

# Antifungal activity of rosemary essential oil against *Candida spp.* isolates from HIV/AIDS patients with oral candidiasis

Dwi Murtiastutik, Putri Intan Primasari, Evy Ervianti, Lunardi Bintanjoyo

Department of Dermatology and Venereology, Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Airlangga/ Dr. Soetomo General Academic Hospital, Surabaya, Jawa Timur, Indonesia.

## Abstract

**Background** Oral candidiasis (OC) develops in most HIV/AIDS patients. Increasing resistance to antifungals leads to searches for alternative treatment for OC. This study evaluated the *in vitro* activity of rosemary (*Rosmarinus officinalis L.*) essential oil compared to fluconazole against *Candida spp.*

**Methods** The rosemary essential oil used in this study is a commercial product (Young Living Ltd.). This essential oil and fluconazole were tested by broth microdilution assay against 40 isolates of *Candida spp.* (20 *C. albicans* and 20 *C. non-albicans*) obtained from HIV/AIDS patients with OC.

**Results** Against *C. albicans*, MIC and MFC of rosemary essential oil were 6.25% and 25%, and fluconazole were 100% and >100%. Against *C. non-albicans*, MIC and MFC of rosemary essential oil were 12.5% and 25%, and fluconazole were 100% and >100%.

**Conclusion** Rosemary essential oil was a potential antifungal candidate showing higher antifungal activity compared to fluconazole. It was fungistatic against *C. albicans* but fungicidal against *C. non-albicans*, suggesting its potential role in the treatment of OC due to *C. non-albicans*. Further studies are needed to determine safety and toxicity of this essential oil prior to human use especially in immunocompromised patients.

## Key words

Rosmarinus officinalis; Essential oil; Candida; Antifungal resistance; HIV.

## Introduction

Oral candidiasis (OC) is infection of the oral mucosa by *Candida* yeasts. It occurs in up to 95% of patients with human immunodeficiency virus infection/acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (HIV/AIDS).<sup>1-3</sup> It is more prevalent and can disseminate to gastrointestinal tract and other organs along with the progression of HIV

infection, where the viral load is increasing and CD4+ T cell count is decreasing.<sup>4,5</sup>

Fluconazole is currently recommended as the first-line treatment for OC in HIV/AIDS patients. It inhibits conversion of lanosterol to ergosterol, a bioregulator which maintains the integrity of fungal cell membrane. However, increasing rate of fluconazole resistance has been reported in many studies due to widespread use of this medication.<sup>6-8</sup> Fluconazole resistance was also attributed to the emergence of *Candida (C.) non-albicans* as significant causes of OC in HIV/AIDS patients, commonly in those with lower CD4 count. Some *C. non-albicans* species

---

## Address for correspondence

Dr. dr. Dwi Murtiastutik, Sp.KK(K)  
Dermatology and Venereology Department,  
Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Airlangga/Dr.  
Soetomo General Academic Hospital, Surabaya,  
Jawa Timur, Indonesia.  
Email: dwimurtiastutik@yahoo.co.id

possess intrinsic resistance against azole antifungals.<sup>4,5,9</sup> Drug interactions between fluconazole and antiretrovirals or other medications are also of important concern, which may limit its use to treat OC among HIV/AIDS patients.<sup>10</sup> Thus, alternative therapies for OC are being investigated.<sup>6,7</sup>

*Rosemary (Rosmarinus officinalis L.)*, a common shrub for food additive, has been historically used to treat human diseases such as renal colic, asthma, and mental fatigue.<sup>11</sup> Several studies have also reported antifungal activity of rosemary essential oil. However, there were differences in the minimum inhibitory concentration of this essential oil between studies.<sup>7,12,13</sup> This may be partly attributed to variation in plant sources and extraction method resulting in variable concentration of the constituents of the rosemary essential oil.<sup>14</sup> In order to have more reproducible result, a commercially-available rosemary essential oil was chosen for this study. This study evaluated *in vitro* activity of rosemary essential oil compared to fluconazole against *Candida spp.* isolated from patients with HIV infection.

## Methods

**Strains isolation and identification and inoculum preparation** Forty (20 *C. albicans* and 20 *C. non-albicans*) out of 149 isolates stored in cryotube from Department of Microbiology at the hospital at which this study was conducted were randomly sampled and used for this study. Species of *C. non-albicans* comprised of nine isolates of *C. krusei*, four isolates of *C. glabrata*, two isolates of *C. parapsilosis*, two isolates of *C. tropicalis*, two isolates of *C. dubliniensis*, and one isolate of *C. lipolytica*.

These stored isolates came from oral rinse solutions from 40 HIV/AIDS patients with OC, which were cultured in Chromagar media, and

then subsequently cultured in VITEK2 for species identification. All stored isolates were activated by culturing on Sabouraud Dextrose Agar within aerobic conditions and temperature of 37°C for 24 hours. Yeast suspensions in 5 mL 0.9% NaCl solution were prepared in sterile tubes. These suspensions were vortexed for 2 minutes. The turbidity was adjusted to 0.5 McFarland standard which approximately equal to a concentration of 10<sup>6</sup> CFU/mL.

**Rosemary (*Rosmarinus officinalis L.*) essential oil** Rosemary (*Rosmarinus officinalis L.*) essential oil used in this study was a commercial product by Young Living, Ltd (Utah, United States). This product contained rosemary leaf extract with concentration of 0.920 g/ml, and the component of this product according to gas chromatography–mass spectroscopy (GC–MS) analysis provided by the manufacturer was listed on **Table 1**.

**Table 1** The chemical composition of rosemary essential oil.

No.	Compounds	Retention Time	Relative Percentage
1	1,8-Cineole	8.94	45.12
2	Camphor	11.06	12.78
3	α-Pinene	6.46	10.08
4	β-Caryophyllene	15.17	5.12
5	β-Pinene	7.56	4.91
6	Camphene	6.82	4.17
7	Borneol	11.41	3.50
8	γ-Terpinene	6.04	1.18
9	Terpinolene	9.99	1.31
10	Bornyl acetate	13.27	0.97
11	β-Mircerene	7.97	0.97
12	δ-Cadinene	14.18	0.82
13	β-Cadinene	16.44	0.82
14	α-Caryophyllene	15.60	0.68
1	α-Copapaene	15.55	0.59
16	α-Amorphene	15.87	0.57
17	Isoledene	16.15	0.46
18	Germacrene-D	16.24	0.29
19	Phellandrene	8.22	0.21
20	β-Guainen	15.21	0.14
21	α-Cubebene	14.18	0.11

This pale yellow-colored essential oil was stored in an amber-colored glass vial at room temperature. The undiluted rosemary essential oil was designated as 100% v/v concentration.

**Fluconazole** Fluconazole used in this study is in the forms of 2 mg/ml solution, which was designated as 100% v/v concentration.

**Antifungal assay** Serial microdilution using 96-well cell plates culture was performed according to the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) 2002, M27-A2.<sup>15</sup> A plate of 96-well microtiter was filled with 100µL of rosemary essential oil or fluconazole solution with ten-level concentration of 100% v/v; 50% v/v; 25% v/v; 12.5% v/v; 6.25% v/v; 3.125% v/v; 1.56% v/v; 0.78% v/v; 0.39% v/v; and 0.19% v/v using multilevel dilution in Saboraoud Dextrose Broth. A 100µL inoculum was subsequently added to each wells, but leaving the first row left as negative control. MIC was the lowest concentration at which the well began to clear without turbidity which indicates inhibition of *Candida* growth. Minimal fungicidal concentration (MFC) was evaluated

by obtaining 10 µL aliquots from the wells with MIC, MIC x 2 and MIC x 4 concentrations and subculturing in Saboraoud Dextrose Agar plates incubated at 37°C for 48 hours. MFC was the lowest concentration without growth. The tested substance was defined to be fungistatic if the MFC/MIC ratio ≥ 4, and fungicidal if the MFC/MIC ratio < 4.<sup>16</sup>

**Statistical analysis** Statistical differences were analyzed by SPSS 17 version. Results from microdilution assay were analyzed by Chi-square test for normality of distribution and Mann-Whitney test for non normally distributed data. Statistical significance was defined at p<0.05.

**Results**

MIC against *Candida albicans* was at 6.25% concentration for rosemary essential oil and at 100% concentration for fluconazole. Significant difference (p<0.05) between fluconazole and rosemary essential oil were observed at concentration between 6.25%-50% (**Table 2**).

**Table 2** Minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) determination of fluconazole and rosemary essential oil against *Candida albicans*.

Concentration (v/v)	Turbidity	Treatment		p-value
		Fluconazole	Rosemary essential oil	
100%	(+)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1.000
	(-)	20 (100%)	20 (100%)	
50%	(+)	19 (95%)	0 (0%)	<0.001
	(-)	1 (5%)	20 (100%)	
25%	(+)	20 (100%)	0 (0%)	<0.001
	(-)	0 (0%)	20 (100%)	
12.5%	(+)	20 (100%)	4 (20%)	<0.001
	(-)	0 (0%)	16 (80%)	
6.25%	(+)	20 (100%)	10 (50%)	0.001
	(-)	0 (0%)	10 (50%)	
3.125%	(+)	20 (100%)	19 (95%)	1.000
	(-)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	
1.56%	(+)	20 (100%)	20 (100%)	1.000
	(-)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	
0.78%	(+)	20 (100%)	20 (100%)	1.000
	(-)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	
0.38%	(+)	20 (100%)	20 (100%)	1.000
	(-)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	
0.19%	(+)	20 (100%)	20 (100%)	1.000
	(-)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	

**Table 3** Minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) determination of fluconazole and rosemary essential oil against *Candida non-albicans*.

Concentration (v/v)	Turbidity	Treatment		p-value
		Fluconazole	Rosemary essential oil	
100%	(+)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1.000
	(-)	20 (100%)	20 (100%)	
50%	(+)	11 (55%)	0 (0%)	<0.001
	(-)	9 (45%)	20 (100%)	
25%	(+)	14 (70%)	1 (10%)	<0.001
	(-)	6 (30%)	19 (90%)	
12.5%	(+)	17 (85%)	8 (40%)	<0.001
	(-)	3 (15%)	12 (60%)	
6.25%	(+)	19 (95%)	16 (80%)	0.342
	(-)	1 (5%)	4 (20%)	
3.125%	(+)	19 (95%)	19 (95%)	1.000
	(-)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	
1.56%	(+)	19 (95%)	20 (100%)	1.000
	(-)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	
0.78%	(+)	19 (95%)	20 (100%)	1.000
	(-)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	
0.38%	(+)	19 (95%)	20 (100%)	1.000
	(-)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	
0.19%	(+)	20 (100%)	20 (100%)	1.000
	(-)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	

**Table 4** Minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) and minimum fungicidal concentration (MFC) of fluconazole and rosemary essential oil against *Candida spp.*

Species	Fluconazole			Rosemary essential oil		
	MIC	MFC	MFC/MIC ratio	MIC	MFC	MFC/MIC ratio
<i>C. albicans</i>	100%	>100%	C/E	6.25%	25%	4
<i>C. non-albicans</i>	100%	>100%	C/E	12.5%	25%	2

C/E = cannot be evaluated.

MIC against *Candida non-albicans* was at 12.5% concentration for rosemary essential oil and at 100% concentration for fluconazole. Significant difference (p<0.05) between fluconazole and rosemary essential oil were observed at concentration between 12.5%-50% (Table 3).

MFC analysis showed that 15 of 20 (75%) plates showed growth of *C. albicans* at 100% concentration of fluconazole, indicating that the MFC of fluconazole was above 100% and fluconazole was fungistatic against *C. albicans*. On the other hand, the MFC of rosemary essential oil against *C. albicans* was 25%. The MFC/MIC ratio of rosemary essential oil against *C. albicans* was 4, indicating that rosemary

essential oil was fungistatic against *C. albicans* (Table 4).

MFC analysis showed that 19 of 20 (95%) plates showed growth of *C. non-albicans* at 100% concentration of fluconazole, indicating that the MFC of fluconazole was above 100% and fluconazole was fungistatic against *C. albicans*. On the other hand, the MFC of rosemary essential oil against *C. non-albicans* was 25%. The MFC/MIC ratio of rosemary essential oil against *C. albicans* was 2, indicating that rosemary essential oil was fungicidal against *C. non-albicans* (Table 4).

**Discussion**

Fluconazole is the recommended first line

antifungal for mucocutaneous candidiasis. However, resistance to fluconazole has been increasingly observed, either primary or intrinsic resistance of certain *C. non-albicans* species, or extrinsic resistance attributed to widespread use of this antifungal.<sup>17,18</sup> Thus, substances with antifungal properties were investigated to become alternative to fluconazole, including rosemary essential oil.

This study used microdilution assay to determine MIC and MFC value of fluconazole and rosemary essential oil. Microdilution assay is more suitable for rosemary essential oil compared to diffusion assay. Due to the volatility of rosemary essential oil, active ingredients will evaporate before diffusing into the paper disc resulting in the reduction of observed efficacy.<sup>19</sup> This assay was also reported to be more sensitive in determination of MIC and MFC of natural products.<sup>20</sup> Microdilution assay also has other advantages, namely less amount of samples required, qualitative and quantitative nature of the results, and homogeneity of the media which allowed better interaction between the yeast and test substances. However, microdilution assay is more complex and requires precise concentration of the test substances.<sup>21</sup>

The MIC of fluconazole against both *Candida albicans* and non-*albicans* were 100%. On the other hand, the MIC of rosemary essential oil against *Candida albicans* and non-*albicans* were 6.25% and 12.5% respectively in this study. *In vitro* studies on antifungal activity of rosemary essential oil against *Candida spp.* showed varying results. Study by Gauch *et al.* reported that the MIC of rosemary essential oil was 0.5% against *Candida albicans* and 1-2% against *Candida non-albicans*. The use of Tween 80 as surfactant to emulsify rosemary essential oil may account for the different MIC value compared to this study. Surfactant allowed

hydrophobic active ingredients such as camphor and  $\alpha$ -pinene to become soluble in the culture medium, which may increase antifungal activity of rosemary essential oil by two- to four-fold.<sup>12</sup>

This study showed that fluconazole has higher MIC than rosemary essential oil. Higher MIC corresponded to lower antifungal activity.<sup>22</sup> Fluconazole was also fungistatic against both *C. albicans* and *C. non-albicans*, as reported in other study.<sup>19</sup> Rosemary essential oil was fungistatic against *C. albicans*, but was fungicidal against all species of *C. non-albicans*. Greater inhibition of biofilm production by rosemary essential oil against *C. non-albicans* compared to *C. albicans* may be responsible for this finding.<sup>23</sup> Greater cell walls hydrophobicity of some *C. non-albicans* compared to *C. albicans* corresponding to higher susceptibilities to hydrophobic essential oil, may also explain this finding.<sup>24</sup>

Rosemary essential oil contained terpenes such as 1,8-cineole,  $\alpha$ -pinene and camphor, which were considered responsible for its antifungal properties.<sup>25-27</sup> These terpenes were also constituents of the commercially-available rosemary essential oil used in this study, as shown in **Table 1**. These lipid soluble terpenes interacted with lipid-containing cell membrane, resulting in increased membrane permeability, electrolyte imbalance and cell death.<sup>25</sup> Chemotypes contained in rosemary essential oil especially cineole also inhibited the formation of biofilms of *Candida spp.*<sup>28</sup> However, the whole composition of rosemary essential oil should be taken into consideration, because synergistic interactions of the components, including the minority constituents, may be important for antifungal properties of this essential oil.<sup>25,28</sup>

## Conclusion

In conclusion, this study highlighted rosemary

essential oil as a potential antifungal candidate. Rosemary essential oil showed higher antifungal activity compared to fluconazole, and was fungistatic against *C. albicans* but fungicidal against *C. non-albicans*, suggesting its potential role in the treatment of OC by some intrinsically fluconazole-resistant *C. non-albicans*. Further studies are needed to determine the active components of the essential oil and their mechanism of action against *Candida* spp. and to analyze the safety and toxicity of rosemary essential oil prior to human use especially in immunocompromised patients as medicine.

**Acknowledgement** We are grateful for the assistance of Pepy Dwi Indraswari, dr., M.Si., M.Ked.Klin., Sp.MK, from the Department of Microbiology, Dr. Soetomo General Academic Hospital, Surabaya, Indonesia.

## References

1. Suyoso S. Kandidiasis Mukosa. In: Bramono K, Suyoso S, Indriatmi W, *et al.*, editors. *Dermatomikosis superfisialis pedoman dokter dan mahasiswa kedokteran*. 2nd ed. Jakarta: Badan Penerbit Fakultas Kedokteran Universitas Indonesia; 2013. p. 120–48.
2. Kundu R, Garg A. Yeast Infection: Tinea (Pityriasis) Versicolor, Malassezia (Pityrosporum) Folliculitis. In: Goldsmith LA, Katz SI, Gilchrist BA, *et al.*, editors. *Fitzpatrick's Dermatology in General Medicine*. 8th ed. New York: McGraw Hill; 2012. p. 2298–311.
3. Dewi ISL, Hidayati AN. Manifestasi Kelainan Kulit pada Pasien HIV & AIDS (Manifestation of Skin Disorders in HIV & AIDS Patients). *Berk Ilmu Kesehat Kulit dan Kelamin - Period Dermatol Venereol*. 2015;27(2):97–105.
4. Moges B, Bitew A, Shewaamare A. Spectrum and the In Vitro Antifungal Susceptibility Pattern of Yeast Isolates in Ethiopian HIV Patients with Oropharyngeal Candidiasis. *Int J Microbiol*. 2016;2016:1–8.
5. Murtiastutik D, Prakoeswa CRS, Tantular IS, *et al.* Association between etiologic species with CD4 count and clinical features of oral candidiasis among HIV/AIDS patients. *J Egypt Women's Dermatologic Soc*. 2022;19(1):51–7.
6. Murtiastutik D, Maharani CS, Rahmadewi R. Profile of *Candida* Resistancy to Fluconazole in Male Patient with Oral Candidiasis and HIV/AIDS. *J AIDS Clin Res*. 2019;10(3):1–6.
7. Pozzatti P, Loreto ÉS, Nunes Mario DA, *et al.* Activities of essential oils in the inhibition of *Candida albicans* and *Candida dubliniensis* germ tube formation. *J Mycol Med*. 2010;20(3):185–9.
8. Murtiastutik D, Listiawan MY, Bintanjoyo L, *et al.* Ketoconazole: A Re-emerging choice for Oral candidiasis in patients with human immunodeficiency virus infection/acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome. *Res J Pharm Technol*. 2022;15(3):1071–6.
9. Maheshwari M, Kaur R, Chadha S. *Candida* Species Prevalence Profile in HIV Seropositive Patients from a Major Tertiary Care Hospital in New Delhi, India. *J Pathog*. 2016;2016:2016.
10. Rajadurai SG, Maharajan MK, Veetil SK, *et al.* Comparative efficacy of antifungal agents used in the treatment of oropharyngeal candidiasis among HIV-infected adults: A systematic review and network meta-analysis. *J Fungi*. 2021;7:637.
11. Oliveira JR De, Esteves S, Camargo A. *Rosmarinus officinalis* L. (rosemary) as therapeutic and prophylactic agent. *J Biomed Sci*. 2019;8:1–22.
12. Gauch LMR, Pedrosa SS, Esteves RA, *et al.* Antifungal activity of *Rosmarinus officinalis* Linn. essential oil against *Candida albicans*, *Candida dubliniensis*, *Candida parapsilosis* and *Candida krusei*. *Rev Pan-Amazônica Saúde*. 2014;5(1):61–6.
13. Delic DN, Skrobonja JR, Karaman MA, *et al.* Antifungal activity of essential oils of *Origanum vulgare* and *Rosmarinus officinalis* against three *Candida albicans* strains. *Zb Matice Srp za Prir Nauk*. 2013;124:203–11.
14. Melero-Bravo E, Elguea-Culebras GO de, Sánchez-Vioque R, *et al.* Variability of essential oil in cultivated populations of *Rosmarinus officinalis* L. in Spain. *Euphytica*. 2022;218(6):65.
15. NCCLS. Reference Method for Broth Dilution Antifungal Susceptibility Testing of Yeasts; Approved Standard—Second

- Edition. 2nd ed. NCCLS document M27-A2. Pennsylvania: NCCLS; 2002.
16. Freire JCP, Júnior JKDO, Silva DDF, *et al.* Antifungal Activity of Essential Oils against *Candida albicans* Strains Isolated from Users of Dental Prostheses. *Evidence-based Complement Altern Med.* 2017;2017:7158756.
  17. Whaley SG, Berkow EL, Rybak JM, *et al.* Azole antifungal resistance in *Candida albicans* and emerging non-*albicans* *Candida* Species. *Front Microbiol.* 2017;7:1–12.
  18. Reza NR, Tantari SHW, Basuki S. Uji Kepekaan In Vitro Flukonazol Terhadap Spesies *Candida* penyebab Kandidiasis Oral Pada Pasien HIV/AIDS dengan Vitek II (In Vitro Susceptibility Test of Fluconazole to *Candida* spp in Patients with Oropharyngeal Candidiasis and HIV/AIDS with Vitek II). *Berk Ilmu Kesehat Kulit dan Kelamin - Period Dermatology Venereol.* 2017;29(3):234–42.
  19. Jacob R, Konnikov N. Oral antifungal agents. In: Goldsmith LA, Katz SI, Gilchrist BA, *et al.*, editors. *Fitzpatrick's Dermatology in General Medicine*. 8th ed. New York: McGraw Hill; 2012. p. 2796–806.
  20. Cavalcanti YW, de Almeida L de FD, Padilha WWN. Anti-adherent activity of *Rosmarinus officinalis* essential oil on *Candida albicans*: an SEM analysis. *Rev Odonto Cienc.* 2011;26(2):139–44.
  21. Soleha TU. Uji kepekaan terhadap antibiotik. *J K Unila* [Internet]. 2015;5:119–23. Available from: <https://juka.kedokteran.unila.ac.id/index.php/juka/article/view/644/648>
  22. Alexander BD, Procop GW, Dufresne P, *et al.* Performance Standards for Antifungal Susceptibility Testing of Yeasts. Wayne, PA, USA: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute; 2018.
  23. Atron B, Ahamada H, Kafa AHT, *et al.* Antifungal and Antibiofilm Activities of Some Essential Oils Against *Candida* spp. *Cumhur Sci J.* 2022;43(3):404–8.
  24. Pozzatti P, Loreto ÉS, Lopes PGM, *et al.* Comparison of the susceptibilities of clinical isolates of *Candida albicans* and *Candida dubliniensis* to essential oils. *Mycoses.* 2010;53(1):12–5.
  25. Nazzaro F, Fratianni F, Coppola R, *et al.* Essential oils and antifungal activity. *Pharmaceuticals.* 2017;10:1–20.
  26. Jiang Y, Wu N, Fu YJ, *et al.* Chemical composition and antimicrobial activity of the essential oil of Rosemary. *Environ Toxicol Pharmacol.* 2011;32:63–8.
  27. Matsuzaki Y, Tsujisawa T, Nishihara T, *et al.* Antifungal activity of chemotype essential oils from rosemary against *Candida albicans*. *Open J Stomatol.* 2013;3:176–82.
  28. Chifiriuc C, Grumezescu V, Grumezescu AM, *et al.* Hybrid magnetite nanoparticles/*Rosmarinus officinalis* essential oil nanobiosystem with antibiofilm activity. *Nanoscale Res Lett.* 2012;7:209.