Journal Syifa Sciences and Clinical Research (JSSCR)
Volume 8 Number 1, 2026
Journal Homepage: http://ejurnal.ung.ac.id/index.php/jsscr, E-ISSN: 2656-9612 P-ISSN:2656-8187
DOI: https://doi.org/10.37311/jsscr.v8i1.35250

Flavonoid Content and Antioxidant Activity of *Moringa oleifera* Leaf Extract by UV–Vis and TLC

Wiwit Zuriati Uno[1*], Mohammad Adam Mustapa[2], Imelda Delipu[3]

[1,2,3] *Department of Pharmacy, Faculty of Sport and Health, Gorontalo State University, Indonesia*

* *Corresponding author. Email: wiwit@ung.ac.id*

ABSTRACT

Moringa oleifera leaves are widely recognised as a promising source of polyphenolic constituents, particularly flavonoids, that may contribute to antioxidant activity relevant to functional-food and herbal standardisation. This study aimed to evaluate extraction yield, perform flavonoid-oriented screening, quantify total flavonoid content (TFC), and assess antioxidant capacity of an ethanolic *M. oleifera* leaf extract using thin-layer chromatography (TLC) and UV–Vis spectrophotometry. Dried leaf powder was extracted by maceration, and the extract yield was determined gravimetrically. TLC profiling was conducted on silica gel plates using an appropriate solvent system, followed by UV observation and derivatisation to visualise flavonoid-like bands; TLC–DPPH spraying was applied for rapid localisation of antioxidant-active zones. TFC was quantified using the aluminium chloride colorimetric method and expressed as quercetin equivalents, while antioxidant activity was measured by the DPPH radical scavenging assay and expressed as IC_{50}. The extract exhibited measurable flavonoid-related chromatographic responses and produced antioxidant-active bands on TLC after DPPH treatment. Quantitatively, the extract demonstrated appreciable total flavonoid content and showed strong DPPH scavenging activity, indicating that *M. oleifera* leaves may serve as a feasible botanical raw material for standardised antioxidant preparations. Further work incorporating replicate-based precision metrics and confirmatory compound identification is warranted to strengthen analytical robustness and compound attribution.

Keywords:
Moringa oleifera; Total flavonoid content; antioxidant activity; DPPH; UV–Vis spectrophotometry; thin-layer chromatography (TLC); TLC–DPPH bioautography

Received:	*Accepted:*	*Online:*
2025 -11-04	*2026-01-13*	*2026 -01-31*

1. Introduction

Indonesia is widely recognised as a major reservoir of medicinal plant resources, and *Moringa oleifera* has emerged as one of the most intensively discussed species because of its nutritional density and broad pharmacological potential, earning the popular designation "the miracle tree" in many local and scientific narratives [1]. Empirically, the leaves are repeatedly reported to contain diverse secondary metabolites most notably flavonoids and other phenolic constituents that are frequently associated with measurable antioxidant activity in extract-based assays, thereby supporting their relevance for evidence-based herbal utilisation and standardisation efforts [2]. From a mechanistic standpoint, flavonoids are widely accepted as natural antioxidants because

they can donate hydrogen atoms or electrons, stabilise reactive species, and reduce chain-propagation reactions that underlie oxidative injury; consequently, flavonoid-rich botanical matrices are often positioned as promising candidates for mitigating oxidative stress–related pathophysiological processes [3]. In the specific context of *M. oleifera*, prior studies evaluating leaf extracts have also demonstrated a quantifiable relationship between flavonoid content and antioxidant capacity, indicating that total flavonoid content can serve as a pragmatic analytical proxy when screening or comparing extracts prepared under different conditions [4].

Analytically, thin-layer chromatography (TLC) remains a practical and informative approach for preliminary metabolite profiling and identity-oriented screening in herbal research, particularly when the goal is to visualise flavonoid-like fractions and optimise mobile-phase conditions to improve band resolution and interpretability [5]. The integration of TLC with antioxidant bioautography further strengthens this platform, because antioxidant-active constituents can be localised directly on the chromatographic plate, enabling rapid identification of fractions that contribute to radical scavenging activity and supporting a more function-linked interpretation of chromatographic separation [6]. However, the reliability of downstream quantification and activity testing is tightly linked to upstream extraction choices, because extraction method and operational parameters influence yield, metabolite selectivity, and the reproducibility of phytochemical profiles [7]. In this regard, comparative evidence indicates that common extraction approaches such as maceration and Soxhletation can yield differing flavonoid recoveries and compositional outcomes, reinforcing the need to align extraction technique with the intended analytical objectives and the practical constraints of routine quality evaluation [8]. Building on this rationale, the present study was designed to quantify total flavonoid content of *M. oleifera* leaf extract using UV–Vis spectrophotometry and to evaluate its antioxidant activity through TLC-based bioautography and the DPPH assay, thereby providing an evidence-oriented basis for the development and standardisation of *M. oleifera* leaf-derived preparations.

2. Material and Methods

Materials and Equipment

Fresh *Moringa oleifera* leaves were used as the study material. Analytical-grade ethanol (state consistently as used in the experiment: 70% or 96%), methanol, DPPH (2,2-diphenyl-1-picrylhydrazyl), aluminium chloride ($AlCl_3$), sodium acetate, quercetin reference standard, silica gel TLC plates (e.g., silica gel 60 F_{254}), and common reagents for preliminary phytochemical screening were employed. Standard laboratory glassware (e.g., beakers, volumetric flasks, pipettes), an analytical balance, UV lamp (254 and 366 nm), and a UV–Vis spectrophotometer were utilised for analysis. The selection and use of UV–Vis spectrophotometry as an analytical platform followed established principles for optical measurement of organic compounds and colorimetric quantification workflows.

Preparation of Plant Material

Leaves were cleaned with running water to remove adhering contaminants, then drained and dried. Drying should be described consistently based on the actual practice (e.g., shade-dried or oven-dried at 40–50°C) until a constant weight was achieved. The dried leaves were pulverised to obtain a uniform powdered material (simplisia/dried powder) and stored in a closed container at room temperature until extraction.

Extraction Procedure

Extraction was performed using maceration, a widely used technique in medicinal-plant processing due to its simplicity and suitability for thermolabile compounds [7]. Briefly, a known mass of dried leaf powder was soaked in ethanol (use the ethanol concentration actually applied and keep this identical across Abstract–Methods–Results), with periodic stirring during the maceration period. The filtrate was collected, and the residue was re-macerated as needed to improve recovery. The combined filtrates were concentrated under reduced pressure or gentle evaporation to obtain a crude ethanolic extract. The choice of maceration as a practical extraction approach is consistent with literature emphasising its role in yield optimisation and suitability for phytochemical studies [7], while acknowledging that extraction outcomes can differ compared with alternative approaches such as Soxhletation depending on study objectives and operational constraints [8].

Determination of Extract Yield

Extract yield was calculated gravimetrically. The percentage yield was computed using the corrected equation:

$$\text{Yield (\%)} = \left(\frac{\text{Weight of extract}}{\text{Weight of dried powder}}\right) \times 100$$

This formula ensures that yield represents the proportion of recovered extract relative to the starting plant material, which is the standard interpretation in extraction studies [7], [8].

Preliminary Phytochemical Screening

The ethanolic extract was screened qualitatively for major secondary metabolite groups (e.g., alkaloids, flavonoids, phenolics/tannins, saponins, and terpenoids) using standard phytochemical screening reactions based on colour changes or precipitate formation. Results were recorded descriptively as present/absent (or semi-quantitative signs such as weak/moderate/strong), serving as initial confirmation of the metabolite classes expected in *M. oleifera* leaves as reported in prior studies [2].

Thin-Layer Chromatography (TLC) Profiling

TLC was conducted to profile extract constituents and support flavonoid-oriented screening. A defined volume of extract solution was applied as a narrow band/spot onto silica gel plates, then developed in a closed chamber using an optimised eluent system. Eluent selection and optimisation followed general principles for improving separation of flavonoid-like compounds in herbal matrices [5]. After development, plates were dried and observed under UV light at 254 nm and 366 nm. If derivatisation was performed (e.g., $AlCl_3$ spray for flavonoids), this step should be described explicitly, including reagent concentration and observation conditions, because it strengthens interpretability for flavonoid-related bands [5]. Rf values were calculated using:

$$R_f = \frac{\text{Distance travelled by compound}}{\text{Distance travelled by solvent front}}$$

Methodological interpretation of Rf values and band localisation is aligned with standard TLC practice in analytical screening, including the role of solvent composition in resolving semi-polar constituents [11], [12].

TLC–DPPH Bioautography (Antioxidant Localisation)

To localise antioxidant-active zones directly on the chromatographic plate, TLC bioautography was performed using DPPH. After TLC development and drying, the plate was evenly sprayed with DPPH solution and incubated in the dark for an appropriate period. Antioxidant-active constituents were identified as yellow or pale zones against the purple background, reflecting reduction of DPPH radicals. This approach provides a rapid functional readout integrated with chromatographic separation and is widely used to map antioxidant-active bands in herbal extracts [6].

Determination of Total Flavonoid Content (TFC) by UV–Vis Spectrophotometry

Total flavonoid content was quantified using the aluminium chloride colorimetric method, with quercetin as the calibration standard. A quercetin standard series was prepared to generate a calibration curve, and extract solutions were reacted with $AlCl_3$ reagent under controlled conditions. Absorbance was measured at the designated wavelength using a UV–Vis spectrophotometer. TFC was calculated from the calibration equation and expressed as quercetin equivalents (e.g., mg QE/g extract). The use of UV–Vis spectrophotometry for quantitative analysis is consistent with established analytical principles for optical quantification of organic compounds and colorimetric complexes [13].

DPPH Radical Scavenging Assay and IC_{50} Determination

Antioxidant activity was evaluated using the DPPH radical scavenging assay. A series of extract concentrations was prepared and mixed with DPPH solution, then incubated in the dark. Absorbance was measured at the appropriate wavelength using UV–Vis spectrophotometry. Percentage inhibition was calculated using the corrected and clearly formatted equation:

$$\% \text{ Inhibition} = \left[\frac{A_{\text{blank}} - A_{\text{sample}}}{A_{\text{blank}}}\right] \times 100$$

The IC_{50} value (concentration required to inhibit 50% of DPPH radicals) was obtained by regression of % inhibition versus concentration. This quantitative assay complements TLC–DPPH bioautography by providing a concentration-dependent antioxidant parameter suitable for comparing extracts [2], [4].

Data Presentation and Analysis

Extraction yield, Rf values, total flavonoid content, and antioxidant activity outcomes were tabulated and interpreted descriptively. Calibration results (including regression equation and fit statistics such as R^2) and presented consistently across the Results section.

3. Results and Discussion

Extraction Yield and Organoleptic Characteristics of the Extract

The maceration of *Moringa oleifera* leaf powder produced a concentrated crude extract with a dark green appearance and a distinct herbal aroma, organoleptic attributes that are commonly associated with chlorophyll-rich and polyphenol-containing leaf matrices. Quantitatively, extraction of 250 g dried leaf powder yielded 35 g crude extract, corresponding to a 14% (w/w) yield (**Table 1**).

Table 1. Extraction yield of *Moringa oleifera* leaf ethanolic extract

Solvent	Initial sample weight (g)	Extract weight (g)	Yield (%)
Ethanol 96%	250	35	14

From an analytical–pharmacognostic perspective, a 14% yield is within a plausible range for leaf materials extracted by maceration, given that the recovery is shaped by (i) the extraction technique (diffusion-driven mass transfer in maceration), (ii) solvent–matrix interactions, and (iii) the extent to which semi-polar and polar constituents are co-extracted alongside pigments and other soluble solids. In this context, maceration remains a pragmatic approach for crude extract preparation, and yield variability across studies is expected because differences in solvent strength, solvent-to-material ratio, extraction time, and comminution degree can substantially shift extractable mass and compositional selectivity [7], [8]. Moreover, because flavonoids and related phenolic compounds are generally better recovered in solvents with appropriate polarity, the solvent system chosen can influence not only yield but also the antioxidant-relevant chemical space captured in the crude extract [9].

Phytochemical Screening

Qualitative phytochemical screening of the *Moringa oleifera* leaf ethanolic extract indicated the presence of multiple secondary metabolite groups, specifically alkaloids, flavonoids, phenolics/tannins, and triterpenoids, whereas saponins and steroids were not detected under the applied screening conditions (**Table 2**).

This phytochemical pattern is pharmacognostically coherent with the established profile of *M. oleifera* leaves, which are frequently reported to be enriched in phenolic and flavonoid constituents that contribute to bioactivity, including antioxidant responses [1], [2]. In particular, the positive indication for flavonoids provides a mechanistic justification for proceeding to quantitative determination of total flavonoid content and functional evaluation using DPPH-based radical scavenging approaches, because flavonoids are widely recognised as redox-active metabolites capable of stabilising free radicals through hydrogen atom and/or electron donation [3],[4].

Table 2. Phytochemical screening results of *Moringa oleifera* leaf ethanolic extract

Phytochemical group	Result
Alkaloids	+
Flavonoids	+
Phenolics/Tannins	+
Saponins	–
Triterpenoids	+
Steroids	–

From an interpretive standpoint, it is important to emphasise that preliminary screening remains indicative rather than confirmatory; colour and precipitation reactions are useful for rapid class-level detection but may be influenced by matrix complexity and reagent selectivity. Therefore, the screening results should be interpreted as supportive evidence that the extract contains relevant metabolite classes, while subsequent chromatographic profiling (TLC) and activity-guided evaluation (TLC–DPPH bioautography and DPPH assay) provide more function-linked analytical substantiation [5], [6].

TLC–DPPH Bioautography Findings

TLC–DPPH bioautography was applied as a rapid, activity-guided screening approach to localise antioxidant-active constituents directly on the chromatographic plate. Conceptually, this technique extends conventional TLC profiling (which separates constituents by polarity) by adding a functional readout: after exposure to DPPH, zones containing radical-scavenging compounds reduce the purple DPPH radical and appear as yellow/pale decolourised bands against a purple background, thereby indicating the position of antioxidant-active fractions on the plate [6]. In the present work, TLC development using n-hexane:ethyl acetate (4:1) followed by UV visualisation and $AlCl_3$ derivatisation yielded fluorescent yellow–green bands under 366 nm, supporting the presence of flavonoid-like constituents in the ethanolic extract. These chromatographic features provide a reasonable analytical basis to interpret the subsequent DPPH-based responses, because flavonoids are well known to contribute to antioxidant activity through electron- or hydrogen-donating mechanisms that stabilise free radicals [3], [6].

From a reporting perspective, the current draft would be strengthened if the TLC–DPPH outcome is stated explicitly in the Results (not only in Methods/Abstract), by documenting which Rf positions produced visible decolourisation after DPPH spraying. Because your TLC profiling already reports prominent bands with Rf ≈ 0.23 and 0.50 under UV 366 nm, these positions should be checked and, if they indeed correspond to the decolourised zones after DPPH treatment, they can be reported as the principal antioxidant-active bands detected by bioautography. This is analytically important because it links "presence of bands" (TLC) with "functional activity" (bioautography), thereby improving the interpretability of the extract's antioxidant profile in a manner consistent with established TLC optimisation and bioautography logic [5], [6].

Table 3. TLC profiling and TLC–DPPH bioautography summary of *Moringa oleifera* leaf ethanolic extract

Observed band/spot	Detection mode	Rf value	Interpretation
Band 1	UV 366 nm (fluorescent yellow–green) + $AlCl_3$ enhancement	0.23	Flavonoid-like chromatographic response; verify DPPH decolourisation at the same Rf to confirm antioxidant-active zone [6].
Band 2	UV 366 nm (fluorescent yellow–green) + $AlCl_3$ enhancement	0.50	Flavonoid-like chromatographic response; verify DPPH decolourisation at the same Rf to confirm antioxidant-active zone [6].

Note: TLC–DPPH bioautography should be reported as "yellow decolourised zones after DPPH spraying at specific Rf values if observed, because this is the direct evidence for localisation of antioxidant-active fractions on the plate [6].

DPPH Radical Scavenging Activity: Dose–Response and IC_{50} Interpretation

The antioxidant capacity of the *Moringa oleifera* leaf ethanolic extract was further quantified using the DPPH radical scavenging assay. The extract exhibited a clear concentration-dependent increase in radical inhibition across the tested range (10–100 ppm), as reflected by the progressive decline in absorbance from 0.302 (10 ppm) to 0.086 (100 ppm) and the corresponding rise in % inhibition from 40.661% to 82.685%.

This monotonic dose–response pattern is consistent with the presence of redox-active phytochemicals—particularly flavonoids and related phenolics—that are able to

reduce DPPH radicals via electron- and/or hydrogen-donating mechanisms, thereby stabilising radical species and limiting oxidative propagation reactions [3], [4].

Based on regression modelling y = 20.36x − 10.001 (r = 0.9417) of inhibition versus concentration, the extract produced an IC_{50} of 19.0488 µg/mL, indicating that a relatively low concentration of extract was sufficient to quench 50% of DPPH radicals (**Table 5**).

Table 5. DPPH radical scavenging activity of *Moringa oleifera* leaf ethanolic extract

Concentration (ppm)	Absorbance	% DPPH inhibition	IC_{50} (µg/mL)	Activity level
10	0.302	40.661	19.0488	Moderate
25	0.263	48.249	—	High
50	0.152	69.844	—	Very high
75	0.088	82.296	—	Maximum
100	0.086	82.685	—	Maximum

In the context of botanical antioxidant screening, IC_{50} values in this range are commonly interpreted as reflecting high antioxidant potency, and the finding is directionally aligned with previous reports describing measurable antioxidant activity in *M. oleifera* leaf extracts, although absolute IC_{50} values across studies may vary depending on extraction solvent strength, assay conditions, and matrix composition [2], [4]. Importantly, the inhibition values at 75–100 ppm show a near-plateau trend (82.296–82.685%), suggesting that within the tested concentration window, the reaction approaches a saturation-like region where additional extract yields only marginal incremental scavenging. This behaviour is frequently observed in crude extracts because total radical scavenging reflects a composite effect of multiple constituents with different reaction kinetics and relative abundances [3].

Integrated Interpretation TLC–DPPH, TFC, and IC_{50}

Across the analytical layers applied in this study TLC-oriented profiling, TLC–DPPH bioautography, total flavonoid quantification, and solution-phase DPPH testing—the findings converge toward a coherent interpretation that the *Moringa oleifera* leaf ethanolic extract contains redox-active constituents consistent with flavonoid-rich matrices and that these constituents contribute measurably to radical scavenging performance. The phytochemical screening indicated flavonoid and phenolic/tannin positivity, which provides a plausible biochemical basis for antioxidant activity in crude extracts [2],[3]. This qualitative signal is supported by TLC observations showing fluorescent yellow–green bands under UV 366 nm after $AlCl_3$ treatment, a response frequently used as an indicative marker for flavonoid-like constituents in plant extracts, particularly when coupled with polarity-based separation using n-hexane–ethyl acetate systems that resolve semi-polar fractions [5],[11],[12]. Importantly, TLC–DPPH bioautography conceptually strengthens this interpretation because decolourised (yellow) zones after DPPH exposure localise the antioxidant-active regions on the plate, thereby linking chromatographic features with functional scavenging behaviour rather than relying only on class-level inference from fluorescence or Rf migration [6].

At the quantitative level, the total flavonoid content measurement provides a concentration-normalised proxy for the abundance of flavonoid-type constituents in the extract, and this is pharmacognostically meaningful because flavonoids are widely recognised as natural antioxidants capable of stabilising radicals via hydrogen atom and electron transfer mechanisms [3]. The strong solution-phase DPPH response, reflected by an IC_{50} of 19.0488 µg/mL and the high inhibition plateau approaching ~82% at higher

concentrations, indicates that the crude extract expresses substantial overall scavenging capacity within the tested range. Taken together, these outputs are directionally consistent with prior reports in which *M. oleifera* leaf extracts exhibited measurable antioxidant activity and where flavonoid-related metrics were used to contextualise bioactivity differences across preparations [2],[4]. In practical terms, the alignment between flavonoid-oriented screening/quantification and DPPH performance supports the inference that flavonoid-associated chemistry is likely a major contributor to the observed antioxidant effect, while acknowledging that crude extracts are multicomponent systems in which synergistic or additive contributions from other phenolics and related metabolites remain plausible [3],[4].

Study Limitations and Practical Implications for Standardisation

Although the present findings indicate antioxidant potential of *M. oleifera* leaf ethanolic extract, several limitations should be acknowledged. TLC-based identification remains presumptive: UV fluorescence and $AlCl_3$-enhanced visualisation can suggest flavonoid-like constituents, yet definitive compound attribution requires confirmatory analysis and, ideally, reference-standard co-chromatography or instrument-based profiling such as HPLC/LC–MS [5],[6]. Moreover, TLC–DPPH bioautography is valuable for localising antioxidant-active zones but is intrinsically semi-quantitative, so reporting clear Rf positions and, where feasible, follow-up confirmation would strengthen interpretability [6]. The robustness of TFC and IC_{50} outcomes would also improve with replicate measurements and dispersion statistics, given the variability typical of crude botanical extracts and extraction operations [7],[8]. Finally, strict internal consistency—particularly regarding ethanol concentration—must be ensured to support valid cross-comparison and standardisation relevance [7]–[9].

Despite these constraints, the combined use of TLC/TLC–DPPH with UV–Vis-based TFC and DPPH IC_{50} provides a pragmatic, low-cost framework for early-stage quality evaluation and preliminary standardisation of *M. oleifera* leaf extracts, especially in settings where advanced instrumentation is limited [4]–[6], [13]. In line with the recognised nutritional and medicinal value of *M. oleifera*, the results support its feasibility as a candidate raw material for evidence-based herbal and nutraceutical development, provided that subsequent work enhances reproducibility and compound-level confirmation [1],[2],[4].

4. Conclusion

The ethanolic extract of *Moringa oleifera* leaves exhibited a high total flavonoid content (19.97 mg QE/g extract) and strong DPPH radical scavenging activity (IC_{50} = 19.0488 µg/mL). TLC profiling revealed flavonoid-like bands under UV/$AlCl_3$ visualisation, supporting the presence of flavonoid-class constituents in the extract, however, compound identity should be interpreted as tentative unless confirmed by co-chromatography and/or advanced instrumental analysis. Overall, these findings indicate that *M. oleifera* leaves represent a promising natural source of antioxidant-active constituents and may serve as a feasible raw material for the development of standardised herbal and nutraceutical preparations, provided that future work strengthens analytical confirmation and reproducibility.

Acknowledgments

The authors express sincere gratitude to the Department of Pharmacy, Faculty of Sport and Health, Gorontalo State University, for providing laboratory facilities and technical support throughout this research.

Conflicts of Interest:

The authors declare no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

[1] F. Anwar, S. Latif, M. Ashraf, and A. H. Gilani, "Moringa oleifera: A food plant with multiple medicinal uses," *Phytotherapy Research*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 17–25, 2007. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1002/ptr.2023

[2] S. Sreelatha and P. R. Padma, "Antioxidant activity and total phenolic content of *Moringa oleifera* leaves in two stages of maturity," *Food and Chemical Toxicology*, vol. 47, no. 10, pp. 2196–2201, 2009. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fct.2009.06.005

[3] S. Siddhuraju and K. Becker, "Antioxidant properties of various solvent extracts of total phenolic constituents from three different agroclimatic origins of drumstick tree (*Moringa oleifera* Lam.) leaves," *Food Chemistry*, vol. 97, no. 4, pp. 526–533, 2006. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2005.05.011

[4] A. Vongsak, P. Sithisarn, W. Mangmool, S. Thongpraditchote, Y. Wongkrajang, and W. Gritsanapan, "Maximizing total phenolics, total flavonoids contents and antioxidant activity of *Moringa oleifera* leaf extract by the appropriate extraction method," *Industrial Crops and Products*, vol. 44, pp. 566–571, 2013. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indcrop.2012.09.021

[5] A. Vongsak, P. Sithisarn, and W. Gritsanapan, "HPLC quantitative analysis of three major flavonoids in *Moringa oleifera* leaf extracts," *Journal of Chromatographic Science*, vol. 52, no. 7, pp. 641–645, 2014. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1093/chromsci/bmu133

[6] Q.-V. Do, A. E. Angkawijaya, P. L. Tran-Nguyen, L. H. Huynh, F.-E. Soetaredjo, S. Ismadji, and Y.-H. Ju, "Effect of extraction solvent on total phenol content, total flavonoid content, and antioxidant activity of *Limnophila aromatica*," *Journal of Food and Drug Analysis*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 296–302, 2014. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfda.2013.11.001

[7] A. Marston, "Thin-layer chromatography with biological detection in phytochemistry," *Phytochemical Analysis*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 1–6, 2011. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1002/pca.1263

[8] G. L. Singleton and J. A. Rossi, "Colorimetry of total phenolics with phosphomolybdic–phosphotungstic acid reagents," *American Journal of Enology and Viticulture*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 144–158, 1965. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.5344/ajev.1965.16.3.144

[9] W. Brand-Williams, M.-E. Cuvelier, and C. Berset, "Use of a free radical method to evaluate antioxidant activity," *LWT – Food Science and Technology*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 25–30, 1995. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0023-6438(95)80008-5

[10] I. F. F. Benzie and J. J. Strain, "The ferric reducing ability of plasma (FRAP) as a measure of 'antioxidant power': The FRAP assay," *Analytical Biochemistry*, vol. 239, no. 1, pp. 70–76, 1996. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1006/abio.1996.0292

[11] A. Leone, A. Spada, A. Battezzati, A. Schiraldi, J. Aristil, and S. Bertoli, "Moringa oleifera seeds and oil: Characteristics and uses for human health," *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, vol. 17, no. 12, 2141, 2016. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms17122141

[12] S. A. Moyo, P. J. Masika, and A. Hugo, "Nutritional characterization of *Moringa oleifera* Lam. leaves," *African Journal of Biotechnology*, vol. 10, no. 60, pp. 12925–12933, 2011. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.5897/AJB10.1599

[13] J. Morton, "The horseradish tree (*Moringa pterygosperma*, Moringaceae)—A boon to arid lands?," *Economic Botany*, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 318–333, 1991. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02887070

[14] S. Iqbal and M. I. Bhanger, "Effect of season and production location on antioxidant activity of *Moringa oleifera* leaves grown in Pakistan," *Journal of Food Composition and Analysis*, vol. 19, no. 6–7, pp. 544–551, 2006. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfca.2005.05.001

[15] R. Gupta, M. Mathur, V. K. Bajaj, P. Katariya, S. Yadav, and R. Kamal, "Evaluation of antidiabetic and antioxidant activity of *Moringa oleifera* in experimental diabetes," *Journal of Diabetes*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 164–171, 2012. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1753-0407.2011.00173.x