



International Bioscience Conference and the
8th International PSU – UNS Bioscience Conference

Towards the SDG Challenges

ONLINE

25–26 November 2021, Novi Sad, Serbia

BOOK OF ABSTRACTS



IBCS2021 is organized jointly by:



University Prince of Songkla,
Thailand



University of Novi Sad,
Faculty of Sciences, Serbia

Content

Committee	3
Program IBSC 2021 25-26 November	5
ABSTRACTS	
Plenary Lectures	13
Track 1	19
Track 2	86
Track 3	119
Track 4	203
AUTHORS INDEX	253

Committee

Organizing Committee

1. Slobodanka Pajević, President, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia
2. Anamarija Mandić, Vice president, University of Novi Sad, Institute of Food Technology, Serbia
3. Srđan Rončević, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia
4. Gordana Vlahović, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia
5. Ivana Pejović, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia
6. Živana Komlenov Mudrinski, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia
7. Saša Rakić, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia
8. Branislava Lalić, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Agriculture, Serbia
9. Vesna Mijatović Jovin, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Medicine, Serbia
10. Biljana Božin, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Medicine, Serbia
11. Nataša Simin, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia
12. Milan Borišev, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia
13. Dejan Orčić, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia
14. Emilija Svirčev, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia
15. Danijela Arsenov, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia
16. Milan Župunski, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia
17. Aleksandra Tubić, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia
18. Vidak Raičević, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia
19. Jovana Grahovac, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Technology, Serbia
20. Jaroslava Švarc-Gajić, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Technology, Serbia
21. Neda Lakić, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Medicine, Serbia
22. Mladen Horvatović, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia
23. Oskar Marko, University of Novi Sad, BioSense Institute, Serbia
24. Miloš Ilić, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia
25. Milana Rošul, University of Novi Sad, Institute of Food Technology, Serbia
26. Nataša Đerić, University of Novi Sad, Institute of Food Technology, Serbia
27. Nemanja Teslić, University of Novi Sad, Institute of Food Technology, Serbia
28. Dejan Čačić, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia

Scientific Committee

1. Neda Mimica Dukić, President, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia
2. Anchana Prathep, Prince of Songkla University (PSU), Thailand
3. Pimonsri Mittraparp-Arthorn, Prince of Songkla University (PSU), Thailand
4. Sara Bumrungsri, Prince of Songkla University (PSU), Thailand
5. Wipawadee Sianglum, Prince of Songkla University (PSU), Thailand
6. Chongdee Buranachai, Prince of Songkla University (PSU), Thailand
7. Pissared Muangnil, Prince of Songkla University (PSU), Thailand
8. Jaruwan Mayakul, Prince of Songkla University (PSU), Thailand
9. Komwit Surachat, Prince of Songkla University (PSU), Thailand
10. Patamarerk Engsontia, Prince of Songkla University (PSU), Thailand

-
11. Viktor Nedović, Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia, University of Belgrade, Faculty of Agriculture, Serbia
 12. Snežana Đorđević, University Colleague London (UCL), UK
 13. Rudolf Bauer, University of Graz, Faculty of Pharmacy, Austria
 14. Sari Kontunen-Soppela, University of Eastern Finland (UEF), Joensuu, Finland
 15. Carmen Arena, University of Naples Federico II, Italy
 16. Sílvia Rocha, University of Aveiro, Portugal
 17. Declan Troy, The Agriculture and Food Development Authority (TEAGASC), Ireland
 18. Brijesh Tiwary The Agriculture and Food Development Authority (TEAGASC), Ireland
 19. Valerija Dunkić, University of Split, Croatia
 20. Darko Modun, University of Split, Croatia
 21. Olga Tzakou, University of Athens, Greece
 22. Maria Couladis, University of Athens, Greece
 23. Svetlana Kulevanova, University of Skopje, Macedonia
 24. Rossella Russo, University of Calabria, Italy
 25. Guido Jurgenliemk, University of Regensburg, Germany
 26. Saša Orlović, University of Novi Sad, Institute of Lowland Forestry and Environment, Faculty of Agriculture, Serbia
 27. Dragana Miladinović, Institute of Field and Vegetable Crops, Novi Sad, Serbia
 28. Branko Ćupina, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Agriculture, Serbia
 29. Diana Bugarski, University of Belgrade, Institute for Medical Research, Serbia
 30. Nada Kovačević, University of Belgrade, Faculty of Pharmacy, Serbia
 31. Niko Radulović, University of Niš, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia
 32. Jasmina Agbaba, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia
 33. Jadranka Luković, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia
 34. Snežana Radenković, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia
 35. Marijana Ačanski, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Technology, Serbia
 36. Jelena Pejin, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Technology, Serbia
 37. Aleksandar Fišteš, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Technology, Serbia
 38. Isidora Samojlik, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Medicine, Serbia
 39. Biljana Basarin, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia
 40. Ivana Beara, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia
 41. Nataša Nikolić, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia
 42. Aleksandra Mišan, University of Novi Sad, Institute of Food Technology, Serbia
 43. Jaroslava Švarc-Gajić, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Technology, Serbia
 44. Jovan Matović, University of Novi Sad, BioSense Institute, Serbia
 45. Milica Pojić, University of Novi Sad, Institute of Food Technology, Serbia
 46. Suzana Jovanović-Šanta, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia
 47. Mihajla Đan, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Science, Serbia
 48. Silvana Andrić, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia
 49. Jelica Simeunović, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Serbia

OBJECTIVES:

The study aimed to analyze the time-dependent consequences of stress on gene expression responsible for diurnal endocrine Leydig cell function connecting them to the glucocorticoid-signaling.

METHOD / DESIGN:

Three *in vivo* and one *ex vivo* experimental approaches were applied: (1) to examine the effect of Immobilization stress (IMO) on Leydig cell activity, IMO was applied from ZT0-3 followed by the expressional/functional study in hours after IMO (ZT3, ZT11, ZT17, and ZT23); (2) to prove that glucocorticoids mimic IMO effects rats were treated orally with Dexason at ZT0 and effects were analyzed after treatment in ZT3, ZT11, ZT17, and ZT23 respectively; (3) to estimate glucocorticoids contribution in the effects of stress, testes of IMO rats were treated by RU486 (glucocorticoid receptor blocker) (4) to obtain information about direct effect of glucocorticoids on clock and steroidogenesis in Leydig cells, *ex vivo* experiments were performed using primary cultures of purified Leydig cells.

RESULTS:

In the first 24h after the stress event, a daily variation of blood glucocorticoids increased, and testosterone decreased; the reduced testosterone/corticosterone detected were lowest at the end of the stress session overlapping with inhibition of Leydig cells' steroidogenesis-related genes (*Nr3c1/GR*, *Hsd3b1/2*, *Star*, *Cyp17a1*) and changed circadian activity of the clock genes (the increased *Bmal1/BMAL1* and *Per1/2/PER1* and decreased *Cry1* and *Rev-erba*). The glucocorticoid-treated rats showed a similar response. The PCA displayed an absence of significant differences between treatments especially *Per1* and *Rev-erba*. This observation was confirmed by the *in vivo* blockade of the testicular glucocorticoid receptor during stress and *ex vivo* treatment of the Leydig cells with hydrocortisone and glucocorticoid receptor blocker.

CONCLUSIONS:

In summary, stressful stimuli can entrain the clock in the Leydig cells through glucocorticoid-mediated communication.

T3-P-57 *In vitro* and *in silico* investigation of antimicrobial activity of essential oils from two *Pastinaca Sativa* subspecies

Ljuboš Ušjak, Milica Drobac, Silvana Petrović¹⁶⁴,

Marija Ivanov, Marina Soković¹⁶⁵,

Marina T. Milenković¹⁶⁶, Marjan Niketić¹⁶⁷

KEYWORDS: *Pastinaca sativa* subsp. *sativa*; *Pastinaca sativa* subsp. *urens*; essential oils; microdilution method; molecular docking.

INTRODUCTION:

Cultivated parsnip (*Pastinaca sativa* subsp. *sativa* L., Apiaceae) root is a well-known vegetable, common ingredient of soups,

¹⁶⁴ Department of Pharmacognosy, University of Belgrade - Faculty of Pharmacy, Vojvode Stepe 450, Belgrade, Serbia.

Corresponding author: ljubos.usjak@pharmacy.bg.ac.rs

¹⁶⁵ Institute for Biological Research "Siniša Stanković" - National Institute of Republic of Serbia, University of Belgrade, Bulevar Despota Stefana 142, Belgrade, Serbia

¹⁶⁶ Department of Microbiology and Immunology, University of Belgrade - Faculty of Pharmacy, Vojvode Stepe 450, Belgrade, Serbia

¹⁶⁷ Natural History Museum, Njegoševa 51, Belgrade, Serbia

stews, salads, casseroles etc. Besides, its leaves and young shoots can be added to soups and fruits are used as a condiment. Furthermore, young shoots of wild-growing parsnips, e.g. *P. sativa* subsp. *urens* (Req. ex Godr.) Čelak., are consumed pickled or in salads or soups and it is considered that their essential oil acts as a natural preservative.

OBJECTIVES:

To investigate and compare the antimicrobial activity of the essential oils obtained from the roots, leaves, stems, flowers and fruits of cultivated *P. sativa* subsp. *sativa* and wild-growing *P. sativa* subsp. *urens* collected in Serbia. Furthermore, the most active essential oil constituents (against the most susceptible microorganisms) were predicted *in silico*.

METHOD / DESIGN:

Minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) and minimum bactericidal/fungicidal concentrations (MBCs/MFCs) of the essential oils (isolated by hydrodistillation using Clevenger-type apparatus) were determined by microdilution method against three Gram-positive bacteria: *Staphylococcus aureus* ATCC 11632, *Bacillus cereus* clinical isolate and *Listeria monocytogenes* NCTC 7973, three Gram-negative bacteria: *Escherichia coli* ATCC 25922, *Salmonella Typhimurium* ATCC 13311 and *Enterobacter cloacae* ATCC 35030, three *Candida* standard strains: *C. albicans* ATCC 10231, *C. tropicalis* ATCC 750 and *C. parapsilosis* ATCC 22019, and three *Candida* isolates from oral cavity: *C. albicans* 475/15, *C. krusei* H1/16 and *C. glabrata* 4/6/15. Pharmacokinetic properties of the compounds present in at least one oil in the quantity $\geq 1\%$ (determined by GC-FID and GC-MS) were initially evaluated using SwissADME web tool and molecular docking was performed using AutoDock Vina 1.1.2 (interactions were visualized using Discovery Studio Visualizer 2019).

RESULTS:

All the investigated essential oils of the two *Pastinaca sativa* subspecies were able to reduce the growth of different tested *Candida* strains (MIC range 0.25-2 mg/mL; MFC range 0.5-4 mg/mL). The most promising activity was observed for both root oils (MIC range 0.25-1 mg/mL; MFC range 0.5-2 mg/mL). Among investigated *Candida* strains, *C. parapsilosis* strain was the most sensitive to these essential oils (MIC range 0.25-1 mg/mL; MFC range 0.5-2 mg/mL). The antibacterial activity of the tested essential oils was lower compared to their anticandidal potential (MIC range 1-4 mg/mL; MBC range 2-8 mg/mL). Thirty compounds were present in at least one oil in the quantity $\geq 1\%$. Estimation of pharmacokinetic properties using SwissADME tool suggested that 23 of these compounds are inhibitors of some of the cytochrome P450 system isoenzymes. This fact led to assumption that they could also act against fungal sterol 14 α -demethylase (CYP51), which is a common target of antifungal drugs (e.g., ketoconazole). Thus, the compounds (3D structures downloaded from PubChem) were docked to the active site of this enzyme (downloaded from Protein Data Bank, PDB code 5TZ1). The highest affinities were predicted for sesquiterpenes caryophyllene oxide, (E)-caryophyllene, germacrene D, α -copaene, β -bourbonene and δ -cadinene (free binding energies from -9.4 to -8.7 kcal/mol; ketoconazole -11.6 kcal/mol). These compounds were present in somewhat lower quantities in the essential oils ($\leq 9.9\%$). For dominant compounds of the tested essential oils, e.g. myristicin, γ -palmitolactone and octyl butanoate a bit lower affinities were predicted (free binding energies from -7.3 to -5.8 kcal/mol). Tested compounds mostly docked near the heme of the enzyme and formed hydrophobic interactions with the amino acid residues of the active site. According to SwissADME tool, four of five most active compounds have low absorption from gastrointestinal tract and higher skin permeation value, while caryophyllene oxide and three dominant compounds have high absorption and lower skin permeation value (similarly to ketoconazole).

CONCLUSIONS:

Investigated parsnips represent sources of essential oils and compounds with anticandidal activity.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of Republic of Serbia (Grant numbers: 451-03-9/2021-14/200161 and 451-03-9/2021-14/200007).