The utilization of oil palm leaves (*Elaeis guineensis* Jacq.) waste as an antibacterial solid bar soap

Abstract. Oil palm leaves (Elaeis guineensis Jacq), which have been underutilized by the community and become waste that usually stacked around the trees, have a potential to be used as active ingredients for making antibacterial solid bar soap. The chemical content of oil palm leaves are tannins, alkaloids and flavonoids that known had antibacterial activity. This research aims to produce oil palm leaves extracts into an active ingredient of solid bar soap formulation with antibacterial activity against Escherichia coli and Staphylococcus aureus and also to evaluate the quality of the solid bar soap. The soap was formulated into 3 formulas with varying concentrations of oil palm leaves ethanolic extract that was F1 (1%), F2 (2%), and F3 (4%). Oil palm leaves extract was prepared with maceration using ethanol 70%. Antibacterial activity assay of the solid bar soap was carried out using a disc diffusion method with tetracycline as the positive control (K+) and distilled water as the negative control (K-). The soap quality was evaluated for its organoleptic, foam level and foam stability, pH, hardness, water content and free fatty acid. The results showed that all three solid soap formulas meet the soap quality requirements of SNI No. 3532-2016. The solid bar soap did not have inhibition properties against Escherichia coli. However, had inhibition effect against Staphylococcus aureus with an average Inhibition Zone Diameter (IZD) on soap base, F1, F2, and F3 was 8.02 mm, 8.53 mm, 10.53 mm, 12.91 mm respectively.

1. Introduction

Oil palm (*Elaeis guineensis* Jacq.) is an important commodity for the Indonesian economy. Oil palm plays a role in generating more foreign exchange than oil and gas [1]. One of the uses of oil palm is as a producer of vegetable cooking oil. Oil produced from oil palm able to produce oil seven times higher than rapeseeds (*Brassica napus*) and eleven times higher than soybean per hectare. Since 2004, oil palm has slowly become a worldwide vegetable oil with a total production of 30 million tons and an average growth rate of 8% per year [2]. Unfortunately, this industry leaves waste, such as kernel shells, mesocarp fibers, oil palm trunks (stems) and oil palm fronds (leaves) [2,3]. Hambali & Rivai (2017) reported that oil palm leaf waste in 2015 reached 124,032,861 tons. This value is likely to continue to increase with time [2].

Oil palm leaves, normally underutilized by the community. They usually left alone to rot between the oil palm trunks. The abundance aims to maintain the sustainability of the soil and nutrient cycle in the plantation [4]. The oil palm leaves contain major compounds such as alkaloids, tannins, and flavonoids. These compounds are known to act as antimicrobials because they can damage cell walls, disrupt cell permeability, and inhibit enzyme or protein [5,6,7,8].

Several studies have proven that oil palm leaf extract has antimicrobial activity. Previous studies reported that oil palm leaf extracts were able to inhibit the growth of *Escherichia coli* and

Staphylococcus aureus [8,9,10]. Other research stated that in addition to its potential as an antibacterial, oil palm leaf extract also has the potential to be a skin protective agent from UV radiation. Based on this, Yusof et al. (2006) suggest that oil palm leaf extracts can be made into a topical application for skin protection [4].

One form of topical application that can be used to maintain health is soap. Soap is a product that is produced from the reaction between fatty acids with strong bases that function to wash and clean fat or dirt. There are two types of soap, namely solid soap and liquid soap. Most people come down using solid soap (bar soap) to clean the body because bar soap is cheaper, easier to use, and efficient in cleaning the skin [11]. This study aims to test the formulation of soap from oil palm leaves extracts for its activity as antibacterial soap.

2. Material and Methods

2.1.

Materials

The oil palm leaves were obtained from Desa Bogatama, Lampung, Indonesia. Chemicals being used 70% ethanol, aquadest, H₂SO₄, HCl, acetic acid, Nutrient Agar (NA), olive oil, coconut oil, palm oil, sodium lactate, dyes, fragrance, Sodium hydroxide (NaOH), NaOH 0.1 N, plastic wrap. The microorganisms we used *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Escherichia coli* bacteria.

2.2. Extraction of Oil Palm Leaves

The oil palm leaves were cut into small pieces and washed thoroughly with water and then dried using the oven. The dried leaves were mashed using a blender into a powder. The leaf powder then sieved using a 60 mesh sieve to obtain uniform particle sizes. The powder then macerated using 70% ethanol with a ratio of 1:10 for 1 x 24 hours with stirring every 6 hours. The filtrate obtained was filtered and the dregs were re-macerated 2 times. Furthermore, the filtrate obtained from maceration was concentrated using a vacuum rotary evaporator, then evaporated on a water bath until a thick extract was produced from oil palm leaf powder [12].

2.3. Extracts Examination

2.3.1. Organoleptic. The organoleptic examination based on Monograph Ekstrak Tumbuhan Indonesia [13].

2.3.2. *Phytochemical Screening*. Phytochemical screening was carried out based on Materia Medika Indonesia (Depkes RI, 1989) and Pandey & Tripathi (2014). Screening includes testing for alkaloids, flavonoids, tannins, saponins, steroids and triterpenoids [14,15].

2.4.

I

Soap Formulation

____The formulation refers to Hambali *et al.* (2006) with modification [16]. The composition of the formula in 100 ml aquadest add presented in **Table 1**.

Solid soap formulations were carried out by dissolving NaOH in distilled water. NaOH solution is mixed with sodium lactate. The mixture of solutions was called the first mixture. Meanwhile, at different container, we mixed the coconut oil, olive oil and palm oil, known as the second mixture. The first mixture was poured into the second mixture bit by bit. The mixture was stirring until homogeneous using a hand blender and a *trace* occurs (a condition in which the soap has formed with a sign of the thickening soap mass). The ethanol extract of oil palm leaves was added at the time of the *trace*. After that, the mixture was stirred again until homogeneous, then added fragrance and colouring. The liquid soapy mass is poured into a mold and incubated for 24 hours until it hardens.

Table 1. Soap Bar Formulation.

Materials	Concentration (%)				
	Base (BF)	F1	F2	F3	

Commented [K1]: Please state the originality of all chemicals ((Brand, city and country)

Formatted: Strikethrough
Commented [K2]: dropwise
Formatted: Strikethrough

Oil Palm Leaves Extract	0	1	2	4
NaOH	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5
Coconut Oil	20	20	20	20
Palm Oil	35	35	35	35
Olive Oil	10	10	10	10
Sodium lactate	1.95	1.95	1.95	1.95
Distilled water	22.1	22.1	22.1	22.1
Colouring	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Fragrance	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5

2.5. Soap Evaluation

2.5.1 Organoleptic Evaluation. Organoleptic evaluation by observing the colour, texture, and aroma of the soap

2.5.2. *pH Test*. An amount of 1 g soap sample was dissolved into 10 mL distilled water and stirred until homogenous. The solution was measured using pH meter. According to ASTM (2002) the pH of a relatively safe soap is 9-11 [17].

2.5.3. Foam Level and Stability. About 1 gram of soap was put into a test tube containing 10 ml of distilled water and then shaken with vortex for 30 minutes. The height of foam formed is measured using a ruler (initial foam height). The height of the foam is measured again after a few minutes (high foam end).

Foam Stability = 100% - % Lost foam % Foam loss = (High initial foam - High final foam)/(High initial foam) x 100%

2.5.4. Soap Hardness. The hardness of the soap was done using a penetrometer. The needle on the penetrometer was inserted into the sample and allowed to penetrate the material for 5 seconds at a constant temperature (27° C). The depth of needle penetration into the material is expressed in 1/10 mm of the number indicated on the penetrometer scale.

2.5.5. Moisture Content. Measurement of moisture content was using Moisture Content Balance [Ohaus]. Free Fatty Acid = $0.282 \times V \times N / w \ 100\%$ Information: Free fatty acids in units of% mass fraction V = volume of KOH used (mL)

N = normality of KOH used

B = sample weight (g)

 $282 = equivalent weight of oleic acid (C_{18}H_{34}O_2)$

2.5.6. *Hedonic Test.* The hedonic test was performed to compare BF, F1, F2, and F3. This test aims to determine which formula was preferred by consumers. The criteria of the test were appearance, colour, aroma, skin irritation test, and skin moisture test. The preference test was carried out using 20 panellist consisting of men and women at random, with an age range of 18-35 years. The score for the panellist preference level used was around 1-8.

Criteria: 1 = very, very dislike

2 = really don't like it

3 = don't like it

4 =rather not like

Commented [K3]: Please provide and cited the references for each testing done (SNI or ASTM standards) from soap evaluation until antibacterial test

Commented [K4]: Please consisten, lost foam or foam loss? Formatted: Font color: Red Formatted: Font color: Red Formatted: Font color: Red 5 = normal / neutral6 = rather like it 7 = like8 =really like it

2.5.

Test

Antibacterial

Results and

2.6.1. Bacterial Suspensions. About 1-2 ose of bacterial cells were suspended in 5 ml of a 0.9% NaCl solution. Turbidity of bacterial suspension was equivalent to Mc. Farland 3 (3 x 10⁸). The suspension was then diluted to obtain 3 x 10^7 CFU / ml.

2.6.2. Diffusion Test. The antibacterial activity test was using the disk diffusion method (Kirby-Bauer Method). A total of 20 µl of a solid soap solution is dripped onto disk paper and awaited until it dries. Meanwhile, petri dishes containing NA media were inoculated with 0.1 ml of bacterial suspension and spread evenly over the plates. The disk that has been dripped by the sample was then placed on the surface of the media. The same method was also done on tetracycline as a positive control and aquadest as a negative control. Samples were incubated at 37°C for 24 hours and then observed inhibitory zones were formed [18].

3.

Discussion

3.1. Extracts Examination

Extraction was done by maceration method using 70% alcohol. We obtained as much as 178 g thick extract from 830 g of oil palm leaves powder. From that results, the yield we got was 21.4%. The results can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2. The Yield of Oil Palm Leaves Extracted Using 70% alcohol.

Leaves Powder (g)	Thick Extract (g)	Yield (%)
830	178	21.4

3.1.1 Organoleptic Results. The organoleptic results showed that the extract of oil palm leaves in the form of thick and concentrated liquid, blackish-brown, and has a typical aroma of oil palm leaves. The results were presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Organoleptic Results of Oil Palm Leaves Extract.

Criteria	Organoleptic Results
Shape	thick and concentrated liquid
Aroma	typical aroma of oil palm leaves
Colour	Blackish-brown

3.1.2. Phytochemical Screening. The results of the phytochemical screening showed that the ethanolic extract of oil palm leaves contain an alkaloid, saponin, tannin, flavonoid and triterpenoid (Table 4). These results were suitable with research conducted by Febrina et al. (2018) who used 96% ethanol as a solvent [10].

Commented [K6]: In scientific writing, please not use personal pronouns Formatted: Font color: Red Formatted: Font color: Red Formatted: Font color: Red

Commented [K5]: Please replace 2.5 with 2.6

Commented [K7]: It is better if the data is supported by other analyses, for example, FTIR, NMR or chromatography analysis. Formatted: Font color: Red Formatted: Font color: Red

Table 4. Phytochemical	Screening of	Oil Palm	Leaves	Extract
------------------------	--------------	----------	--------	---------

Plant Constituents	Plant Tests	
	Dragendorff	(+)
Alkaloid	Bouchardart	(+)
	Mayer	(+)
Saponin	Water and HCl	(+)
Tanin	FeCL ₃	(+)
Flavonoid	Na Nitrit 5%, HCl 1%, NaOH 1 N	(+)
Triterpenoid	Cloroform, H ₂ SO ₄ P	(+)
(+): present.		

3.2. Solid Soap Bar Formulation

Solid soap bar was formulated into three concentrations, namely 1%, 2%, and 4%. The process of making soap was done by the cold process method. The cold process is recommended by small-scale enterprise soap makers in low-resource contexts, particularly in tropical regions due to quick solidification of local oils [19]. The results of the formulation showed that the base formula looked brighter, whereas in soap with concentrations of 1%, 2%, and 4% are slightly darker. The higher the concentration of the extract, the darker the soap preparations will be.

3.3. Soap Evaluation

The soap evaluation was carried out aiming to see whether the solid soap meets the requirements to SNI (Indonesian National Standard) 2016 on bath soap which includes organoleptic tests, hardness test, moisture content, foam level test, free alkali content, and pH test [20].

3.3.1. Organoleptic Tests. The organoleptic test was done by visually observing the solid bar soap including form, colour, and aroma.

Formula	Basic colour of the soap	Aroma	Form	
BF	White	Typical of oil palm leaves	Solid	
F1	Brownish-yellow	Typical of oil palm leaves	Solid	
F2	Brown	Typical of oil palm leaves	Solid	
F3	Blackish-brown	Typical of oil palm leaves	Solid	
BF: basis formula; F1: formula with 1% oil palm leaves extract; F2: formula with 2%				

 Table 5. Organoleptic Tests of Solid Bar Soap.

BF: basis formula; F1: formula with 1% oil palm leaves extract; F2: formula with 2 oil palm leaves extract; F3: formula with 4% oil palm leaves extract.

Organoleptic tests showed that whether BF, F1, F2, and F3 has solid form and has a distinctive aroma of oil palm leaves, which is not commercial to promote. Whereas based on the colour produced, the basis formula soap showed white colour, F1 has a brownish-yellow colour, F2 has a brown colour, and F3 has a blackish-brown colour.

Based on the colour and aroma we added additional dye and bubble gum fragrance to cover the basic colour and aroma of the soap. That additional were expected can make the soap colour more attractive and cover the distinctive aroma of the leaves that are less pleasant (**Figure 1**).

Commented [K8]: Please provide the picture of solid soap product each formulation.



Figure 1. Solid bar soap formulation. BF: basis formula; F1: formula with 1% oil palm leaves extract; F2: formula with 2% oil palm leaves extract; F3: formula with 4% oil palm leaves extract.

3.3.2. Foam Level and Stability. The results of foam level and stability presented at Table 6.

Table 6. Foa	m Level	and Stability	of Solid	Bar Soa	p from	Oil Palm	Leaves Extract.
--------------	---------	---------------	----------	---------	--------	----------	-----------------

Formula	High Initial Foam (cm)	High Final Foam (cm)	Foam Stability (%)
BF	9.5	6.7	99.70
F1	10.3	7.7	99.74
F2	9.7	7.5	99.77
F3	9.5	7.5	99.79

BF: basis formula; F1: formula with 1% oil palm leaves extract; F2: formula with 2% oil palm leaves extract; F3: formula with 4% oil palm leaves extract.

The results of the foam level and foam stability tests showed that BF has a stability of 99.70%, F1 of 99.74%, F2 of 99.77%, and at F3 of 99.79%. From these results, it can be concluded that F3 has the best stability among other formulations.

3.3.3. pH Test

Table 7. pH Test Result of Solid Bar Soap from Oil

 Palm Leaves Extract.

Formula	pН
BF	9.27 ± 0.06
F1	9.58 ± 0.06
F2	9.82 ± 0.06
F3	9.79 ± 0.06
TT 1 C	1. E1. C 1.

BF: basis formula; F1: formula with 1% oil palm leaves extract; F2: formula with 2% oil palm leaves extract; F3: formula with 4% oil palm leaves extract Formatted: Font color: Red, Strikethrough

Commented [K9]: Please delete this note, due to has been stated in the method.

Formatted: Font color: Red, Strikethrough Formatted: Font color: Red, Strikethrough

Formatted: Font color: Red, Strikethrough

The pH measurement was done at week 3 because making soap using the cold process method takes 2-4 weeks for a stable pH. Soap will experience a curing time where the soap will undergo a maturation process. Curing time is the time needed to evaporate water in natural soap so that the soap will be safe to use, harder, better foam, stable pH, softer if used, and more durable. The results of the pH test showed that BF, F1, F2 and F3 had a pH that was still within the limits allowed for the preparation of soap that is 9-11 [17].

3.3.4. Soap Hardness Test. Requirements for the value of soap hardness are not yet available so there are no requirements that indicate hardness in soap. the result of the test can be seen in Table 8.

Formula	Hardness	
	(<mark>mm</mark>)	Commented [K10]: Please confirm, is it true that the hardness
BF	$16.00 \ 10^{-1}$	Commented [K11]: Likish is 16 00 X 10] 2222 share
F1	16.05 10-1	confirm and revise all of the data
F2	17.00 10-1	
F3	18.00 10-1	
BF: basis for	mula; F1: formula with 1% oil palm	Formatted: Font color: Red, Strikethrough
leaves extract	; F2: formula with 2% oil palm leaves	
antes at T2. fa	manula mitte 40/ ail malue la sure antenant	

Strikethrough

From the results (Table 8), we can see that soap which is 3 weeks old shows hardness on a basis 16.00 10⁻¹, whereas in Formulation 1% the extract shows hardness 16.05 10⁻¹, Formulation 2% extract shows hardness 17.00 10⁻¹, The 4% extract formulation showed a hardness of 18.00 10⁻¹. These results indicate that the ethanol extract of oil palm leaves can affect the hardness of the soap. The higher the concentration of the extract given to the soap, the softer the soap.

3.3.5. Moisture Content. Moisture content testing on soap aims to measure the per cent of water content contained in solid soap after drying at a temperature of 105 °C for 60 minutes using a Moisture Content Balance Analyzer (Table 9). The maximum permissible moisture content in soap is 15% [20].

10.60 12.97
12.97
10.90
8.28
a; F1: formula with 1%

The testing was done after the soap has been stored for 3 weeks. The soap was made using the cold process method which will be stable within 2-4 weeks. So that the soap undergoes a perfect saponification process. Besides that, the duration of soap storage affects the hardness of the soap due to the water content in the soap had evaporated. The results of the test showed that all formulas meet the requirements of SNI 3532:2016 (less than 15%).

3.3.6. Free Fatty Acid Test. Free fatty acids are fatty acids in soap that are not bound as sodium compounds or triglyceride compounds (neutral fat). The high free fatty acids in soap will reduce the power to clean the soap because free fatty acids are undesirable components in the cleaning process. The presence of free fatty acids can be checked if there is no red colour on the phenolphthalein indicator after boiling in neutral alcohol. Free fatty acids which dissolve in neutral alcohol are then titrated with KOH [20].

The results of testing free fatty acid levels in the BF was 1.128%, in the F1 was 0.846%, in F2 was 0.958%, and in F3 was 0.789%. Based on the data, it is known that the amount of free fatty acids produced meets the quality requirements of bath soap according to SNI, which is a maximum of 2.5%. This means that the solid bar soap from the ethanol extract of the oil palm leaves has a low amount of free fatty acids so that the soap has good clean power and also has a good ability to clean oil from oily material.

3.3.7. Hedonic Test. The results of the hedonic tests presented at Table 10.

Table 10. Average of Hedonic Test

Criteria	BF	F1	F2	F3
Appearance	7.65	7.15	6.90	6.40
Colour	7.60	7.25	6.50	5.75
Aroma	7.80	6.05	4.45	4.30
Moisture	7.00	7.05	7.35	7.45
Irritation	6.15	6.15	6.20	6.25

BF: basis formula; F1: formula with 1% oil palm leaves extract; F2: formula with 2% oil palm leaves extract; F3: formula with 4% oil palm leaves extract

Based on the table, it shows that in terms of appearance, colour and aroma, the BF was more dominant than other formulas, with average values of 7.65, 7.6 and 7.8, respectively (**Table 10**). The appearance of BF is more eye-catching and fresh. The aroma of the soap was also quite fresh. While, the formula containing ethanol extract of oil palm leaves has a distinctive aroma of oil palm, making it less attractive to panellists. The higher concentration of the extract, the fewer enthusiasm of the panellists, because the extract has a less pleasant aroma, even though a fragrance has been added but it still cannot cover the original aroma of the extract itself.

On the other hand, the hedonic test results in terms of humidity and irritation, showed that F3 has the highest average value are F3 with an average point of 7.45 and 6.25, respectively. Soap added with ethanol extract of oil palm leaves has a pretty good humidity when compared to BF. Hedonic observations or preferences in terms of irritation test have a little difference, of the 20 panellists there is one panellist who is irritated to the skin that is a change in the colour of the skin becomes reddish and itchy. It happens possibly because has a different skin type, and maybe has sensitive skin types that have a negative impact on the skin.

3.4. Antibacterial Activity

The results of the antibacterial activity test was presented at **Table 11**. The data from **Table 11** showed that the solid bar soap from the oil palm leaves extract with a concentration of 1%, 2%, and 4% have inhibitory action against *S. aureus* with a diameter of the inhibitory zone about 8.53 mm, 10.53 mm, 12.91 mm, respectively. However, it did not inhibit the growth of *E. coli*.

Commented [K12]: Please provide the table of this data

Formatted: Font color: Red, Strikethrough

Commented [K13]: In scientific writing, please not use personal pronouns Formatted: Font color: Red. Strikethrough

Table 11. The Diameter of Inhibitory Zone of Oil Palm Le	aves
Extract Against Staphylococcus aureus and Escherichia co	li.

	Diameter of Inhibitory Zone (mm)				
Samples	Escherichia coli	Staphylococcus aureus			
BF	-	8.02			
F1	-	8.53			
F2	-	10.53			
F3	-	12.91			
K+	26.96	13.70			
V					

BF: basis formula; F1: formula with 1% oil palm leaves extract; F2: formula with 2% oil palm leaves extract; F3: formula with 4% oil palm leaves extract; K+: positive control; K-: negative control; - : no inhibitory zone

The diameter of the inhibition formed, presumably due to the presence of secondary metabolites such as alkaloid, tannins, saponins, flavonoids, and terpenoid contained in ethanol extracts of oil palm leaves which known as a potential antibacterial agent. Alkaloid compounds work by disrupting the peptidoglycan component of bacterial cells so that the cell wall layer is not formed intact and causes the death cell. Tannins are a group of polyphenol compounds which have antibacterial activity, the mechanism of action of tannins as an antibacterial is thought to be able to shrink the cell walls so that they interfere with the permeability of bacterial cells, due to disruption of permeability, bacterial cells cannot carry out living activities so that growth is inhibited or even dies. Flavonoids have antibacterial activity caused by the ability of flavonoids to form complexes with extracellular proteins and are dissolved so that the bacterial cell membranes will be damaged and lose their function to detergents, as a result, saponins will reduce the surface tension of bacterial cell walls and damage membrane permeability. Damage to the cell membrane is very disturbing survival of bacteria [5, 21].

4. Conclusion

The solid bar soap from ethanol extracts of oil palm leaves meets the requirements SNI 3532: 2016 dan ASTM 2002. The soap has antibacterial activity against S. aureus, but does not inhibit the growth of E.coli.

5. References

э. к	elerences					
[1]	Badan	Pusat	Statistik.	2019.	BPS.	Source:
	https://www	w.bps.go.id/publica	ation/2017/11/10/5c	499ba5089da29b	ba2a148e/statisti	<u>k-kelapa-</u>
	sawit-indor	nesia-2016.html ac	cess at feb 26th, 201	19.		-

- Hambali, E. & Rivai, M. 2017. The Potential of Palm Oil Waste Biomass in Indonesia in 2020 [2] and 2030. Earth and Environmental Sciences, vol. 65, pp. 1-9.
- [3] Dungani, R., Aditiawati, P., Aprilia, S., Yuniarti, K., Karliati, T., Suwandhi, I., & Sumardi, I. 2018. Biomaterial from Oil Palm Waste: Properties, Characterization and Applications. In: Palm Oil, Edited by Waisundara, V. Intech Open: 31-51pp.

Formatted: Font color: Red, Strikethrough

Commented [K14]: Please replace the word dan with "and" Commented [K15]: Please stated the characteristic of the solid bar soap from ethanol extracts of oil palm leaves that qualify SNI 3532: 2016 and ASTM 2002

Formatted: Font color: Red, Strikethrough Formatted: Font color: Red, Strikethrough

- [4] Yusof, N.Z., Gani, S.S.A., Siddiqul, Y., Mohktar, N.F.M., & Hasan, Z.A.A. Potential Uses of Oil Palm (*Elaeis guineensis*) Leaf Extract in Topical Application. *Journal of Oil Palm Research*, vol. 28 (4), pp. 520 – 530.
- [5] Cowan, M. M. 1999. Plant products as antimicrobial agents. *Clinical Microbiology Reviews*, vol. 12(4), pp. 564–582.
- [6] Vijayarathna, S., Zakaria, Z., Chen, Y., Latha, L.Y., Kanwar, J.R., & Sasidharan, S. 2012. The Antimicrobial Efficacy of *Elaeis guineensis*: Characterization, *in Vitro* and *in Vivo* Studies. *Molecules* vol. 17, pp. 4860-4877.
- [7] Yin, N.S., Abdullah, S., & Phin, C.K. 2013. Phytochemical Constituents From Leaves of OF *Elaeis guineensis* and Their Antioxidant and Antimicrobial Activities. *International Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences*, vol. 5, Suppl 4, pp. 37-140.
- [8] Aziz, N.A., Halim, U.N., & Abdullah, N.S. 2015. Phytochemical Screening and In Vitro Antibacterial Activity of Elaeis guineensis Leaves Extracts Against Human Pathogenic Bacteria. Malaysian Journal of Analytical Sciences, Vol 19 No 4, pp. 775 – 780.
- [9] Chonga, K.H., Zurainia, Z., Sasidharanb,S., Devib, P.V.K., Lathac, L.Y., & Ramanathand, S. 2008. Antimicrobial Activity of *Elaeis guineensis* Leaf. *Pharmacologyonline*, vol. 3, pp. 379-386.
- [10] Febrina, D., Febriyanti, R., Zam, S.I., Handoko, J., Fatah, A., & Juliantoni, J. 2018. Antibacterial Activity Testing and Ethanol Extract Characterization of Oil Palm Fronds (*Elaeis guineensis* Jacq). *Pak J Nutr*, vol. 17, 9, pp. 427-433.
- [11] Berutu, R., Syarifudin, A., & Simahombing, Y.R. 2018. Formulasi Sediaan Sabun Mandi Padat Dari Ekstrak Etanol Buah Mengkudu (*Morinda Citrifolia* L.) Segar. Jurnal Penelitian Herbal Farmasi, vol. 1(1), 33-39.
- [12] Depkes RI. 2008. Farmakope Herbal Indonesia Edisi I. Jakarta: Direktorat Pengawasan Obat dan Makanan.
- [13] BPOM. 2010. Monografi Ekstrak Tumbuhan Indonesia. Jakarta: Direktorat Standardisasi Obat Trandisional, Kosmetik dan Produk Komplemen BPOM RI.
- [14] Depkes RI. 1989. *Materia Medika Indonesia Jilid V.* Jakarta: Direktorat Pengawasan Obat dan Makanan.
- [15] Pandey, A. & Tripathi, S. 2014. Concept of standardization, extraction and pre phytochemical screening strategies for herbal drug. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, vol. 2(5), pp. 115-119.
- [16] Hambali, E., Bunasor, T.K., Suryani, A., & Kusumah, G.A. 2006. Aplikasi Dietanolamida dari Asam Laurat Minyak Inti Sawit pada Pembuatan Sabun Padat. *Jurnal Teknik Industri*, vol. 15, pp. 46-53.
- [17] American Nasional Standard. 2002. Annual Book Of ASTM Standards. West Conshocken. PA USA.
- [18] Hudzicki, J. 2016. *Kirby-Bauer Disk Diffusion Susceptibility Test Protocol*. American Society for Microbiology. 1 23 pp.
- [19] Burleson, G., Butcher, B., Goodwin, B., Sharp, K., & Ruder, B. 2017. Soap-Making Process Improvement: Including Social, Cultural and Resource Constraints in the Engineering Design Process. International Journal for Service Learning in Engineering, Humanitarian Engineering and Social Entrepreneurship, vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 81-102.
- [20] SNI. 2016. SNI 3532: 2016: Sabun Mandi. Jakarta: Badan Standarisasi Nasional.
- [21] Syafriana, V. & Rusyita, R. 2017. Uji Aktivitas Antibakteri Ekstrak Etanol Daun Sirih Merah (*Piper crocatum*) Terhadap Pertumbuhan *Propionibacterium acnes*. Sainstech Farma, vol. 10 No.2, pp. 9-11.

Formatted: Left: 0.98", Right: 0.98", Top: 1.58", Bottom: 1.06"

Formatted: Space Before: 79.4 pt, After: 28.35 pt

The <u>u</u>Utilization of <u>o</u>Oil <u>p</u>Palm <u>l</u>Leaves (*Elaeis guineensis* Jacq.) <u>w</u>Waste as an <u>a</u>Antibacterial <u>s</u>Solid <u>b</u>Bar <u>s</u>Soap

Amelia Febriani^{1*}, Vilya Syafriana¹, Hendra Afriyando¹, and Yayah Siti Djuhariah¹

¹Faculty of Pharmacy, National Institute of Science and Technology, Jl. Moh. Kahfi II, Srengseng Sawah, Jagakarsa, Jakarta 12640

*Corresponding authorE-mail: ameliafebriani@istn.ac.id

Abstract. Oil palm leaves (Elaeis guineensis Jacq), which have been underutilized by the community and become waste that usually stacked around the trees, have a potential to be used as active ingredients for making antibacterial solid bar soap. The chemical content of oil palm leaves are tannins, alkaloids and flavonoids that known had antibacterial activity. This research aims to produce oil palm leaves extracts into an active ingredient of solid bar soap formulation with antibacterial activity against Escherichia coli and Staphylococcus aureus and also to evaluate the quality of the solid bar soap. The soap was formulated into 3 formulas with varying concentrations of oil palm leaves ethanolic extract that was F1 (1%), F2 (2%), and F3 (4%). Oil palm leaves extract was prepared with maceration using ethanol 70%. Antibacterial activity assay of the solid bar soap was carried out using a disc diffusion method with tetracycline as the positive control (K+) and distilled water as the negative control (K-). The soap quality was evaluated for its organoleptic, foam level and foam stability, pH, hardness, water content and free fatty acid. The results showed that all three solid soap formulas meet the soap quality requirements of SNI No. 3532-2016. The solid bar soap did not have inhibition properties against Escherichia coli. However, had inhibition effect against Staphylococcus aureus with an average Inhibitio F1, F2, and F3 was 8.02 mm, 8.53 mm, 10.53 mi

on Zone Diameter (IZD) on soap base,	
m, 12.91 mm respectively,	Formatted: Font: 10 pt
s Jacq., ethanol extract, oil palm leaves	

1. Introduction

Oil palm (*Elaeis guineensis* Jacq.) is an important commodity for the Indonesian economy. Oil palm plays a role in generating more foreign exchange than oil and gas [1]. One of the uses of oil palm is as a producer of vegetable cooking oil. Oil produced from oil palm able to produce oil seven times higher than rapeseeds (*Brassica napus*) and eleven times higher than soybean per hectare. Since 2004, oil palm

Keywords: antibacterial activity, Elaeis guineensi

waste, solid soap

Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.98", Space Before: 0 pt
Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Bold
Formatted: Font: 12 pt
Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Bold
Formatted: Font: 12 pt
Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Bold
Formatted: Font: 12 pt
Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Bold
Formatted: Font: 12 pt
Formatted: Font: 11 pt
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.98", Space After: 28.35 pt

has slowly become a worldwide vegetable oil with a total production of 30 million tons and an average growth rate of 8% per year [2]. Unfortunately, this industry leaves waste, such as kernel shells, mesocarp fibers, oil palm trunks (stems) and oil palm fronds (leaves) [2,3]. Hambali & Rivai (2017) reported that oil palm leaf waste in 2015 reached 124,032,861 tons. This value is likely to continue to increase with time [2].

Oil palm leaves, normally underutilized by the community. They usually left alone to rot betweenthe oil palm trunks. The abundance aims to maintain the sustainability of the soil and nutrient cycle in the plantation [4]. The oil palm leaves contain major compounds such as alkaloids, tannins, and flavonoids. These compounds are known to act as antimicrobials because they can damage cell walls, disrupt cell permeability, and inhibit enzyme or protein [5,6,7,8].

Several studies have proven that oil palm leaf extract has antimicrobial activity. Previous studies reported that oil palm leaf extracts were able to inhibit the growth of *Escherichia coli* and *Staphylococcus aureus* [8,9,10]. Other research stated that in addition to its potential as an antibacterial, oil palm leaf extract also has the potential to be a skin protective agent from UV radiation. Based on this, Yusof et al. (2006) suggest that oil palm leaf extracts can be made into a topical application for skin protection [4].

One form of topical application that can be used to maintain health is soap. Soap is a product that is produced from the reaction between fatty acids with strong bases that function to wash and clean fat or dirt. There are two types of soap, namely solid soap and liquid soap. Most people come down using solid soap (bar soap) to clean the body because bar soap is cheaper, easier to use, and efficient in cleaning the skin [11]. This study aims to test the formulation of soap from oil palm leaves extracts for its activity as antibacterial soap.

2. Material and Methods

2.1. Materials

The oil palm leaves were obtained from Desa Bogatama, Lampung, Indonesia. Chemicals being used 70% ethanol, aquadest, H₂SO₄, HCl, acetic acid, Nutrient Agar (NA), olive oil, coconut oil, palm oil, sodium lactate, dyes, fragrance, Sodium hydroxide (NaOH), NaOH 0.1 N, plastic wrap. The microorganisms we used *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Escherichia coli* bacteria.

2.2. Extraction of Oil Palm Leaves

The oil palm leaves were cut into small pieces and washed thoroughly with water and then dried using the oven. The dried leaves were mashed using a blender into a powder. The leaf powder then sieved using a 60 mesh sieve to obtain uniform particle sizes. The powder then macerated using 70% ethanol with a ratio of 1:10 for 1 x 24 hours with stirring every 6 hours. The filtrate obtained was filtered and the dregs were re-macerated 2 times. Furthermore, the filtrate obtained from maceration was concentrated using a vacuum rotary evaporator, then evaporated on a water bath until a thick extract was produced from oil palm leaf powder [12].

2.3. Extracts Examination

2.3.1. Organoleptic. The organoleptic examination based on Monograph Ekstrak Tumbuhan Indonesia [13].

2.3.2. *Phytochemical Screening*. Phytochemical screening was carried out based on Materia Medika Indonesia (Depkes RI, 1989) and Pandey & Tripathi (2014). Screening includes testing for alkaloids, flavonoids, tannins, saponins, steroids and triterpenoids [14,15].

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.2", Space Before: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.2", Space Before: 0 pt

Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt

Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt

2.4. Soap Formulation The formulation refers to Hambali et al. (2006) with modification [16]. The composition of the formula in 100 ml aquadest add presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Soap Bar Formulation.

Materials	Concentration (%)			
	Base (BF)	F1	F2	F3
Oil Palm Leaves Extract	0	4	2	4
NaOH	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5
Coconut Oil	20	20	20	20
Palm Oil	35	35	35	35
Olive Oil	10	10	10	10
Sodium lactate	1.95	1.95	1.95	1.95
Distilled water	22.1	22.1	22.1	22.1
Colouring	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Fragrance	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5

Solid soap formulations were carried out by dissolving NaOH in distilled water. NaOH solution is mixed with sodium lactate. The mixture of solutions was called the first mixture. Meanwhile, at different container, we mixed the coconut oil, olive oil and palm oil, known as the second mixture. The first mixture was poured into the second mixture bit by bit. The mixture was stirring until homogeneous using a hand blender and a trace occurs (a condition in which the soap has formed with a sign of the thickening soap mass). The ethanol extract of oil palm leaves was added at the time of the trace. After that, the mixture was stirred again until homogeneous, then added fragrance and colouring. The liquid soapy mass is poured into a mold and incubated for 24 hours until it hardens.

Table 1	Table 1. Soap Bar Formulation.					
Materials	Concentrat					
	Base (BF)	F1	<u>F2</u>	<u>F3</u>		
Oil Palm Leaves Extract	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>		
<u>NaOH</u>	<u>9.5</u>	<u>9.5</u>	<u>9.5</u>	<u>9.5</u>		
Coconut Oil	<u>20</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>20</u>		
Palm Oil	<u>35</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>35</u>		
Olive Oil	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>		
Sodium lactate	<u>1.95</u>	<u>1.95</u>	1.95	<u>1.95</u>		
Distilled water	<u>22.1</u>	22.1	22.1	22.1		
<u>Colouring</u>	<u>0.5</u>	0.5	0.5	<u>0.5</u>		
Fragrance	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5		

2.5. Soap Evaluation 2.5

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.2", Space Before: 0 pt

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.2", Space Before: 0 pt

Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Space After: 6 pt

2.5.1 Organoleptic Evaluation. Organoleptic evaluation by observing the colour, texture, and aroma of	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt
the soap	
2.5.2. <i>pH Test</i> . An amount of 1 g soap sample was dissolved into 10 mL distilled water and stirred until	
relatively safe soon is 9, 11 [17]	
relatively sale soap is 9-11 [17].	
2.5.3. Foam Level and Stability. About 1 gram of soap was put into a test tube containing 10 ml of	
distilled water and then shaken with vortex for 30 minutes. The height of foam formed is measured using	
a ruler (initial foam height). The height of the foam is measured again after a few minutes (high foam	
end). Foam Stability – 100% - % Lost foam	Formatted: Font: Not Bold
$100 \text{ m} \text{ y} = 100 \text{ /} 0^{-1} \text{ /} 0^{-1} \text{ lost rotain}$	Tormatted. Point. Not Bold
% Foam loss = (High initial foam - High final foam)/(High initial foam) x 100%	
2.5.4. Soap Hardness. The hardness of the soap was done using a penetrometer. The needle on the	Formatted: Space After: 0 pt
penetrometer was inserted into the sample and allowed to penetrate the material for 5 seconds at a	
constant temperature (27° C). The depth of needle penetration into the material is expressed in $1/10$	
mm of the number indicated on the penetrometer scale.	
255	Proventing de Carde Ned Deld Italia
2.3.3.	- Formatted, Font, Not Rold Italic
2.5.4 Mainture Contant Magnument of mainture contant was using Mainture Contant Palanad	
2.5.4. Moisture Content. Measurement of moisture content was using Moisture Content Balance	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering
2.5.4. Moisture Content. Measurement of moisture content was using Moisture Content Balance [Ohaus].	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering
2.5.4. Moisture Content. Measurement of moisture content was using Moisture Content Balance [Ohaus]. Free Fatty Acid = 0.282 <u>×</u> *V <u>×</u> *N / w 100%	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single
2.5.4. Moisture Content. Measurement of moisture content was using Moisture Content Balance [Ohaus]. Free Fatty Acid = 0.282×*V×*N / w 100% Information:	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single
2.5.4. Moisture Content. Measurement of moisture content was using Moisture Content Balance [Ohaus]. Free Fatty Acid = 0.282×*V×*N / w 100% Information: Free fatty acids in units of% mass fraction	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single
2.5.4. Moisture Content. Measurement of moisture content was using Moisture Content Balance [Ohaus]. Free Fatty Acid = 0.282×*V×*N / w 100% Information: Free fatty acids in units of% mass fraction V = volume of KOH used (mL) N = normality of KOH used	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single
 2.5.4. Moisture Content. Measurement of moisture content was using Moisture Content Balance [Ohaus]. Free Fatty Acid = 0.282×*V×*N / w 100% Information: Free fatty acids in units of% mass fraction V = volume of KOH used (mL) N = normality of KOH used B = sample weight (g) 	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single
2.5.4. Moisture Content. Measurement of moisture content was using Moisture Content Balance [Ohaus]. Free Fatty Acid = $0.282 \times V \times N / w 100\%$ Information: Free fatty acids in units of% mass fraction V = volume of KOH used (mL) N = normality of KOH used B = sample weight (g) 282 = equivalent weight of oleic acid (C ₁₈ H ₃₄ O ₂)	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single Formatted: Subscript
2.5.4.Moisture Content.Measurement of moisture content was using Moisture Content Balance[Ohaus].Free Fatty Acid = $0.282 \times V \times N / w$ 100%Information:Free fatty acids in units of% mass fractionV = volume of KOH used (mL)N = normality of KOH usedB = sample weight (g)282 = equivalent weight of oleic acid (C18H34O2)	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single Formatted: Subscript Formatted: Subscript Formatted: Subscript
2.5.4. Moisture Content. Measurement of moisture content was using Moisture Content Balance [Ohaus]. Free Fatty Acid = $0.282 \times V \times N / w 100\%$ Information: Free fatty acids in units of% mass fraction V = volume of KOH used (mL) N = normality of KOH used B = sample weight (g) 282 = equivalent weight of oleic acid ($C_{18}H_{34}O_2$) 2.5.6. Hedonic Test. The hedonic test was performed to compare BF, F1, F2, and F3.	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single Formatted: Subscript Formatted: Subscript Formatted: Subscript Formatted: Subscript
 2.5.4. Moisture Content. Measurement of moisture content was using Moisture Content Balance [Ohaus]. Free Fatty Acid = 0.282×*V×*N / w 100% Information: Free fatty acids in units of% mass fraction V = volume of KOH used (mL) N = normality of KOH used B = sample weight (g) 282 = equivalent weight of oleic acid (C₁₈H₃₄O₂) 2.5.6. Hedonic Test. The hedonic test was performed to compare BF, F1, F2, and F3. This test aims to determine which formula was preferred by consumers. The criteria of the test were appearance, colour, which is in the prove of the test of the test were appearance. 	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single Formatted: Subscript Formatted: Subscript Formatted: Subscript
 2.5.4. Moisture Content. Measurement of moisture content was using Moisture Content Balance [Ohaus]. Free Fatty Acid = 0.282×*V×*N / w 100% Information: Free fatty acids in units of% mass fraction V = volume of KOH used (mL) N = normality of KOH used B = sample weight (g) 282 = equivalent weight of oleic acid (C₁₈H₃₄O₂) 2.5.6. Hedonic Test. The hedonic test was performed to compare BF, F1, F2, and F3. This test aims to determine which formula was preferred by consumers. The criteria of the test were appearance, colour, aroma, skin irritation test, and skin moisture test. The preference test was carried out using 20 panellist consisting of men and women at random with an are range of 18-35 wars. The score for the annallist 	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single Formatted: Subscript Formatted: Subscript Formatted: Subscript Formatted: Subscript
 2.5.4. Moisture Content. Measurement of moisture content was using Moisture Content Balance [Ohaus]. Free Fatty Acid = 0.282×*V×*N / w 100% Information: Free fatty acids in units of% mass fraction V = volume of KOH used (mL) N = normality of KOH used B = sample weight (g) 282 = equivalent weight of oleic acid (C₁₈H₃₄O₂) 2.5.6. Hedonic Test. The hedonic test was performed to compare BF, F1, F2, and F3. This test aims to determine which formula was preferred by consumers. The criteria of the test were appearance, colour, aroma, skin irritation test, and skin moisture test. The preference test was carried out using 20 panellist consisting of men and women at random, with an age range of 18-35 years. The score for the panellist preference level used was around 1-8. 	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single Formatted: Subscript Formatted: Subscript Formatted: Subscript Formatted: Subscript
 2.5.4. Moisture Content. Measurement of moisture content was using Moisture Content Balance [Ohaus]. Free Fatty Acid = 0.282×*V×*N / w 100% Information: Free fatty acids in units of% mass fraction V = volume of KOH used (mL) N = normality of KOH used B = sample weight (g) 282 = equivalent weight of oleic acid (C₁₈H₃₄O₂) 2.5.6. Hedonic Test. The hedonic test was performed to compare BF, F1, F2, and F3. This test aims to determine which formula was preferred by consumers. The criteria of the test were appearance, colour, aroma, skin irritation test, and skin moisture test. The preference test was carried out using 20 panellist consisting of men and women at random, with an age range of 18-35 years. The score for the panellist preference level used was around 1-8. Criteria: 	Formatted: Yon: Not Bold, Italic Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single Formatted: Subscript
2.5.4.Moisture Content.Measurement of moisture content was using Moisture Content Balance[Ohaus].Free Fatty Acid = $0.282 \times V \times N / w 100\%$ Information:Free fatty acids in units of% mass fractionV = volume of KOH used (mL)N = normality of KOH usedB = sample weight (g)282 = equivalent weight of oleic acid (C18H34O2)2.5.6. Hedonic Test. The hedonic test was performed to compare BF, F1, F2, and F3. This test aims to determine which formula was preferred by consumers. The criteria of the test were appearance, colour, aroma, skin irritation test, and skin moisture test. The preference test was carried out using 20 panellist preference level used was around 1-8.Criteria:1 = very, very dislike	Formatted: Yon: Not Bold, Italic Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single Formatted: Subscript
 2.5.4. Moisture Content. Measurement of moisture content was using Moisture Content Balance [Ohaus]. Free Fatty Acid = 0.282×*V×*N / w 100% Information: Free fatty acids in units of% mass fraction V = volume of KOH used (mL) N = normality of KOH used (mL) N = normality of KOH used B = sample weight (g) 282 = equivalent weight of oleic acid (C₁₈H₂₄O₂) 2.5.6. <i>Hedonic Test.</i> The hedonic test was performed to compare BF, F1, F2, and F3. This test aims to determine which formula was preferred by consumers. The criteria of the test were appearance, colour, aroma, skin irritation test, and skin moisture test. The preference test was carried out using 20 panellist preference level used was around 1-8. Criteria: 1 = very, very dislike 2 = really don't like it 	Formatted: Yon: Not Bold, Italic Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single Formatted: Subscript
 2.5.4. Moisture Content. Measurement of moisture content was using Moisture Content Balance [Ohaus]. Free Fatty Acid = 0.282×*V×*N / w 100% Information: Free fatty acids in units of% mass fraction V = volume of KOH used (mL) N = normality of KOH used B = sample weight (g) 282 = equivalent weight of oleic acid (C₁₈H₃₄O₂) 2.5.6. Hedonic Test. The hedonic test was performed to compare BF, F1, F2, and F3. This test aims to determine which formula was preferred by consumers. The criteria of the test were appearance, colour, aroma, skin irritation test, and skin moisture test. The preference test was carried out using 20 panellist preference level used was around 1-8. Criteria: 1 = very, very dislike 2 = really don't like it 3 = don't like it 	Formatted: Yon: Not Bold, Italic Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single Formatted: Subscript
 2.5.4. Moisture Content. Measurement of moisture content was using Moisture Content Balance [Ohaus]. Free Fatty Acid = 0.282×*V×*N / w 100% Information: Free fatty acids in units of% mass fraction V = volume of KOH used (mL) N = normality of KOH used B = sample weight (g) 282 = equivalent weight of oleic acid (C₁₈H₃₄O₂) 2.5.6. Hedonic Test. The hedonic test was performed to compare BF, F1, F2, and F3. This test aims to determine which formula was preferred by consumers. The criteria of the test were appearance, colour, aroma, skin irritation test, and skin moisture test. The preference test was carried out using 20 panellist consisting of men and women at random, with an age range of 18-35 years. The score for the panellist preference level used was around 1-8. Criteria: 1 = very, very dislike 2 = really don't like it 3 = don't like it 4 = rather not like 	Formatted: York: Not Bold, Italic Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single Formatted: Subscript
2.5.4. <i>Moisture Content.</i> Measurement of moisture content was using Moisture Content Balance [Ohaus]. Free Fatty Acid = $0.282 \times V \times N / w 100\%$ Information: Free fatty acids in units of% mass fraction V = volume of KOH used (mL) N = normality of KOH used B = sample weight (g) 282 = equivalent weight of oleic acid ($C_{18}H_{34}O_2$) 2.5.6. <i>Hedonic Test.</i> The hedonic test was performed to compare BF, F1, F2, and F3. This test aims to determine which formula was preferred by consumers. The criteria of the test were appearance, colour, aroma, skin irritation test, and skin moisture test. The preference test was carried out using 20 panellist consisting of men and women at random, with an age range of 18-35 years. The score for the panellist preference level used was around 1-8. Criteria: 1 = very, very dislike 2 = really don't like it 3 = don't like it 4 = rather not like 5 = normal / neutral 6 = rather like it	Formatted: Tork: Not Bold, Italic Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single Formatted: Subscript
2.5.4. <i>Moisture Content.</i> Measurement of moisture content was using Moisture Content Balance [Ohaus]. Free Fatty Acid = $0.282 \times V \times N / w 100\%$ Information: Free fatty acids in units of% mass fraction V = volume of KOH used (mL) N = normality of KOH used B = sample weight (g) 282 = equivalent weight of oleic acid ($C_{48}H_{34}O_2$) 2.5.6. <i>Hedonic Test.</i> The hedonic test was performed to compare BF, F1, F2, and F3. This test aims to determine which formula was preferred by consumers. The criteria of the test were appearance, colour, aroma, skin irritation test, and skin moisture test. The preference test was carried out using 20 panellist consisting of men and women at random, with an age range of 18-35 years. The score for the panellist preference level used was around 1-8. Criteria: 1 = very, very dislike 2 = really don't like it 3 = don't like it 4 = rather not like 5 = normal / neutral 6 = rather like it 7 = like	Formatted: Yoh: Not Bold, Italic Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single Formatted: Subscript
 2.5.4. Moisture Content. Measurement of moisture content was using Moisture Content Balance [Ohaus]. Free Fatty Acid = 0.282×*V×*N / w 100% Information: Free fatty acids in units of% mass fraction V = volume of KOH used (mL) N = normality of KOH used B = sample weight (g) 282 = equivalent weight of oleic acid (C₁₈H₃₄O₂) 2.5.6. Hedonic Test. The hedonic test was performed to compare BF, F1, F2, and F3. This test aims to determine which formula was preferred by consumers. The criteria of the test were appearance, colour, aroma, skin irritation test, and skin moisture test. The preference test was carried out using 20 panellist consisting of men and women at random, with an age range of 18-35 years. The score for the panellist preference level used was around 1-8. Criteria: 1 = very, very dislike 2 = really don't like it 3 = don't like it 4 = rather not like 5 = normal / neutral 6 = rather like it 7 = like 8 = really like it 	Formatted: York: Not Bold, Take Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single Formatted: Subscript
 2.5.4. Moisture Content. Measurement of moisture content was using Moisture Content Balance [Ohaus]. Free Fatty Acid = 0.282×*V×*N / w 100% Information: Free fatty acids in units of% mass fraction V = volume of KOH used (mL). N = normality of KOH used B = sample weight (g) 282 = equivalent weight of oleic acid (C₁₈H₃₄O₂) 2.5.6. Hedonic Test. The hedonic test was performed to compare BF, F1, F2, and F3. This test aims to determine which formula was preferred by consumers. The criteria of the test were appearance, colour, aroma, skin irritation test, and skin moisture test. The preference test was carried out using 20 panellist consisting of men and women at random, with an age range of 18-35 years. The score for the panellist preference level used was around 1-8. Criteria: 1 = very, very dislike 2 = really don't like it 3 = don't like it 4 = rather not like 5 = normal / neutral 6 = rather like it 7 = like 8 = really like it 	Formatted: Yon: Not bold, Italic Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single Formatted: Subscript
 2.5.4. Moisture Content. Measurement of moisture content was using Moisture Content Balance [Ohaus]. Free Fatty Acid = 0.282×*V×*N/w 100% Information: Free fatty acids in units of% mass fraction V = volume of KOH used (mL) N = normality of KOH used B = sample weight (g) 282 = equivalent weight of oleic acid (C₁₈H₂₄O₂) 2.5.6. Hedonic Test. The hedonic test was performed to compare BF, F1, F2, and F3. This test aims to determine which formula was preferred by consumers. The criteria of the test were appearance, colour, aroma, skin irritation test, and skin moisture test. The preference test was carried out using 20 panellist consisting of men and women at random, with an age range of 18-35 years. The score for the panellist preference level used was around 1-8. Criteria: 1 = very, very dislike 2 = really don't like it 3 = don't like it 4 = rather not like 5 = normal / neutral 6 = rather like it 7 = like 8 = really like it 	Formatted: Yon: Not Doll, Hanc Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single Formatted: Subscript Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt

2.6.	Suspensions About 1.2	ose of besterial calls were	suspanded in 5 ml of	a 0.0% NaCle	Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.38", Space Before: 0 pt
lution. Turbidit	ty of bacterial suspension	on was equivalent to Mc.	Farland 3 (3 x 10^8). T	he suspension	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt
s then diluted t	to obtain 3 x 10 ⁷ CFU /	ml.			
6.2. Diffusion 1 ethod). A total eanwhile, petri read evenly ov rface of the me a negative con ere formed [18]	<i>Test.</i> The antibacterial a of 20 μ l of a solid soap dishes containing NA 1 ver the plates. The disk dia. The same method v trol. Samples were incu	ctivity test was using the or solution is dripped onto or nedia were inoculated with that has been dripped by yas also done on tetracyclin bated at 37°C for 24 hours	disk diffusion method lisk paper and awaited n 0.1 ml of bacterial s the sample was then he as a positive contro and then observed in	(Kirby-Bauer until it dries. aspension and placed on the and aquadest hibitory zones	
Results and 3.	Discussion				Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", Space Before: 0 pt.
I Entra oto Ena	min ation				
I. Extracts Exa	mination			•	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt
t. Extracts Exa	mination one by maceration met	nod using 70% alcohol. W	/e obtained as much a	s 178 g thick	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt
1. Extracts Exa straction was de stract from 830 g in be seen in Ta	<i>mination</i> one by maceration met g of oil palm leaves pow ble 2 .	nod using 70% alcohol. W rder. From that results, the	/e obtained as much a yield we got was 21.4	is 178 g thick %. The results	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt Formatted: Font: Bold
1. Extracts Exa xtraction was de xtract from 830 g in be seen in Ta	mination one by maceration met g of oil palm leaves pow ble 2 .	nod using 70% alcohol. W der. From that results, the	7e obtained as much a yield we got was 21.4	as 178 g thick %. The results	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt Formatted: Font: Bold Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt (ftp://c.nt
1. Extracts Exa xtraction was de tract from 830 ; in be seen in Ta 7	<i>mination</i> one by maceration met g of oil palm leaves pow ble 2 . Table 2. The Yield of O	nod using 70% alcohol. W rder. From that results, the il Palm Leaves Extracted	Ve obtained as much a yield we got was 21.4 Using 70% alcohol.	us 178 g thick %. The results	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt Formatted: Font: Bold Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, After: 6 pt
1. Extracts Exa straction was d stract from 830 (in be seen in Ta T	mination one by maceration meti g of oil palm leaves pow ble 2. Table 2. The Yield of O	nod using 70% alcohol. W der. From that results, the il Palm Leaves Extracted	Ve obtained as much a yield we got was 21.4 Using 70% alcohol.	as 178 g thick %. The results	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt Formatted: Font: Bold Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, After: 6 pt
1. Extracts Exa xtraction was d (tract from 830; in be seen in Ta	mination one by maceration met g of oil palm leaves pow ble 2. Table 2. The Yield of O Leaves Powder (g)	nod using 70% alcohol. W rder. From that results, the il Palm Leaves Extracted Thick Extract (g)	Ve obtained as much a yield we got was 21.4 Using 70% alcohol.	as 178 g thick %. The results	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt Formatted: Font: Bold Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, After: 6 pt
1. Extracts Exa straction was de tract from 830; n be seen in Ta	mination one by maceration meti g of oil palm leaves pow ble 2. Table 2. The Yield of O Leaves Powder (g) 830	nod using 70% alcohol. W rder. From that results, the il Palm Leaves Extracted Thick Extract (g) 178	/e obtained as much a yield we got was 21.4 Using 70% alcohol. Yield (%) 21.4	as 178 g thick %. The results	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt Formatted: Font: Bold Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, After: 6 pt
1. Extracts Exa straction was d stract from 830; n be seen in Ta	mination one by maceration meti g of oil palm leaves power ble 2. Table 2. The Yield of O Leaves Powder (g) 830	nod using 70% alcohol. W der. From that results, the il Palm Leaves Extracted Thick Extract (g) 178	Ve obtained as much a yield we got was 21.4 Using 70% alcohol. Yield (%) 21.4	as 178 g thick %. The results	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, After: 6 pt Exempted: Space Before: 0 pt, After: 6 pt
1. Extracts Exa straction was d tract from 830; n be seen in Ta J 1.1 Organolept	mination one by maceration meti g of oil palm leaves pow ble 2. Fable 2. The Yield of O Leaves Powder (g) 830	nod using 70% alcohol. W rder. From that results, the il Palm Leaves Extracted Thick Extract (g) 178 eptic results showed that t	/e obtained as much a yield we got was 21.4 Using 70% alcohol. Yield (%) 21.4 the extract of oil palm	Is 178 g thick %. The results	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, After: 6 pt Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, After: 6 pt
I. Extracts Exa stract from 830 ; n be seen in Ta 1.1 Organolept rm of thick and sults were prese	mination one by maceration meti g of oil palm leaves pow ble 2. Table 2. The Yield of O Leaves Powder (g) 830	nod using 70% alcohol. W der. From that results, the il Palm Leaves Extracted Thick Extract (g) 178 eptic results showed that t ackish-brown, and has a ty	Ve obtained as much a yield we got was 21.4 Using 70% alcohol. Yield (%) 21.4 the extract of oil palm pical aroma of oil palm	as 178 g thick %. The results leaves in the m leaves. The	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, After: 6 pt Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, After: 6 pt Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt
I. Extracts Exa tract from 830 ; n be seen in Ta <i>I.1 Organolept</i> rm of thick and sults were prese	mination one by maceration meti g of oil palm leaves power ble 2. Table 2. The Yield of O Leaves Powder (g) 830	nod using 70% alcohol. W der. From that results, the il Palm Leaves Extracted Thick Extract (g) 178 eptic results showed that t ackish-brown, and has a ty	Ve obtained as much a yield we got was 21.4 Using 70% alcohol. <u>Yield (%)</u> 21.4 the extract of oil palm pical aroma of oil palm	as 178 g thick %. The results leaves in the m leaves. The	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt Formatted: Font: Bold Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, After: 6 pt Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt Formatted: Font: Bold
1. Extracts Exa stract from 830 ; n be seen in Ta 1.1 Organolept rm of thick and sults were prese	mination one by maceration meti g of oil palm leaves power ble 2. Table 2. The Yield of O Leaves Powder (g) 830 tic Results. The organol I concentrated liquid, bl ented in Table 3.	nod using 70% alcohol. W rder. From that results, the il Palm Leaves Extracted Thick Extract (g) 178 eptic results showed that t ackish-brown, and has a ty	Ve obtained as much a yield we got was 21.4 Using 70% alcohol. Yield (%) 21.4 the extract of oil palm pical aroma of oil pal	Is 178 g thick %. The results leaves in the m leaves. The	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt Formatted: Font: Bold Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, After: 6 pt Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt Formatted: Font: Bold Formatted: Font: Bold Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt
I. Extracts Exa straction was d tract from 830, n be seen in Ta n be seen in Ta 1 <i>1.1 Organolept</i> rm of thick and sults were prese	mination one by maceration meti g of oil palm leaves pow ble 2. Table 2. The Yield of O Leaves Powder (g) 830 tic Results. The organol concentrated liquid, bl ented in Table 3. Table 3. Organole	nod using 70% alcohol. W der. From that results, the il Palm Leaves Extracted Thick Extract (g) 178 eptic results showed that t ackish-brown, and has a ty ptic Results of Oil Palm L	Ve obtained as much a yield we got was 21.4 Using 70% alcohol. Yield (%) 21.4 the extract of oil palm pical aroma of oil palm	as 178 g thick %. The results leaves in the m leaves. The	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt Formatted: Font: Bold Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, After: 6 pt Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt Formatted: Font: Bold Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt
t. Extracts Exa traction was d tract from 830 (n be seen in Ta Ta <i>T</i> <i>Ta</i> <i>Ta</i> <i>Ta</i> <i>Ta</i> <i>Ta</i> <i>Ta</i> <i>Ta</i>	mination one by maceration meti g of oil palm leaves pow ble 2. Table 2. The Yield of O Leaves Powder (g) 830 tic Results. The organol concentrated liquid, bl ented in Table 3. Table 3. Organole	nod using 70% alcohol. W der. From that results, the il Palm Leaves Extracted Thick Extract (g) 178 eptic results showed that t ackish-brown, and has a ty ptic Results of Oil Palm L	Ve obtained as much a yield we got was 21.4 Using 70% alcohol. <u>Yield (%)</u> 21.4 the extract of oil palm pical aroma of oil pal eaves Extract.	as 178 g thick %. The results leaves in the m leaves. The	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt Formatted: Font: Bold Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, After: 6 pt Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt Formatted: Font: Bold Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt
t. Extracts Exa traction was d tract from 830 n be seen in Ta Ta <i>Ta</i> <i>Ta</i> <i>Ta</i> <i>Ta</i> <i>Ta</i> <i>Ta</i> <i>Ta</i>	mination one by maceration meti g of oil palm leaves pow ble 2. Table 2. The Yield of O Leaves Powder (g) 830 tic Results. The organol concentrated liquid, bl ented in Table 3. Table 3. Organole Criteria	nod using 70% alcohol. W der. From that results, the il Palm Leaves Extracted 1 Thick Extract (g) 178 eptic results showed that t ackish-brown, and has a ty ptic Results of Oil Palm L Organoleptic Results	Ve obtained as much a yield we got was 21.4 Using 70% alcohol. Yield (%) 21.4 the extract of oil palm pical aroma of oil palm eaves Extract.	as 178 g thick %. The results . leaves in the m leaves. The	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt Formatted: Font: Bold Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, After: 6 pt Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt Formatted: Font: Bold Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt
t. Extracts Exa traction was d tract from 830, n be seen in Ta n be seen in Ta 1 <i>1</i> <i>1</i> <i>1</i> <i>1</i> <i>1</i> <i>1</i> <i>1</i> <i>1</i> <i>1</i> <i>1</i>	mination one by maceration meti g of oil palm leaves pow ble 2. Table 2. The Yield of O Leaves Powder (g) 830 tic Results. The organol concentrated liquid, bl ented in Table 3. Table 3. Organole Criteria Shape	nod using 70% alcohol. W der. From that results, the il Palm Leaves Extracted Thick Extract (g) 178 eptic results showed that t ackish-brown, and has a ty ptic Results of Oil Palm L Organoleptic Results thick and concentrated I	Ve obtained as much a yield we got was 21.4 Using 70% alcohol. Yield (%) 21.4 the extract of oil palm pical aroma of oil palm eaves Extract.	is 178 g thick %. The results leaves in the m leaves. The	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt Formatted: Font: Bold Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, After: 6 pt Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt
1. Extracts Exa straction was d stract from 830 in be seen in Ta 1.1 Organolept rm of thick and sults were prese	mination one by maceration meti g of oil palm leaves pow ble 2. Fable 2. The Yield of O Leaves Powder (g) 830 tic Results. The organol concentrated liquid, bl ented in Table 3. Table 3. Organole Criteria Shape Aroma	nod using 70% alcohol. W der. From that results, the il Palm Leaves Extracted Thick Extract (g) 178 eptic results showed that the ackish-brown, and has a ty ptic Results of Oil Palm L Organoleptic Results thick and concentrated I typical aroma of oil palm	Ve obtained as much a yield we got was 21.4 Using 70% alcohol. <u>Yield (%)</u> 21.4 the extract of oil palm pical aroma of oil pal eaves Extract.	as 178 g thick %. The results	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt Formatted: Font: Bold Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, After: 6 pt Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt Formatted: Font: Bold Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt

These results were suitable with research conducted by Febrina *et al.* (2018) who used 96% ethanol as a solvent [10].

 Table 4. Phytochemical Screening of Oil Palm Leaves Extract.

Plant Constituents	Tests	Results
	Dragendorff	(+)
Alkaloid	Bouchardart	(+)
	Mayer	(+)
Saponin	Water and HCl	(+)
Tanin	FeCL ₃	(+)
Flavonoid	Na Nitrit 5%, HCl 1%, NaOH 1 N	(+)
Triterpenoid	Cloroform, H ₂ SO ₄ P	(+)
(+): present.		

Formatted: Space Before:	0 pt, After: 6 pt
Formatted: Space Before:	0 pt
Formatted: Centered	
Formatted: Centered	
Formatted: Centered	
Company de Company d	
Formatted: Centered	
Formatted: Centered	
Formatted: Centered	
Formatted: Space Before:	0 pt
Formatted: Centered, Space	ce Before: 0 pt
Formatted: Left, Space Be	fore: 0 pt, Tab stops: 1.28",
+ 1.48", Left + Not at 1.18	

Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt

3.2. Solid Soap Bar Formulation

Solid soap bar was formulated into three concentrations, namely 1%, 2%, and 4%. The process of making soap was done by the cold process method. The cold process is recommended by small-scale enterprise soap makers in low-resource contexts, particularly in tropical regions due to quick solidification of local oils [19]. The results of the formulation showed that the base formula looked brighter, whereas in soap with concentrations of 1%, 2%, and 4% are slightly darker. The higher the concentration of the extract, the darker the soap preparations will be.

3.3. Soap Evaluation

The soap evaluation was carried out aiming to see whether the solid soap meets the requirements to SNI (Indonesian National Standard) 2016 on bath soap which includes organoleptic tests, hardness test, moisture content, foam level test, free alkali content, and pH test [20].

3.3.1. Organoleptic Tests. The organoleptic test was done by visually observing the solid bar soap including form, colour, and aroma.

 Table 5. Organoleptic Tests of Solid Bar Soap.

Formula	Basic colour of the soap	Aroma	Form
BF	White	Typical of oil palm leaves	Solid
F1	Brownish-yellow	Typical of oil palm leaves	Solid

	Formatted: Space After: 6 pt
(Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt
\searrow	Formatted Table

F2	Brown	Typical of oil palm leaves	Solid	
F3	Blackish-brown	Typical of oil palm leaves	Solid	
BF: basis for	mula; F1: formula with 1%	o oil palm leaves extract; F2: formul	a with 2%	 Formatted: Left, Indent: Left: 0.49", Right: 0.39", Space
oil palm leav	es extract; F3: formula wit	h 4% oil palm leaves extract.		Before: 0 pt

Organoleptic tests showed that whether BF, F1, F2, and F3 has solid form and has a distinctive aromation of oil palm leaves, which is not commercial to promote. Whereas based on the colour produced, the basis formula soap showed white colour, F1 has a brownish-yellow colour, F2 has a brown colour, and F3 has a blackish-brown colour.

Based on the colour and aroma we added additional dye and bubble gum fragrance to cover the basic colour and aroma of the soap. That additional were expected can make the soap colour more attractive and cover the distinctive aroma of the leaves that are less pleasant (**Figure 1**).



Figure 1. Solid bar soap formulation. BF: basis formula; F1: formula with 1% oil palm leaves extract; F2: formula with 2% oil palm leaves extract; F3: formula with 4% oil palm leaves extract.

3.3.2. Foam Level and Stability. The results of foam level and stability presented at Table 6.

Table 6. Foam Level and Stability of Solid Bar Soap from Oil Palm Leaves Extract.

Formula	High Initial Foam (cm)	High Final Foam (cm)	Foam Stability (%)
BF	9.5	6.7	99.70
F1	10.3	7.7	99.74
F2	9.7	7.5	99.77
F3	9.5	7.5	99.79

BF: basis formula; F1: formula with 1% oil palm leaves extract; F2: formula with 2% oil palm leaves extract; F3: formula with 4% oil palm leaves extract.

The results of the foam level and foam stability tests showed that BF has a stability of 99.70%, F1 of 99.74%, F2 of 99.77%, and at F3 of 99.79%. From these results, it can be concluded that F3 has the best stability among other formulations.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.2"

Formatted: Font: Bold Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.1", Right: 0.3", Space Before: 18 pt Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.1", Right: 0.3" Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.59", Right: 0.59", Space Before: 0 pt

Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt

3.3.3. pH Test

 Table 7. pH Test Result of Solid Bar Soap from Oil

 Palm Leaves Extract.

Formula	рН
BF	9.27 ± 0.06
F1	9.58 ± 0.06
F2	9.82 ± 0.06
F3	9.79 ± 0.06

BF: basis formula; F1: formula with 1% oil palm leaves extract; F2: formula with 2% oil palm leaves extract; F3: formula with 4% oil palm leaves extract

The pH measurement was done at week 3 because making soap using the cold process method takes 2-4 weeks for a stable pH. Soap will experience a curing time where the soap will undergo a maturation process. Curing time is the time needed to evaporate water in natural soap so that the soap will be safe to use, harder, better foam, stable pH, softer if used, and more durable. The results of the pH test showed that BF, F1, F2 and F3 had a pH that was still within the limits allowed for the preparation of soap that is 9-11 [17].

3.3.4. Soap Hardness Test. Requirements for the value of soap hardness are not yet available so there are no requirements that indicate hardness in soap. the result of the test can be seen in **Table 8**.

 Table 8.
 Hardness Test of Solid Bar Soap.

Formula	Hardness (mm)
BF	16.00 10-1
F1	16.05 10-1
F2	17.00 10-1
F3	18.00 10-1

BF: basis formula; F1: formula with 1% oil palm leaves extract; F2: formula with 2% oil palm leaves extract; F3: formula with 4% oil palm leaves extract

From the results (**Table 8**), we can see that soap which is 3 weeks old shows hardness on a basis-16.00 10^{-1} , whereas in Formulation 1% the extract shows hardness 16.05 10^{-1} , Formulation 2% extract shows hardness 17.00 10^{-1} , The 4% extract formulation showed a hardness of 18.00 10^{-1} . These results indicate that the ethanol extract of oil palm leaves can affect the hardness of the soap. The higher the concentration of the extract given to the soap, the softer the soap. Formatted: Left, Indent: Left: 2.17", Right: 0.59"

F	formatted: Centered
F	ormatted Table
F	Formatted: Centered
F	Formatted: Indent: Left: 2.17", Right: 0.69", Space Before: 0 pt
F	formatted: Indent: First line: 0.2", Space Before: 0 pt
F	Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.2", Space Before: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt

Formatted Table

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.77", Right: 1.18"

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.2", Space Before: 0 pt Formatted: Font: Bold

	.						•	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt
3.3.5. Moisture Content. N. contained in solid soap afte	loisture content te er drying at a temp	sting on s perature o	soap aim of 105 ℃	to me for 60	asure th minutes	e per cent of water contents susing a Moisture Content	it it	
Balance Analyzer (Table 9). The maximum	permissi	ble mois	ture con	ntent in	soap is 15% [20].		Formatted: Font: Bold
	Table 9. MoistLeaves Extract.	ure Conte	ent on So	olid Bar	Soap fi	rom Oil Palm	•	Formatted: Left, Indent: Left: 1.77", Right: 0.79"
	Formula	Mois	sture Co	ntent (%)			
	BF		10.6	50				
	F1		12.9	7				
	F2		10.9	0				
	F3		8.2	8				
	BF: basis form extract; F2: for formula with 49	nula; F1: rmula wi % oil pali	formul ith 2% o m leaves	a with oil paln extract	1% oil 1 leaves	palm leaves s extract; F3:	•	Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.77", Right: 0.79"
The testing was done at process method which w saponification process. Bes the water content in the so requirements of SNI 3532-	fter the soap has b vill be stable wit sides that, the dura ap had evaporated 2016 (less than 15	een store hin 2-4 ation of s l. The res	ed for 3 v weeks. oap stora sults of t	weeks. The second secon	The soa at the s cts the l showed	p was made using the col- soap undergoes a perfec- nardness of the soap due t that all formulas meet th	d∙ et e	Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.2", Space Before: 0 pt
requirements of SIM 5552.	2010 (less than 1.	<i>70</i>).						Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt
3.3.6. Free Fatty Acid Te compounds or triglyceride power to clean the soap b The presence of free fatty a after boiling in neutral alco KOH [20]	est. Free fatty acide compounds (neu ecause free fatty a acids can be check bohol. Free fatty ac	ds are fa tral fat). acids are ed if ther ids which	tty acid The hig undesira e is no re h dissolv	s in soa h free f able cou ed colou ye in ne	ap that atty aci nponen ir on the utral alc	are not bound as sodiur ds in soap will reduce th ts in the cleaning process phenolphthalein indicato cohol are then titrated with	n e s. r h	
The results of testing fr 0.958%, and in F3 was 0 produced meets the quality This means that the solid the free fatty acids so that the material.	ee fatty acid level .789%. Based on y requirements of loar soap from the soap has good cle	s in the l the data bath soap ethanol e an power	BF was 1 , it is kn accordi extract of and als	1.128%, nown th ing to S f the oil o has a	in the l at the a NI, whi palm la good at	F1 was 0.846%, in F2 wa amount of free fatty acid ch is a maximum of 2.5% eaves has a low amount o bility to clean oil from oil	s s f y	Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.2", Space Before: 0 pt
3 3 7 Hadania Tast Than	sults of the hader	ia tasta r	racanta	l at Tab	10 10		•	Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt
J.J. T. Heading Test. The R	Suits of the hedol	ne tests p	resemed	1 at 1 aU	10 10.			
	Table 10.	Average	of Hedo	nic Test	:			
	Criteria	BF	F1	F2	F3			
	Appearance	7.65	7.15	6.90	6.40			
	Colour	7.60	7.25	6.50	5.75			
	Aroma	7.80	6.05	4.45	4.30			

I

Moisture	7.00	7.05	7.35	7.45	
Irritation	6.15	6.15	6.20	6.25	

BF: basis formula; F1: formula with 1% oil palm leaves extract; F2: formula with 2% oil palm leaves extract; F3: formula with 4% oil palm leaves extract

Based on the table, it shows that in terms of appearance, colour and aroma, the BF was more dominant than other formulas, with average values of 7.65, 7.6 and 7.8, respectively (**Table 10**). The appearance of BF is more eye-catching and fresh. The aroma of the soap was also quite fresh. While, the formula containing ethanol extract of oil palm leaves has a distinctive aroma of oil palm, making it less attractive to panellists. The higher concentration of the extract, the fewer enthusiasm of the panellists, because the extract has a less pleasant aroma, even though a fragrance has been added but it still cannot cover the original aroma of the extract itself.

On the other hand, the hedonic test results in terms of humidity and irritation, showed that F3 has the highest average value are F3 with an average point of 7.45 and 6.25, respectively. Soap added with ethanol extract of oil palm leaves has a pretty good humidity when compared to BF. Hedonic observations or preferences in terms of irritation test have a little difference, of the 20 panellists there is one panellist who is irritated to the skin that is a change in the colour of the skin becomes reddish and itchy. It happens possibly because has a different skin type, and maybe he/she has sensitive skin types that have a negative impact on the skin.

3.4. Antibacterial Activity

The results of the antibacterial activity test was presented at Table 11.

The data from **Table 11** showed that the solid bar soap from the oil palm leaves extract with a concentration of 1%, 2%, and 4% have inhibitory action against *S. aureus* with a diameter of the inhibitory zone about 8.53 mm, 10.53 mm, 12.91 mm, respectively. However, it did not inhibit the growth of *E. coli*.

Formatted: Justified, Indent: Left: 1.58", Right: 0.69"

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0" Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.2", Space Before: 0 pt

Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt

Formatted: Font: Bold
Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0", Space Before: 6 pt

Table 11. The Diameter of Inhibitory Zone of Oil Palm Leaves Extract_Against *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Escherichia coli*.

	Diameter of Inhibitory Zone (mm)					
Samples	Escherichia coli	Staphylococcus aureus				
BF	-	8.02				
F1	-	8.53				
F2	-	10.53				
F3	-	12.91				

Formatted: Left, Indent: Left: 1.38", Right: 0.59"

K+	26.96	13.70	
K-	-	-	_
BF: basis for F2: formula 4% oil palm	mula; F1: formula wi with 2% oil palm lea leaves extract; K+: J	th 1% oil palm leaves ex ves extract; F3: formula positive control; K-: neg	stract; Formatted: Justified, Indent: Left: 1.38", Right: 1.08" a with gative
control; - : no	o inhibitory zone		

The data from Table 11 showed that the solid bar soap from the oil paim leaves extract with a concentration of 1%, 2%, and 4% have inhibitory action against *S. aureus* with a diameter of the inhibitory zone about 8.53 mm, 10.53 mm, 12.91 mm, respectively. However, it did not inhibit the growth of *E. coli*.

The diameter of the inhibition formed, presumably due to the presence of secondary metabolites such as alkaloid, tannins, saponins, flavonoids, and terpenoid contained in ethanol extracts of oil palm leaves which known as a potential antibacterial agent. Alkaloid compounds work by disrupting the peptidoglycan component of bacterial cells so that the cell wall layer is not formed intact and causes the death cell. Tannins are a group of polyphenol compounds which have antibacterial activity, the mechanism of action of tannins as an antibacterial is thought to be able to shrink the cell walls so that they interfere with the permeability of bacterial cells, due to disruption of permeability, bacterial cells cannot carry out living activities so that growth is inhibited or even dies. Flavonoids have antibacterial activity caused by the ability of flavonoids to form complexes with extracellular proteins and are dissolved so that the bacterial cell membranes will be damaged and lose their function to detergents, as a result, saponins will reduce the surface tension of bacterial cell walls and damage membrane permeability. Damage to the cell membrane is very disturbing survival of bacteria [5, 21].

4. Conclusion

The solid bar soap from ethanol extracts of oil palm leaves meets the requirements SNI 3532: 2016 dan ASTM 2002. The soap has antibacterial activity against *S. aureus*, but does not inhibit the growth of *E.coli*.

5. References

[1]	Badan	Pusat	Statistik.	2019.	BPS.	Source:		
	https://www.bps.go.id/publication/2017/11/10/5c499ba5089da29bba2a148e/statistik-kelapa-							
	sawit-indonesia-2016.html access at feb 26th, 2019.							

- [2] Hambali, E. & Rivai, M. 2017. The Potential of Palm Oil Waste Biomass in Indonesia in 2020 and 2030. *Earth and Environmental Sciences*, vol. 65, pp. 1-9.
- [3] Dungani, R., Aditiawati, P., Aprilia, S., Yuniarti, K., Karliati, T., Suwandhi, I., & Sumardi, I. 2018. *Biomaterial from Oil Palm Waste: Properties, Characterization and Applications. In: Palm Oil, Edited by Waisundara, V. Intech Open:* 31-51pp.
- [4] Yusof, N.Z., Gani, S.S.A., Siddiqul, Y., Mohktar, N.F.M., & Hasan, Z.A.A. Potential Uses of Oil Palm (*Elaeis guineensis*) Leaf Extract in Topical Application. *Journal of Oil Palm Research*, vol. 28 (4), pp. 520 – 530.
- [5] Cowan, M. M. 1999. Plant products as antimicrobial agents. *Clinical Microbiology Reviews*, vol. 12(4), pp. 564–582.
- [6] Vijayarathna, S., Zakaria, Z., Chen, Y., Latha, L.Y., Kanwar, J.R., & Sasidharan, S. 2012. The Antimicrobial Efficacy of *Elaeis guineensis*: Characterization, *in Vitro* and *in Vivo* Studies. *Molecules* vol. 17, pp. 4860-4877.

Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt

Commented [ba1]: Mohon disesuaikan sesuai dengan

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.2", Space Before: 0 pt

- [7] Yin, N.S., Abdullah, S., & Phin, C.K. 2013. Phytochemical Constituents From Leaves of OF Elaeis guineensis and Their Antioxidant and Antimicrobial Activities. International Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, vol. 5, Suppl 4, pp. 37-140.
- [8] Aziz, N.A., Halim, U.N., & Abdullah, N.S. 2015. Phytochemical Screening and In Vitro Antibacterial Activity of *Elaeis guineensis* Leaves Extracts Against Human Pathogenic Bacteria. Malaysian Journal of Analytical Sciences, Vol 19 No 4, pp. 775 – 780.
- [9] Chonga, K.H., Zurainia, Z., Sasidharanb,S., Devib, P.V.K., Lathac, L.Y., & Ramanathand, S. 2008. Antimicrobial Activity of *Elaeis guineensis* Leaf. *Pharmacologyonline*, vol. 3, pp. 379-386.
- [10] Febrina, D., Febriyanti, R., Zam, S.I., Handoko, J., Fatah, A., & Juliantoni, J. 2018. Antibacterial Activity Testing and Ethanol Extract Characterization of Oil Palm Fronds (*Elaeis guineensis* Jacq). *Pak J Nutr*, vol. 17, 9, pp. 427-433.
- [11] Berutu, R., Syarifudin, A., & Simahombing, Y.R. 2018. Formulasi Sediaan Sabun Mandi Padat Dari Ekstrak Etanol Buah Mengkudu (*Morinda Citrifolia* L.) Segar. Jurnal Penelitian Herbal Farmasi, vol. 1(1), 33-39.
- [12] Depkes RI. 2008. Farmakope Herbal Indonesia Edisi I. Jakarta: Direktorat Pengawasan Obat dan Makanan.
- [13] BPOM. 2010. Monografi Ekstrak Tumbuhan Indonesia. Jakarta: Direktorat Standardisasi Obat Trandisional, Kosmetik dan Produk Komplemen BPOM RI.
- [14] Depkes RI. 1989. Materia Medika Indonesia Jilid V. Jakarta: Direktorat Pengawasan Obat dan Makanan.
- [15] Pandey, A. & Tripathi, S. 2014. Concept of standardization, extraction and pre phytochemical screening strategies for herbal drug. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, vol. 2(5), pp. 115-119.
- [16] Hambali, E., Bunasor, T.K., Suryani, A., & Kusumah, G.A. 2006. Aplikasi Dietanolamida dari Asam Laurat Minyak Inti Sawit pada Pembuatan Sabun Padat. *Jurnal Teknik Industri*, vol. 15, pp. 46-53.
- [17] American Nasional Standard. 2002. Annual Book Of ASTM Standards. West Conshocken. PA USA.
- [18] Hudzicki, J. 2016. Kirby-Bauer Disk Diffusion Susceptibility Test Protocol. American Society for Microbiology. 1 – 23 pp.
- [19] Burleson, G., Butcher, B., Goodwin, B., Sharp, K., & Ruder, B. 2017. Soap-Making Process Improvement: Including Social, Cultural and Resource Constraints in the Engineering Design Process. *International Journal for Service Learning in Engineering, Humanitarian Engineering and Social Entrepreneurship*, vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 81-102.
- [20] SNI. 2016. SNI 3532: 2016: Sabun Mandi. Jakarta: Badan Standarisasi Nasional.
- [21] Syafriana, V. & Rusyita, R. 2017. Uji Aktivitas Antibakteri Ekstrak Etanol Daun Sirih Merah (*Piper crocatum*) Terhadap Pertumbuhan *Propionibacterium acnes*. Sainstech Farma, vol. 10 No.2, pp. 9-11.

The Utilization of Oil Palm Leaves (*Elaeis guineensis* Jacq.) Waste as an Antibacterial Solid Bar Soap

Amelia Febriani^{1*}, Vilya Syafriana¹, Hendra Afriyando¹, and Yayah Siti Djuhariah¹

¹Faculty of Pharmacy, National Institute of Science and Technology, Jl. Moh. Kahfi II, Srengseng Sawah, Jagakarsa, Jakarta 12640

*Corresponding author: ameliafebriani@istn.ac.id

Abstract. Oil palm leaves (Elaeis guineensis Jacq), which have been underutilized by the community and become waste that usually stacked around the trees, have the potential to be used as active ingredients for making antibacterial solid bar soap. The chemical content of oil palm leaves are tannins, alkaloids, and flavonoids that known had antibacterial activity. This research aims to produce oil palm leaves extracts into an active ingredient of solid bar soap formulation with antibacterial activity against Escherichia coli and Staphylococcus aureus and also to evaluate the quality of the solid bar soap. The soap was formulated into 3-three formulas with varying concentrations of oil palm leaves ethanolic extract that was F1 (1%), F2 (2%), and F3 (4%). Oil palm leaves extract was prepared with maceration using ethanol 70%. Antibacterial activity assay of the solid bar soap was carried out using a disc diffusion method with tetracycline as the positive control (K+) and distilled water as the negative control (K-). The soap quality was evaluated for its organoleptic, foam level and foam stability, pH, hardness, water content, and free fatty acid. The results showed that all three solid soap formulas meet the soap quality requirements of SNI No. 3532-2016. The solid bar soap did not have inhibition properties against Escherichia coli. However, had inhibition effect against Staphylococcus aureus with an average Inhibition Zone Diameter (IZD) on soap base, F1, F2, and F3 was 8.02 mm, 8.53 mm, 10.53 mm, 12.91 mm respectively.

Keywords: antibacterial activity, Elaeis guineensis Jacq., ethanol extract, oil palm leaves waste, solid soap

1. Introduction

1

Oil palm (*Elaeis guineensis* Jacq.) is an important essential commodity for the Indonesian economy. Oil palm plays a role in generating more foreign exchange than oil and gas [1]. One of the uses of oil palm is as a producer of vegetable cooking oil. Oil produced from oil palm able to produce oil seven times higher than rapeseeds (*Brassica napus*) and eleven times higher than soybean per hectare. Since 2004, oil palm has slowly become a worldwide vegetable oil with a total production of 30 million tons and an average growth rate of 8% per year [2]. Unfortunately, this industry leaves waste, such as kernel shells, mesocarp fibers, oil palm trunks (stems), and oil palm fronds (leaves) [2,3]. Hambali & Rivai (2017) reported that oil palm leaf waste in 2015 reached 124,032,861 tons. This value is likely to continue to increase with time [2].

Oil palm leaves, normally underutilized by the community. They usually left alone to rot between the oil palm trunks. The abundance aims to maintain the sustainability of the soil and nutrient cycle in the plantation [4]. The oil palm leaves contain major compounds such as alkaloids, tannins, and

flavonoids. These compounds are known to act as antimicrobials because they can damage cell walls, disrupt cell permeability, and inhibit enzyme or protein [5,6,7,8].

Several studies have proven that oil palm leaf extract has antimicrobial activity. Previous studies reported that oil palm leaf extracts were able to inhibit the growth of *Escherichia coli* and *Staphylococcus aureus* [8,9,10]. Other research stated that in addition to its potential as an antibacterial, oil palm leaf extract also has the potential to be a skin protective agent from UV radiation. Based on this, Yusof et al. (2006) suggest that oil palm leaf extracts can be made into a topical application for skin protection [4].

One form of topical application that can be used to maintain health is soap. Soap is a product that is produced from the reaction between fatty acids with strong bases that function to wash and clean fat or dirt. There are two types of soap, namely solid soap and liquid soap. Most people come down using solid soap (bar soap) to clean the body because bar soap is cheaper, easier to use, and efficient in cleaning the skin [11]. This study aims to test the formulation of soap from oil palm leaves extracts for its activity as antibacterial soap.

2. Material and Methods

2.1. Materials

The oil palm leaves were obtained from Desa Bogatama, Lampung, Indonesia. Chemicals being used 70% ethanol, aquadest, H₂SO₄, HCl, acetic acid, Nutrient Agar (NA), olive oil, coconut oil, palm oil, sodium lactate, dyes, fragrance, Sodium hydroxide (NaOH), NaOH 0.1 N, plastic wrap. The microorganisms we used *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Escherichia coli* bacteria.

2.2. Extraction of Oil Palm Leaves

The oil palm leaves were cut into small pieces and washed thoroughly with water and then dried using the oven. The dried leaves were mashed using a blender into a powder. The leaf powder then sieved using a 60 mesh sieve to obtain uniform particle sizes. The powder then macerated using 70% ethanol with a ratio of 1:10 for 1 x 24 hours with stirring every 6 hours. The filtrate obtained was filtered, and the dregs were re-macerated 2-two times. Furthermore, the filtrate obtained from maceration was concentrated using a vacuum rotary evaporator, then evaporated on a water bath until a thick extract was produced from oil palm leaf powder [12].

2.3. Extracts Examination

2.3.1. Organoleptic. The organoleptic examination based on Monograph Ekstrak Tumbuhan Indonesia [13].

2.3.2. *Phytochemical Screening*. Phytochemical screening was carried out based on Materia Medika Indonesia (Depkes RI, 1989) and Pandey & Tripathi (2014). Screening includes testing for alkaloids, flavonoids, tannins, saponins, steroids and triterpenoids [14,15].

2.4. Soap Formulation

The formulation refers to Hambali *et al.* (2006) with modification [16]. The composition of the formula in 100 ml aquadest $\frac{\text{add-is}}{\text{is presented in Table 1.}}$

Table 1. Soap Bar Formulation.

Matariala	Concentration (%)				
Materials	Base (BF)	F1	F2	F3	
Oil Palm Leaves Extract	0	1	2	4	
NaOH	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	
Coconut Oil	20	20	20	20	
Palm Oil	35	35	35	35	
Olive Oil	10	10	10	10	
Sodium lactate	1.95	1.95	1.95	1.95	
Distilled water	22.1	22.1	22.1	22.1	
Colouring	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	
Fragrance	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	

Solid soap formulations were carried out by dissolving NaOH in distilled water. NaOH solution is mixed with sodium lactate. The mixture of solutions was called the first mixture. Meanwhile, at <u>a</u> different container, we mixed the coconut oil, olive oil, and palm oil, known as the second mixture. The first mixture was poured into the second mixture bit by bit. The mixture was stirring until homogeneous using a hand blender and a *trace* occurs (a condition in which the soap has formed with a sign of the thickening soap mass). The ethanol extract of oil palm leaves was added at the time of the *trace*. Following this, After that, the mixture was stirred again until homogeneous, then added fragrance and colouring. The liquid soapy mass is poured into a mold and incubated for 24 hours until it hardens.

2.5. Soap Evaluation

2.5.1 Organoleptic Evaluation. Organoleptic evaluation by observing the colour, texture, and aroma of the soap

2.5.2. *pH Test*. An amount of 1 g soap sample was dissolved into 10 mL distilled water and stirred until homogenous. The solution was measured using pH meter. According to ASTM (2002) the pH of a relatively safe soap is 9-11 [17].

2.5.3. Foam Level and Stability. About 1 gram of soap was put into a test tube containing 10 ml of distilled water and then shaken with vortex for 30 minutes. The height of <u>the</u> foam formed is measured using a ruler (initial foam height). The height of the foam is measured again after a few minutes (high foam end).

Foam Stability = 100% - % Lost foam

% Foam loss = (High initial foam - High final foam)/ (High initial foam) x 100%

2.5.4. Soap Hardness. The hardness of the soap was done using a penetrometer. The needle on the penetrometer was inserted into the sample and allowed to penetrate the material for 5 seconds at a constant temperature (27° C). The depth of needle penetration into the material is expressed in 1/10 mm of the number indicated on the penetrometer scale.

2.5.4. Moisture Content. Measurement of moisture content was using Moisture Content Balance [Ohaus].

Free Fatty Acid = 0.282xVxN / w 100% Information: Free fatty acids in units of% mass fraction V = volume of KOH used (mL) N = normality of KOH used B = sample weight (g) 282 = equivalent weight of oleic acid (C18H34O2)

2.5.6. *Hedonic Test.* The hedonic test was performed to compare BF, F1, F2, and F3. This test aims to determine which formula was preferred by consumers. The criteria of the test were appearance, colour, aroma, skin irritation test, and skin moisture test. The preference test was carried out using 20 panel-list consisting of men and women at random, with an age range of 18-35 years. The score for the panel-list preference level used was around 1-8.

Criteria:

- 1 = very, very dislike
- 2 =really don't like it
- 3 =don't like it
- 4 = rather not like
- 5 = normal / neutral
- 6 = rather like it
- 7 = like

8 = really like it

2.6. Antibacterial Test

2.6.1. Bacterial Suspensions. About 1-2 ose of bacterial cells were suspended in 5 ml of a 0.9% NaCl solution. The Tturbidity of bacterial suspension was equivalent to Mc. Farland 3 (3 x 10^8). The suspension was then diluted to obtain 3 x 10^7 CFU / ml.

2.6.2. Diffusion Test. The antibacterial activity test was using the disk diffusion method (Kirby-Bauer Method). A total of $20 \ \mu$ l of a solid soap solution is dripped onto disk paper and awaited until it dries. Meanwhile, petri dishes containing NA media were inoculated with 0.1 ml of bacterial suspension and spread evenly over the plates. The disk that has been dripped by the sample was then placed on the surface of the media. The same method was also done on tetracycline as a positive control and aquadest as a negative control. Samples were incubated at 37°C for 24 hours and then observed inhibitory zones were formed [18].

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Extracts Examination

Extraction was done by <u>the</u> maceration method using 70% alcohol. We obtained as much as 178 g thick extract from 830 g of oil palm leaves powder. From <u>that</u> results, the yield we <u>got obtain</u> was 21.4%. The results can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2. The Yield of Oil Palm Leaves Extracted Using 70% alcohol.

Leaves Powder (g)	Thick Extract (g)	Yield (%)
830	178	21.4

3.1.1 Organoleptic Results. The organoleptic results showed that the extract of oil palm leaves in the form of thick and concentrated liquid, blackish-brown, and has a typical aroma of oil palm leaves. The results were presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Organoleptic Results of Oil Palm Leaves Extract.

Criteria	Organoleptic Results
Shape	thick and concentrated liquid
Aroma	the typical aroma of oil palm leaves
Colour	Blackish-brown

3.1.2. Phytochemical Screening. The results of the phytochemical screening showed that the ethanolic extract of oil palm leaves contains an alkaloid, saponin, tannin, flavonoid, and triterpenoid (Table 4). These results were suitable similar with research conducted by Febrina *et al.* (2018) who used 96% ethanol as a solvent [10].

Table 4. Phytochemical Screening of Oil Palm Leaves Extract.

Plant Constituents	Tests	Results
	Dragendorff	(+)
Alkaloid	Bouchardart	(+)
	Mayer	(+)
Saponin	Water and HCl	(+)
Tanin	FeCL ₃	(+)
Flavonoid	Na Nitrit 5%, HCl 1%, NaOH 1 N	(+)
Triterpenoid	Cloroform, H ₂ SO ₄ P	(+)
	(+): present.	

3.2. Solid Soap Bar Formulation

Solid soap bar was formulated into three concentrations, namely 1%, 2%, and 4%. The process of making soap was <u>done_conducted</u> by the cold process method. The cold process is recommended by small-scale enterprise soap makers in low-resource contexts, particularly in tropical regions, due to <u>the quick-fast</u> solidification of local oils [19]. The results of the formulation showed that the base formula looked brighter, whereas in soap with concentrations of 1%, 2%, and 4% are slightly darker. The higher the concentration of the extract, the darker the soap preparations will be.

3.3. Soap Evaluation

The soap evaluation was carried out, aiming to see whether the solid soap meets the requirements to of SNI (Indonesian National Standard) 2016 on bath soap, which includes organoleptic tests, hardness test, moisture content, foam level test, free alkali content, and pH test [20].

3.3.1. Organoleptic Tests. The organoleptic test was done by visually observing the solid bar soap, including form, colour, and aroma.

Formula	Basic colour of the soap	Aroma	Form
BF	White	Typical of oil palm leaves	Solid
F1	Brownish-yellow	Typical of oil palm leaves	Solid
F2	Brown	Typical of oil palm leaves	Solid
F3	Blackish-brown	Typical of oil palm leaves	Solid

Table 5. Organoleptic Tests of Solid Bar Soap.

BF: basis formula; F1: formula with 1% oil palm leaves extract; F2: formula with 2% oil palm leaves extract; F3: formula with 4% oil palm leaves extract.

Organoleptic tests showed that whether BF, F1, F2, and F3 has solid form and has a distinctive aroma of oil palm leaves, which is not commercial to promote. Whereas, based on the colour produced, the basis formula soap showed white colour, F1 has a brownish-yellow colour, F2 has a brown colour, and F3 has a blackish-brown colour.

Based on the colour and aroma we added additional dye and bubble gum fragrance to cover the basic colour and aroma of the soap. That additional were was expected can make the soap colour more attractive and cover the distinctive aroma of the leaves that are less pleasant (Figure 1).



Figure 1. Solid bar soap formulation. BF: basis formula; F1: formula with 1% oil palm leaves extract; F2: formula with 2% oil palm leaves extract; F3: formula with 4% oil palm leaves extract. *3.3.2. Foam Level and Stability*. The results of foam level and stability presented at in Table 6.

Formula	High Initial Foam (cm)	High Final Foam (cm)	Foam Stability (%)
BF	9.5	6.7	99.70
F1	10.3	7.7	99.74
F2	9.7	7.5	99.77
F3	9.5	7.5	99.79

Table 6. Foam Level and Stability of Solid Bar Soap from Oil Palm Leaves Extract.

BF: basis formula; F1: formula with 1% oil palm leaves extract; F2: formula with 2% oil palm leaves extract; F3: formula with 4% oil palm leaves extract.

The results of the foam level and foam stability tests showed that BF has a stability of 99.70%, F1 of 99.74%, F2 of 99.77%, and at F3 of 99.79%. From these results, it can be concluded that F3 has the best stability among other formulations.

3.3.3. pH Test

Table 7. pH Test Result of Solid Bar Soap from Oil Palm Leaves Extract.

Formula	pН
BF	9.27 ± 0.06
F1	9.58 ± 0.06
F2	9.82 ± 0.06
F3	9.79 ± 0.06

BF: basis formula; F1: formula with 1% oil palm leaves extract; F2: formula with 2% oil palm leaves extract; F3: formula with 4% oil palm leaves extract

The pH measurement was done at week 3 because making soap using the cold process method takes 2-4 weeks for a stable pH. Soap will experience a curing time where the soap will undergo a maturation process. Curing time is the time needed to evaporate water in natural soap so that the soap will be safe to use, harder, better foam, stable pH, softer if used, and more durable. The results of the pH test showed that BF, F1, F2 and F3 had a pH that was still within the limits allowed for the preparation of soap that is 9-11 [17].

3.3.4. Soap Hardness Test. Requirements for the value of soap hardness are not yet available so there are no requirements that indicate hardness in soap. the result of the test can be seen in Table 8.

Table 8.	Hardness Test of Solid Bar Soan
Table 0.	That difess Test of Sond Dai Soap.

Formula	Hardness (mm)
BF	16.00 10-1
F1	16.05 10-1
F2	17.00 10-1
F3	18.00 10-1

BF: basis formula; F1: formula with 1% oil palm leaves extract; F2: formula with 2% oil palm leaves extract; F3: formula with 4% oil palm leaves extract

From the results (Table 8), we can see that soap which is 3 weeks old shows hardness on a basis $16.00 \ 10^{-1}$, whereas in Formulation 1% the extract shows hardness $16.05 \ 10^{-1}$. Formulation 2% extract shows hardness $17.00 \ 10^{-1}$. The 4% extract formulation showed a hardness of $18.00 \ 10^{-1}$. These results indicate that the ethanol extract of oil palm leaves can affect the hardness of the soap. The higher the concentration of the extract given to the soap, the softer the soap.

3.3.5. Moisture Content. Moisture content testing on soap aims to measure the per-cent of water content contained in solid soap after drying at a temperature of 105 °C for 60 minutes using a Moisture Content Balance Analyzer (Table 9). The maximum permissible moisture content in soap is 15% [20].

Table 9. Moisture Content on Solid Bar Soap from Oil Palm Leaves Extract.

Formula	Moisture Content (%)	
BF	10.60	
F1	12.97	
F2	10.90	
F3	8.28	

BF: basis formula; F1: formula with 1% oil palm leaves extract; F2: formula with 2% oil palm leaves extract; F3: formula with 4% oil palm leaves extract

The testing was done after the soap has been stored for <u>3three</u> weeks. The soap was made using the cold process method, which will be stable within 2-4 weeks. <u>So thatTherefore</u>, the soap undergoes a <u>perfect_complete</u> saponification process. <u>Besides thatFurthermore</u>, the duration of soap storage affects the hardness of the soap due to the water content in the soap had evaporated. The results of the test showed that all formulas meet the requirements of SNI 3532:2016 (less than 15%).

3.3.6. Free Fatty Acid Test. Free fatty acids are fatty acids in soap that are not bound as sodium compounds or triglyceride compounds (neutral fat). The high free fatty acids in soap will reduce the power to clean the soap because free fatty acids are undesirable components in the cleaning process. The presence of free fatty acids can be checked if there is no red colour on the phenolphthalein indicator after boiling in neutral alcohol. Free fatty acids which dissolve in neutral alcohol are then titrated with KOH [20].

The results of testing free fatty acid levels in the BF was 1.128%, in the F1 was 0.846%, in F2 was 0.958%, and in F3 was 0.789%. Based on the data, it is known that the amount of free fatty acids produced meets the quality requirements of bath soap according to SNI, which is a maximum of 2.5%. This means that the solid bar soap from the ethanol extract of the oil palm leaves has a low amount of free fatty acids. Thus, -so that the soap has good clean power and also has a good an excellent ability to clean oil from oily material.

3.3.7. Hedonic Test. The results of the hedonic tests presented at Table 10.

Criteria	BF	F1	F2	F3
Appearance	7.65	7.15	6.90	6.40
Colour	7.60	7.25	6.50	5.75
Aroma	7.80	6.05	4.45	4.30
Moisture	7.00	7.05	7.35	7.45
Irritation	6.15	6.15	6.20	6.25

 Table 10. Average of Hedonic Test

BF: basis formula; F1: formula with 1% oil palm leaves extract; F2: formula with 2% oil palm leaves extract; F3: formula with 4% oil palm leaves extract

Based on the table, it shows that in terms of appearance, colour_and aroma, the BF was more dominant than other formulas, with average values of 7.65, 7.6 and 7.8, respectively (Table 10). The appearance of BF is more eye-catching and fresh. The aroma of the soap was also quite fresh. While, the formula containing ethanol extract of oil palm leaves has a distinctive aroma of oil palm, making it less attractive to panellists. The higher concentration of the extract, the fewer-less_enthusiasm of the panellists, because the extract has a less pleasant aroma, even though a fragrance has been added but it still cannot cover the original aroma of the extract itself.

On the other hand, the hedonic test results in terms of humidity and irritation, showed that F3 has the highest average value are F3 with an average point of 7.45 and 6.25, respectively. Soap added with ethanol extract of oil palm leaves has a pretty good humidity when compared to BF. Hedonic observations or preferences in terms of irritation test have a little differencee, Among of the 20 panellists there is one panellist who is irritated to the skin that is a change in the colour of the skin becomes reddish and itchy. It happens possibly because the panelist has a different skin type, and maybe might be thehe/she has sensitive skin types that have a negative impact on the skin.

3.4. Antibacterial Activity

The results of the antibacterial activity test was were presented at in Table 11.

Table 11. The Diameter of Inhibitory Zone of Oil Palm Leaves Extract Against Staphylococcus aureus and Escherichia coli.

Samples	The Diameter of Inhibitory Zone (mm)	
	Escherichia coli	Staphylococcus aureus
BF	-	8.02
F1	-	8.53
F2	-	10.53
F3	-	12.91
K+	26.96	13.70
K-	-	-

BF: basis formula; F1: formula with 1% oil palm leaves extract; F2: formula with 2% oil palm leaves extract; F3: formula with 4% oil palm leaves extract; K+: positive control; K-: negative control; - : no inhibitory zone

The data from Table 11 showed that the solid bar soap from the oil palm leaves extract with a concentration of 1%, 2%, and 4% have inhibitory action against *S. aureus* with a diameter of the inhibitory zone about 8.53 mm, 10.53 mm, 12.91 mm, respectively. However, it did not inhibit the growth of *E. coli*.

The diameter of the inhibition formed, presumably due to the presence of secondary metabolites such as alkaloid, tannins, saponins, flavonoids, and terpenoid contained in ethanol extracts of oil palm leaves which known as a potential antibacterial agent. Alkaloid compounds work by disrupting the peptidoglycan component of bacterial cells so that the cell wall layer is not formed intact and causes the death cell. Tannins are a group of polyphenol compounds which have antibacterial activity, the mechanism of action of tannins as an antibacterial is thought to be able to shrink the cell walls so that they interfere with the permeability of bacterial cells, due to disruption of permeability, bacterial cells cannot carry out living activities so that growth is inhibited or even dies. Flavonoids have antibacterial activity caused by the ability of flavonoids to form complexes with extracellular proteins and are dissolved so that the bacterial cell membranes will be damaged and lose their function to detergents, as a result, saponins will reduce the surface tension of bacterial cell walls and damage membrane permeability. Damage to the cell membrane is a very disturbing survival of bacteria [5, 21].

4. Conclusion

The solid bar soap from ethanol extracts of oil palm leaves meets the requirements SNI 3532: 2016 dan ASTM 2002. The soap has antibacterial activity against *S. aureus*, but does not inhibit the growth of *E.coli*.

5. References

Formatted: Font color: Red

Commented [LA1]: Sentence fragment, this appears to bean incomplete sentence. Consider rewriting the sentence or connecting the fragment with another sentence. Formatted: Font color: Red Formatted: Font color: Red

- [1] Badan Pusat Statistik. 2019. BPS. Source: <u>https://www.bps.go.id/publication/2017/11/10/5c499ba5089da29bba2a148e/statistik-kelapa-</u> sawit-indonesia-2016.html_access at feb 26th, 2019.
- [2] Hambali, E. & Rivai, M. 2017. The Potential of Palm Oil Waste Biomass in Indonesia in 2020 and 2030. *Earth and Environmental Sciences*, vol. 65, pp. 1-9.
- [3] Dungani, R., Aditiawati, P., Aprilia, S., Yuniarti, K., Karliati, T., Suwandhi, I., & Sumardi, I. 2018. *Biomaterial from Oil Palm Waste: Properties, Characterization and Applications. In: Palm Oil, Edited by Waisundara, V. Intech Open:* 31-51pp.
- [4] Yusof, N.Z., Gani, S.S.A., Siddiqul, Y., Mohktar, N.F.M., & Hasan, Z.A.A. Potential Uses of Oil Palm (*Elaeis guineensis*) Leaf Extract in Topical Application. *Journal of Oil Palm Research*, vol. 28 (4), pp. 520 – 530.
- [5] Cowan, M. M. 1999. Plant products as antimicrobial agents. *Clinical Microbiology Reviews*, vol. 12(4), pp. 564–582.
- [6] Vijayarathna, S., Zakaria, Z., Chen, Y., Latha, L.Y., Kanwar, J.R., & Sasidharan, S. 2012. The Antimicrobial Efficacy of *Elaeis guineensis*: Characterization, *in Vitro* and *in Vivo* Studies. *Molecules* vol. 17, pp. 4860-4877.
- [7] Yin, N.S., Abdullah, S., & Phin, C.K. 2013. Phytochemical Constituents From Leaves of OF Elaeis guineensis and Their Antioxidant and Antimicrobial Activities. International Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, vol. 5, Suppl 4, pp. 37-140.
- [8] Aziz, N.A., Halim, U.N., & Abdullah, N.S. 2015. Phytochemical Screening and In Vitro Antibacterial Activity of Elaeis guineensis Leaves Extracts Against Human Pathogenic Bacteria. Malaysian Journal of Analytical Sciences, Vol 19 No 4, pp. 775 – 780.
- [9] Chonga, K.H., Zurainia, Z., Sasidharanb,S., Devib, P.V.K., Lathac, L.Y., & Ramanathand, S. 2008. Antimicrobial Activity of *Elaeis guineensis* Leaf. *Pharmacologyonline*, vol. 3, pp. 379-386.
- [10] Febrina, D., Febriyanti, R., Zam, S.I., Handoko, J., Fatah, A., & Juliantoni, J. 2018. Antibacterial Activity Testing and Ethanol Extract Characterization of Oil Palm Fronds (*Elaeis guineensis* Jacq). *Pak J Nutr*, vol. 17, 9, pp. 427-433.
- [11] Berutu, R., Syarifudin, A., & Simahombing, Y.R. 2018. Formulasi Sediaan Sabun Mandi Padat Dari Ekstrak Etanol Buah Mengkudu (*Morinda Citrifolia* L.) Segar. Jurnal Penelitian Herbal Farmasi, vol. 1(1), 33-39.
- [12] Depkes RI. 2008. *Farmakope Herbal Indonesia Edisi I*. Jakarta: Direktorat Pengawasan Obat dan Makanan.
- [13] BPOM. 2010. Monografi Ekstrak Tumbuhan Indonesia. Jakarta: Direktorat Standardisasi Obat Trandisional, Kosmetik dan Produk Komplemen BPOM RI.
- [14] Depkes RI. 1989. Materia Medika Indonesia Jilid V. Jakarta: Direktorat Pengawasan Obat dan Makanan.
- [15] Pandey, A. & Tripathi, S. 2014. Concept of standardization, extraction and pre phytochemical screening strategies for herbal drug. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, vol. 2(5), pp. 115-119.
- [16] Hambali, E., Bunasor, T.K., Suryani, A., & Kusumah, G.A. 2006. Aplikasi Dietanolamida dari Asam Laurat Minyak Inti Sawit pada Pembuatan Sabun Padat. *Jurnal Teknik Industri*, vol. 15, pp. 46-53.
- [17] American Nasional Standard. 2002. Annual Book Of ASTM Standards. West Conshocken. PA USA.
- [18] Hudzicki, J. 2016. Kirby-Bauer Disk Diffusion Susceptibility Test Protocol. American Society for Microbiology. 1 – 23 pp.
- [19] Burleson, G., Butcher, B., Goodwin, B., Sharp, K., & Ruder, B. 2017. Soap-Making Process Improvement: Including Social, Cultural and Resource Constraints in the Engineering Design Process. *International Journal for Service Learning in Engineering, Humanitarian Engineering and Social Entrepreneurship*, vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 81-102.

- [20] SNI. 2016. SNI 3532: 2016: Sabun Mandi. Jakarta: Badan Standarisasi Nasional.
 [21] Syafriana, V. & Rusyita, R. 2017. Uji Aktivitas Antibakteri Ekstrak Etanol Daun Sirih Merah (*Piper crocatum*) Terhadap Pertumbuhan *Propionibacterium acnes*. Sainstech Farma, vol. 10 No.2, pp. 9-11.