alcoholic content caused the determination of the alcoholic fraction. The alcoholic fraction was determined by the distillation method, and the water content was determined by Karl Fischer titration. The total ash content was determined by burning the samples at 550°C for 3 hours. The pH of the extracts was measured using a pH meter (Model 220, Metrohm, Herisau, Switzerland).

Results and Discussion:

The alcoholic fraction of the extracts was found to be 46.7% ± 1.2%, which is comparable to the alcoholic fraction reported for similar species (5).

The water content of the extracts was found to be 4.5% ± 0.3%, which is within the range reported for similar species (5).

The total ash content of the extracts was found to be 11.2% ± 0.5%, which is comparable to the ash content reported for similar species (5).

The pH of the extracts was found to be 5.2 ± 0.1, which is similar to the pH reported for similar species (5).

Identification of the compounds in the extracts was performed by thin-layer chromatography (TLC) and high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC). The TLC analysis showed the presence of flavonoids, phenolic compounds, and alkaloids, which are known to have antioxidant and anti-inflammatory properties. The HPLC analysis confirmed the presence of these compounds.

Conclusion:

The alcoholic extract of A. malaccensis leaves is a promising source of bioactive compounds with potential therapeutic applications. Further studies are needed to investigate the in vivo effects of these compounds.
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after cleaning for each device. Results for the 3 posttreatment sections were averaged to give a mean result per test. Log-transformed data were used in the analyses.

Comparison of the most effective device against the alternatives was performed with the 2-sample t test; P values (α = 0.1) less than .05 were considered significant.

The electrostatic cloth sweeper removed significantly more Der p 1, Fel d 1, and Can f 1 from the vinyl floor than the other devices (Fig 1); it removed >94% of Der p 1, >93% of Fel d 1, and >93% of Can f 1. The ranking of the devices with respect to cleaning efficiency was similar for all 3 allergens tested on the vinyl floor. In this protocol, 3 devices showed a large variation in cleaning efficiency, which was the result of dust being redistributed rather than removed.

The devices tested on the wooden floor displayed results similar to those seen with the vinyl floor, the electrostatic cloth sweeper again being the most effective device tested; it removed >90% of Der p 1, >95% of Der f 1, and >89% of Fel d 1. Other devices maintained similar rankings.

In this standardized cleaning procedure, sweepers featuring cloth pads were the devices most efficient at reducing allergen levels. Electrostatic materials are known to increase allergen capture in air filters. In our tests, the electrostatic cloth sweeper removed significantly more allergen than the other devices.
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