Antibacterial Activity and Mechanism of Plant Flavonoids to Gram-positive Bacteria Predicted from their Lipophilicities

Ganjun Yuan (✉ gyuan@jxau.edu.cn)

Jiangxi Agricultural University

Yingying Guan

Jiangxi Agricultural University

Houqin Yi

Jiangxi Agricultural University

Shan Lai

Jiangxi Agricultural University

Yifei Sun

Jiangxi Agricultural University

Seng Cao

Jiangxi Agricultural University

Research Article

Keywords: Antimicrobial resistance, antimicrobial agents, flavonoids, minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs)

Posted Date: March 15th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-289653/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published at Scientific Reports on May 18th, 2021. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-90035-7>.

Antibacterial activity and mechanism of plant flavonoids to gram-positive bacteria predicted from their lipophilicities

Ganjun Yuan^{1,2,*}, Yingying Guan¹, Houqin Yi¹, Shan Lai^{1,2}, Yifei Sun¹, Seng Cao^{1,2}

¹Laboratory of Natural Medicine and Microbiological Drug, College of Bioscience and Bioengineering, Jiangxi Agricultural University, Nanchang 330045, China

²Biotechnological Engineering Center for Pharmaceutical Research and Development, Jiangxi Agricultural University, Nanchang 330045, China

*Correspondence: Ganjun Yuan, gyuan@jxau.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

Antimicrobial resistance seriously threatened human health, and new antimicrobial agents are desperately needed. As one of the largest classes of plant secondary metabolite, flavonoids can be widely found in various parts of the plant, and their antibacterial activities have been increasingly paid attention to. Based on the physicochemical parameters and antibacterial activities of sixty-six flavonoids reported, two regression equations between their ACD/LogP or LogD_{7.40} and their minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) to gram-positive bacteria were established with the correlation coefficients above 0.93, and then were verified by another sixty-eight flavonoids reported. From these two equations, the MICs of most flavonoids against gram-positive bacteria could be roughly calculated from their ACD/LogP or LogD_{7.40}, and their minimum MICs were predicted as approximately 1.7 or 3.0 μM , respectively, more likely fall into the range from 0.9 to 3.4 μM , or from 1.5 to 6.0 μM , respectively. Simultaneously, both tendentiously concave regression curves indicated that the lipophilicity is a key factor for flavonoids against gram-positive. Combined with the literature analyses, the results also suggested that the cell membrane is the main site of flavonoids acting on gram-positive bacteria, and which likely involves the damage of phospholipid bilayers, the inhibition of the respiratory chain or the ATP synthesis, or some others.

Introduction

Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) has been seriously threatened human public health and global economic development, and new antimicrobial agents are desperately needed¹⁻². Antibiotics, as the secondary metabolites produced by many bacteria, actinomycetes and fungi, showed remarkably antimicrobial activities, while they also bring some toxic side effects to human body, and are unavoidable to lead to the resistance³. Many plant ingredients present weaker antimicrobial activities, while some of them can reverse the resistance of antimicrobial agents⁴. Simultaneously, most of them are considered nontoxic to human body because of their ubiquity in all sorts of plant derived foods and beverages.

As one of the largest classes of plant secondary metabolite, flavonoids can be widely found in various parts of the plants, such as fruit, vegetables, nuts and tea⁴. These compounds have a wide range of pharmacological activities including antibiosis, antioxidation, and coronary heart disease prevention, etc. It is worth noting that some flavonoids can enhance the sensitivity of bacteria to antibiotics, and even reverse the AMR^{4,5}. Thereout, the antibacterial activities of flavonoids have been paid more and more attention to. Recently, several investigations were performed for the antimicrobial activities of flavonoids, and the probable relationships between their chemical structures and antimicrobial activities were also summarized^{4,6}. However, the regularity conclusions on the structure-activity relationships of flavonoids against bacteria still need to be further explored.

During our researches on antimicrobial agents⁷⁻⁹, it is vaguely found that the antimicrobial activities of flavonoids are not related to their special structure, while may be related to their polarities or lipid-water partition coefficients. Many data of plant flavonoids, involving their chemical structures and antibacterial activities reported in previous papers, were searched and analyzed for proving it. The inhibitory activities of plant flavonoids against gram-positive bacteria especially *Staphylococcus aureus* can be widely searched, while those against gram-negative ones and fungi were reported too few to carry out statistical analyses^{4,6}. Thereby, the former was our focus in this research. As the inhibitory activities of a compound against different pathogenic bacteria are varied, this paper will pay more attention to the inhibitory activities of these flavonoids against *Staphylococcus aureus*, a species most reported in the literature.

Results

Structure, antibacterial activity, and physicochemical parameter. Sixty-six flavonoids (**1** to **66**) shown on **Fig. 1** to **6**, reported in six papers¹⁰⁻¹⁵, were selected for the preliminary structure-physicochemical parameter-activity analyses of plant flavonoids against gram-positive bacteria, especially *Staphylococcus aureus*. These flavonoids include four subclasses flavones, flavonols, dihydroflavones and dihydroflavonols. Regression analyses indicated that no universal correlation between the antimicrobial activity (expressed as minimum inhibitory concentration, MIC) and the physicochemical parameter Gibbs energy, LogP (Partition coefficient), MR (Molar Refractivity), CMR (Calculated Molar Refractivity), tPSA (Topological Polar Surface Area), or solubility (SolDB) could be established for these flavonoids. However, probable correlations between the antimicrobial activities (MIC or MIC₉₀) and the physicochemical parameter CLogP (Calculated Partition coefficient), ACD/LogP, or LogD_{7.40} (Log₁₀ of distribution coefficient at pH 7.40) were respectively discovered, and the physicochemical parameters and antimicrobial activities of these compounds were listed in **Tables 1** to **6** for further analyses¹⁰⁻¹⁵.

Fig. 1 Chemical structures of compounds 1 to 19¹⁰.

Fig. 2 Chemical structures of compounds 20 to 27¹¹.

Fig. 3 Chemical structures of compounds 21 to 24, and 26 to 33¹².

Fig. 4 Chemical structures of compounds 34 to 44¹³.

Fig. 5 Chemical structures of compounds 17, and 45 to 54¹⁴.

Fig. 6 Chemical structures of compounds 55 to 66¹⁵.

Table 1. Physicochemical parameters and antimicrobial activities of compounds **1** to **19**¹⁰.

Compounds	CLogP ^a	ACD/LogP ^b	LogD _{7.40} ^b	MIC (μM) ^c	
				<i>S. aureus</i>	<i>B. subtilis</i>
1	4.67	5.55	5.38	L	L
2	4.08	5.09	4.92	11.3	11.3
3	6.31	7.02	6.80	11.8	5.9
4	4.35	5.29	5.09	14.7	14.7
5	4.52	5.52	5.35	/	/
6	6.36	7.02	6.81	23.7	23.7
7	3.53	4.18	4.09	25.9	25.9
8	3.58	4.18	3.98	25.9	25.9
9	4.50	5.74	5.50	22.7	22.7
10	5.58	6.52	6.33	5.9	5.9
11	5.64	6.30	6.08	5.7	5.7
12	6.46	7.05	6.83	5.5	5.5
13	6.40	7.27	7.09	5.7	5.7
14	3.86	4.80	4.63	L	L
15	3.92	4.58	4.37	L	L
16	6.25	7.24	7.06	12.2	6.1
17	3.68	4.56	4.37	14.0	7.0
18	4.57	5.53	5.26	/	/
19	2.84	3.81	3.56	/	/

^a: The CLogP values were calculated using software ChemBioDraw Ultra 12.0.

^b: The ACD/Log P and LogD_{7.40} values were calculated using software ACD/Labs 6.0.

^c: MIC, minimum inhibitory concentration; *S. aureus*, *Staphylococcus aureus*; *B. subtilis*, *Bacillus subtilis*.

Table 2. Physico-chemical parameters and antimicrobial activities of compounds **20** to **27**¹¹.

Compounds	CLogP ^a	ACD/LogP ^b	LogD _{7.40} ^b	MIC (μM) ^c	
				<i>S. aureus</i>	<i>S. epidermidis</i>
20	4.22	5.56	5.34	35.2	70.4
21	5.68	6.54	6.32	4.4	8.8
22	6.01	6.61	6.39	8.5	8.5
23	4.22	5.18	4.96	140.8 ^d	140.8 ^d
24	5.15	6.25	5.97	4.4	4.4
25	6.23	7.02	6.81	18.2	9.1
26	6.38	7.32	7.12	19.6	9.8
27	5.78	6.72	6.51	9.4	9.4

^a: The CLogP values were calculated using software ChemBioDraw Ultra 12.0.

^b: The ACD/Log P and LogD_{7.40} values were calculated using software ACD/Labs 6.0.

^c: MIC, minimum inhibitory concentration; *S. aureus*, *Staphylococcus aureus* ATCC 25923; *S. epidermidis*, *Staphylococcus epidermidis* ATCC 12228.

^d: Both MICs of compound **23** against *S. aureus* ATCC 25923 and *S. epidermidis* ATCC 12228 were more than 32 μg/mL. As microdilution broth method was used to test MIC, we set 64 μg/mL as their MICs.

Table 3. Physico-chemical parameters and antimicrobial activities of compounds **21** to **24**, and **26** to **33**¹².

Compounds	CLogP ^a	ACD/LogP ^b	LogD _{7.40} ^b	MIC (μM) ^c	
				MRSA 6975	MRSA 630
28	1.83	3.27	3.04	140.2	560.8
29	3.68	4.60	4.38	36.2	144.6
30	3.28	4.27	4.05	19.4	155.2
31	3.91	4.67	4.46	32.9	263.2
32	4.47	6.10	5.76	18.9	151.5
33	4.47	5.63	5.29	37.9	151.5
23	4.22	5.18	4.96	17.6	35.2
27	5.78	6.72	6.51	18.8	37.7
21	5.68	6.54	6.32	17.6	8.8
22	6.01	6.61	6.39	17.1	17.1
26	6.38	7.32	7.12	4.9	9.8
24	5.15	6.25	5.97	8.8	8.8

^a: The CLogP values were calculated using software ChemBioDraw Ultra 12.0.

^b: The ACD/Log P and LogD_{7.40} values were calculated using software ACD/Labs 6.0.

^c: MIC, minimum inhibitory concentration; MRSA 6975, methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* 6975; MRSA 630, methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* 630.

Table 4. Physico-chemical parameters and antimicrobial activities of compounds **34** to **44**¹³.

Compounds	CLogP ^a	ACD/LogP ^b	LogD _{7.40} ^b	MIC (μM) ^c	
				<i>S. aureus</i>	<i>B. subtilis</i>
34	3.46275	4.52	3.84	140.2	140.2
35	3.71275	4.52	3.93	140.2	140.2
36	5.18575	6.2	5.53	73.0	73.0
37	6.24315	6.53	6.04	9.5	9.5
38	6.83729	6.23	5.76	19.7	9.8
39	8.27415	8.56	8.07	32.6	16.3
40	6.88729	6.23	5.78	9.8	39.4
41	5.43725	5.24	4.80	90.8	90.8
42	7.46825	7.27	6.81	19.0	19.0
43	5.99315	6.53	5.98	37.9	37.9
44	7.94415	8.62	8.17	8.2	16.3

^a: The CLogP values were calculated using software ChemBioDraw Ultra 12.0.

^b: The ACD/Log P and LogD_{7.40} values were calculated using software ACD/Labs 6.0.

^c: MIC, minimum inhibitory concentration; *S. aureus*, *Staphylococcus aureus* 209P; *B. subtilis*, *Bacillus subtilis* NBRC 3134.

Table 5. Physico-chemical parameters and antimicrobial activities of compounds **17**, and **45** to **54**¹⁴.

Compounds	CLogP ^a	ACD/LogP ^b	LogD _{7.40} ^b	MIC ₉₀ (μM) ^c	
				MRSA (22)	MSSA (7)
45	2.55	3.79	3.67	167.8	335.7
46	2.60	3.79	3.53	167.8	167.8
47	2.65	3.92	3.59	42.1	42.1
48	3.42	4.67	4.35	81.4	40.6
49	2.65	4.11	3.67	84.5	84.5
17	3.68	4.56	4.37	175.4	350.8
50	4.40	5.29	5.10	183.6	183.6
51	2.44	3.19	2.96	≥1734.6	≥1734.6
52	3.32	4.51	4.27	87.8	87.8
53	1.37	2.42	2.11	1734.6	1734.6 ^d
54	3.37	4.64	4.34	88.3	88.3

^a: The CLogP values were calculated using software ChemBioDraw Ultra 12.0.

^b: The ACD/Log P and LogD_{7.40} values were calculated using software ACD/Labs 6.0.

^c: MIC₉₀, minimum inhibitory concentration of 90% test isolates; MRSA (22), twenty-two isolates of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*; MSSA (7), seven isolates of methicillin-susceptible *Staphylococcus aureus*.

^d: Both MIC₉₀s of compound 53 against MRSA and MSSA were more than 250 μg/mL (867.3 μM). As microdilution broth method was used to test MIC, we set 500 μg/mL (1734.6 μM) as their MIC₉₀s.

Table 6. Physico-chemical parameters and antimicrobial activities of compounds **55** to **66**¹⁵.

Compounds	CLogP ^a	ACD/LogP ^b	LogD _{7.40} ^b	MIC (μM) ^c	
				MRSA G31	MRSA G47
55	5.58	6.52	6.33	14.7	7.4
56	7.58	8.76	8.70	12.0	6.0
57	3.78	4.72	4.51	16.2	32.3
58	5.53	6.52	6.33	14.7	14.7
59	4.94	5.89	5.67	28.4	7.1
60	4.99	5.89	5.68	28.4	14.2
61	5.71	6.60	6.35	29.4	14.7
62	4.86	5.81	5.62	28.4	28.4
63	4.81	5.81	5.62	28.4	28.4
64	3.68	4.56	4.37	35.1	35.1
65	6.25	7.24	7.06	> 61.2	> 61.2
66	2.44	3.19	2.96	1469.2	734.6

^a: The CLogP values were calculated using software ChemBioDraw Ultra 12.0.

^b: The ACD/Log P and LogD_{7.40} values were calculated using software ACD/Labs 6.0.

^c: MIC, minimum inhibitory concentration; MRSA G31 and G47, methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* G31 and G47.

Data analysis and correlation establishment. The regression analyses for the physicochemical parameters CLogP, ACD/LogP, or LogD_{7.40} and the antimicrobial activities (MIC or MIC₉₀) of these flavonoids to a certain pathogenic bacterium were respectively performed, and their regression curves were showed on **Fig. 7** to **12**. From these figures, nearly all regression curves indicate that the antibacterial activities of these flavonoids present similar change characteristics along with the increase of their LogP or LogD_{7.40}. First, the antibacterial activities will dramatically increase when the LogP or LogD_{7.40} increase up to a specific value. Along with the further increase of LogP or LogD_{7.40}, the antibacterial activities will first increase tendentiously and then decrease. Simultaneously, their regression equations between the physicochemical parameter (x) and the MIC (y), together with the correlation coefficients (r), were respectively presented on **Fig. 7** to **12**, and they were also summarily listed in **Table 7**. Most correlation coefficients (r) were more than 0.90 (**Table 7**). This indicated that there is a good correlation between the physicochemical parameter CLogP, ACD/LogP, or LogD_{7.40} and the antimicrobial activities (MIC), of these flavonoids to a certain pathogenic bacterium.

Fig. 7 Polynomial regression analyses for the physicochemical parameters CLogP, ACD/LogP or LogD_{7.40} (x) and the MIC (y) to *Staphylococcus aureus* (upper row) or *Bacillus subtilis* (lower row), of compounds **1** to **19**¹⁰.

Fig. 8 Polynomial regression analyses for the physicochemical parameters CLogP, ACD/LogP or LogD_{7.40} (x) and the MIC (y) to *S. aureus* ATCC 25923 (upper row) or *S. epidermidis* ATCC 12228 (lower row), of compounds **20** to **27**¹¹.

Fig. 9 Polynomial regression analyses for the physicochemical parameters CLogP, ACD/LogP or LogD_{7.40} (x) and the MIC (y) to methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) 6975 (upper row), MRSA 630 (middle row) or MRSA 6205 (lower row), of compounds **21** to **24**, and **26** to **33**¹².

Fig. 10 Polynomial regression analyses for the physicochemical parameters CLogP, ACD/LogP or LogD_{7.40} (x) and the MIC (y) to MRSA 209P (upper row) or *B. subtilis* NBRC 3134 (lower row), of compounds **34** to **44**¹³.

Fig. 11 Polynomial regression analyses for the physicochemical parameters CLogP, ACD/LogP or LogD_{7.40} (x) and the MIC (y) to MRSA (upper row) or methicillin-susceptible *S. aureus* (lower row), of compounds **17**, **45** to **54**¹⁴.

Fig. 12 Polynomial regression analyses for the physicochemical parameters CLogP, ACD/LogP or LogD_{7.40} (x) and the MIC (y) to MRSA G31 (upper row) or G47 (lower row), of compounds **55** to **66**¹⁵.

Table 7. Regression equations between the physicochemical parameter (x) and the antimicrobial activity (y) to a certain pathogenic microorganism^a

Compounds	Parameters ^b	Pathogenic bacteria ^a	Regression equation (r ^c)
1 to 19	CLogP	<i>S. aureus</i>	$y = -14.562x^5 + 368.41x^4 - 3689.3x^3 + 18274x^2 - 44755x + 43369$ (0.8514)
	ACD/LogP		$y = -6.1684x^5 + 180.3x^4 - 2090x^3 + 12006x^2 - 34172x + 38560$ (0.7592)
	LogD _{7.40}		$y = -5.3777x^5 + 151.88x^4 - 1700.4x^3 + 9430.9x^2 - 25910x + 28225$ (0.7331)
	CLogP	<i>B. subtilis</i>	$y = -13.392x^5 + 345.58x^4 - 3527.6x^3 + 17792x^2 - 44315x + 43606$ (0.8093)
	ACD/LogP		$y = -8.1245x^5 + 238.87x^4 - 2785.6x^3 + 16098x^2 - 46081x + 52265$ (0.8168)
	LogD _{7.40}		$y = -6.8012x^5 + 193.67x^4 - 2186.6x^3 + 12230x^2 - 33875x + 37175$ (0.7660)
20 to 27	CLogP	<i>S. aureus</i>	$y = 8.524x^4 - 204.37x^3 + 1846.7x^2 - 7432.5x + 11221$ (0.7878)
	ACD/LogP		$y = -35.117x^5 + 1129.5x^4 - 14526x^3 + 93407x^2 - 300407x + 386677$ (0.9998)
	LogD _{7.40}		$y = -32.854x^5 + 1023.1x^4 - 12742x^3 + 79351x^2 - 247194x + 308250$ (0.9998)
	CLogP	<i>S. epidermidis</i>	$y = 27.806x^4 - 635.4x^3 + 5428.8x^2 - 20549x + 29078$ (0.9228)
	ACD/LogP		$y = 49.336x^5 - 1560.6x^4 + 19638x^3 - 122806x^2 + 381390x - 470183$ (0.9999)
	LogD _{7.40}		$y = 50.433x^5 - 1541.1x^4 + 18726x^3 - 113020x^2 + 338580x - 402381$ (0.9999)
21 to 24, and 26 to 33	CLogP	MRSA 6975	$y = 1.8495x^4 - 35.986x^3 + 255.94x^2 - 793.24x + 933.27$ (0.9727)
	ACD/LogP		$y = 4.3462x^4 - 100.91x^3 + 865.04x^2 - 3250.5x + 4550$ (0.9737)
	LogD _{7.40}		$y = 3.9824x^4 - 89.302x^3 + 738.93x^2 - 2679.6x + 3624.8$ (0.9724)
	CLogP	MRSA 630	$y = 10.879x^4 - 191.45x^3 + 1229.6x^2 - 3477.2x + 3852.9$ (0.9458)
	ACD/LogP		$y = 15.861x^4 - 359.02x^3 + 3006.4x^2 - 11100x + 15450$ (0.9371)
	LogD _{7.40}		$y = -3.7809x^5 + 113.73x^4 - 1337.2x^3 + 7689.2x^2 - 21703x + 24314$ (0.9399)
	CLogP		$y = 31.311x^2 - 363.78x + 1075$ (0.8791)
	ACD/LogP		$y = -5.7946x^5 + 182.21x^4 - 2240.3x^3 + 13456x^2 - 39498x + 45507$ (0.9205)
	LogD _{7.40}		$y = -10.159x^5 + 288.79x^4 - 3227.7x^3 + 17699x^2 - 47582x + 50299$ (0.9243)

34 to 44	CLogP		$y = 4.2583x^3 - 68.132x^2 + 312.26x - 299.28$ (0.9740)
	ACD/LogP	<i>S. aureus</i>	$y = -1.1241x^3 + 35.494x^2 - 345.54x + 1082$ (0.9389)
	LogD _{7.40}		$y = 1.3247x^3 - 11.566x^2 - 38.871x + 389.65$ (0.9481)
17, 45 to 54	CLogP		$y = 2.4312x^3 - 37.053x^2 + 144.3x - 12.474$ (0.9598)
	ACD/LogP	<i>B. subtilis</i>	$y = -0.256x^3 + 17.257x^2 - 222.67x + 818.35$ (0.9503)
	LogD _{7.40}		$y = 1.8435x^3 - 21.985x^2 + 27.108x + 259.51$ (0.9595)
55 to 66	CLogP		$y = -187.27x^3 + 2012.3x^2 - 7014.5x + 8045.6$ (0.9982)
	ACD/LogP	MRSA	$y = -141.22x^3 + 2038.8x^2 - 9673x + 15205$ (0.9972)
	LogD _{7.40}		$y = -138.02x^3 + 1870.5x^2 - 8315.2x + 12249$ (0.9964)
55 to 66	CLogP		$y = -186.51x^3 + 1996x^2 - 6936.4x + 7973.6$ (0.9830)
	ACD/LogP	MSSA	$y = -129.02x^3 + 1872.9x^2 - 8962.9x + 14287$ (0.9789)
	LogD _{7.40}		$y = -146.22x^3 + 1942.5x^2 - 8495.7x + 12386$ (0.9760)
	CLogP		$y = -14.267x^5 + 375.32x^4 - 3885.8x^3 + 19812x^2 - 49782x + 49383$ (0.9999)
	ACD/LogP	MRSA G31	$y = -7.8565x^5 + 248.61x^4 - 3108.1x^3 + 19202x^2 - 58654x + 70920$ (0.9999)
	LogD _{7.40}		$y = -3.9143x^5 + 129.59x^4 - 1690.2x^3 + 10849x^2 - 34258x + 42597$ (0.9999)
55 to 66	CLogP		$y = -11.317x^5 + 288.29x^4 - 2877.2x^3 + 14082x^2 - 33853x + 32062$ (0.9997)
	ACD/LogP	MRSA G47	$y = -9.0556x^5 + 272.04x^4 - 3210.1x^3 + 18620x^2 - 53152x + 59836$ (0.9997)
55 to 66	LogD _{7.40}		$y = -8.3648x^5 + 243.82x^4 - 2784.9x^3 + 15604x^2 - 42952x + 46563$ (0.9996)

^a: The antimicrobial activity (y) was expressed as MIC or MIC₉₀ to a certain pathogenic microorganism. *S. aureus*, *Staphylococcus aureus*; *S. epidermidis*, *Staphylococcus epidermidis*; *B. subtilis*, *Bacillus subtilis*; MRSA, methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*; MSSA methicillin-susceptible *Staphylococcus aureus*.

^b: CLogP was calculated using software ChemBioDraw Ultra 12.0, and ACD/LogP and LogD_{7.40} were calculated using software ACD/Labs 6.0.

^c: r, correlation coefficients.

As we pointed out above, the antimicrobial activities of a compound against different pathogenic bacteria were varied, and even against the same one in different determination conditions. Thereby, the regression analyses were respectively performed for these flavonoids reported in different papers. Considering that the pathogenic bacteria used for antibacterial experiments mainly involved *S. aureus*, *S. epidermidis*, and *B. subtilis*, the same compound should present similar inhibitory activities and identical antibacterial mechanism to these gram-positive bacteria. Thereby, we put the physicochemical parameters and the average MICs to *S. aureus*, *S. epidermidis*, or/and *B. subtilis* (Tables 1 to 6), of these flavonoids together for further regression analyses. The results indicated that the correlation between CLogP and antibacterial activities (MICs) is weak with a correlation coefficient of 0.8412, while that between ACD/LogP or LogD_{7.40} (x) and MICs (y) is more reliable (Fig. 13). The regression equations were respectively expressed as $y = 16.281x^4 - 375.09x^3 + 3205.1x^2 - 12064x + 16967$ and $y = 13.32x^4 - 298.32x^3 + 2478.8x^2 - 9079.8x + 12449$, with the correlation coefficients of 0.9371 and 0.9333, respectively.

These further proved, by a larger sample, that the inhibitory activities of these flavonoids to gram-positive bacteria will nonlinearly increase as the ACD/LogP or LogD_{7.40} increase to approximately 7.0, and then decrease along with the further increase of ACD/LogP or LogD_{7.40}.

Fig. 13 Polynomial regression analyses for the physicochemical parameters ACD/LogP or LogD_{7.40} (x) and the average MICs (y) to gram-positive bacteria including *S. aureus*, *S. epidermidis*, or/and *B. subtilis*, of compounds **1** to **66**.

Verification. To verify the above correlations, other sixty-eight flavonoids (**Fig. 14**) including flavone, isoflavone, flavonol, flavanone, flavanonol, dihydroisoflavone, flavan, flavan-3-ols, chalcone, and dihydrochalcone subclasses etc., reported in seven papers^{4,16-21}, were selected for the comparison of theoretical and reported MICs. Using above two regression equations $y = 16.281x^4 - 375.09x^3 + 3205.1x^2 - 12064x + 16967$ and $y = 13.32x^4 - 298.32x^3 + 2478.8x^2 - 9079.8x + 12449$ (x is the ACD/LogP or LogD_{7.40}, and y is the antimicrobial activities (MICs)), the theoretical MICs of these flavonoids can be calculated. Considering that many factors, such as determination method, concentration of bacterial suspension, and test medium used, may influence on the determination of MIC⁵, the results reported would fluctuate within a reasonable range of the actual values. Thereout, the predicted MICs ranged from 1/4× to 4× the determined one were acceptable (marked as A), especially those ranged from 1/2× to 2× the determined one, were considered as complete coincidence (marked as C) since the MICs were generally determined by double dilution method²². Simultaneously, those more than or equal to the minimum value when the determined MICs were no upper limit were also regarded as complete coincidence (marked as C). Otherwise, those were unacceptable (marked as U). The results (**Table 8**) indicated that the predicted MICs were in acceptable or complete coincidence with the measured ones for approximate 85.3% flavonoids. Although the antibacterial activities of ten flavonoids (14.7%) are unsatisfactorily predicted, there are six compounds with the predicted MICs falling into the range of 1/8× to 8× determined ones. This together indicated that the MICs of most flavonoids against gram-positive bacteria can be roughly calculated from their ACD/LogP or LogD_{7.40} although the predicted values are not in accordance with their tested ones for a few flavonoids. At least, these indicated that the ACD/LogP or LogD_{7.40} is a key factor for the inhibitory activities of plant flavonoids against gram-positive bacteria.

Fig. 14 Chemical structures of compounds 67 to 134^{4,16-21}.

Table 8. Comparison of predicted and reported antibacterial activities of some flavonoids^a

Compounds	Molecular Weight	Predicted antibacterial activities ^b				Measured antibacterial activities		Coincidence ^c	Reference
		By LogP		By LogD _{7.40}		MIC (μg/mL)	MIC (μM)		
		LogP	MIC (μM)	LogD _{7.40}	MIC (μM)				
67	338.35	4.20	112.65	3.77	166.10	62.5	184.7	C	16
68	336.34	5.55	61.12	4.82	56.63	62.5	185.8	A	16
69	314.29	2.16	2436.83	1.72	2918.75	≥200	≥636.4	C	17
70	298.29	3.10	698.89	2.32	1473.21	≥200	≥670.5	C	17
71	240.25	3.93	174.29	3.62	213.71	50~200	208.1~832.5	C	17
72	406.47	7.33	21.52	6.89	3.58	1.56~3.13	3.8~7.7	C	4
73	270.24	2.83	1038.02	2.16	1787.58	>125~240	>462.6~888.1	C	4
74	432.38	1.70	4014.10	0.76	7187.18	1~2	2.3~4.6	U	4
75	542.62	8.63	784.47	8.17	363.59	2.3~37.5	4.4~69.1	U	4
76	422.47	6.59	15.16	6.40	14.79	0.5~4	1.2~9.5	C	4
77	424.49	6.60	14.65	6.38	15.69	2.9	6.8	A	4
78	324.37	5.49	61.93	5.44	51.03	0.3~0.6	0.9~1.9	U	4
79	408.49	5.95	49.55	5.70	44.91	0.6~1.22	1.5~3.0	U	4
80	406.51	8.35	474.85	7.93	217.70	0.125~2	0.3~4.9	U	4
81	338.4	4.95	64.15	4.82	56.63	3.13~16	9.3~47.3	C	4
82	338.4	4.95	64.15	4.82	56.63	3.13~6.25	9.4~18.9	A	18,19
83	286.28	2.57	1475.14	2.44	1266.80	>25~100	>87.3~349.3	C	18,19
84	256.25	2.76	1144.17	2.61	1013.57	>100	>390.2	C	18,19
85	418.39	0.61	10717.7	0.46	9179.44	>50	>119.5	C	18,19
86	352.34	5.67	58.81	5.07	54.71	12.5	35.5	C	18,19
87	268.26	3.15,16	647.20	2.91	664.94	>25~100	>93.2~372.8	C	18,19
88	382.41	5.38	62.90	5.12	54.40	>25~50	>65.4~130.8	C	18,19
89	354.35	4.15,16	121.47	3.48	270.43	12.5~25	35.3~70.6	C	18,19
90	382.41	5.75	56.73	5.75	43.31	>50	>130.8	A	18,19
91	424.53	4.41	85.79	6.32	18.45	3.13~6.25	7.4~14.7	C	18,19
92	370.44	6.32	30.33	4.40	70.00	6.25~12.5	16.9~33.7	C	18,19
93	324.37	4.18	116.05	4.18	88.98	6.25~12.5	19.3~38.5	A	18,19
94	322.35	6.64	12.68	6.63	6.19	12.5~25	38.8~77.6	A	18,19
95	302.24	2.07	2700.03	1.40	4032.38	>125	>413.6	C	20
96	254.24	2.88	967.04	2.33	1455.08	>125	>491.7	C	20
97	302.24	2.62	1381.68	1.95	2275.19	500	1654.3	C	20
98	318.24	2.11	2580.52	1.42	3954.64	62.5~125	196.4~392.8	U	20
99	238.24	3.76	234.09	3.74	174.63	>125	>524.7	A	20
100	270.24	2.1	2610.02	1.57	3407.05	≥125	≥462.6	C	20
101	286.24	2.52	1573.39	2.22	1664.21	>125	>436.7	C	20
102	284.26	3.04	765.25	2.50	1172.38	>125	>439.7	C	20
103	300.26	3.00	812.23	2.33	1455.08	>125	>416.3	C	20
104	302.24	2.54	1533.51	2.14	1830.22	31.3~62.5	103.4~206.8	U	20
105	360.31	3.02	788.46	2.32	1473.21	>125	>346.9	C	20
106	284.26	3.22	580.10	2.45	1250.67	>125	>439.7	C	20

107	254.24	2.51	1593.63	2.19	1725.05	31.3~62.5	122.9~245.8	U	20
108	418.39	0.61	10717.7	0.46	9179.44	>128	>305.9	C	21
109	460.43	2.46	1697.84	2.31	1491.51	>128	>278.0	C	21
110	550.51	2.24	2219.65	2.06	2008.61	>128	>232.5	C	21
111	418.39	1.04	7484.20	0.87	6544.98	>128	>305.9	C	21
112	302.28	2.36	1921.85	2.19	1725.05	>128	>423.5	C	21
113	270.28	3.23	571.00	3.10	499.45	64-128	236.8~473.6	C	21
114	256.25	3.40	433.51	3.26	388.08	128	499.5	C	21
115	354.35	5.03	63.76	4.48	65.65	32-64	90.3~180.6	C	21
116	352.34	4.63	71.12	4.07	103.44	32-64	90.8~181.6	C	21
117	368.38	5.33	63.16	5.08	54.65	64	173.73	A	21
118	352.38	5.69	58.33	5.40	51.66	16	45.41	C	21
119	406.47	7.33	21.52	7.16	15.57	8	19.68	C	21
120	338.35	5.24	63.43	4.69	58.72	16~32	47.3~94.6	C	21
121	368.38	4.70	68.50	4.27	79.80	64	173.7	A	21
122	422.47	7.13	6.70	6.89	3.58	16	37.9	U	21
123	368.38	4.56	74.62	4.27	79.80	32-64	86.9~173.7	C	21
124	354.35	5.47	62.15	5.21	53.77	32-64	90.3~180.6	C	21
125	354.35	5.47	62.15	5.21	53.77	32	90.3	C	21
126	384.42	4.83	65.46	4.67	59.16	32-64	83.2~166.5	C	21
127	424.49	6.69	10.41	6.50	10.59	8	18.9	C	21
128	368.38	5.99	47.79	5.98	34.40	16	43.4	C	21
129	384.38	3.76	234.09	3.76	168.89	≥128	≥333.0	C	21
130	368.38	5.61	60.08	5.59	47.94	16~32	43.4~86.9	C	21
131	384.38	3.86	196.67	3.86	143.18	>128	>333.0	C	21
132	410.46	5.79	55.51	5.79	41.94	>128	>311.9	U	21
133	340.37	4.10	131.37	4.10	99.11	16	47.0	A	21
134	382.41	5.75	56.73	5.75	43.31	>50~128	>130.8~334.7	A	21

a: Antibacterial activities were expressed as MICs of flavonoids to gram-positive bacteria which include *S. aureus*, *S. epidermidis* and *B. subtilis*.

b: LogP and LogD_{7.40} were calculated using software ACD/Labs 6.0.

c: C, Complete coincidence; A, Acceptable; U, Unacceptable.

Discussion and conclusion

Flavonoids can be widely found in various parts of the plant, and their antibacterial activities have been paid more and more attention to, especially after some of them were discovered to have the potency to enhance the susceptibility of some antibiotics to bacteria^{4,5}. Based on the related data of plant flavonoids reported, many related physicochemical parameters were calculated, using software ChemBioDraw Ultra 12.0 and ACD/Labs 6.0, for the discovery of the correlations between the physicochemical parameters and the MICs of flavonoids against gram-positive bacteria. Two regression equations between the ACD/LogP or LogD_{7.40} (x) and the antimicrobial activities (MICs) (y) were established as $y=16.281x^4-375.09x^3+3205.1x^2-12064x+16967$ and

$y=13.565x^4-305.72x^3+2556.5x^2-9424.7x+13003$. From these two equations, the MICs of most flavonoids against gram-positive bacteria could be roughly calculated from their ACD/LogP or LogD_{7.40}, and their minimum values were predicted as approximately 1.7 or 3.0 μM , respectively. Considering that the experimental MICs would fluctuate within a reasonable range⁵, the minimum MICs of plant flavonoids will likely fall into the range from 0.9 to 3.4 μM , or from 1.5 to 6.0 μM , predicted from their ACD/LogP or LogD_{7.40}, respectively.

Lipophilicity is a very important descriptor indicating membrane permeation²³, and generally expressed as LogP which is valid only for a single electrical species. For ionizable drugs, LogD that refers to a pH-dependent mixture of all electrical species presented at any given pH was regarded as a better descriptor reflecting the actual partitioning and lipophilicity^{24,25}. Generally, most flavonoids contain two or more phenolic hydroxyl groups⁴⁻⁶, and present similar weak acidity with the pKa of 7.0 to 10.0. Thereby, their LogD will correspondingly decrease along with the increase of environmental pH from about 5.0. Considering the pH in human blood or in the media of MIC determination was approximately 7.40, their LogD at pH 7.40 were selected. These together above indicate that the lipophilicity of plant flavonoids is a key factor for their inhibitory activities to gram-positive bacteria. As the lipophilicity is closely related to membrane permeability²⁶, the tendentially concave regression curves between the antibacterial activity and the LogP or LogD_{7.40} also indicate that the cell membrane is probably an important site of flavonoids acting on gram-positive bacteria.

Different antibacterial mechanisms of plant flavonoids were reported⁴⁻⁶, such as causing cell-membrane damage, inhibition on various synthase involving the nucleic acid synthesis, the bacterial respiratory chain, or the cell envelope synthesis. However, the results above suggested that the antibacterial activities of these plant flavonoids had no obvious relationship with the specific fragments of their structures, while presented great relationship with their lipophilicities. Simultaneously, the antibacterial activities of plant flavonoids will dramatically increase as the LogP or LogD increases from 2.5 to 4.0 which range the membrane permeability remarkably decrease while the affinity to lipid bilayer greatly increase²⁷⁻²⁹. According to this, plant flavonoids may not target specific synthases, but more likely to nonspecifically act on the cell-membrane bilayer or the respiratory chain to kill bacteria. This deduction was indirectly supported by many researches which were reviewed in three paper⁴⁻⁶, such as follows: 1) two mechanisms may be involved the interactions of flavonoids with lipid bilayers, which include the interactions at the membrane interface between the polar heads of phospholipids and the more hydrophilic flavonoids, and the partition of the more hydrophobic flavonoids in the interior of the lipid bilayer³⁰; 2) nonspecific interactions of flavonoids with phospholipids can lead to the changes of the membrane properties³¹; 3) The increased activities of more lipophilic flavonoids are due to the enhanced membrane affinity of their long acyl chains³²; 4) Some lipophilic flavonoids can decrease the fluidity and integrity of cellular membrane to inhibit gram-positive bacteria^{33,34}, such as sophoraflavanone G and 3-arylideneflavanones.

Although many other antibacterial mechanisms acting on various synthase for the

nucleic acid or cell envelope syntheses were mentioned in these reviews^{4,6}, two facts found from the researches of the cited literature are worth further discussing. First, most flavonoids used for mechanism exploration have the cLogP ranged from about 2.0 to 4.0, and are easy to infiltrate into the bacterial cell, while they present very weak antibacterial activities with the MICs more than 250 µg/mL. Second, most experiments were achieved by the determination of enzyme activities *in vitro*^{35,36}, the molecular docking of flavonoids with various synthases³⁷, the proteomics technology without the combination of related experiments and the consideration of first the chicken or the egg³⁸. Another thing should be considered is whether some molecules can pass through the cell membrane and infiltrate into the bacterial cell or not. Moreover, previous works indicated the antibacterial activity to gram-positive bacteria was observed only four of fourteen flavonoids, while only four of seven flavonoids with DNA gyrase inhibition showed weak inhibitory activity to gram-positive bacteria²⁰. Simultaneously, the authors pointed out that mechanisms other than DNA gyrase inhibition may also play a role in the antibacterial activity. Thereby, the conclusion that some of these flavonoids studied are potent inhibitors of DNA gyrase is worth reconsidering²⁰. In fact, this work just right indicated that the inhibitory activity of flavonoids against gram-positive bacteria did not correlate with their *in vitro* DNA gyrase inhibition to a large extent. This was also supported by previous publication³⁹. These together further confirmed that the cell-membrane should be the main region of plant flavonoids acting on Gram-positive bacteria, and which likely involving the disruption or damage of phospholipid bilayers, the inhibition of the respiratory chain or ATP synthesis, or some others.

According to the regression equations and above conclusions, the inhibitory activities of flavonoids to gram-positive bacteria will increase when the alkyl especially isopentyl were introduced into the structures of flavonoids no matter carbon position it is introduced into. This can be interpreted that the introduction of alkyl would increase the lipophilicity of flavonoids or the LogP, and thereout increase their interactions with phospholipids of cell membrane. However, the introduction of too many alkyls will overmuch increase the LogP of these flavonoids, and which will lead their lipophilicities too large to pass through the hydrophilic region of phospholipid bilayers. This was proved by previous similar work^{26,32,40}. On the contrary, the inhibitory activities of flavonoids to gram-positive bacteria will decrease when polar groups, such as hydroxyl and glycosyl, were introduced into their structures. This can be interpreted as that the excessive hydrophilicity of flavonoids will hinder its infiltration into phospholipid bilayers and interaction with hydrophobic region of cell membrane.

Based on the physicochemical parameters and MICs of various flavonoids, the regression equations and above conclusions were achieved. For a certain subclass of flavonoids, the regression equations with larger correlation coefficient can be established for their more accurate MIC predictions, and then can be further used for the structural design and optimization to obtain more efficient antibacterial activity.

As the inhibitory activities of plant flavonoids against gram-negative bacteria were reported less, it is difficult to draw a statistical conclusion. Considering that the

cell envelope of gram-negative bacteria was different from that of gram-positive ones, it is worth further exploring whether the above regression equations and above conclusions are suitable for plant flavonoids against gram-negative bacteria. However, these can provide good references for their related researches. Referring to the above conclusions, the anti-MRSA activities of trimethylhydroquinone, vitamin K₃ and carnosic acid were successfully predicted and verified by our laboratory^{9,41}.

In conclusion, the MICs of most flavonoids against gram-positive bacteria can be roughly calculated from their physicochemical parameters ACD/LogP or LogD_{7.40}, and the lipophilicity is a key factor of plant flavonoids against gram-positive bacteria. Combined with the analyses of previous publications, the results also suggest that the cell membrane may be the main site of plant flavonoids acting on gram-positive bacteria, and which likely involves the damage of phospholipid bilayers, the inhibition of the respiratory chain or ATP synthesis, or some others.

Methods

Information and data. The structures, antimicrobial activities and other related information of plant flavonoids were unsystematically searched from Google academic search engine, and several databases SciFinder, Medline, Elsevier, ACS, ScienceDirect, Wiley Online Library, Springer-Link, and RSC, using keywords flavonoid and antimicrobial, or and antibacterial, or and anti-MRSA. Furthermore, the relevant references in the obtained literature were also tracked. The structures, antibacterial activities, and other related information of flavonoids were collected from the obtained literature that can provide more than five or more flavonoids. As the antimicrobial activities of a certain compound against different pathogenic strains were varied, compounds reported in different papers were independently collected for the following analyses. Finally, the structures of selected compounds were drawn using software ChemBioDraw Ultra 12.0.

Simulation calculation of physicochemical parameters. The physicochemical parameters Gibbs energy, LogP, CLogP, MR, CMR and tPSA were calculated using software ChemBioDraw Ultra 12.0. Moreover, another software ACD/Labs 6.0 was also used for the calculations of physicochemical parameters LogP, LogD_{7.40} and solubility (SolDB).

Data analysis and correlation establishment. The physicochemical parameters and antibacterial activities of flavonoids reported in the same paper were respectively listed in a table, even those of the same compound. The regression analyses between the calculated values of each parameter and the antimicrobial activities (expressed as MICs) of all compounds in a table were respectively performed using Microsoft Excel software. It is noting that compounds without related antimicrobial information were not considered for the regression analyses, while they can be used for the following discussion. The physicochemical parameters significantly correlating with the antimicrobial activities were selected for the further analyses of correlations between the physicochemical parameters and antimicrobial activities of flavonoids.

Verification. Some other flavonoids were searched from above several databases, and

the chemical structures of various flavonoids presented in previous publications were also drawn using software ChemBioDraw Ultra 12.0. The physicochemical parameters LogP and LogD_{7.40} of these flavonoids were respectively calculated by software ACD/Labs 6.0, and then their antimicrobial activities (MICs) were respectively predicted using the above regression equations. Comparing with the predicted MICs with the determined one, the regression equations can be verified.

Data Availability

The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

References

1. Laxminarayan, R., Sridhar, D., Blaser, M. & Wang, M. & Woolhouse, M. Achieving global targets for antimicrobial resistance. *Science*, **353**, 874–875 (2016).
2. Kurosu, M., Siricilla, S. & Mitachi, K. Advances in MRSA drug discovery: where are we and where do we need to be? *Exp. Opin. Drug Discov.* **8**, 1095–1116 (2013).
3. Xu, X., Xu, L., Yuan, G., Wang, Y., Qu, Y. & Zhou, M. Synergistic combination of two antimicrobial agents closing each other's mutant selection windows to prevent antimicrobial resistance. *Sci. Rep.* **8**, 7237 (2018).
4. Górniak, I., Bartoszewski, R. & Króliczewski, J. Comprehensive review of antimicrobial activities of plant flavonoids. *Phytochem. Rev.* **18**, 241–272 (2019).
5. Cushnie, T. P. T. & Lamb, A. J. Antimicrobial activity of flavonoids. *Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents* **26**, 343–356; doi:10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2005.12.002 (2005).
6. Xie, Y., Yang, W., Tang, F., Chen, X. & Ren, L. Antibacterial activities of flavonoids: structure-activity relationship and mechanism. *Curr. Med. Chem.* **22**, 132–149; doi: 10.2174/0929867321666140916113443 (2015).
7. Xu, X. *et al.* Synergistic combination of two antimicrobial agents closing each other's mutant selection windows to prevent antimicrobial resistance. *Sci. Rep.* **8**, 7237; doi:10.1038/s41598-018-25714-z (2018).
8. Yuan, G. *et al.* Azalomycin F_{5a}, a polyhydroxy macrolide binding to the polar head of phospholipid and targeting to lipoteichoic acid to kill methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Biomed. Pharmacother.* **109**, 1940–1950 (2019).
9. Yuan, G., Zhu, X., Li, P., Zhang, Q. & Cao, J. New activity for old drug: *In vitro* activities of vitamin K₃ and menadione sodium bisulfite against methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Afr. J. Pharm. Pharmacol.* **8**, 364–371 (2014).
10. Kuroyanagi, M., Arakawa, T., Hirayama, Y. & Hayashi T. Antibacterial and antiandrogen flavonoids from *Sophora flavescens*. *J. Nat. Prod.* **62**, 1595–1599 (1999).
11. Šmejkal, K. *et al.* Antibacterial C-geranylfavonoids from *Paulownia tomentosa* fruits. *J. Nat. Prod.* **71**, 706–709 (2008).
12. Navrátilová, A. *et al.* Minor C-geranylated flavanones from *Paulownia tomentosa* fruits with MRSA antibacterial activity. *Phytochemistry* **89**, 104–113 (2013).
13. Inui, S. *et al.* Solophenols B–D and solomonin: new prenylated polyphenols isolated from propolis collected from the solomon islands and their antibacterial activity. *J. Agric. Food*

- 628 *Chem.* **60**, 11765–11770 (2012).
- 629 14. Sasaki, H., Kashiwada, Y., Shibata, H. & Takaishi, Y. Prenylated flavonoids from *Desmodium*
630 *caudatum* and evaluation of their anti-MRSA activity. *Phytochemistry* **82**, 136–142 (2012).
- 631 15. Tsuchiya, H., Sato, M. *et al.* Comparative study on the antibacterial activity of phytochemical
632 flavanones against methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*. *J. Ethnopharmacol.* **50**, 27–34
633 (1996).
- 634 16. Edziri, H. *et al.* Antibacterial, antifungal and cytotoxic activities of two flavonoids from *Retama*
635 *raetam* flowers. *Molecules* **17**, 7284–7293; doi:10.3390/molecules17067284 (2012).
- 636 17. Sufian, A. S., Ramasamy, K., Ahmat, N., Zakaria, Z.A. & Yusof, M. I. M. Isolation and
637 identification of antibacterial and cytotoxic compounds from the leaves of *Muntingia calabura*
638 L. *J. Ethnopharmacol.* **146**, 198–204 (2013).
- 639 18. Fukai, T. *et al.* Antimicrobial activity of licorice flavonoids against methicillin-resistant
640 *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Fitoterapia* **73**, 536–539 (2002).
- 641 19. Fukai, T., Marumo, A., Kaitou, K., Kanda, T., Terada, S. & Nomura T. Anti-*Helicobacter*
642 *pylori* flavonoids from licorice extract. *Life Sci.* **71**, 1449–1463 (2002)
- 643 20. Ohemeng, K. A., Schwender, C. F., Fu, K. P. & Barrett, J. F. DNA gyrase inhibitory and
644 antibacterial activity of some flavones(1). *Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett.* **3**, 225–230 (1993).
- 645 21. Hatano, T. *et al.* Phenolic constituents of Licorice. VIII.¹⁾ structures of glicophenone and
646 glicoisoflavanone, and effects of Licorice phenolics on methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus*
647 *aureus*. *Chem. Pharm. Bull.* **48**, 1286–1292 (2000).
- 648 22. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. *CLSI Document M07-A9. Methods for Dilution*
649 *Antimicrobial Susceptibility Tests for Bacteria That Grow Aerobically: Approved Standard*. 19th
650 ed. Wayne: CLSI (2012).
- 651 23. Malkia, A., Murtomaki, L., Urtti, A. & Kontturi, K. Drug permeation in biomembranes: *in vitro*
652 and *in silico* prediction and influence of physicochemical properties. *Eur. J. Pharm. Sci.* **23**,
653 13–47 (2004).
- 654 24. Bhal, S. K., Kassam, K., Peirson, I. G. & Pearl, G. M. The rule of five revisited: applying log d
655 in place of log p in drug-likeness filters. *Mol. Pharm.* **4**, 556–560 (2007).
- 656 25. Hou, T. J., Zhang, W., Xia, K., Qiao, X. B. & Xu, X.J. ADME evaluation in drug discovery. 5.
657 Correlation of Caco-2 permeation with simple molecular properties. *J. Chem. Inf. Comput. Sci.*
658 **44**, 1585–1600 (2004).
- 659 26. Testa, B., Crivori, P., Reist, M. & Carrupt, P.A. The influence of lipophilicity on the
660 pharmacokinetic behavior of drugs: Concepts and examples. *Perspect. Drug Discov.* **19**,
661 179–211 (2000).
- 662 27. Jaehde, U., Goto, T., de Boer, A.G. & Breimer, D.D.B. Blood-brain barrier transport rate of
663 quinoline antibacterials evaluated in cerebrovascular endothelial cell cultures. *Eur. J. Pharm.*
664 *Sci.* **1**, 49–55 (1993).
- 665 28. Le Brun, P. P. H., Fox P. L. A., de Vries, M. E. & Bodde, H. E. *In vitro* penetration of some
666 b-adrenoreceptor blocking drugs through porcine buccal mucosa. *Int. J. Pharm.* **49**, 141–145
667 (1989).
- 668 29. Tsuchiya, H. Membrane interactions of phytochemicals as their molecular mechanism
669 applicable to the discovery of drug leads from plants. *Molecules* **20**, 18923–18966 (2015).
- 670 30. Arora, A., Byrem, T. M., Nair, M. G. & Strasburg, G. M. Modulation of liposomal membrane
671 fluidity by flavonoids and isoflavonoids. *Arch. Biochem. Biophys.* **373**, 102–109 (2000).

31. Matsumoto, Y. *et al.* Antibacterial and antifungal activities of new acylated derivatives of epigallocatechin gallate. *Front. Microbiol.* **3**, 53 (2012).
32. Tsuchiya, H. & Iinuma, M. Reduction of membrane fluidity by antibacterial sophoraflavanone G isolated from *Sophora exigua*. *Phytomedicine* **7**, 161–165 (2000).
33. Budzynska, A. *et al.* Synthetic 3-arylidene flavanones as inhibitors of the initial stages of biofilm formation by *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Enterococcus faecalis*. *Z. Naturforsch. C* **66**, 104–114 (2011).
34. Singh, S.P., Konwarh, R., Konwar, B.K. & Karak, N. Molecular docking studies on analogues of quercetin with D-alanine: D-alanine ligase of *Helicobacter pylori*. *Med. Chem. Res.* **22**, 2139–2150 (2013).
35. Wu, D. *et al.* D-Alanine: D-alanine ligase as a new target for the flavonoids quercetin and apigenin. *Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents* **32**, 421–426 (2008).
36. Jeong, K. W. *et al.* Screening of flavonoids as candidate antibiotics against *Enterococcus faecalis*. *J. Nat. Prod.* **72**, 719–724 (2009).
37. Elmasri, W. A. *et al.* Multitargeted flavonoid inhibition of the pathogenic bacterium *Staphylococcus aureus*: a proteomic characterization. *J. Proteome Res.* **16**, 2579–2586 (2017).
38. Havsteen, B. Flavonoids, a class of natural products of high pharmacological potency. *Biochem. Pharm.* **32**, 1141–1148 (1983).
39. Hansch, C. & Fujita, T. ρ - σ - π analysis. A method for the correlation of biological activity and chemical structure. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **86**, 1616–1626 (1964).
40. Baláž Š. Lipophilicity in trans-bilayer transport and subcellular pharmacokinetics. *Perspect. Drug Discov.* **19**, 179–211 (2000).
41. Yuan, G., Li, P. & Yang, H. Anti-MRSA activity of carnosic acid in rosemary. *Chin. J. Mod. Appl. Pharm.* **29**, 571–574 (2012).

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by grants from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 82073745, 81960636 and 81660578).

Author contributions

G.Y. initiated the project, hypothesis and design, analyzed the data and obtained regression equations, wrote the manuscript text, took part in the search and collection of flavonoids data, and prepared the figures and tables; Y.G. performed the search and collection of flavonoids data, and took part in the preparation of figures and tables; H.Y., S.L., Y.S. and S.C. took part in the data processing and analysis. All authors reviewed the manuscript.

Additional Information

Competing Interests: The author declare that they have no competing interests.

Figures

Figure 1

Chemical structures of compounds 1 to 1910.

Figure 2

Chemical structures of compounds 20 to 2711.

Figure 3

Chemical structures of compounds 21 to 24, and 26 to 3312.

Figure 4

Chemical structures of compounds 34 to 4413.

Figure 5

Chemical structures of compounds 17, and 45 to 5414.

Figure 6

Chemical structures of compounds 55 to 6615.

Figure 7

Polynomial regression analyses for the physicochemical parameters CLogP, ACD/LogP or LogD_{7.40} (x) and the MIC (y) to *Staphylococcus aureus* (upper row) or *Bacillus subtilis* (lower row), of compounds 1 to 1910.

Figure 8

Polynomial regression analyses for the physicochemical parameters CLogP, ACD/LogP or LogD_{7.40} (x) and the MIC (y) to *S. aureus* ATCC 25923 (upper row) or *S. epidermidis* ATCC 12228 (lower row), of compounds 20 to 2711.

Figure 9

Polynomial regression analyses for the physicochemical parameters CLogP, ACD/LogP or LogD_{7.40} (x) and the MIC (y) to methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) 6975 (upper row), MRSA 630 (middle row) or MRSA 6205 (lower row), of compounds 21 to 24, and 26 to 3312.

Figure 10

Polynomial regression analyses for the physicochemical parameters CLogP, ACD/LogP or LogD_{7.40} (x) and the MIC (y) to MRSA 209P (upper row) or *B. subtilis* NBRC 3134 (lower row), of compounds 34 to 4413.

Figure 11

Polynomial regression analyses for the physicochemical parameters CLogP, ACD/LogP or LogD7.40 (x) and the MIC (y) to MRSA (upper row) or methicillin-susceptible *S. aureus* (lower row), of compounds 17, 45 to 5414.

Figure 12

Polynomial regression analyses for the physicochemical parameters CLogP, ACD/LogP or LogD7.40 (x) and the MIC (y) to MRSA G31 (upper row) or G47 (lower row), of compounds 55 to 6615.

Figure 13

Polynomial regression analyses for the physicochemical parameters ACD/LogP or LogD_{7.40} (x) and the average MICs (y) to gram-positive bacteria including *S. aureus*, *S. epidermidis*, or/and *B. subtilis*, of compounds 1 to 66.

Figure 14

Chemical structures of compounds 67 to 134,16-21.