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Abstract: Microorganisms develop resistance due to excessive and improper usage of synthetic chemicals as antimicrobials which have high toxic effects in food industry. Therefore, biological preservatives having antifungal properties began to take place of toxic chemicals. Essential oils (EOs) derived from plants which prevents the deterioration of biofilm formed by yeast and prolongs shelf life as protective agents have recently become important in food industry. However, there is a significant restriction on the usage of essential oils due to variations in their content depending on the extraction methods and storage time. Thus, direct usage of active substances involved in the plant extracts may be preferred for industrial production. On the other hand, knowledge about antifungal mechanisms of substance is an important factor to determine the areas where the components can be used effectively. Cell membrane has a vital role because of providing cellular integrity and homeostasis and carrying out molecular transport. Antifungal agents have activity at very low concentrations via disrupting cell membrane integrity. They can be used for preservation of foods, as well as for additives which are not toxic, and decreasing contamination and biofilm formation via coatings in food industry. Since, EOs can be used as food preservatives and pharmaceutical agents, it is very important to understand their mode of action and their main target sites in the cell. Thus this research not only opens new perspectives to understand antifungal activity mechanisms of EOs, but also help widen their use.
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Introduction

Essential oils (EOs) are complex mixtures of volatile compounds produced by plants and fruits. They are known to have antioxidant (Yang at al., 2010), antibacterial (Reichling at al., 2009), antifungal (Hammer at al., 2004), antiplasmid (Schelz et al., 2006), antiviral, antiparasitic and insecticidal properties (Unal et al., 2009). It is clear from different studies on EOs which are defined ‘generally regarded as safe’ (GRAS) by the FDA that they have potential uses in medicine and applications in the cosmetic, pharmaceutical and food industries and also in cleaning products (Souza et al., 2007; Van Vuuren et al., 2009; Lima de Sousa et al., 2013; Bialon et al., 2014; Rajkowska et al., 2014; Boire et al., 2016). There are different antimicrobial mechanisms of EOs. Cell wall, cell membrane, intracellular proteins, enzymes and nucleic acids are significant target sites for EO contents (Helander et al., 1998; Burt et al., 2004; Morten et al., 2012). Cell membrane is the first line of defense against environmental stresses. It was suggested that the lipophilic nature of EOs allows them to easily pass through cell membranes to change biological responses of cells (Wang et al., 2015). Especially phenolic compounds and terpenes may accumulates in the cell membrane and result in instant loss of membrane integrity, making it highly permeable to ions that might be responsible for the establishment of antimicrobial activity. It has also been shown that essential oil affects the membrane composition of Yarrowia lipolytica yeast and some bacteria (Di Pasqua et al., 2006; Papanikolaou et al., 2008). In other cases, changes in membrane fluidity and integrity of yeast cells were observed upon exposure to various
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stress conditions, by regulating the biosynthesis of fatty acids and sterols (Ding et al., 2009; Ta et al., 2010; Dupont et al., 2011; Turk et al., 2011).

Although antifungal activity of EOs was examined before, their effects on cytoplasmic membrane of \textit{S. cerevisiae} have not been extensively studied (Tao et al., 2014a, 2014b). Due to our continuing interest on the mode of action of various chemicals on yeast membranes (Sezen, 2015), we set out to unearth the possible membrane dependent action of essential oils on yeast cells. In this study, we first examined the antifungal effects of \textit{lemon peel, orange peel, tea tree, turpentine, rosemary, peppermint, thyme, oregano and clove oil} against \textit{S. cerevisiae} by applying the measurement of Minimum Inhibitory Concentration (MIC), Minimum Fungicidal Concentration (MFC) and inhibition zone techniques. Then we evaluated the membrane damage by measuring the extracellular pH of glucose-induced cells and conductivity of yeast cells after exposure to different concentrations of above EOs.

**Method**

**Inhibition Zone Measurement**

The agar diffusion method (Skocibusic et al., 2006) was employed for the determination of antifungal activities of the essential oils. 500 \(\mu\)L of fresh culture of \textit{S. cerevisiae} was spread on the YPD agar media plates and allowed to dry for 2 hours. Later, 5 mm diameter wells were opened in solid media plates. EOs were diluted in DMSO at different concentrations and 55 \(\mu\)L of essential oils were filled into the each well. Plates were placed in the incubator at 25 \(^\circ\)C for 48 hours. After incubation, the diameters of the inhibition zones were measured in centimeter.

**Extracellular pH Measurement**

The permeability of \textit{S. cerevisiae} cell membranes is expressed in terms of their electric conductivity and extracellular pH value (Gaskova et al., 2013) and was determined by following method. \textit{S. cerevisiae} strain was cultured overnight at 25\(^\circ\)C in 20 mL of YPD broth. After incubation, the yeast cells were centrifuged at 3200 rpm for 5 min and pellet was washed twice with sterilized dH\textsubscript{2}O. The pellet was then resuspended in sterilized dH\textsubscript{2}O. About 50 mg wet weight of yeast cells were used for each experiment. The essential oils dissolved in DMSO were diluted to the mentioned concentrations. 2% glucose (zero point) and essential oils (18. min) were manually injected to the final concentrations. Extracellular pH was recorded with an HI 98127 water proof pH meter (HANNA, USA).

**Results and Discussion**

The main purpose of this study was to unearth the dependence of antifungal activity of various essential oils on the integrity of cell membrane. After a thorough search of the literature we uncovered that the information on the antifungal activity against \textit{S. cerevisiae} was limited. More importantly experimental data reported in the literature were based on studies with different experimental conditions preventing a simple comparison of the data with each other. Thus at the beginning of our studies we set out to determine the antifungal activity of \textit{lemon peel, orange peel, tea tree, turpentine, rosemary, peppermint, thyme, oregano and clove oil} against \textit{S. cerevisiae} via MIC, MFC and inhibition zone measurements.

The inhibition zones of essential oils are presented in Table 1. According to inhibitory zone measurements five oils with the highest efficacy were oregano oil (for 20% dilution, 3.6 \(\pm\) 0.1), orange peel oil (for 20% dilution 3.3 \(\pm\) 0.9), thyme oil (for 20% dilution 3.0 \(\pm\) 0.5), turpentine oil (for 20% dilution 2.5 \(\pm\) 0.2), and clove oil (for 20% dilution 2.2 \(\pm\) 0.5). The inhibition zone values generally confirmed the results obtained in the MIC and MFC data. Slight differences between the two data sets may be caused by different rates of diffusion of particular oil components into the agar medium or by evaporation of some of the components during the incubation time (Kunicka-Styczyńska, 2011). Recent studies highlight the role of water-soluble and vaporized components in the assessment of antimicrobial activity of essential oils (Inouye et al., 2006; Fisher et al., 2006).
Table 1. Antifungal activity of essential oils presented as Zones of Inhibition. Essential oils were mixed with DMSO to increase solubility. The values are mean of four replicates ± standard deviation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Essential Oil</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Zones of Inhibition (cm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>lemon peel</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.3 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>orange peel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.3 ± 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tea tree</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>turpentine</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.5 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>rosemary</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>peppermint</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.7 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>thyme</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.0 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>oregano</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.6 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>clove</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.2 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Later, extracellular pH and conductivity measurements were performed to determine their effect on membrane integrity and membrane permeability of yeast cells (Gaskova et al., 2013). It is well known that glucose-induced cells show a decrease in extracellular pH values (Souza et al., 2007). In order to reach a maximal pH gradient across the cell membrane, yeast cells were glucose-induced before extracellular pH measurement experiments. Figure 1 shows the changes in extracellular pH of orange peel, turpentine, thyme and oregano oil treated yeast cells for 0-60 min. Upon addition of essential oils, an increase in extracellular pH was observed.

Figure 1. Effects of essential oils on the extracellular pH of *S. cerevisiae*. Concentration dependent effects of essential oils on yeast cells in glucose-induced medium are shown. The arrows indicate the time of addition of a) orange peel oil: 0.1; 0.2; 0.4; 0.5 μL/mL, b) turpentine oil: 0.01; 0.02; 0.04; 0.08; 0.2 μL/mL, c) thyme oil: 0.2; 0.5; 1 μL/mL, d) oregano oil: 0.2; 0.5; 1 μL/mL. The data represent the average of at least two independent experiments.

Especially extracellular pH of yeast cells treated with various concentrations of turpentine oil dramatically increased in a concentration dependent-manner. Higher concentrations than 0.2 μL/mL could not be tested due to solubility problems. Addition of orange peel, thyme and oregano oils also caused an increase in the extracellular pH of yeast cells, possibly due to the neutralization of the glucose-induced pH gradient upon impairment of the cell membrane.
The interest in EOs has significantly grown in recent years and there has been an increase in the number of scientific publications of essential oils. Our results demonstrate that essential oils extracted from different plants show wide spectrum of antifungal activity against \textit{S. cerevisiae} and that the cell membrane is the main target for the antifungal agents in the content of EOs, while disruption of yeast cell membrane integrity is the basic mode of action of these agents. These results will augment our knowledge about the mechanism of action of EOs against \textit{S. cerevisiae} cells and help us widen their usage in food, cosmetic and pharmaceutical industries.
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