapsulated HAEO ($IC_{50}$ (DPPH) = 15.9 μL/mL). Further, CS-HAEO-Ne caused significant reduction in ergosterol content in treated *A. flavus* and provoked leakage of cellular ions (Ca$^{2+}$, Mg$^{2+}$ and K$^+$) as well as 260 nm and 280 nm absorbing materials. Depletion of methylglyoxal level in treated *A. flavus* cells deals with the novel antiaflatoxigenic efficacy of CS-HAEO-Ne. CS-HAEO-Ne depicted excellent *in situ* efficacy by inhibiting mold attack and AFB$_1$ contamination, mineral preservation and acceptable sensorial profile. Moreover, broad safety paradigm (LD$_{50}$ value = 8006.84 μL/kg) of CS-HAEO-Ne also suggest it as novel green preservative to enhance shelf life of stored spices.
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Introduction

Spices are aromatic food commodities obtained from different plant parts such as root, seed, leaves, bark, flower, bulb, and fruit that are used all over the world in food preparations (Thanushree et al. 2019). Peculiar flavor, colour and aromatic attributes of spices make them highly demanding food ingredients globally. In addition, several spices have been reported for their antimicrobial and antioxidant potential, along with vast therapeutic values such as analgesic, antipyretic, blood purifier, hepatoprotective, carminative, anticancerous, antidiabetic, and anti-inflammatory (Gupta 2010; Singh et al. 2020a).

Unscientific and inappropriate harvesting, drying and storage techniques as well as warm and humid environmental conditions of storage make spices highly prone towards contamination by mold and their associated mycotoxins. Spices are reported to be second highly mycotoxin contaminated food item after nut products and fruits and vegetables (RASFF 2019). Among wide array of mycotoxins reported from different stored spices such as aflatoxins, citrinin, fumonisins, zearalenone, sterigmatocystin, tenuazonic, alternariol, and deoxynivalenol (Pickova et al. 2020), aflatoxins are reported to be the most prevailing spice contaminant (Potorti et al. 2020). Aflatoxins, especially aflatoxin B$_1$ (AFB$_1$) contamination in stored spices has become a matter of great concern due to its potential properties of hepatocarcinogen, mutagen, teratogen, nephrotoxic, and immunosuppressive agent for which it has been categorized as group 1 human carcinogen by International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC 2012). Stringent regulations have been imposed by Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) for the maximum acceptable limit of AFB$_1$ in spices and set as 5 µg/kg (FAO 2004). Yang et al. (2017) reported that fungal and mycotoxin contamination causes depletion of bioactive components of spices, thereby deteriorating spice quality. Moreover, AFB$_1$ contamination further provokes oxidative stress
resulting to rancidity and degradation of nutritive constituents of food items (Kovesi et al. 2020).

Oxidative stress also enhances biosynthesis of methylglyoxal, the AFB$_1$ inducer molecule.

Hence, in order to mitigate biodeterioration of food products caused due to fungal and mycotoxin contamination, chemicals such as butylated derivatives, potassium sorbate, and propyl gallate have been widely used. However, issues of environmental toxicity, resistance development, residual toxicity and carcinogenic effects (Rajkumar et al. 2020a) greatly limit their applicability.

On the contrary, plant based green preservatives have been considered as better alternative to synthetic food preservatives based on eco-friendly and broad safety profile. Among various phytochemicals, aromatic plant essential oils (EOs) and their active components have been highly encouraged to be used as novel green preservative due to its considerable antibacterial, antifungal, antimycotoxigenic, insecticidal and antioxidant efficacy. Moreover, several EOs such as *Coriandrum sativum*, *Ocimum basilicum*, *Mentha piperita*, *Matricaria chamomilla*, *Cuminum cyminum* and EO bioactives such as limonene, carvone, eugenol, linalool, citral, vanillin, thymol and menthol are also grouped under generally recognized as safe category (GRAS), which strongly recommends botanical formulations as next generation pesticide (Prakash et al. 2018).

In spite of tremendous preservative potential, high volatility, less water solubility, intense aroma and easy degradation of active components limit the large scale practical application of EOs in food system (Marques et al. 2019). In order to deal with these challenges, nanoencapsulation of EOs using food grade biopolymer has emerged as a novel and efficient technique. In recent past, chitosan biopolymer has gained prime attention as superior encapsulating agent, based on its biodegradability, non-mammalian toxicity, hydrophilicity, controlled release and emulsion forming property (Wu and Liu 2008). Among different nanoencapsulation techniques utilized, ionic-gelation method is more preferred. This method is
comparatively simple, economical and non–toxic. Further, suitability for both hydrophilic and
lipophilic component also suggests ionic-gelation method as an efficient strategy to formulate
nanoemulsion.

*Homalomena aromatica* (Sugandh mantri) is an aromatic perennial herb reported for
therapeutic values (Roy et al. 2019). *Homalomena aromatica* EO (HAEO) has been widely used
in perfumery and cosmetics and reported to have potent antimicrobial efficacy (Policegoudra et
al. 2012). However, the data are unavailable on the antiaflatoxigenic efficacy of HAEO and
exploration of its preservative potential in food system. Moreover, no study has been performed
on nanoencapsulation of HAEO in chitosan polymer. Hence, the present study focused on
exploration of the efficacy of HAEO loaded chitosan nanoparticle as fungitoxic and antiaflatoxin
B₁ candidate to prevent deterioration of spices under storage. Study comprised of biosynthesis of
HAEO nanoparticle, its characterization, evaluation of antioxidant, antifungal and
antimycotoxigenic efficacy along with probable mode of actions. The study also includes *in vivo*
investigation on spice sample, sensorial analysis and assessment of lethal toxic dose in
comparison with unencapsulated HAEO in order to strengthen recommendation as promising
preservative agent in food sectors with sufficient consumer acceptance.

**Methodology**

**Chemicals**

Chemicals such as low molecular weight chitosan, glacial acetic acid, dichloromethane
(DCM), tripolyphosphate (TPP), Tween 20, Tween 80, chloroform (CHCl₃), perchloric acid,
nitric acid (HNO₃) methylglyoxal, diaminobenzene (DAB), thiobarbituric acid (TBA),
trichloroacetic acid (TCA), potassium hydroxide (KOH), isoamyl alcohol, toluene, sucrose,
acetonitrile, hydrochloric acid (HCl), n-heptane, methanol, sucrose, magnesium sulphate
(MgSO₄), potassium nitrate (KNO₃), yeast extract, DPPH and sodium chloride (NaCl) were procured from SRL Pvt LTD and Hi-Media Mumbai, India.

**Test fungal species**

Aflatoxin secreting strain of *Aspergillus flavus* AF-LHP-NS 7 selected during mycobiota analysis of different spices was utilized for further investigations. Storage fungi including *Aspergillus niger, A. repens, A. luchuensis, A. terreus, Fusarium oxysporum, F. graminearum, Penicillium italicum, P. chrysogenum, Mucor sp., Rhizopus sp., Alternaria alternata, Curvularia lunata* and *Mycelia sterilia* were used during fungitoxic experiments.

**Extraction and phytochemical analysis of HAEO**

Rhizomes of *Homalomena aromatica* procured from Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh, India, were transferred to Clevenger’s apparatus for 5 hour in order to extract EO.

Chemical characterization of HAEO was done through GC-MS analysis. TG-5 MS fused silica capillary column of dimensions 30 m × 0.25 mm × 0.25 µm fitted inside Thermo Scientific 1300 GC interfaced with TSQ Duo triple quadruple mass spectrophotometer. Sample was injected to column at 70 °C temperature with programmed increment up to 250 °C. Individual phyto components were identified based on spectral peaks available in NIST, Wiley, and other published literature (Carneiro et al. 2020).

**Synthesis of HAEO entrapped in chitosan based emulsion (CS-HAEO-Ne)**

CS-HAEO-Ne was prepared using ionic gelation technique (Rajkumar et al. 2020b). 1% v/v glacial acetic acid (GAA) was added to 1.5% chitosan solution prepared in distilled water, and mixed at 27 °C for 24 hour. Different w/v ratio of chitosan and HAEO *i.e.* 1:0, 1:0.2, 1:0.4, 1:0.6, 1:0.8 and 1:1 was prepared by mixing different amount of HAEO *i.e.* 0.00, 0.06, 0.12, 0.18, 0.24 and 0.30 g to chitosan solution. Further drop wise STPP (4 mg/mL) was added in
order to obtain nanoemulsion. Prepared nanoemulsion was lyophilized (Alpha 1-2 LD plus Entry Laboratory Freeze Drier for aqueous samples, John Morris Scientific, Sydney, Australia) at -62 °C for 72 hour and kept at 4 °C for further experiments.

**Physico-chemical analysis of CS-HAEO-Ne**

Structural and morphological analysis of lyophilized CS-Ne and CS-HAEO-Ne was performed through scanning electron microscopy (SEM) (EVO-18 researcher, Zeiss). A 10 fold dilution of 1 mg lyophilized CS-Ne and CS-HAEO-Ne was done followed by 10 min of sonication. A thin film of prepared solution was spreaded over glass slide, gold coated and viewed using SEM. Lyophilized CS-Ne and CS-HAEO-Ne was further used for FTIR analysis in between absorbance 500-4000 cm\(^{-1}\) at 4 cm\(^{-1}\). Crystallinity of lyophilized CS-Ne and CS-HAEO-Ne was determined through XRD analysis using diffractometer at 2θ degree between 5-50°, step angle 0.02° min\(^{-1}\) with scan rate of 5° min\(^{-1}\).

**Estimation of nanoencapsulation efficiency (NEE) and loading capacity (LC)**

Content of HAEO in CS-HAEO-Ne was estimated by UV-visible spectrophotometry. CS-HAEO-Ne (0.1 mL) was added in ethyl acetate (3 mL) followed by centrifugation at 10,000×g for 15 min. Content of HAEO was determined by taking the optical density of supernatant at absorbance maxima of HAEO \(viz\). 265 nm and using calibration graph \((R^2 = 0.998)\) of HAEO mixed in ethyl acetate. CS-Ne prepared in the same way was treated as control.

NEE and LC were calculated through formula

\[
\text{Nanoencapsulation efficiency}(\text{NEE}) = \frac{\text{Total amount of loaded HAEO} - \text{amount of HAEO into nanoemulsion}}{\text{Initial amount of HAEO}} \times 100
\]
Loading capacity \((LC) = \frac{\text{Mass of loaded HAEO}}{\text{Mass of loaded nanoemulsion}} \times 100\)

**In vitro release profile of CS-HAEO-Ne**

*In vitro* release profile of CS-HAEO-Ne was calculated following Chaudhari et al. (2020) with slight modification. 500 µL of CS-HAEO-Ne was added to 5 mL phosphate buffer saline (PBS and ethanol 3:2 v/v) under gentle agitation for 0-96 h at 30 °C. 3 mL suspension was removed at specific time interval which was replenished with the equal volume of fresh buffer. Amount of HAEO at each time was calculated by measuring absorbance at 293 nm as well as using standard calibration curve. Release profile of HAEO was calculated using the following formula.

\[
\text{Cumulative release of HAEO (\%) = \frac{\text{Cumulative amount of HAEO released at each time interval}}{\text{Initial mass of HAEO loaded in the sample}}} \times 100
\]

**Antifungal and AFB$_1$ inhibitory efficacy of HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne**

Antifungal activity of HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne was estimated as minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC). Toxigenic *A. flavus* AFLHP NS-7 strain was treated with different concentration of HAEO (0.25, 0.50, 0.75, 1.0, 1.25, 1.50 and 1.75 µL/mL) and CS-HAEO-Ne (0.25, 0.50, 0.75, 1.0, 1.25 µL/mL) for 10 days. Sample without any treatment worked as control. Minimum concentration of HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne that completely inhibited growth of AFLHP NS-7 was considered as its MIC.

Antiaflatoxigenic efficacy of HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne was calculated in terms of minimum aflatoxin inhibitory concentration (MAIC) (Rasooli and Abyaneh 2004). To determine the amount of AFB$_1$ content, filtered media was extracted with chloroform and developed in TLC plate by using mobile phase toluene, isoamyl alcohol and methanol in 90:32:2 (v/v/v).
Absorbance of spots was recorded at 360 nm and AFB$_1$ content was calculated based on the formula given below.

$$AFB_1 \, (\mu g/mL) = \frac{Absorbance \, at \, 360 \, nm \times \, Molecular \, weight \, of \, AFB_1 \times 1000}{Molar \, extinction \, coefficient \, of \, AFB_1 \times \, Path \, length}$$

Where, molecular mass of AFB$_1$ is 312 g/mol, molar extinction coefficient is 21800 mol cm$^{-1}$ and path length is 1 cm.

% inhibition of AFB$_1$ was calculated as

$$% \, inhibition = \frac{AFB_1 \, (control) - AFB_1 \, (treatment)}{AFB_1 \, (control)} \times 100$$

**Antifungal action of HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne**

**Ergosterol quantification**

In order to estimate ergosterol content of fungal plasma membrane, *A. flavus* cells were treated with different concentration of HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne (0.25, 0.50, 0.75, 1.0, 1.25 and 0.25, 0.50 and 0.75 µL/mL, respectively) and kept in B.O.D. incubator for 5 days at 27 ± 2 °C. Samples without HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne worked as controls. *A. flavus* biomass was harvested from each sample and net wet weights of mycelia were measured followed by vortexing in 25% KOH solution. Thereafter, ergosterol from samples was extracted using n-heptane and water 2:5 (v/v) and scanned spectrophotometrically between 230-300 nm. Formula given by Tian et al. (2012) was used to quantify ergosterol.

$$% \, ergosterol+ \, % \, 24 \, (28) \, dehydroergosterol= \frac{(A_{282}/ \, 290)}{Pellet \, weight}$$

$$% \, 24 \, (28) \, dehydroergosterol= \frac{(A_{230}/ \, 518)}{Pellet \, weight}$$

$$% \, ergosterol= \frac{(% \, ergosterol+ \, % \, 24 \, (28) \, dehydroergosterol) - \, % \, 24 \, (28) \, dehydroergosterol}{290}$$

Where 290 and 518 are the E values determined for crystalline ergosterol and dehydroergosterol, respectively.

**Effect on cellular cations (Ca$^{2+}$, K$^+$ and Mg$^{2+}$) and 260 and 280 absorbing materials**
Seven days grown biomass of *A. flavus* obtained from liquid SMKY media was fumigated HAEO (0.25 to 1.75 µL/mL and 2 MIC) and CS-HAEO-Ne (0.25 to 1.25 µL/mL and 2 MIC). Efflux of calcium, potassium and magnesium ions was analyzed by atomic absorption spectroscopy (Perkin Elmer AAnalyst 800, USA). For measuring release of 260 and 280 nm absorbing materials, 7 days grown *A. flavus* biomass was treated with different concentration of HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne *i.e.*, 0.25 to 1.75 µL/mL and 0.25 to 1.25 µL/mL as well as 2 MIC doses, respectively for 24 h and absorbance of samples were taken at 260 and 280 nm.

**HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne effect on methylglyoxal (MG)**

Seven days old *A. flavus* mycelia was treated at different doses *viz.* MIC and 2MIC (1.75 and 3.5 µL/mL) of HAEO and MIC and 2MIC (1.25 to 2.5 µL/mL) of CS-HAEO-Ne for 24 h. Samples without HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne were treated as controls. Estimation of methyglyoxal was done following the methods of Yadav et al. (2005). 300 mg sample from each set was crushed in 3 mL of perchloric acid (0.5 M) and subjected to centrifugation at 4 °C on 10000 x g for 10 min. Supernatant was neutralized (pH = 7) by saturated potassium carbonate solution and centrifuged again at 10000 x g for 10 min (4 °C). Reaction mixture containing 0.5 mL 1,2 diaminobenzene (DAB), 0.2 mL HClO₄ (5 M) and 1.3 mL neutralized supernatant was prepared and its optical density was recorded at 341 nm. Total amount of MG was estimated using the standard curve of pure MG (10-100 µM).

**Antioxidant potential of HAEO, CS-Ne and CS-HAEO-Ne**

Free radical removal potential of HAEO, CS-Ne and CS-HAEO-Ne was calculated using the DPPH assay following slightly modified method of Balasubramani et al. (2017). IC₅₀ (50 % radical scavenging potential of HAEO, CS-Ne and CS-HAEO-Ne) was determined using the following formula.
% Radical scavenging potential = \((A_0 - A_1)/A_0 \times 100\)

Where \(A_0\) and \(A_1\) are expressing the absorbance of blank and samples (HAEO, CS-Ne and CS-HAEO-Ne) at 517 nm, respectively.

**Estimation of phenolics present in HAEO, CS-Ne and CS-HAEO-Ne**

Amount of phenolics in HAEO, CS-Ne and CS-HAEO-Ne was calculated following Dzhanfezova et al. (2020) with slight modifications. Reaction mixture containing Folin-Ciocalteu’s reagent and sample was allowed to stand for 2 h in dark after addition of 3 mL Na\(_2\)CO\(_3\) and optical densities of samples were measured at 760 nm. The result was calculated in terms of \(\mu\)g gallic acid equivalent (GAE)/g.

\[
\text{Absorbance (760 nm)} = 0.0012 \times \text{GA (}\mu\text{g)} + 0.024
\]

**Study on in vivo AFB\(_1\) inhibitory efficacy of HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne in (Nigella sativa) food system: High performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) assay**

*In situ* efficacy of HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne were estimated by fumigating black cumin seeds (model spice system; 250 g) in 500 mL air tight plastic containers for storage period of 18 months. Spice samples were fumigated with HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne at their respective MIC concentrations. Control sets were devoid of any treatment.

AFB\(_1\) content in stored spice samples were determined through HPLC method following Sheijooni-Fumani et al. (2011). 5 g of grinded spice samples were mixed with methanol and double distilled water (8/10; v/v), centrifuged and supernatant was mixed with 300 \(\mu\)L chloroform and 6 mL water containing 3% KBr. Obtained reaction mixtures were centrifuged again (5000 x g), settled portion was isolated and dried at 85 °C on water bath and further dissolved in 500 \(\mu\)L of HPLC grade methanol for injecting into HPLC column. Amount of AFB\(_1\) (\(\mu\)g/kg) was determined at 365 nm from the prepared standard curve of AFB\(_1\) (50-500 ng/50 \(\mu\)L).
(Upadhyay et al. 2018). Methanol, acetonitrile and water (17:19:64 v/v/v) was used as mobile phase (1.2 mL/min flow rate) to separate AFB$_1$ on C18 reverse phase column (4.6 mm × 25 cm × 5 µm) at ambient temperature of 25°C.

**Analysis of lipid peroxidation and mineral loss in HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne treated black cumin (Nigella sativa) seeds**

*In vivo* preservative efficacy of HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne was tested in terms of lipid peroxidation inhibitory action at their respective MIC and 2 MIC value following Iseri et al. (2013). Lipid peroxidation was measured using thiobarbituric acid reactive substance (TBRAS) assay. In order to execute experiment, 1 g of grinded spice sample was added to 5 mL TBA reagent comprising 0.375 % TBA, 15 % TCA, and 0.2 N HCl. Further, samples were subjected to water bath at 95°C for 25 min, following centrifugation (10000 x g for 10 min). Thereafter, absorbance of supernatant was recorded at 532 nm and 600 nm and results were expressed as µM equivalent MDA/g FW. Mineral biodeterioration level in HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne treated spice samples were evaluated through atomic absorption spectrometry (Perkin Elmer AAnalyst 800, USA).

**Sensorial analysis of fumigated black cumin (Nigella sativa) seeds with HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne**

Effect of HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne fumigation (at MIC concentration) on sensorial characteristics of stored black cumin seeds (18 months duration) was analyzed by a panel comprising of 10 panelists of both genders. 7 point hedonic scale (5 = extremely like, 4 = slightly like, 3 = neither like nor dislike, 2 = slightly dislike, 1 = extremely dislike) was used to estimate taste, colour and odor of stored spice samples.
Safety profile assessment of HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne

Safety profile of HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne was evaluated in terms of toxicity assay on male mice using oral administration and represented in terms of LD\textsubscript{50} value (Singh et al. 2020b). Different amount of HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne mixed with stock solution (Tween 20 and deionized distilled water, 1:1) were administered orally to each mice group (10 mice). Mice administered with stock and CS-Ne was considered as control. LD\textsubscript{50} value was based on the number of mice dead within 24 h of study period and calculated through probit analysis.

Statistical analysis

The experiments were carried out in triple sets and the data represented as mean (n = 3) ± standard error (SE). Further it was analyzed by one way ANOVA followed by Tukey’s B multiple comparison test at significant (P < 0.05) differences. SPSS and Sigma plot program were used for data analysis and creating graphs.

Result and discussion

Extraction and GC-MS of HAEO

HAEO was extracted from rhizome of the plant and per cent yield was found to be 8.6 mL/kg. Phytochemical analysis of HAEO through GC-MS analysis revealed 26 compounds comprising 91.71\% of EO. Linalool was found to be the major component contributing 68.51\% of total bioactive components. The outcomes of the present study are in line with the previous study of Policegoudra et al. (2012) describing linalool (62.5\%) as the major bioactive component. Per cent occurrence and retention time of different compounds are presented in Table 1. Bioefficacy of EOs are based on their bioactive components whose composition and amount may vary with variation in geological and environmental conditions, harvesting stage and oil extraction procedure, ultimately affecting the biological activity of EOs (Dhifi et al.}
Thus, analysis of EO bioactive composition is a crucial step before its detailed bioactivity evaluation.

**Preparation of HAEO loaded chitosan nanoemulsion (CS-HAEO-Ne)**

CS-HAEO-Ne was prepared using tripolyphasphae (TPP) as cross linking agent following ionic gelation technique. Interaction between protonated -NH$_2$ group of chitosan and negative charged ions of TTP leads to formation of biocompatible nanoparticles. CS-HAEO-Ne was formed following the two step strategy *i.e.* droplet formation and solidification.

Encapsulation enhance stability of volatile aromatic substances such as EOs and their bioactive components against environmental factors *i.e.* light, chemical, oxygen, pressure and heat mediated degradation (Delshadi et al. 2020). Ionotropic gelation method is well known for encapsulating bioactive principles due to its non toxic, organic solvent free, appropriate and easily controllable properties (Esmaeili and Asgari 2015). Chitosan, obtained by deacetylation of chitin, was selected as coating matrix as it an efficient, non toxic, biodegradable and film/ gel forming polymer matrix. Effective entrapment of HAEO was determined through preparing different chitosan and HAEO ratios *viz.* 1:0, 1:0.2, 1:0.4, 1:0.6, 1:0.8 and 1:1.

**Physico-chemical characterization of CS-HAEO-Ne**

**Scanning electron microscopic (SEM) analysis**

SEM analysis was done to analyze the morphological features of CS-Ne and CS-HAEO-Ne which depicted spherical structure and smooth surface of the prepared nanoparticles. Size of CS-Ne and CS-HAEO-Ne was found in range of 37-81.4 nm and 48.3-94.6 nm, respectively (Fig. 1A, 1B). Increment in size of CS-Ne after encapsulation of HAEO could be to the result of swelling of chitosan matrix by entrapped HAEO (Kumar et al. 2019). This finding on enhanced
particle size of EO loaded nanoparticles in comparison to unencapsulated chitosan nanoparticle is supported by previous reports of Hosseini et al. (2013).

**Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) spectroscopic analysis**

FTIR analysis of pure chitosan powder, CS-Ne, HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne showing chemical interaction between chitosan and HAEO are presented in Fig. 2. Chitosan indicated specified peaks at 3445 cm$^{-1}$ for -OH and -NH stretching, 2916 cm$^{-1}$ for symmetric or asymmetric –CH stretching and at 1066 cm$^{-1}$ for C-O-C linkage. In addition 1645 cm$^{-1}$, 1581 cm$^{-1}$ and 1316 cm$^{-1}$ peaks represented presence of amide I, amide II and amide III group (Branca et al. 2016). Prominent peak at 1375 cm$^{-1}$ in chitosan represent –C-N- bond stretching. Presence of new peaks in CS-Ne at 1556 cm$^{-1}$ (N-H bending) and 888 cm$^{-1}$ (P-O stretching) specified the electrostatic bonding between amide group of CS and phosphate moiety of TPP. Furthermore, in HAEO several peaks at/in between 1644-1447cm$^{-1}$ (for phenyl ring), 1713 cm$^{-1}$ for presence of ether group, 3541 cm$^{-1}$ (O-H stretching), 2966 cm$^{-1}$ (–CH stretching) and 739 cm$^{-1}$ (aromatic C-H bending) appeared. Most of the aforementioned peaks were retained in the spectra of CS-HAEO-Ne. Shifting of peak from 2966 cm$^{-1}$ in spectra of HAEO to 2922cm$^{-1}$ in spectra of CS-HAEO-Ne also denotes successful encapsulation of HAEO inside chitosan polymer.

**X-ray diffraction (XRD) analysis**

Crystallographic pattern of chitosan powder, CS-Ne and CS-HAEO-Ne has been shown in Fig. 3. Diffraction spectrum of chitosan powder represented peaks at 20 value 10.2° and 19.8°, denoting the characteristic peak of chitosan viz. 10° and 20° and increased crystallinity (Su et al. 2020). However, the diffractogram of CS-Ne and CS-HAEO-Ne depicted flattening and broadening of characteristic peaks suggesting destruction of chitosan crytallinity as a result of successful TPP cross linking with chitosan and loading of HAEO into the polymer matrix.
Estimation of per cent nanoencapsulation efficiency (NEE) and loading capacity (LC) of CS-HAEO-Ne

NEE and LC of HAEO inside chitosan nanomatrix was determined through UV-visible spectrophotometric analysis which revealed that NEE and LC of CS-HAEO-Ne ranged between 22.0-83.41 % and 0.15-2.32 % (Table 2). NEE showed dose dependent increment up to the ratio 1:1.08 (CS:HAEO), representing good entrapment of HAEO inside chitosan nanomatrix. However, decline in NEE was recorded at the ratio 1:1 (CS: HAEO) depicting insufficiency of chitosan matrix to entrap further more HAEO. The result is in accordance with the previous reports of Feyzioglu and Tornuk (2016).

**In vitro release of CS-HAEO-Ne**

The *in vitro* cumulative release mechanism of HAEO from CS-HAEO-Ne was measured at room temperature for 1:0.8 ratio of chitosan to HAEO. The release of EO comprised of two steps *i.e.* initial rapid release and then constant release as shown in Fig. 4. This result is supported by the previous study of Li et al. (2018) describing controlled release of curcumin encapsulated in chitosan. Initial fast release phase could be a response of unencapsulated EO that is adsorbed on the surface of polymeric matrix or due to diffusion of EO from higher concentration till attainment of equilibrium. After 6 h, release was recorded to be 51.36 % followed by 26.90 % and 3.27 % release in between (10-24) and (24-96) h respectively. Maximum release of EO observed was 81.55 % after 96 h, showing that 1.87 % HAEO out of 83.41 % was still entrapped inside the polymeric matrix. The result suggested that encapsulation maintained the stability of volatile compounds through its control release.

**In vitro antifungal and antiaflatoxigenic efficacy of HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne**
Minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) and AFB\textsubscript{1} inhibitory concentration of HAEO was 1.75 µL/mL and 1.25 µL/mL, respectively. However, CS-HAEO-Ne showed enhanced the bioefficacy against \textit{A. flavus} and its MIC and MAIC value declined to 1.25 µL/mL and 1.0 µL/mL, respectively (Table 3). In addition, both HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne significantly suppressed the growth of other storage molds (\textit{A. niger}, \textit{A. repens}, \textit{A. luchuensis}, \textit{A. terreus}, \textit{Fusarium oxysporum}, \textit{F. graminearum}, \textit{Penicillium italicum}, \textit{Mucor sp.}, \textit{Rhizopus sp.}, \textit{P. chrysogenum Alternaria alternata}, \textit{Curvularia lunata} and \textit{Mycelia sterilia}) at their respective MIC values \textit{viz.}, 1.75 µL/mL and 1.25 µL/mL (Fig. 5). Potent fungitoxic profile of HAEO and its nanoformulation also favored for their application as botanical preservative for stored products. The boosted bio-efficacy of CS-HAEO-Ne in comparison to HAEO could be the result of controlled release and improved stability of constituent volatiles, enhanced water solubility, wider surface area and fastened adsorption through cell wall and membrane (Hasheminejad et al. 2019). The antifungal efficacy of HAEO is more efficacious than other reported EOs such as \textit{Pelargonium roseum} EO (3.8 µL/mL), \textit{Thymus vulgaris} EO (2.3 µL/mL) and \textit{Cymbopogon nardus} EO (6.4 µL/mL) (Zabka et al. 2009) and other synthetic preservatives such as propionic acid and sodium sulphite having MIC value ranged from 2 to > 83 µL/mL against \textit{P. verrucosum} and two strain of \textit{A. westerdikiae} (Schlosser and Prange 2018). The boosted potency of encapsulated HAEO could also be due to additive action of chitosan and HAEO. Cationic charge of chitosan has been reported to interact with anionic charges of oxygenated lactone ring causing enhanced antiaflatoxigenic efficacy (Cortes-Higareda et al. 2019). Hence, CS-HAEO-Ne could be highly preferred green preservative over other synthetic preservatives with potent toxicity.

Antifungal mode of action of HAEO and CS-HAEO Ne

Effect on ergosterol content and leakage of vital cellular ions
Ergosterol is the unique sterol associated with fungal plasma membrane, responsible to maintain proper functioning of membrane by controlling membrane permeability and integrity. Ergosterol content in treated *A. flavus* cells declined in dose dependent manner with increasing doses of 0.25, 0.50, 0.75, 1.0 and 1.25 μL/mL. HAEO concentrations showed 33.96 %, 40.78 %, 46.81 %, 61.91 % and 82.31 % decline of ergosterol content, respectively. However, CS-HAEO-Ne inhibited ergosterol content to 11.02 %, 33.26 % and 96.88% at just 0.25, 0.50 and 0.75 μL/mL respectively (Fig. 6). Obtained results are supported by the investigations of Khan et al. (2010).

Antifungal drugs such as azoles are reported to inhibit ergosterol biosynthesis through targeting cytochrome 450 lanosterol 14α-demethylase enzyme, the ERG11 gene product involved in ergosterol pathway (Lupetti et al. 2002). Thus, HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne mediated depletion in ergosterol content could also be based on downregulation of lanosterol 14α demethylase enzyme functioning, involved in crucial step of ergosterol biosynthesis *i.e.* 14α demethylation. Decline of ergosterol content would make membrane porous leading to loss of vital ions *viz.* Ca$^{2+}$, Mg$^{2+}$ and K$^{+}$ as well as 260 nm and 280 nm absorbing material (Table 4), responsible for vital metabolic activities of cell. Therefore, present study concluded fungal plasma membrane as one of the prime targets for antifungal action of HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne as the cause of cell death through altering vital cellular mechanisms of fungus.

Methylglyoxal (MG), an endogeneous product of metabolic pathways such as polyol pathway, glycolytic pathway and amino acetone metabolism is reported to be highly reactive and strong glycaling agent (Antognelli et al. 2013). MG is also reported to induce cytotoxic effects through inducing apoptosis *via* enhancing reactive oxygen species production or through accumulation of MG mediated advanced glycation end products. Moreover, MG has been also reported to have inductive role in AFB$_1$ production. Chen et al. (2004) reported upregulation of
the major regulatory gene $aflR$ and other AFB$_1$ biosynthetic gene $nor1$ by MG. In present experiment MG content in control was found to be 232.4 μM/g FW, while it decreased in HAEO treated cells in dose dependent manner. Further, CS-HAEO-Ne depicted maximum suppression of MG formation in treated cells at relatively low concentration in comparison to unencapsulated HAEO (Fig. 7). Obtained outcome is in accordance with the findings of Chaudhari et al. (2020). Considerable difference between bioactivity of unencapsulated and encapsulated HAEO might be due to enhanced bioavailability along with targeted and slow release caused by encapsulation. Based on the above findings, we hypothesize that inhibition of MG formation might have a significant role in antiaflatoxicogenic activity of HAEO or CS-HAEO-Ne.

**Antioxidant efficacy**

DPPH based free radical scavenging assay basically relies on the principle of antioxidant mediated quenching of single electron form DPPH radical and subsequently decolorization of purple colour of DPPH solution. Encapsulation of EOs along with boosting its bioefficacy also enhances its antioxidant potency through protecting bioactive components of EOs from environmental degradation caused due to light and temperature. In the present experiment CS-HAEO-Ne depicted enhanced antioxidant potency over HAEO. IC$_{50}$ value for HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne were recorded as 15.98 μL/mL and 4.57 μL/mL, respectively, describing enhancement of antioxidant potency through nanoencapsulation (Fig. 8). In addition, chitosan was found to be deprived of promising antioxidant efficacy. Siva et al. (2020) also reported enhanced antioxidant efficacy of isoeugenol encapsulated inside methyl β-cyclodextrin in comparison to its free form. In addition, Cetin Babaoglu et al. (2017) suggested that boosted free radical scavenging potency of hydropropyl beta cyclodextrin (HPβCD) loaded clove EO was either due to its enhanced water solubility or preservation of phenolic compounds under Clove-
HPβCD complex from oxidative degradation. IC\textsubscript{50} value of CS-HAEO-Ne is lower in comparison to that recorded for other synthetic antioxidants as ascorbic acid and BHT (Ricci et al. 2005), suggesting encapsulated HAEO as future sustainable green food preservative.

Total phenolic content of chitosan, HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne was found as 0.18 (µg gallic acid equivalent/g HAEO), 3.37 and 5.91 µg gallic acid equivalent respectively. The present result showed improved total phenolic content of HAEO after encapsulation which is in accordance with the previous study of Attallah et al. (2020). Such enhancement could result due to enhanced surface to volume ratio of nanomeric particle size of EO. In addition, ameliorated water solubility of EO phenolic content as well as its improved protection against evaporation loss by environmental gradient also contributes towards enhanced total phenolics.

**In situ antifungal and antiaflatoxigenic potential of HAEO and CS-HAEO Ne on black cumin seeds (model food system)**

Based on *in vitro* investigations, HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne was found to be efficient antifungal and antiaflatoxigenic agent. However, in order to recommend large scale commercialization, it is mandatory to analyze *in situ* efficacy. HPLC analysis of 18 months stored black cumin seed sample manifested potent AFB\textsubscript{1} inhibitory efficacy of HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne. HPLC result depicted 208.37 µg/Kg concentration of AFB\textsubscript{1} in control samples. While both HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne completely inhibited AFB\textsubscript{1} biosynthesis at their respective MIC concentrations. AFB\textsubscript{1} concentration at MIC of both HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne was found to be 7.39 µg/Kg and 7.34 µg/Kg (Fig. 9). Highly efficacious *in situ* antifungal and antiaflatoxigenic potency of non-encapsulated as well as encapsulated HAEO is based on its diverse *in vitro* antifungal mode of actions such as disruption of membrane permeability through
depleting ergosterol content, leakage of vital cellular components and ions as well as through inhibiting biosynthesis of aflatoxin inducer molecule (methylglyoxal).

**Estimation of lipid peroxidation inhibitory efficacy and mineral preservation potency of HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne fumigated *Nigella sativa* seeds**

Reactive oxygen species (ROS) like superoxide radical and peroxide radicals due to its highly reactive nature interact with biomolecules such as nucleic acids, proteins and polyunsaturated fatty acids (PUFAs). Reaction between ROS and PUFA ultimately leads to generation of malondialdehyde (MDA), F$_2$-isoprostanes and 4-hydrox-2-nonenal (HNE), a biomarker molecule of oxidative stress or lipid peroxidation (Tsikas 2017). The MDA, a significant biomarker of lipid peroxidation, generate pink colour MDA-thiobarbituric acid complex which is measured via TBARS assay in order to quantify lipid peroxidation in a sample. In control sets for HAEO and CS-HAEO Ne MDA content was noted as 351.21 and 334.39 µM/g FW. However, MDA content in HAEO treated samples was declined and found to be 224.51 and 129.03 µM/g FW at its MIC and 2 MIC value, respectively. Conversely, samples fumigated with encapsulated HAEO revealed presence of only 176.8 and 105.8 µM/g FW MDA content at relatively low concentration (Fig. 10). Outcome of the result is corroborated with the previous report of Hu et al. (2015) suggesting enhanced preservative potential of cinnamon essential oil loaded chitosan nanoparticle in order to prevent lipid peroxidation and maintain sensory quality of stored meat based on synergism between antioxidant potency of HAEO and chitosan. Moreover, earlier reported resistance quality of chitosan coating towards oxygen permeability and of chitosan amine group with malondialdehyde (Sathivel et al. 2007) might also be one of the major causes related with boosting of preservative potential of nanoencapsulated EO. Furthermore, entrapped HAEO inside chitosan matrix have been protected against environmental degradation, have
sustainable release profile and potent free radical scavenging property might be a promising reason owing to its shelf life enhancer efficacy. Mineral content of stored food substances are also lost due to action of storage fungi. Fagbohun and Ogundahunsi (2019) reported diminished mineral content in stored *Citrullus lanatus* seeds, as the minerals are metabolized and utilized by the storage fungi for their growth and physiological activity. Black cumin seed is reported to have vast medicinal history and it is huge repository of nutritional substances and minerals such as iron, sodium, potassium, phosphorus, calcium, manganese, zinc, magnesium, and copper. Our experimental analysis revealed that fumigation of HAEO as well as CS-NHAEO-Ne has capability to preserve nutritional property of black cumin via protecting its mineral content loss. Table 5 presents mineral content in control, HAEO and CS-NHAEO-Ne fumigated black cumin seed at its MIC and 2 MIC concentrations. Hence, the present investigation recommends CS-NHAEO to be used as a sustainable green shelf life enhancer food additive substance.

Sensorial profile of black cumin (*Nigella sativa*) seeds fumigated with HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne

Sensorial properties of food products are important perspective with respect to consumer’s acceptance. Therefore, in order to recommend HAEO loaded nanoformulation as commercial green food preservative, it is a very crucial to evaluate sensorial attributes of fumigated samples for its wide consumer acceptance in global market. Considering this, three different sets of 18 months stored samples *i.e.* stored black cumin seed without fumigation, black cumin seed fumigated with HAEO at MIC concentration *i.e.* 1.75 µL/ml and black cumin seed fumigated with CS-HAEO-Ne at its MIC concentration *i.e.* 1.25 µL/ml sensorial aspects was assessed. Obtained result is presented in Fig. 11. The obtained sensorial score for odor, taste, texture and colour was lower for control set, in comparison to fumigated samples. However, in between
HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne treated samples CS-HAEO-Ne is having better score suggesting food grade coating as an efficient strategy to prevent undesirable sensorial effect of HAEO on food products. Entrapment of HAEO inside polymeric nanomatrix masked the intense aroma of essential oil and caused its controlled release as well as lower concentration of EO is required; besides, above mentioned potent radical scavenging action, prevention of lipid peroxidation and efficient antifungal characteristics of encapsulated HAEO also contributed to its food items sensorial properties preservation quality. Pabast et al. (2018) reported nanoencapsulated *Satureja khuzestanica* EO as better substance over free EO to extend shelf life of lamb meat with improved sensorial quality.

**Safety assessment of HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne: Acute oral toxicity test on male mice**

In acute oral toxicity assay, LD$_{50}$ value for HAEO was determined as 11334.6 µL/kg body weight, while it is 8006.84 µL/kg for CS-HAEO-Ne. Controls containing Tween 20 and chitosan nanoemulsion are non toxic to the mice. The outcome is in accordance with the previous report of Ribeiro et al. (2014), indicating that encapsulated *Eucalyptus citriodora* EO have enhanced acute oral toxicity in comparison to free EO. LD$_{50}$ value of HAEO was higher as compared to some previous studies focused on plant products like *Nepeta cataria* EO *i.e.* 2710 mg/kg BW (Zhu et al. 2009), *Artemisia annua* *i.e.* 790 mg/kg (Perazzo et al. 2003), thymol and carvacrol bioactive component *i.e.* 980 mg/kg and 810 mg/kg (Bahuguna et al. 2020) recommending nanoformulated HAEO as safer next generation green preservative.

**Conclusion**

The findings of present study recommend utilization of nanoformulated essential oils as efficacious antifungal agent. Encapsulated HAEO exhibited improved antifungal,
antiaflatoxigenic as well as free radical scavenging activity over the unencapsulated HAEO.

Noticeable destruction of ergosterol level, efflux of important cellular ions and inhibition of methylglyoxal biosynthesis suggested possible mechanisms underlying antifungal and AFB\textsubscript{1} suppression potencies of encapsulated HAEO. Moreover, CS-HAEO Ne was also found to have significant \textit{in vivo} AFB\textsubscript{1} inhibitory potency as well as protective role against lipid peroxidation and mineral loss in stored \textit{Nigella sativa} seeds without compromising its organoleptic attributes. Thus, the above findings provide an exciting future opportunity for food industries to prefer HAEO nanoformulation as a natural and safe alternative of synthetic chemicals due to its potent preservative potential and safety profile.
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Fig. 11 Sensorial profile of HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne fumigated black cumin (*Nigella sativa*) seed
### Table 1: Chemical Profile of *Homalomena aromatica* essential oil (HAEO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.NO.</th>
<th>Bioactive Components</th>
<th>Retention time</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Terpinolene</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>β-pinene</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>α-pinene</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>α-terpinene</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>o-cymene</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>D-limonene</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>β-ocimene</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>γ-terpinene</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Linalool oxide</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Linalool</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>68.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hotrienol</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Terpinen-4-ol</td>
<td>11.06</td>
<td>8.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>m-cymen-8-ol</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Terpineol</td>
<td>11.61</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>cis-geraniol</td>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Geraniol</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Espatulenol</td>
<td>26.49</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Globulol</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Tau-cadinol acetate</td>
<td>28.76</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>α-cadinol</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Caryophyllene oxide</td>
<td>30.46</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>91.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Compounds in bold are major components

### Table 2: % nanoencapsulation efficiency and % loading capacity of HAEO inside chitosan polymeric matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chitosan: HAEO (w/v)</th>
<th>NEE %</th>
<th>LC %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:0.0</td>
<td>0.00±0.00a</td>
<td>0.00±0.00a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:0.2</td>
<td>22.01±0.25b</td>
<td>0.15±0.00b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:0.4</td>
<td>24.82±0.37c</td>
<td>0.35±0.01c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:0.6</td>
<td>55.68±0.25d</td>
<td>1.16±0.01d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:0.8</td>
<td>83.42±0.38e</td>
<td>2.32±0.01e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>60.07±0.05f</td>
<td>2.08±0.00f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEE=** nanoencapsulation efficiency, **LC=** Loading capacity

Values are mean (n=3) ± standard error

Significance difference between the means (p < 0.05, ANOVA test)
Table 3 Effect of HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne on mycelial dry weight (MDW) and AFB$_1$ production by AF-LHP-NS 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concentration (μL/mL)</th>
<th>HAEÖ</th>
<th></th>
<th>CS-HAEO-Ne</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MDW (g)</td>
<td>AFB$_1$ (μg/mL)</td>
<td>% inhibition</td>
<td>MDW (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNT</td>
<td>0.69±0.03$^a$</td>
<td>3.94±0.05$^a$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.67±0.01$^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.63±0.01$^a$</td>
<td>3.76±0.07$^b$</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.55±0.00$^b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.53±0.00$^a$</td>
<td>2.74±0.04$^c$</td>
<td>30.47</td>
<td>0.38±0.01$^c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.47±0.00$^b$</td>
<td>2.38±0.06$^d$</td>
<td>39.78</td>
<td>0.29±0.01$^d$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0**</td>
<td>0.22±0.07$^c$</td>
<td>0.34±0.02$^c$</td>
<td>92.57</td>
<td>0.13±0.01$^e$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25*</td>
<td>0.00±0.00$^{cd}$</td>
<td>0.00±0.00$^f$</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.00±0.00$^f$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.00±0.00$^{d}$</td>
<td>0.00±0.00$^f$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.00±0.00$^{c}$</td>
<td>0.00±0.00$^f$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AFB$_1$ = aflatoxin B$_1$

Values are mean (n = 3) ± standard error

Significance difference between the means (p<0.05, ANOVA test)

CNT = Control
Table 4 Effect of HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne on vital cellular constituent’s release of AF-LHP-NS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conc. (µL/mL)</th>
<th>Ca^{2+} (mg/L)</th>
<th>Mg^{2+} (mg/L)</th>
<th>K^{+} (mg/L)</th>
<th>260 nm absorbing material</th>
<th>280 nm absorbing material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNT</td>
<td>6.57±0.73a</td>
<td>2.83±0.95a</td>
<td>3.98±0.46a</td>
<td>3.48±0.67a</td>
<td>11.90±1.75a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>9.35±0.85a</td>
<td>8.92±0.62b</td>
<td>8.20±1.41bc</td>
<td>30.22±2.05b</td>
<td>42.10±2.39ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>6.55±2.59ab</td>
<td>10.72±1.35bc</td>
<td>7.85±0.88abc</td>
<td>40.1±4.95bc</td>
<td>81.50±11.57abc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>10.50±0.90abc</td>
<td>12.43±1.01bc</td>
<td>9.18±0.43abc</td>
<td>9.74±5.69bcd</td>
<td>91±11.03abc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>12.13±1.42b</td>
<td>14.15±0.635c</td>
<td>10.42±0.76abcd</td>
<td>10.15±0.78c</td>
<td>56.38±5.21bcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25*</td>
<td>13.38±1.09ab</td>
<td>18.72±0.32d</td>
<td>12.52±1.21bdc</td>
<td>13.05±0.73c</td>
<td>59.17±4.23bcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>16.07±2.14ab</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13.10±1.49cd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67.33±6.50ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.75**</td>
<td>20.35±4.41b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.67±1.45d</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>72.33±8.64abc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2MIC</td>
<td>37.20±5.59c</td>
<td>38.08±1.77p</td>
<td>23.78±1.48e</td>
<td>25.92±1.44d</td>
<td>85.97±5.07c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Values are mean(n=3) ± standard error
- Significance difference between the means (p < 0.05, ANOVA test)
- * =Minimum inhibitory concentration for CS-HAEO-Ne, ** =Minimum inhibitory concentration for HAEO, - = not measured

*p = Minimum inhibitory concentration for CS-HAEO-Ne, ** = Minimum inhibitory concentration for HAEO, - = not measured
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Table 5 Effect of HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne on in situ mineral content of black cumin seeds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>Potassium (K)</th>
<th>Calcium (Ca)</th>
<th>Magnesium (Mg)</th>
<th>Iron (Fe)</th>
<th>Zinc (Zn)</th>
<th>Manganese (Mn)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAEO CNT</td>
<td>55.77±11.03^a</td>
<td>63.17±5.70^a</td>
<td>4.55±0.52^a</td>
<td>1.87±0.26^a</td>
<td>1.55±0.13^a</td>
<td>0.88±0.61^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAEO MIC</td>
<td>79.33±7.37^ab</td>
<td>180.17±9.94^a</td>
<td>20.18±0.77^a</td>
<td>12.88±1.08^a</td>
<td>6.28±0.28^a</td>
<td>2.1±1.15^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS-HAEO-Ne CNT</td>
<td>40.33±0.81^bc</td>
<td>77±1.76^b</td>
<td>5±0.36^b</td>
<td>2.35±0.92^b</td>
<td>2.9±0.65^b</td>
<td>0.45±0.17^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS-HAEO-Ne MIC</td>
<td>95±3.75^c</td>
<td>194.5±13.60^b</td>
<td>22.8±0.82^c</td>
<td>14.56±0.57^b</td>
<td>5.82±0.16^b</td>
<td>2.2±1.21^b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are mean (n=3) ± standard error

Significance difference between the means (p < 0.05, ANOVA test)
Figures

Figure 1

SEM image of (A) CS Ne and (B) CS-HAE0-Ne
Figure 2

FTIR spectra of (A) CS, (B) CS Ne, (C) EO and (D) CS-HAE0-Ne
Figure 3

XRD spectra of CS, CS Ne and CS-HAE0-Ne
Figure 4

In vitro release profile of CS-HAE0-Ne
Figure 5

Fungitoxic spectrum of HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne at their respective MIC concentration

Figure 6

Ergosterol inhibition at different concentration of (A) HAEO and (B) CS-HAEO-Ne
Figure 7

Effect of (A) HAEO and (B) CS-HAEO-Ne on methylglyoxal of AF-LHP NS 7
Figure 8

DPPH free radical scavenging activity of (A) HAEO and (B) CS-HAEO-Ne
Figure 9

In vivo antiaflatoxigenic efficacy of HAE0 and CS-HAE0-Ne; (A) CNT, (B) HAE0 and (C) CS-HAE0-Ne
Figure 10

Effect of HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne fumigation on lipid peroxidation of stored black cumin (Nigella sativa) seeds
Figure 11

Sensorial profile of HAEO and CS-HAEO-Ne fumigated black cumin (Nigella sativa) seed