

Moleculer Docking Extract Ginger Clove Acts As An Antibacterial In Expression Of Tlr2 And Tlr4 Proteins In Recurrent Aphthous Stomatitis (Ras)

Masriadi^{1,2*}, Syahrijuita Kadir³, Ika Yustisia^{4,5}, Sulfahri⁶

^{1,4}MasterProgram ofBiomedicalScience,Graduate School Hasanuddin University,Makassar,South Sulawesi, Indonesia

²Departmentof Epidemiology, Faculty of Public Health, Universitas Muslim Indonesia, Makassar, Indonesia

^{3,5}Departement of Biochemistry, Faculty of Medicine, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia

⁶DepartmentofBiology,Faculty ofMathematic and NaturalSciences, HasanuddinUniversity, Makassar,Indonesia

^{1,2}ORCID ID:0000-0001-6927-7292
 ³ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5149-2274
 ^{4,5}ORCID ID: 0000-0001-7611-968X
 ⁶ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8837-1388

Abstract

Toll-Like Receptors (TLRs) are vital components playing important role in pathogen recognition and natural immunity. TLRs recognize microbial structure and transmit this information into the cell, culminating in an inflammatory cytokine response and in co-stimulatory molecule expression involve in induction of adaptive immunity. This study aims to explore the chemical compounds of ginger and clove as antibacterial. The water molecules and ligands were removed using PyMOL vl.7.4.5 Software (Schrödinger).Molecular docking experiments were performed using the PyRx0.8 software. The expression of TLR2 and TLR4 proteins in Recurrent Aphthous Stomatitis has different ligands and binding affinities. Expression of TLR2 protein with peptidoglycan ligand for microbial sources of gram-positive bacteria, while TLR4 has lipopolysaccharide (LPS) ligand for gram negative bacteria. Lipopolysaccharide (LPS) is a major component of the outer membrane of Gram-negative bacteria. Peptidoglycan (PGN) recognition proteins (PGRPs) are pattern-recognition receptors of the innate immune system that bind and, in some cases, hydrolyze bacterial PGNs. The result showed that quercetin has greater potential as an antibacterial based on its binding affinity and intermolecular interactions. The binding affinity of gingerol eugenol with TLR2 is -5.70, TLR4 protein is -4.60, while binding affinity chlorhexidine (as control) with TLR2 and TLR4 was -7.20. AMES Tests howed that gingeroleugenol is not

potential mutagen and not carcinogens. Druglikeness prediction showed that gingerol and eugenol fulfil the rules of Lipinski, Ghose, Veber, Egan, and Nuegge.

Keywords: Recurrent Aphthous Stomatitis, Ginger, Clove, TLR2, TLR4, lipopolysaccharide, Peptidoglycan

Introduction

Ginger (Zingiber Officinale) and Clove (SyzygiumAromaticum) are natural ingredients that are often used for seasoning in various dishes. Ginger (ZingiberofficinaleRosc) is a plant belonging to the class Monocotyledoneae and the Zingiberaceae family of spices (Mohaddese Mahboubi, 2019). Ginger contains chemical compounds such as (6.8, and 10)- gingerol, (6.8 and 10)-shogaol, paradol, methyl gingerol, gingerdiol, dehydrogingerdion, gingerdion. The main chemical content of cloves is eugenol with a composition of eugenol (81.20%), trans- β -caryophyllene (3.92%), -humulene (0.45%), eugenol acetate (12.43%), caryophyllene oxide (0.25%) and trimetoxyacetophenone (0.53%). Ginger is used for the treatment of diseases, including muscle pain, rheumatism, sinusitis, cough, afternoon throat, diarrhea, cramps, indigestion, loss of appetite, fever, flu, and infectious and non-communicable diseases, while Clove has stimulant, anesthetic, carminative, antiemetic, antiseptic and antispasmodic (Mengmeng Zhang, 2020).

Toll-Like Receptors (TLRs) are vital components playing important role in pathogen recognition and natural immunity. TLRs recognize microbial structure and transmit this information into the cell, culminating in an inflammatory cytokine response and in co-stimulatory molecule expression involve in induction of adaptive immunity. Failure of the receptor to recognize pathogen may result in recurrent infection in hosts (Muthukuru M, 2005). Oral mucosal cells such as epithelial cells are thought to act as physical barrier against the invasion of pathogenic organism, but they have an ability to produce inflammatory cytokines and express adhesion molecules.Oral epithelial cells are refractory to many bacterial components although they express TLR/MyD88 (Sugawara S, 2002). Epithelium of oral mucosal is the first line of defense against invading pathogens. TLR4, along with CD14 and other adaptor molecules, recognize pathogen-associated molecular patterns such as lipopolysaccharides (LPS) from gram negative enteric bacteria. TLR2 along with TLR1/TLR6, recognize gram positive peptidoglycans eg. From oral commensal (Dong Z, 2005).

Minute amounts of LPS released from infecting pathogens can initiate potent innate immune responses that prime the immune system against further infection. However, when the LPS response is not properly controlled it can lead to fatal septic shock syndrome. The common structural pattern of LPS in diverse bacterial species is recognized by a cascade of LPS receptors and accessory proteins,

12372

LPS binding protein (LBP) and the Toll-like receptor4 (TLR4) complex (Rongjin Guan, 2004). One recent study indicates that both TLR2 and TLR4 positive cells infiltrate the oral mucosa in mucosal health and disease., but very little is understood about the overall expression pattern of PRRs in the human oral mucosal health and in Recurrent Aphthous Stomatitis and how they regulate local immune responsiveness (Ortega Cava, 2003).

Recurrent Aphthous Stomatitis (RAS) are the most common oral disease characterized by repeated development of painful ulcers. The etiology of RAS is still unknown. Many local and systemic factors such as viral or bacterial infection, food hypersensitivity, genetic factors, and systemic disease could be involved in the pathogenesis of RAS. Previous study have also suggested that this inflammatory disease is a result of abnormal immune response directed towards the oral mucosal. The Innate immune system also plays a role in several human diseases. The primary function of Toll Like receptors (TLRs) is to recognized pathogens (DiahSavitriErnawati, 2016).

Ginger and cloves are herbal plants that are used to treat diseases such as muscle pain, rheumatism, sinusitis, cough, sore throat, diarrhea, cramps, indigestion, loss of appetite, fever, flu, and infectious and non-communicable diseases such as mouth disease (RAS). Ginger Clove has stimulant, anesthetic, carminative, antiemetic, antiseptic and antispasmodic properties so that it is feasible to be used as an extract that is useful for human health in general and dental and oral health in particular (Kawiji, 2016).

Based on this background, researchers are interested in conducting "molecular docking" of the active compound in clove ginger as an antibacterial in the expression of TLR2 and TLR4 proteins in RAS patients.

Materials and Methods

Tools and Materials

Laptop with Intel[®] CoreTM specifications, 4 GB RAM and graphics card. The software used is the Windows 10 operating system, the Autodock Tools package (The Scripp Research Institute), Open Babel 2.3.3, Autodock Vina, and PyMOL. The hardware device used is an Acer Aspire E Laptop with OS specifications: Windows 8.1, Processor AMD A-Series Quad Core Processor A10-7300 (4 MB L2 cache, RAM 16 GB DDR3L SDRAM. The software uses applications, namely PyMOL, PyRX.The materials used are protein data bank website (https://www.rsbc.org), PubChem

(http://pubchem.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov), Toxicity Test (http://lmmd.ecust.edu. cn) and Druglikeness Test (http://www.swissadme.ch)

Preparation

Preparation of compounds in Dayak onion plants to be used as ligands was obtained through the PubChem website and then downloaded in 3D SDF format. Preparations of TLR2 and TLR4 receptor proteins were obtained through the PDB website (Protein Data Bank), then downloaded in PDB format. Next, open the PyMOL application to clean the water molecules contained in the target protein that are still dirty to be used as pure target protein.

Research Procedure

The molecular docking process uses the Autodock tools application and Autodock vina on the PyRx application. The receptor and ligand structures that have been optimized are separately stored in the same folder. By opening the application, click the file, click load the target protein molecule that has been cleaned. For ligands click file then click import and select sdf format and enter the ligands that have been downloaded in PubChem previously. Then click on Autodock Vina click start and select molecular and ligand then click forward after it appears click maximise then click forward again until running is complete after that the docking result number appears and select the smallest number then save with sdf format. Furthermore, the saved sdf file is entered into the PyMOL application to see the visualization of the docking results of the target ligand and protein.

Results and Discussion

In this study, to obtain a ligand as a candidate drug to be developed, the criteria for a good drug must follow the Lipinski's Rule of Five developed by Christopher A. Lipinski (Tallei TE, 2020). Prior to molecular docking, it is necessary to check the nature of the ligand used, whether it meets the rules.

Eugenol

Gingerol



Control Ligand: Chlorhexidine



Figure 1. Visualization 3D Eugenol, Gingerol and Chlorhexidine 3D compounds

With water molecules

Without water molecules





Figure 2. Visualization 3D Target Proteins TLR2 (Ligand Peptidoglycan)

Withwater molecules

Without water molecules



Figure 3. Visualization 3D Target Proteins TLR2 (Ligand LPS)

The results of visualization of molecular docking gingerol and eugenol have vander Waals bonds and conventional hydrogen bonds for eugenol, gingerols have conventional hydrogen bonds found in the molecular docking results. Visualization of molecular docking results for eugenol compounds, gingerols with main protein receptors TLR2 and TLR4 in 3D and 2D forms, on residual gingerol and eugenol compounds that act on the active site, namely the van der Waals bond.

Based on the results obtained, gingerol and eugenol showed activity as an antibacterial agent for SAR with the mechanism of inhibition of the SAR protease through the formation of hydrogen bonds with negative affinity.

avigator		Uew View				
Molecules ? AutoDock M TV	TK 🏷 Mayavi	👻 🚳 3D Scene	😒 2D Plots 🛛 📋 Documents 👘	Tables		
 	59		¥ Z Z 🥥 🖥 🛧 🔀 🖡	©		
ontrols Vina Wizard	🛠 Open Babel 🛛 🌏 Python Shell	1 Logger				
ontrols Vina Wizard 🔗 AutoDock Wizard 👘	😭 Open Babel 🛛 🥐 Python Shell rina 🔛 Analyze Results	1 Logger				_
ontrols Vina Wizard R AutoDock Wizard © Start Here X Select Molecules Run t View: [No filter		Cogger			🔀 i	266
Inhole Vina Ward P AutoDock Wizerd Visue X, Select Molecules Run 1 View: No filter Ligand	Open Babel O	v (kcal/mol)	Mode	RMSD lower bound	RMSD upper bound	260
Vina Wizard 🌘 AutoDock Wizard 👘 Start Here 💢 Select Molecules Run 1 Verv: No filter Ugand tr. 2,docleng, 3314_uff, 5=159.59	Open Babel Python Shell Analyze Results Results: All 18 items Sinding Affinit -5.7	y (kcal/mol)	Mode	RMSD lower bound 0.0	RMSD upper bound	
antrols ♥ Mar Wizard ♥ AutsDock Wizard ♥ Start Here X Select Molecules Run t Were; No filter Ligand thr_2_docking_3314_uff_E=169.59 thr_2_docking_3314_uff_E=169.59	Copen Babel Python Shell ina 2 Analyze Results V Results:All 18 items 5.7 -5.7	y (tcal/mol) 0 1	Mode	RMSD lower bound 0.0 38.77	RMSD upper bound 0.0 39,769	2 6
Vina Wizard AutoDock Wizard § Start Here X ₃ Select Molecules Run 1 Wew: No filter Ligand tr.2_docking_3314_urff_E=169.59 tr.2_docking_3314_urff_E=169.59 tr.2_docking_3314_urff_E=169.59 tr.2_socking_3314_urff_E=169.59 tr.2_docking_3314_urff_E=169.59 tr.2_docking_3314_urff_E=169 tr.2_d	Coen Babel Python Shell Inna Analyze Results V Results:All 18 items Binding Affrits -5.7 -5.3 -5.3	y (kcal/mol)	Mode	RMSD lower bound 0.0 38.77 38.599	RMSD upper bound 0.0 39.769 39.473	
Vine Wizer	CoenBabel Python Shell ing 2 Analyze Results Results:All 18 items 5.7 5.3 5.3 5.2	(kcal/mo) (kcal/mo) 1 2 3	Mode	RMSD lower bound 0.0 38.77 38.599 38.664	RMSD upper bound 0.0 39, 769 39, 799	
mitols	Copen Babel Python Shell ina Analyze Results V Results All 18 items 5.7 -5.3 -5.3 -5.3 -5.1	y (ccal/mo) 0 1 2 3 4	Mode	RMSD lower bound 0.0 38.77 38.699 38.604 9.943	RMSD upper bound 0.0 39.769 39.473 39.799 12.662	
Vina Wizzer	Open Babel Python Shel Puthon Shel Analyze Results Binding Affeit -5.7 -5.3 -5.3 -5.1 -5.1	y (scal/mol) 0 1 2 3 4 5	Mode	RMSD lower bound 0.0 38.77 38.699 38.604 9.343 38.455	RMSD upper bound 0.0 39.769 39.473 39.799 12.662 39.602	

Figure 4. Vina Autodocking Process Gingerol compound with TLR2 protein

		View							
V Molecules Y AutoDock M TVTK > Mayavi +		₹ 🚜 3D Scen	🚜 3D Scene 🖄 2D Plots 📳 Documents 🔲 Tables 👹 Open Babel						
Ligands - 3314_uff_E=169.59.pdbqt 42793_uff_E=166.57.pdbqt 42793_uff_E=166.57.pdbqt			Control of the second						
		2, Ligands							
		Ligand		Target	Binding Energy	Unbound Energy	Date Created	Info	
to Macromolecules ⊕- ∰ tr_4.pdb		10445924	uff E=301.77	6LU7 PDB	-6.9	consecute contragy	2021.11.12 19:4	Vina	
		3314 uff	E=169.59	tir 4 pdb	-4.6		2021.11.13 08:0	Vina	
		442793_ut	f_E=166.37	tlr_4_pdb	-4.8		2021.11.13 08:1	Vina	
		97214_uff	_E=492.91	99	-6.7		2021.11.12 11:3	Vina	
ontrols									
ontrols Vina Wizard 💽 AutoDock Wizard 🔋 Start Here 🄀 Select Molecules Ru	🙀 Open Babel 🛛 🥐 Python Sh In Vina 🔛 Analyze Results	el 👔 Logger							
ontrols Vina Wizard AutoDock Wizard Start Here Xa Select Molecules Ru View: No filter	Gpen Babel Python Si in Vina I Analyze Results Results: All 18 its	el 👔 Logger							
ontrols Vina Wizard AutoDock Wizard Start Here S. Select Molecules Ru View: No filter Ligand	Cpen Babel Python Si n Vina Analyze Results Results: All 18 its Binding Af	ell 🕡 Logger ens finity (kcal/mol)		Mode		RMSD low	er bound	E) RMSD upper bound	
AutoDock Wizard AutoDock Wizard Start Here Kaselect Molecules Ru View: No filter Ligand tr_4.pdb_3314_uff_E=169.59	Copen Babel Python St n Vina Analyze Results Results: All 18 its Binding Af -4.6	ell DLogger	0	Mode	0.0	RMSD low	er bound	RMSD upper bound 0.0	
Una Wizard AutoDock Wizard Image: Start Here X, Select Molecules Ru Venc: No filter Ligand tr.4.pdb.3314_uff_E=169.59 tr.4.pdb.3314_uff_E=169.59	Coen Babel Coen Babel Coen Babel Coen Babel Coen Babel Coen Babel Coentration Provided and the Coentration Coentra	ell Dogger	0	Mode	0.0	RMSD low) 201	er bound	RMSD upper bound 0.0 38.058	
Una Wizard AutoDock Wizard Image: Start Here Image: Start Here Image: Start Here Ru View: No filter Ligand Ligand Image: Start Here Ligand thr_4_pdb_3314_uff_E=169.59 thr_4_pdb_3314_uff_E=169.59 Image: Start Here Start Here Image: Start Here	Copen Babel Python Si n Yina 22 Analyze Results Results: Al 18 ib Binding Af -4.6 -4.6 -4.6	ell Dogger	0 1 2	Mode	0.0 35. 35.	RMSD low) 201 017	er bound	RMSD upper bound 0.0 38.058 37.359	
Una Wizer AutoDock Wizerd Visart Here V. Select Molecules Ru View: No fitter Ligand Usard Ligand Usard th_d_pob_3314_uff_E=169.59 th_d_pob_3314_uff_E=169.59 th_d_pob_3314_uff_E=169.59 th_d_pob_3314_uff_E=169.59	Copen Babel Provide Analyze Results Mina Analyze Results Results: Al 18 its Binding Af 4.6 4.6 4.6 4.6 4.6	el Dogger	0 1 2 3	Mode	0.0 35 35 69	RMSD low) .201 .017 .076	er bound	RMSD upper bound 0.0 38.058 37.859 70.704	
Vina Wizzał AutoDock Wizzał Vina Wizzał AutoDock Wizzał Start Here Vina Select Molecules Ru View: No filter Ligand Ru Ligand Ligand Ligand Ru H-4_pob_3314_uff_E=169.59 Hr_4_pob_3314_uff_E=169.59 Hr_4_pob_3314_uff_E=169.59 Hr_4_pob_3314_uff_E=169.59 Hr_4_pob_3314_uff_E=169.59 Hr_4_pob_3314_uff_E=169.59	Come Babel	el Logger	0 1 2 3 4	Mode	0.0 35 35 69 63	RMSD low) 201 017 076 805	er bound	RMSD upper bound 0.0 38.058 37.859 70.704 65.419	
Unit Witz and Start Here AutoDock Witzerd Image: Start Here X Select Molecules Ru View: No filter Ligand Ru Ru Ru User: No filter Ligand Ru Ru Ru Ru User: No filter Ligand Ru	Copen Babel Copen Bab	el Dogger	0 1 2 3 4 5	Mode	0.0 35 35 69, 63, 59, 59, 59,	RMSD low) 201 017 0076 605 124	er bound	RMSD upper bound 0.0 38.058 37.859 70.704 65.419 61.847	

Figure 5. Vina Autodocking Process Eugenol compound with TLR4 protein

1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1						
International Contraction of the American		Anne Manne San				
Molecules AutoDock	P Mayavi = d	3D Scene 🛛 🖄 2D Plots 🚺 Do	cuments Tables & Open Babel			
 	.99		* 22 🖬 🗇			
			- Alexandre - A			
			1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1			
			14.200 Ar			
			NAMES OF A DESCRIPTION			
			1041 TANK			
			18 A.			
Controls						
Vina Wizard Vitard	Open Babel Python Shell Dogger					
V Start Here 🛴 Select Molecules Run Vina	Analyze Results					
View: No filter	V Results: All 9 items					
Ligand	Binding Affinity (kcal/mol)	Mo	de RMSD lower bound	RMSD upper bound		
thr_2_docking_9552079_utf_E=473.99	-7.2	0	0.0	0.0		
Hr 2 docking 9552079_UIT_E=473.99	-7.2	2	17.004	16 545		
thr 2 docking 9552079 uff E=473.99	-7.0	3	5.21	10.325		
tr_2_docking_9552079_uff_E=473.99	-7.0	4	24,408	27.119		
tlr_2_dodking_9552079_uff_E=473.99	-7.0	5	9.379	13.889		
tlr_2_docking_9552079_uff_E=473.99	-7.0	6	10.891	14.641		
· · · · ·		1		Ý		

Figure 6. Vina Autodocking Process of Chlorhexidine Compound with TLR2 protein

🖞 👶 🎒 🦿 🙀 🥥						
Navigator E		View				
Molecules 💡 AutoDock 🕅 TVTK	🗧 🎾 Mayavi 🗢 🗸	ID Scene 🛛 🖄 2D Plots 🛛 📋 Documents	Tables 🛛 🙀 Open Babel			
Ligands 9552079_uff_E=473.99.pdbqt		X X Y X Z 3 📦 🛯 🛧 🔀				
▶ Macromolecules は一副 tir_4_pdb						
Controls						
Vina Wizard 🧖 AutoDock Wizard 🐐	Open Babel 🥐 Python Shell 👔 Logger					
😲 Start Here 🎉 Select Molecules 🛛 Run Vir	na 🔛 Analyze Results					
View: No filter	 Results: All 18 items 					
Ligand	Binding Affinity (kcal/mol)	Mode	RMSD lower bound	RMSD upper bound		
tlr_2_docking_9552079_uff_E=473.99	-7.2	0	0.0	0.0		
tlr_2_docking_9552079_uff_E=473.99	-7.2	1	17.804	22.177		
tlr_2_docking_9552079_uff_E=473.99	-7.1	2	11.57	16.545		
tlr_2_docking_9552079_uff_E=473.99	-7.0	3	5.21	10.325		
tlr_2_docking_9552079_uff_E=473.99	-7.0	4	24,408	27.119		
tlr_2_dodking_9552079_uff_E=473.99	-7.0	5	9.379	13.889		
tlr_2_docking_9552079_uff_E=473.99	-7.0	6	10.891	14.641		

Figure 7. Vina Autodocking Process of Chlorhexidine Compound with TLR4 protein



Toxicity Test

In the toxicity test, the results were obtained for Peptidoglycan, LPS and Chlorhexidine compounds with nonAMES Toxic and Non Carsinogens results.

Toxicity				
Human Ether-a-go-go-Related Gene	Weak inhibitor	0.6699		
Inhibition	Non-inhibitor	0.6467		
AMES Toxicity	Non AMES toxic	0.6199		
Carcinogens	Non-carcinogens	0.8605		
Fish Toxicity	High FHMT	0.9677		
Tetrahymena Pyriformis Toxicity	High TPT	0.9983		
Honey Bee Toxicity	Low HBT	0.8089		
Biodegradation	Not ready biodegradable	0.9963		
Acute Oral Toxicity	III	0.3911		
Carcinogenicity (Three-class)	Non-required	0.6172		
ADMET Predicted Profile Regression				

Table 1. Toxicity Test Results of Gingerol and Eugenol Compounds

Druglikeness Test

Lipinski's rule states that a molecule can be continued with docking simulations if (1) the molecular weight is less than 500 Da, (2) the logpvalue is less than 5, (3) the number of hydrogen bond donors is less than 5, and (4) the number of hydrogen bond acceptors is less than 10. (5). In the druglikeness test (lipisnki) it was found that the compound eugenol, gingerol and chlorhexidine, the result of lipinski was Yes, which means that molecular docking can be continued.

Table 2. Bioavailability Score Compounds Gingerol and Eugenol

Druglikeness
Yes; 0 violation
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
0.55

Table 3. The result of Binding Affinity

Ligand	Binding Affinity
TL	.R2
Peptidoglycan	-5.70
	TLR4
LPS	-4.60
Chlorhexidine (Control)	-7.20

Most of the extracts from herbs such as ginger (gingerol) dan cloves (eugenol), are intended to treat some chronic diseases that exist in the oral cavity such as RAS. Thus, drug concentrations must be consistent if used as antibacterial therapy. Side effects of gingerol and eugenol compounds for the body have been observed, evaluated and associated with cell permeability and good metabolic processes, as the results of this study indicate that gingerol and eugenol are not potential mutagens and are not carcinogens.

Ligands are considered to have the potential to enter cell membranes and be absorbed by the body if they meet Lipinski's rules. After that, look at the lowest binding affinity value because the smaller the binding affinity value, the stronger the binding ability between the ligand used and the receptor (Masula AF, 2018).

Eugenol (4-allyl-2-methoxyphenol) is a major phenolic constituent of essential oils extracted from clove, nutmeg, and cinnamon. It exhibits antimicrobial, anti-inflammatory, and antioxidative properties (Rathinam P, 2017). It has also been widely used in flavoring, as well as in the cosmetic, pharmaceutical, and dentistry industries (MohammadiNejad S, 2017). Nowadays, the application of eugenol in the agricultural industry, such as in animal feeds, is increasing. Previous studies have reported that the administration of eugenol improved the health status and growth performance (Compiani R, 2013).

Additionally, eugenol showed antimicrobial activity against pig gut flora (Marchese A, 2017). Moreover, eugenol has been found to possess anti-inflammatory properties by decreasing the production of proinflammatory cytokines through regulating inflammation and redox status in lipopolysaccharide (LPS)-induced inflammation in acute lung injury (Huang X, 2015). Eugenol suppressed cyclooxygenase-2 expression in LPS-stimulated mouse macrophage RAW264cells. Therefore, eugenol has the potential to be an alternative to AGP, by preventing and alleviating the inflammatory gut diseases caused by weaning stress (Blavi L, 2015). Additionally, the flavor of eugenol in feeds positively affects postweaning performance and feeding behavior of piglets, which helped piglets adapt to a novel solid food from liquid (Qianruhui, 2020).

Based on the results of molecular docking of gingerol and eugenol compounds to TLR2 and TLR4, van der Waals bonds and hydrogen bonds were found in both docking results. Both of these bonds play an important role in the docking results.

12379

Conclussion

This research proves that gingerol and eugenol have the potential as antibacterial based on their binding affinity with -5.70 TLR2 protein and -4.60 TLR4 protein so that intermolecular interactions occur. This can also be seen from the control used, namely chlorhexidine with a binding affinity of -7.20.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the Lecturer of the Graduate School Program at Hasanuddin University Makassar, Indonesia, for their assistance in writing our article, in particular to Mr. Sulfahri who taught us software uses applications, namely PyMOL, PyRX and helped intensively proofread our journal.

Conflict of Interest.

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

References

Mohaddese Mahboubi. (2019).Zingiber officinale Rosc. essential oil, a review on its composition and bioactivity. Mahboubi Clinical Phytoscience, 5(6):1-12.

Mengmeng Zhang, Rong Zhao, Dan Wang, Li Wang, Qing Zhang. (2021). Ginger (Zingiber officinale Rosc.) and its bioactive components are potential resources for health beneficial agents. Phytotherapy Research. 35(2):711-742

Muthukuru M, Jotwani R, Cutler CW. (2005).Oral Mucosal Endotoxin Tolerance Induction in Chronic Periodontitis. Infection and Immunity Feb,p.687-694.

Sugawara S, Uehara A, Tamai R, Takada H. (2002).Innate immune responses in oral mucosa. JEndotoxin Res, 8(6):465-8.

Dong Z, Yang Z, Wang C. (2005). Expression of TLR2 and TLR4 messenger RNE I the epithelial cells of the nasal airway. Am J Rhinol, 19(3):236-9.

Rongjin Guan, Abhijit Roychowdhury, Brian Ember, Sanjay Kumar Geert-Jan Boons, and Roy A. Mariuzza. (2004).Structural basis for peptidoglycan binding by peptidoglycan recognition proteins. PNAS,1(49):17168–17173.

Ortega-Cava CF, Ishihara S, Rumi MA, Kawashima K. Ishimura N, Kazumori H, Udagawa J, Kadowaki Y. (2003).Strategic compartmentalization of TLR4 in the mouse gut. J Immunol, 170 (8):3977-85.

Diah Savitri Ernawati, Desiana Radithia, Bagus Soebadi, Aulanni'Am Aulanni'Am., 2016The Expression of TLR2 and TLR4 Protein in the Epithelial Cells of the Oral Mucosal Patients with Recurrent Apthous Stomatitis (RAS). International J of Pharmaceutical and Clinical Research,8(12): 1659-1662.

Kawiji, Rohula Utami, Erwin Nur Himawan. (2016).Ginger (Zingiber officinale Rosc.) utilization within increasing shelf life and antioxidant activity of Saleh PisangBasah. J of Agricultural Products Technology,4(2):113-119. [In Indonesia]

Tallei TE, Tumilaar SG, Niode NJ, Fatimawali, Kepel BJ, Idroes R, et al. (2020).Potential of Plant Bioactive Compounds as SARS-CoV-2 Main Protease (M^{pro}) and Spike (S) Glycoprotein Inhibitors: A Molecular Docking Study. Scientifica. Article ID 6307457:1-18.

Masula AF, Puspitasari D, Supriatin SWE, Ummah K, Rokhmatin D, Mubarrok, et al. (2018) Docking of lantana camara secondary metabolite molecular compounds as anti-inflammatory against COX-1 enzyme. Journal of Biota,4(2):79-83.

Rathinam P, Vijay Kumar H S, and Viswanathan P. (2017). Eugenol exhibits anti-virulence properties by competitively binding to quorum sensing receptors. Biofouling, 33:624–639.

Mohammadi Nejad S, Özgüneş H, and Başaran N. (2017).Pharmacological and toxicological properties of eugenol. Turk. J. Pharm. Sci, 14:201–206.

Compiani R, Rossi C S, Pizzi A, and Dell'Orto V. (2013).Administration of essential oils cinnamaldehyde, eugenol, and capsicum to beef cattle: effects on health status and growth performance, trends in veterinary sciences. Berlin, Heidelberg:Springer, p. 177–180.

12381

Marchese A, Barbieri R, Coppo E, Orhan I E, Daglia M, Nabavi S F, Izadi M, Abdollahi M, Nabavi S M, and Ajami M. (2017). Antimicrobial activity of eugenol and essential oils containing eugenol: a mechanistic viewpoint. Crit. Rev. Microbiol, 43:668–689.

Huang X, Liu Y, Lu Y, and Ma C. (2015). Anti-inflammatory effects of eugenol on lipopolysaccharideinduced inflammatory reaction in acute lung injury via regulating inflammation and redox status. Int. Immunopharmacol, 26:265–271.

Blavi L, Solà-Oriol D, Mallo J J, and Pérez J F. (2015). Anethol, cinnamaldehyde, and eugenol inclusion in feed affects postweaning performance and feeding behavior of piglets. J. Anim. Sci,94:5262–5271.

QianruHui, Emily Ammeter, Shangxi Liu, Runqiang Yang, Peng Lu, LudovicLahaye, and Chengbo Yang. (2020). Eugenol attenuates inflammatory response and enhances barrier function during lipopolysaccharide-induced inflammation in the porcine intestinal epithelial cells. J AnimSci, 98(8): ska245.

Available online at www.ijpcr.com International Journal of Pharmaceutical and Clinical Research 2016; 8(12): 1659-1662 Available online at www.ijpcr.com International Journal of Pharmaceutical and Clinical Research 2016; 8(12): 1659-1662