

Quantitative and Physical Evaluation of Patchouli Essential Oils Obtained from Different Sources of *Pogostemon cablin*

Norma Hussin^{a,e*}, Luigi Mondello^{b,f}, Rosaria Costa^b, Paola Dugo^b, Nik Idris Nik Yusoff^d, Mohd Ambar Yarmo^c, Ahmad Ab.Wahab^c and Mamot Said^c

^aTwinning University Programme (between ^dUniversity Kebangsaan of Malaysia and ^bUniversity of Messina, Italy)

^bDipartimento Farmaco-Chimico, University of Messina, Viale Annunziata, 98168 Messina, Italy

^cSchool of Food Science and Technology, University of Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia

^dDepartment of Pharmaceutical Chemistry, Faculty of Pharmacy, International Islamic University of Malaysia, 25200 Kuantan, Pahang, Malaysia

^eMalaysian Agricultural Research and Development Institute, 43400 Serdang Selangor, Malaysia

^fUniversità Campus Bio-medico, Via Álvaro del Portillo 21, 00128 Roma, Italy

normahus@mardi.gov.my

Received: March 28th, 2012; Accepted: May 23rd, 2012

Patchouli essential oil can be obtained from fresh, dried and fermented plant material. It is a highly valuable product in the fragrance industry and its quality changes depending upon raw material age and oil storage. In this work, patchouli essential oils derived from different treatments have been subjected to GC-FID quantitative analysis using an internal standard (ISTD) method with response factors (RF). Samples were obtained from i) fresh plants; ii) hydrodistillation of one year mature and fermented plants; iii) hydrodistillation of one year mature plants; iv) commercial products from Indonesia and Malaysia. Linear Retention Indices (LRI) for both polar and non-polar GC-MS analyses were also measured as a tool for qualitative analysis towards a homologous series of C₇-C₃₀ *n*-alkanes. The results obtained confirmed that, in all samples, patchouli alcohol was the main volatile constituent, with higher amount in lab-scale produced oils, compared with commercial samples. Other major compounds, in lab oils and commercial samples respectively, were: δ -guaiene, α -guaiene, pogostol, seychellene and α -patchoulene. Another 36 compounds were also found.

Keywords: Quantitative analysis, Linear retention index (LRI), GC-FID response factor, GC-MS, Patchouli, *Pogostemon cablin*.

Quantification of constituents in essential oil research is a very important tool in order to define a correct chemical amount in the samples. The general procedure adopted when analysing an essential oil by GC techniques is to report the raw area percentage (FID % or MS %). Another common practice is to apply a “semi-quantitation”, which means that peak areas are divided by an internal standard peak area. Basically, both procedures assume that the detector response is equal to unity. This assumption is approximately correct when target analytes are hydrocarbons, due to a linear response of the FID detector to the carbon number. On the other hand, when different moieties are present in the molecules to be quantified, such as keto-groups or carboxylic functions, FID response undergoes a shift that needs to be “corrected” through the measurement of response factors, for single compounds [1a-1c]. Quantitative GC analytical methods based on response factors (RF) and internal standard (ISTD) are still lacking for patchouli essential oil as compared with several reports present in the literature based on the sole GC-MS qualitative fingerprinting. Patchouli essential oil (PEO) is dominated by a large amount of oxygenated sesquiterpenes (such as pogostol and patchoulol). The presence of a hydroxyl group in the structure of patchouli alcohol (PA) affects the FID response, for the reasons briefly explained here. The exact mechanism of flame ionization is still not completely understood. It seems likely that upon burning all carbon atoms are converted into methane [2]. Therefore, hydrocarbons respond always in the same manner. When heteroatoms, like oxygen, are present in the organic solute, it becomes necessary to calibrate this fluctuation by using response factors, as previously reported by Costa *et al.* for other plants [1c].

Recently, some analytical procedures have been applied to *Pogostemon* sp. analysis by means of GC-MS coupled with integrated chemometric methods [3]; application of PA external standard calibration [4]; a comparison between supercritical fluid extraction and steam distillation [5]; a fast analysis with a short capillary column [6]; a simple wavelength detection of patchoulol by means of UV-spectrophotometer [7]; a GC-MS analysis with different ionization techniques [8]; HPLC with UV detection at 220nm for mono and sesquiterpenes [9], and a 2D fingerprinting analysis [10]. *P. cablin* essential oil was recently reported to contain 65.8% of sesquiterpene hydrocarbons, followed by oxygenated sesquiterpenes (27.0%), dominated by patchouli alcohol, α -bulnesene (also known as δ -guaiene), α -guaiene, γ -patchoulene and β -patchoulene [11a]. Other *Pogostemon* species have been recently investigated i.e. *P. heyneanus*, whose predominant constituent was acetophenone (51.0%) followed by patchouli alcohol (14.0%) [11b]; and *P. benghalensis*, which showed a completely different composition compared with *P. cablin* (β -caryophyllene, 12.5-15.2%; β -bisabolene, 8-18%; elemol, 4-20%) [11c]. The woody balsamic notes and the strong fixative properties of patchouli oil made it a basic ingredient for certain high value perfumes, due to the presence of patchouli alcohol (PA) and norpatchoulol (NP) [12a, 12b]. These two compounds have been considered in a study on contact dermatitis as potential allergens [13]. In addition, PEO is not only a fixative material in perfumery, but also an insecticide, flavouring agent and clothing odorant. The traditional uses of *P. cablin* are based on some analgesic, anti-inflammatory and

Table 1: Sample description and physical evaluation of patchouli oil samples analyzed.

No. of Samples	I.D.	Source	Moisture content (%)	Recovery %	Color	Solubility
2	A	Fresh plants ¹	73-75	0.38	Weakly light green and very clear	<i>n</i> -Hexane
2	B	Hydrodistillation of the pre-treated material (heating and fermenting in water for 7 days) of 1 year mature and dried plants	10-12	0.64	Light yellowish, clear	<i>n</i> -Hexane
2	C (Control)	Hydrodistillation of 1 year mature and dried plants	10-12	1.12	Light yellowish, clear	<i>n</i> -Hexane
1	D	Commercial PEO ^{2,3} , Indonesia	unknown	No data received from supplier	Brownish and slightly cloudy	Dichloromethane. Not soluble in <i>n</i> -hexane, turning cloudy
1	E	Commercial PEO ^{4,5} , Malacca, Peninsular Malaysia	unknown	No data received from supplier	Golden yellowish and clear	Dichloromethane. Not soluble in <i>n</i> -hexane, turning cloudy

¹Fresh *P. cablin* leaves and stems (maturity during harvesting was 5 months); ²Unknown distillation type; ³oil ageing time: 4 years; ⁴Steam distillation; ⁵oil ageing time: 3 years

antibacterial effects [4,14]. As reported by Sundaresan *et al.* [15] and Xu *et al.* [3] PA content ranges from 14.6% to 23.3%. However, in some cases it was determined as 60.3% [16a]; 43.60-66.25% [16b]; and 44.35-56.30% [16c]. A standardized grade PEO, besides satisfying specific olfactory needs, must have a PA content between 26-40%, as required by Essential Oil Associations, to enter the global markets. Table 1 reports the list and description of samples analyzed, along with some physico-chemical data. Samples A, B and C were oils produced in the laboratory, whereas D and E were two commercial PEOs produced in Indonesia and Malaysia, respectively.

From morphological observation, sample D was thicker and more brownish than sample E; D oil was older than E oil. Both oils were not fully soluble in *n*-hexane and provided cloudy solution. The solubility of compounds in a non-polar solvent was probably reduced by terpene oxidation, which makes the oil more soluble in a polar solvent (dichloromethane). PEOs from the laboratory (A, B and C) were younger and showed a high solubility in non-polar organic solvents (*n*-hexane). PEO obtained from fresh leaves and stems (A) yielded a very low amount of oil (0.38%). This was due to the higher water content in fresh plant material (73-75%), as can be seen in table 1. However, this result was similar to that reported by Swamy *et al.* although the PA content was much lower (30.31%) [17]. Essential oil yields for B and C samples were 0.64% and 1.12%, respectively. B oil recovery was lower, probably due to volatiles loss during one week of wet fermentation and soaking conditions, after a pre-heating process. Sample C, being one year dried, had a more concentrated essential oil (1.12%). According to Hussin *et al.* [18], PEO recovery from premature and 4 months dried *P. cablin* plants was 0.96%, an amount that increased after 1 year of plant growth. In a research study by Kongkathip *et al.* on 3-9 months dried *P. cablin*, a reduction of the PEO yield from 3.01 to 1.78% was observed [4]. It is a matter of fact, though, that the oil content and its composition are greatly affected by variables such as site of harvest, material and condition of distillation. Evaluation of the PEOs' color was also carried out (Table 1). The main finding was a darker color for commercial samples compared with lab scale produced oils. In total, 44 components have been determined in the GC fingerprint of the PEOs analyzed. Table 2 reports the quantitative data expressed as g/100g, obtained through the application of the internal standard method with FID response

factors. The latter have been measured for chemical groups, following the analytical procedure previously published [1c]: selected standard compounds, representative of a chemical class (e.g. limonene for monoterpene hydrocarbons), have been injected at 5 different concentrations with an internal standard (*n*-nonane). When available, more than one compound for each chemical class was injected. Each PEO sample has been run in triplicate and repeatability tested by measuring the %RSD, which was <5% on average, except for some small peaks, such as linalool, where it was raised up to 12%. Linear Retention Indices (LRIs) have also been measured on both polar and nonpolar columns and reported in Table 2. With regard to the LRIs from the polar stationary phase, it must be highlighted that they are characterized by a lower level of repeatability and by a lack of literature data. Lab produced PEO samples and the other two commercial samples showed the same pattern for six major chemical compounds, namely patchouli alcohol, δ -guaiene, α -guaiene, seychellene, pogostol and α -patchoulene. PA content ranges were 51.9-68.0% and 46.3-45.9%, in lab PEOs and commercial samples, respectively. These results demonstrated that *Pogostemon cablin* produces higher amounts of patchoulol compared with previous research that reported 26-40% and 30-40% [19a,19b]. This range far exceeded the one prescribed by the Essential Oil Associations for authentic oil, that is 26-40%, also reported by Burfield [20,21]. Minor compounds (Table 2), such as norpatchoulol, although present in lower amount, are considered very important to the olfactory character of PEO, as mentioned by Sunderkotter *et al.* in a study on (-)-patchoulol and (+)-norpatchoulol [22]. These two compounds are estimated as the most important woody markers in mature *P. cablin* material and essential oils and suggest a further chiral investigation on the PEOs here investigated.

A samples presented trace amounts ($\geq 0.01\%$) of other compounds, such as benzaldehyde, 1-octen-3-ol, 3-octanone, 2-ethyl hexanol, linalool, methyl salicylate and eugenol. Limonene and δ -elemene were found in slightly higher amounts than in the other PEOs. Phytol, a diterpenoid compound, was also observed in the A oil, although in small amount (0.02%) compared with other samples. A contained a higher amount of *cis*-3-hexen-1-ol, already mentioned by Oyen and Dung, which is a leaf alcohol with green and fresh notes that gives floral notes in trace amount [23]. Commercial PEOs, B and C samples had very low amounts of these compounds.

Two interesting unknown compounds (I and II) were found at consistent level: 3.4-9.8% and 4.7%, <0.01% and 0.8-0.9% and 0.6-0.4%, respectively, for both the 6 lab samples and the 2 commercial PEOs. From a literature survey, it seems likely that the mass spectrum (MS) of unknown II corresponds to that reported by Lu *et al.* [14], while no data can be found about unknown I. Further investigation by isolation, purification steps and NMR, will be carried out in order to elucidate their structure.

From the overall observations, it came out that PEOs produced on the lab-scale were richer in patchoulol compared with commercial samples. This finding could be explained by the raw material used, which was 12 months dried. No data are available for commercial samples which relate to the same material age. Also, it must be taken in consideration that hydrodistillation was conducted with a much lower amount of water and plant material (100 g vs 20 Kg on industrial scale). In this study, a new quantitative analytical method was developed for the chemical investigation of *P. cablin* essential oil. The results gathered from this research can be of support to patchouli traders and producers worldwide. Quantification of volatiles was accomplished by accurate calibration based on the internal standard method and FID response factors.

Table 2: Chemical composition of the 8 patchouli essential oil (PEO) samples analyzed. Quantitative values are expressed as g/100g.

Compounds	R.F.	LRI _P (Exp.P)	LRI _{NP} (ExpNP)	SAMPLE ID							
				A 1	A 2	B 1	B 2	C 1	C 2	D	E
α -Pinene	1.0	1021	932	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.05	0.07	0.07	0.04
Camphene	1.0	-	949	<0.01	<0.01	0.01	0.02	<0.01	<0.01	0.04	<0.01
Sabinene	1.0	-	972	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
β -Pinene	1.0	1107	978	0.1	0.1	0.06	0.08	0.14	0.17	0.16	0.14
Limonene	1.0	-	1029	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01
4,8-Dimethylnona-1,3,7-triene	1.0	-	1113	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
TOTAL MONOTERPENES				0.20	0.20	0.10	0.25	0.20	0.25	0.29	0.29
Linalool	1.3	1544	1099	0.06	0.06	<0.01	0.01	<0.01	0.01	<0.01	<0.01
α -Terpineol	1.3	-	1196	<0.01	<0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	<0.01	<0.01
Geranial	1.3	-	1268	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
TOTAL OXYGENATED MONOTERPENES				0.07	0.07	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
δ -Elemene	1.0	1466	1331	0.04	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.08	0.03
β -Patchoulene	1.0	1475	1388	0.8	1.0	1.5	1.5	1.2	1.7	0.8	1.5
β -Elemene	1.0	1752	1392	0.7	0.6	0.4	0.6	0.4	0.6	1.3	0.7
Cyclosevchellene	1.0	1553	1418	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.5
(<i>E</i>)-Carvophyllene	1.0	1589	1424	1.2	1.1	1.0	1.3	1.1	1.5	1.1	2.0
α -Guaiane	1.0	1584	1443	3.8	3.4	4.3	5.5	4.6	6.3	5.8	9.4
Sevchellene	1.0	1628	1456	2.7	2.3	3.7	4.9	3.7	4.6	7.3	6.2
α -Humulene	1.0	1660	1460	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4
α -Patchoulene	1.0	1624	1468	1.4	1.2	1.8	2.8	1.9	2.5	4.2	4.0
γ -Gurjunene	1.0	-	1473	0.4	0.4	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.9	0.5	1.1
Alloaromadendrene	1.0	-	1478	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3
β -Selinene	1.0	1698	1492	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3
Aciphylene	1.0	1693	1500	0.8	0.7	1.0	1.1	1.0	1.4	1.4	2.2
δ -Guaiane (α -bulnesene)	1.0	1706	1511	5.8	5.2	6.8	7.4	7.0	9.5	9.2	14.4
Eremophila-1(10),8,11-triene	1.0	-	1514	0.06	0.05	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.07	0.1
7- <i>epi</i> - α -selinene	1.0	-	1524	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.2
TOTAL SESQUITERPENES				18.6	16.8	22.3	27.2	22.7	30.2	33.5	43.5
Elemol	1.3	-	1551	0.1	0.1	0.07	0.05	0.07	0.06	0.1	0.09
Norpatchoulene	1.3	2093	1562	1.5	1.2	1.5	1.9	1.9	1.6	4.0	2.2
Carvophyllene oxide	1.5	1960	1586	0.9	0.8	1.7	2.0	1.8	1.6	4.6	1.8
<i>cis</i> -eudesma-4(15),11-dien-5-ol	1.3	-	1655	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.4	<0.01	0.3
Pogostol	1.3	2194	1649	5.7	6.0	5.5	4.6	5.2	4.7	3.5	3.7
Intermedeol	1.3	2236	1651	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2
Patchouli alcohol	1.3	2162	1677	64.4	68.0	61.4	50.9	58.1	51.9	46.3	45.9
unknown #1 (oxygenated sesquiterpene)	1.5	-	1711	4.8	3.4	4.3	9.8	7.0	6.6	4.7	<0.01
(<i>E,E</i>)-Farnesal	1.3	-	1740	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.3
α -Costol	1.3	-	1777	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.	0.2
TOTAL OXYGENATED SESQUITERPENES				79.3	81.4	76.2	71.0	75.7	68.0	64.5	54.7
unknown #2	1.3	-	1774	0.8	0.9	0.80	0.88	0.78	0.80	0.56	0.38
Benzaldehyde	1.3	-	961	0.03	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
1-Octen-3-ol	1.3	1446	979	0.3	0.2	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
2-Ethyl hexanol	1.3	1390	996	0.08	0.07	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.01	<0.01
Methyl salicylate	1.6	-	1193	0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
Eugenol	1.3	-	1353	0.01	0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
Phytol	1.3	-	2110	0.02	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
3-Octanone	1.3	-	984	0.01	0.03	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
TOTAL OTHER COMPOUNDS				1.3	1.2	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.6	0.4

R.F.: response factor; LRI_P: linear retention index from the polar column; LRI_{NP}: linear retention index from the non polar column.

Experimental

Plant material and treatments: Patchouli leaves and stems were collected from Aromatic Plant Nursery, Essential Oil Incubator, MARDI, Kuala Linggi Station, Malacca, Malaysia. The material was dried and aged (fermented) for 12 months. The plant maturity of fresh material during harvesting was 5 months. The plants were growing in acid soil type (containing bisulfite), where the condition was suitable for *Pogostemon* sp. and other aromatic crops in Peninsular Malaysia. The plants collected were pre-dried with a commercial solar dryer until less than 10% moisture, then dried plants were kept in polyethylene (PE) bags, and drying continued at ambient temperature prior to essential oil processing. Each bag was able to hold up to 2.5 Kg dried materials. Fresh material collected was kept in a refrigerator at 4°C for 2 days before distillation. A 100 g portion was added to 1.2 L distilled water and subjected to distillation for up to 7 h using a Clevenger apparatus (2 L capacity). A full description of the samples is described in Table 1.

Moisture analysis: The moisture content of the fresh and dried samples (1 g) was determined using an automatic IR-Moisture balance at 105°C until the moisture was completely removed. The time taken to complete the analysis ranged from 6 to 12 mins.

PEO recovery: One hundred g of wet or dried plant material was weighed, added to 1.2 L distilled water and transferred into a 2 L round bottom flask in a Clevenger system. A cooling system was set up prior to heating the flask. Every hour the PEO was collected and pooled in a closed 10 mL bottle until distillation was completed. The entire process lasted 7. The moist PEO was dried using Na₂SO₄, then carefully pipetted into a 1 mL GC vial and weighed.

Sample preparation for GC analysis: The PEOs (0.10 g), were mixed with ISTD (100 μ L of a 100,000 ppm stock solution) and 0.8 mL *n*-hexane. For retention indices, a mixture of *n*-alkanes {(C₇:C₃₀; Supelco (PA, USA))} was used.

GC-FID analysis: GC-FID analyses were carried out by means of a GC-2010 system (Shimadzu, Japan) equipped with an SLB-5MS column (30 m \times 0.25 mm i.d. \times 0.25 μ m d_f), supplied by Supelco. Oven temperature program was: from 50°C at 3°C/min to 300°C, then held for 5 mins. Injection temperature was 280°C; injection took place in split mode with a split ratio of 1:100. Carrier gas was helium, with a linear velocity of 30 cm/s, pressure was 99.8 KPa. Detector temperature was 300°C, detection gases were H₂ (40 mL/min), N₂ (40 mL/min) and air (400 mL/min).

GC-MS analysis: GC-MS analyses were carried out with 2 different GCMS-QP2010 systems (Shimadzu) equipped with SLB-5MS (30 m × 0.25 mm i.d. × 0.25 µm d_f) and Supelcowax-10 (30 m × 0.25 mm i.d. × 0.25 µm d_f) columns (Supelco), respectively.

Polar column system: Injector temperature was 250°C, and injection took place in split mode with a split ratio of 1:100. Oven temperature program was: from 50°C at 3°C/min to 280°C, held 5 min. Carrier gas was helium, with a linear velocity of 30 cm/s, pressure was 28.4 KPa. Ion source temperature was 220°C, while interface temperature was 250°C. Scan range was 40-350 m/z.

Non-polar system: Injector temperature was 280°C, and injection took place in split mode with a split ratio of 1:200. Oven temperature program was: from 50°C at 3°C/min to 300°C, held 5 min. Carrier gas was helium, with a linear velocity of 30.0 cm/s, pressure was 26.7 KPa. Ion source temperature was 220°C, while interface temperature was 250°C. Scan range was 40-400 m/z. For mass spectral library matching, FFNSC 1.3, Adams and other homemade databases provided with LRIs were used [24a,24b].

Acknowledgements - This work was supported by the University of Messina, Italy, and the University of Kebangsaan, Malaysia.

References

- [1] (a) Bicchì C, Liberto E, Matteodo M, Sgorbini B, Mondello L, Zellner BD, Costa R, Rubiolo P. (2008) Quantitative analysis of essential oils: A complex task. *Flavour and Fragrance Journal*, **23**, 382-391; (b) Cicchetti E, Merle P, Chaintreau A. (2008) Quantitation in gas chromatography: Usual practices and performances of a response factor database. *Flavour and Fragrance Journal*, **23**, 450-459; (c) Costa R, Zellner B, Crupi ML, De Fina MR, Valentino MR, Dugo P, Dugo G, Mondello L. (2008) GC-MS, GC-O and enantio-GC investigation on the essential oil of *Tarhonanthus camphoratus* L. *Flavour and Fragrance Journal*, **23**, 40-48.
- [2] McNair HM, Miller JM. (1998) *Basic Gas Chromatography*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, NY, USA.
- [3] Xu X, Tang Z, Liang Y. (2010) Comparative analysis of plant essential oils by GC-MS coupled with integrated chemometric resolution methods. *Analytical Methods*, **2**, 359-367.
- [4] Kongkathip N, Sam-ang P, Kongkathip B, Pankaew Y, Tanasombat M, Udomkunsri P. (2009) Development of patchouli extraction with quality control and isolation of active compounds with antibacterial activity. *Kasertsart Journal of Natural Science*, **43**, 519-525.
- [5] Donelian A, Carlson LHC, Lopes TJ, Machado RAF. (2009) Comparison of extraction of patchouli (*Pogostemon cablin*) essential oil with supercritical CO₂ and by steam distillation. *The Journal of Supercritical Fluids*, **48**, 15-20.
- [6] Lingga N, Lahey C. (2005) Rapid analysis of bergamot oil and patchouli oil by fast GC/MS. *Application News Shimadzu*, AD-0016-GM, Dec 2005.
- [7] Hybertson BM. (2007) Solubility of the sesquiterpene alcohol patchoulol in supercritical carbon dioxide. *Journal of Chemical and Engineering Data*, **52**, 235-238.
- [8] Burè CM, Sellier NM. (2004) Analysis of the essential oil of Indonesian patchouli (*Pogostemon cablin* Benth.) using GC/MS (EI/CI). *Journal of Essential Oil Research*, **16**, 17-19.
- [9] Kubeczka KH. (2010) History and sources of essential oil research. In *Handbook of Essential Oils - Science, Technology and Applications*. Baser KHC, Buchbauer G. (Eds). CRC Press, Taylor and Francis group, Boca Raton, FL, USA, 3-38.
- [10] Wu J, Lu X, Tang W, Kong H, Zhou S, Xu G. (2004) Application of comprehensive two-dimensional gas chromatography-time-of-flight mass spectrometry in the analysis of volatile oil of traditional Chinese medicines. *Journal of Chromatography A*, **1034**, 199-205.
- [11] (a) Hussain AI. (2009) Characterization and biological activities of essential oils of some species of *Lamiaceae*. Ph.D Thesis. University of Faisalabad, 169-175; (b) Murugan R, Mallavarapu GR, Padmashree KV, Rao RR, Livingstone C. (2010) Volatile oil composition of *Pogostemon heyneanus* and comparison of its composition with patchouli oil. *Natural Product Communications*, **5**, 1961-1964; (c) Chanotiya CS, Yadav A, Singh AK, Mathela CS. (2007) Composition of the leaf and inflorescence essential oil of *Pogostemon benghalensis* Burm. F. from Kumaon. *Natural Product Communications*, **2**, 941-944.
- [12] (a) Kalra A, Prakas Rao EVS, Khanuja SPS. (2006) Cultivation and processing technologies of patchouli (*Pogostemon cablin*). *Journal of Medicinal and Aromatic Plants Science*, **28**, 414-419; (b) Sell C. (1999) Ingredients for the modern perfumery industry. In *The Chemistry of Fragrances*. Pybus DD, Sell CS. (Eds). Royal Society of Chemistry, U.K., 51-124.
- [13] Frosch PJ, Johansen JD, Menne T, Pirker SC, Rastogi SC, Andersen KE, Lepoittevin JL, White IR. (2002) Further important sensitizers in patients sensitive to fragrances. II. Reactivity to essential oils. *Contact Dermatitis*, **47**, 279-287.
- [14] Lu TC, Liao JC, Huang TH, Lin YC, Liu CY, Chiu Y, Peng WH. (2011) Analgesic and anti-inflammatory activities of the methanol extract from *Pogostemon cablin*. *Evidence-Based Complementary and Alternative Medicine*. Article ID 671741, 1-9. Hindawi Publishing Corporation.
- [15] Sundaresan V, Singh SP, Mishra AN. (2009) Composition and comparison of essential oils of *Pogostemon cablin* (Blanco) Benth. (patchouli) and *Pogostemon travancoricus* Bedd. var *travancoricus*. *Journal of Essential Oil Research*, **21**, 220-222.
- [16] (a) Bunrathep S, Lookwood GB, Songsak T, Ruangrunsi N. (2006) Chemical constituents from leaves and cell cultures of *Pogostemon cablin* and use of precursor feeding to improve patchouli alcohol level. *Science Asia*, **32**, 293-296; (b) Santos AV, Arrigoni-Blank MF, Blank AF, Tavares FF, Fernandes RPM, Jesus HCR, Alves PB. (2010) Mass multiplication of *Pogostemon cablin* (Blanco) Benth. genotypes and increase of essential oil and patchoulol yield. *Industrial Crops and Products*, **32**, 445-449; (c) Paul A, Thapa G, Basu A, Mazumdar P, Kalita MC, Sahoo L. (2010) Rapid plant regeneration, analysis of genetic fidelity and essential aromatic oil content of micropropagated plants of Patchouli, *Pogostemon cablin* (Blanco) Benth. - An industrial important aromatic plant. *Industrial Crops and Products*, **32**, 366-374.
- [17] Swamy MK, Balasubramanya S, Anuradha M. (2010) *In vitro* multiplication of *Pogostemon cablin* Benth. through direct regeneration. *African Journal of Biotechnology*, **9**, 2069-2075.
- [18] Hussin N, Nik Yusuf NMI, Ab.Wahab A. (2010) Standardization of patchouli oil and production of natural aromatherapy fragrances scented with patchouli and other local aromatic essential oils. International Conference of Cosmeceutical, Nutraceutical and Cosmetic Formulations Technology, PWTC-KL, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, 25-26 May 2010.
- [19] (a) Teisseire P. (1987) Industrial quality control of essential oils by capillary GC. In *Capillary Gas Chromatography in Essential Oil Analysis*. Sandra P, Bicchì C. (Eds). Huethig, New York; (b) Bruneton J. (1999) *Pharmacognosy, Phytochemistry, Medicinal Plants*, 2nd Edition, Lavoisier Publishing, Paris.
- [20] (a) SCCP. (2006) *Scientific Committee on consumer Products*. The SCCP's Notes of guidance for the testing of cosmetic ingredients and their safety evaluations, 6th Revision, Adopted by the SCCP during the 10th Plenary Meeting of 19th December 2006; (b) *SCCNFP/0389/00 Final*. The first update of the inventory of ingredients employed in cosmetic products. Section II: Perfume and aromatic materials, 24th Oct, 2000.
- [21] (a) <http://www.user.globalnet.co.uk/~notice/new/magazine/october/october.htm>, 10th January 2012; (b) Cornwell CP. (2010) Notes on the composition of patchouli oil (*Pogostemon cablin* (Blanco) Benth.). *Journal of Essential Oil Research*, **22**, 360-364.
- [22] Sunderkotter A, Lorenzen S, Tacke R, Kraft P. (2010) Novel silicon-based patchouli odourants of the trialkyl (1-hydroxy-1-methylethyl)silane type: Design, synthesis, and olfactory properties. *Chemistry European Journal*, **16**, 7404-7421.
- [23] Oyen LPA, Dung NX. (1999) PROSEA Plant resources of south, PROSEA Foundation, Bogor Indonesia.
- [24] (a) Shimadzu FFNSC 1.3 GC-MS library. (2008) Licensed by Chromaleont S.r.l. 2005-2008, Messina, Italy; (b) Adams RP. (2007) Identification of essential oil components by gas chromatography/mass spectrometry, 4th Edition, Allured (Carol Stream, IL, USA).