



Evaluation of Pollen and Chemical Composition of Honey Samples Sourced from Open Markets in Anambra State, Nigeria to Ascertain their Authenticity

Njokuocha, Reginald Chukwuemeka^{1*}

¹Department of Plant Science and Biotechnology, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Enugu State, Nigeria.

Author's contribution

The sole author designed, analysed, interpreted and prepared the manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/JALSI/2019/v22i330128

Editor(s):

(1) Dr. Vasil Simeonov, Chair of Analytical Chemistry, Laboratory of Chemometrics and Environmetrics, Faculty of Chemistry and Pharmacy, University of Sofia St. Kliment Ohridski, 1164 Sofia, J. Bourchier Blvd. 1, Bulgaria.

Reviewers:

(1) Jayath P. Kirthisinghe, University of Peradeniya Peradeniya, 20400, Sri Lanka.
(2) Miroslava Kačániová, Slovak University of Agriculture, Slovakia.

Complete Peer review History: <http://www.sdiarticle4.com/review-history/53233>

Received 01 October 2019

Accepted 06 December 2019

Published 12 December 2019

Original Research Article

ABSTRACT

Aims: To ascertain the predominant honey plants that served as major sources of nectar and or pollen to the honeybees and to determine the quantitative presence of some physico-chemical components of the honey samples.

Study Design: The honey samples were collected from the various locations based on purposive sampling.

Place and Duration of Study: The samples were collected from seven towns in three Local Government Areas of Anambra State as follows; Ukpokwu, Usumenyi and Ezinifite (Nnewi South LGA), Nnokwa, Alor and Nnobi (Idemmili South LGA) and Ezinifite (Aguata LGA) between January and April, 2013.

Methodology: The honey samples were dissolved in warm (40°C) acidified water and subsequently subjected to acetolysis treatment. The recovered residues were suspended in glycerol-alcohol mixture in vials from where samples were collected for routine pollen count and identification. The chemical analysis was carried out according to the analysis of the Association of Official Analytical Chemists with four replicates. The pollen data were converted to percentage, while data from chemical parameters were converted to mean and standard deviation.

*Corresponding author: E-mail: reginald.njokuocha@unn.edu.ng;

Results: A total of 67 pollen types belonging to 39 families were identified. The honey samples were grouped into two based on the botanical origin: three monofloral and four polyfloral honeys. The predominant honey plants include *Hymenocardia acida*, Combretaceae/Melastomataceae, *Lannea* sp., *Alchornea cordifolia* and *Phyllanthus muellerianus*. The chemical analysis showed that the values of all the parameters (moisture, pH, Sucrose, Protein, Hydroxymethyl furfural, etc) tested were within the acceptable limits of international honey standard. However, the sum of glucose and fructose in three honey samples did not meet the 60g/100g recommended as minimum limit for blossom honeys.

Conclusion: The chemical analysis showed that the honey samples contained acceptable standard concentrations of all the physicochemical parameters (such as HMF, protein, moisture, sucrose, etc.) tested with exception of the sum of glucose and fructose which did not meet the standard in some samples. The predominant honey plants that served as sources of nectar and pollen in the to the bees include *Hymenocardia acida*, *Lannea* sp., *Phyllanthus muellerianus* and members of the Combretaceae/Melastomataceae families.

Keywords: Honey; chemical composition; monoflora honey; polyfloral honey; HMF; pollen; nectar.

1. INTRODUCTION

Honey is a highly delicious and sweetened valuable natural product savored for its nutritional, medicinal and other enumerable health benefits. It also serves industrial purposes such as in the confectionary and pharmaceutical industries for production of valuable products [1]. It is an important source of nutrients in human diets, a preferred table sweetener in most homes. It is affordable and its production widely spread not only across the different eco-vegetation zones of Nigeria, but the world over. Honey is an exceptionally heterogeneous viscous liquid characterized by varied physicochemical, sensory, nutritional and epitherapeutic properties.

These characteristic properties of honey are attributed to the presence in honey of sugars (mono-, bi-, tri- and polysaccharides), protein, mineral salts, moisture, flavonoids, hydrogen peroxide, phenols, HMF, vitamins, organic acids and electrical conductivity among other constituents [2,3]. Some of these phyto-constituents are central to the bioactive, antioxidant, antimicrobial, therapeutic and wound healing potentials credited to honeys [4,5]. In fact, the medicinal and healing effects associated with Manuka, Tuelang and other honeys may be attributed to the presence of phenolic acids, flavonoids and anthocyanin inherent in the honey types [6,7]. Generally, the composition of honey is determined to a large extent by the botanical (sources of nectar, extrafloral nectar and pollen grains) and geographical sources as well as climate, soil, honey bee species and other environmental variables surrounding their production [8].

In addition to the knowledge of physicochemical parameters, the characterization of the pollen spectrum of honey makes the honey attract premium price in the international market and guide the ability to make informed choices by consumers, especially individuals allergic to certain pollen types [9]. Because of the importance of honey to health and the associated commercial benefits, it becomes imperative to determine the geographical and botanical origin of the honey so as to differentiate honey produced in different regions and vegetation sources of the world [10]. Studies on pollen analysis of honeys in Nigeria have shown that each ecological region has characteristic honey plants that are sources of nectar and pollen as well as some species that are commonly distributed across most ecological zones of the country [11,12,13,14,15]. Such characteristic plants peculiar to a particular ecological zone can be used as botanical markers to differentiate honey from the different vegetation regions. Good knowledge of these honey plants are important because the present day natural vegetation in the forests and bushland thickets are being demolished indiscriminately due to agricultural expansion, urbanization and industrial establishments. The knowledge provided by pollen analysis may help in apicultural sustenance by reforesting or re-establishment of such known apicultural plants for increased production of honey.

In the past, pollen analysis was the main focus of honey analysis, but recently, other methods such as determination of the physicochemical parameters, DNA method, biomarkers and mineral content have been widely used either alone or in various combinations [16,17]. In this

study the honey analysis will be based on the pollen analysis and chemical composition of the honey samples. In Nigeria, several studies have been published on pollen analysis and especially, physicochemical and metal analyses in other to evaluate the constituent, purity and plants used as sources of nectar and pollen of honey from different regions by the honeybees in different eco-regions of Nigeria. In Anambra State, there are few literatures on pollen and physicochemical analyses of honey produced in the state, particularly with respect to the pollen spectra of honeys [18,19,20]. The main objectives of this work were to ascertain the predominant pollen types and chemical composition of the honey samples from Anambra State. This will provide additional information on melissopalynological research and chemical characterization of honeys from the State regarding the sources of nectar and pollen foraged by *Apis mellifera* and whether the quality of honey produced is according to the Codex Alimentarius Commission [21] and EU Council [22].

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Honey Sample Collection

The study was carried out in Anambra State and the honey samples were sourced from seven towns in three Local Government Areas (LGA) of the state as follows; Ukpok, Usumenyi and Ezinifite in Nnewi South LGA, Nnokwa, Alor and Nnobi in Idemmili South LGA and Ezinifite in Aguata LGA between January and April, 2013. The samples were labelled accordingly and kept at room temperature in the Laboratory prior to analysis. The chemical analyses of the samples were carried out in Devine Laboratory, 12 Ibagwa Road, Nsukka with four replicates, while the pollen analyses were done in the Environment and Palynology Research Unit, Department of Plant Science and Biotechnology, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, all in Enugu State, Nigeria.

2.2 Pollen Analysis

Ten grams of the agitated honey sample were diluted with 35 mls of acidified warm (40°C) water (3 ml Conc. H₂SO₄ and 997 ml distilled water) to dissolve the colloidal matters and sugars. The sample was centrifuged at 2000 rpm for ten minutes to recover the residue and then acetolysed [23,14]. The recovered polliniferous residues were suspended in 2 ml of glycerol-alcohol in vials from where samples were taken for routine pollen count and identification under

the light microscope at X 400 magnification. Routine pollen counts were done on the entire area (484 cm²) of the cover slip and identification of pollen grains was aided by photomicrographs in Bonnefille and Riolett [24], Y'bert [25], APLF [26] and pollen slides in the Environment and Palynology Research Unit, Department of Plant Science and Biotechnology, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.

2.3 Physicochemical Parameters

2.3.1 Determination of proximate components

The honey samples were analyzed for percentage crude protein, moisture, ash, fibre and fat contents. The % crude protein was calculated as Nitrogen (N x 6.25) by Kjeldahl's method. All analyses were carried out according to the methods of Association of Official Analytical Chemists [2,27].

2.3.2 Determination of pH

The pH of the honey sample was measured with a pH meter (Hi 8519 Hanna Instrument). The instrument was standardized with buffer solutions of pH4, pH7 and pH 10. It was then washed with distilled water, dried and immersed in the honey sample until the reading stabilized and was recorded.

2.3.3 Determination of free acidity

Ten grams of the honey sample was dissolved in 75 ml of distilled water and stirred properly until a homogeneous mixture was obtained. Two drops of phenolphthalein indicator were added to the mixture and titrated with 0.1 M sodium hydroxide till the first persistent pink colour. The amount of mills of 0.1 M sodium hydroxide used was recorded as the titre value. The free acidity which is expressed in milliequivalents of acid per kilogram of honey was calculated as titre value x molarity of NaOH x 4.6 / weight of honey sample used.

2.3.4 Determination of HMF

Five grams of honey were measured into 50 ml volumetric flask containing 25 mls of distilled water. 0.5 ml of Carrez solution 1 (K₄Fe (CN) 6 3H₂O 15% w/v and 1.25 ml of Carrez solution 2 (Zn (CH₃ (O₂) 22H₂O) 30% w/v were mixed and diluted to volume with distilled water. It was filtered and 4 ml of the filtrate was pipetted into one test tube and 4 ml of 0.27 sodium bisulfate

into another and were mixed thoroughly and the absorbance was measured against reference at 284 nm and 336 nm. HMF in mg/100 g honey = $(A_{284} - A_{336}) \times 14.97$.

2.3.5 Carbohydrate content

The percentage carbohydrate content was determined by subtracting the percentage values of the proximate parameters from 100 %.

Carbohydrate = 100% - % (moisture + fat + protein + ash).

2.4 Data Analyses

Pollen counts were converted to percentage based on the total pollen count from each samples while data from chemical analysis were converted to mean and standard deviation using IBM SPSS Statistics 20 package.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Pollen Analysis

The results of the pollen analysis of honey samples from Anambra State showed that a total of 67 pollen types belonging to 39 families were identified from both nectariferous and non-nectariferous plants. This is an indication that the honeys were produced from a wide range of plant sources. In Nigeria and other West African countries and environment, tropical lowland rainforests and forest-savanna mosaic woodland vegetations are known to be refuge to abundant and diversity of melliferous plant species of all habits which serve as sources of nectar, extrafloral nectar and pollen to honeybees [28]. This aptly is demonstrated in the level of pollen abundance and diversity recorded in this study. These results are comparable to the findings of some investigations conducted in honey samples from southeast, Nigeria [29,30,27]. From the results of pollen spectrum, the honey samples can be grouped into two on the bases of their botanical origin. The first group of honey samples were categorized as unifloral honeys in accordance to Codex Alimentarius and EU standard designation [31]. This was because each of the honey samples had one predominant pollen type with percentage pollen ≥ 45 .

In the unifloral honeys, Combretaceae-Melastomataceae was predominant (≥ 45) in honey sample from Ukpok and *Hymenocardia acida* predominant (≥ 45) in honey samples from Osumenyi and Ezinifite 1 samples (Table 1).

Combretaceae-Melastomataceae comprised complex plants species most of which are trees and lianas of forest and savanna woodlands, while *Hymenocardia acida* is mostly associated with woodland savanna vegetation. Both group of plants are commonly distributed in the study areas. The rest of the honey samples examined were polyfloral honeys because percentage pollen type of contributing plants ranged from Secondary (16–45%) to minor pollen ($\leq 3\%$) [31] (Table 1). The production of uniflora honeys from wild honeybees is usually rare because most honeys derived from the wild are usually multifloral due to the diversity of plant species readily available to the honeybees to select as pollen and nectar sources. Similar unifloral honeys have also been reported in melissopalynological studies conducted on wild honeys from five states of Nigeria [27]. The production of such unifloral honeys may be attributed to the local abundance of Combretaceae-Melastomataceae and *Hymenocardia acida* in the vegetation and occurrence their flowering periods which usually coincided with major active periods of honeybees as well as their selective preference as major sources of nectar and pollen. Incidentally, *Hymenocardia acida* and members of Combretaceae-Melastomataceae are nectariferous and polliniferous plants and have been generally identified in honeys analysed from this region.

The honey sample from Nnokwa was commonly dominated by pollen types of *Elaeis guineensis* followed by *Irvingia gabonensis* and *Alchornea cordifolia*. The major honey plants recorded out of the 19 pollen types include *Elaeis guineensis*, *Irvingia gabonensis*, *Phyllanthus muellerianus*, *Nauclea latifolia*, Combretaceae-Melastomataceae, *Parkia biglobosa* and *Crossopteryx febrifuga* (Table 1). In that of Alor honey sampl, 24 pollen types were recorded with pollen types of Combretaceae-Melastomataceae families predominating followed by those of *Lannea* sp., *Hymenocardia acida*, *Phyllanthus muellerianus*, *Nauclea latifolia* and *Citrus sinensis*. The nectariferous plants suspected to be main sources of nectar include Combretaceae-Melastomataceae, *Lannea* sp., *Phyllanthus muellerianus*, *Citrus sinensis*, *Syzygium guineense*, *Parkia biglobosa*, *Pentaclethra macrophylla*, *Senna* sp., and *Parinari* sp. *Alchornea cordifolia*, Poaceae, *Elaeis guineensis* and *Nauclea latifolia* were among the important sources of the honey pollen (Table 1).

The sample from Nnobi was characterized by pollen types arising from Combretaceae-Melastomataceae, *Lannea* sp., *Phyllanthus muellerianus*, *Syzygium guineense*, *Prosopis africana*, *Alchornea cordifolia*, *Parinari curatelifolia*, *Senna* sp. and *Hymenocardia acida*. Although 21 pollen types were identified, these plants constituted the major sources of nectar and pollen for the honeybees (Table 1). The plants sources of the pollen grains identified in these locations are characteristic members of the flora of the study areas [32]. Comparatively, similar pollen types have been reported in a study by Agwu and Njokuocha [29] in honey samples from Anambra State.

A total of 30 pollen types were identified in the honey sample from Ukpok. The most common plant sources of nectar and pollen recorded were Combretaceae-Melastomataceae, *Lannea acida*, *Blighia sapida*, *Hymenocardia acida*, Poaceae, *Palisota hirsuta*, *Bombax buonopozense*, *Prosopis africana* and *Phyllanthus muellerianus* (Table 1). In the honey sample from Osumenyi, only 18 pollen types were identified and of these the major plant sources of nectar and pollen include members of Combretaceae-Melastomataceae, *Hymenocardia acida*, *Elaeis guineensis*, *Bridelia ferruginea*, *Prosopis africana* and *Parkia biglobosa* (Table 1). For Ezinifite 1, a total of 23 pollen types were recorded and the major pollen and nectar sources include *Hymenocardia acida*, *Crossopteryx febrifuga*, *Allophylus* sp., *Senna* sp., Combretaceae-Melastomataceae, *Lannea* sp., *Parinari* sp. and *Psorospermum* sp. Commonly recorded in this honey sample were pollen grains of anaemophilous plants such as Poaceae, Moraceae, *Alchornea cordifolia*, *Pinus* sp., Cyperaceae and Amaranthaceae-Chenopodiaceae (Table 1). In Ezinifite II, 42 pollen types were recorded from the honey sample. The most predominant nectariferous and polliniferous plants include Combretaceae-Melastomataceae, *Pterocarpus* sp., *Psorospermum* sp., *Piliostigma thonningii*, *Hymenocardia acida*, *Azelia africana*, *Lannea* sp., *Elaeis guineensis*, *Phyllanthus muellerianus* and *Mangifera indica* (Table 1). Similar findings in pollen characteristics have been reported by Agwu and Njokuocha [29] and in honeys collected from the forest-savanna vegetation of southeastern, Nigeria by Njokuocha and Nnamani [14].

The plant taxa identified in this study reflected to a large extent the characteristic flora existing in

the patches of lowland rainforest and forest-savanna vegetation associated with the study areas. The characteristic taxa of the lowland rainforest recorded in the analyzed honey samples were *Elaeis guineensis*, *Alchornea cordifolia*, *Bombax buonopozense*, *Irvingia gabonensis*, *Canarium sweinfurthii*, Moraceae, *Pentaclethra macrophylla*, *Olox* sp. and *Brachystegia euricoma*. Similarly, the characteristic elements of the forest savanna mosaic vegetation associated with the study area which were identified in the study include Combretaceae-Melastomataceae, *Hymenocardia acida*, *Syzygium guineense*, *Phyllanthus muellerianus*, *Piliostigma thonningii*, *Crossopteryx febrifuga*, *Nauclea latifolia*, *Parkia biglobosa*, *Crossopteryx febrifuga*, *Bridelia ferruginea*, *Spondias mombin*, *Lannea* sp. and *Blighia sapida* among others [33]. Related studies associating honey pollen with the floristic composition of the study area have been reported by previous authors in Nigeria [13,14]. Evidence of anthropogenic activities such as changes in landscape and existence of exotic flora in the study environment were clearly demonstrated by the presence of pollen grains of *Citrus sinensis*, *Mangifera indica*, *Pinus* sp., *Senna* sp., *Delonix regia*, *Triumfetta rhumbiodes*, *Casuarina equisetifolia* and *Manihot esculenta* which occurred in noticeable quantity in the honey samples. Similar findings have also been reported by Njokuocha and Ekweozor [30] and Njokuocha and Nnamani [14].

3.2 Physicochemical Analysis

The results of the proximate analysis showed that the parameters tested in the honey samples conformed with the standards of EU and Codex recommendations for honey produced from nectariferous plants [21,22] (Table 2). These findings are also comparable to the works of previous authors not only in Nigeria [12,1,34,15], but some other parts of the world [35,3]. The variations observed in the values of the moisture, crude protein, ash, pH and free acidity contents of the honeys sourced from different locations of the study area may be attributed to the differences in microclimate and soil properties on which the vegetation of the of the areas depend on for sustenance [36]. The low moisture content, the acidic and free acidity levels of the samples indicate that the honeys have potential for long shelf life and strong inhibitory property against microbial activity. The acidity in honey is attributed to the presence of organic acids such as gluconic acid and inorganic ions [35]. The

considerably low free acidity especially in samples from Ezinifite II and Nnokwa is a good indication of good quality honey because high acidity has been reported to facilitate the breakdown of hexoses to hydroxymethyl furfural [37], therefore the level of acidity recorded is an indication of freshness of the honeys.

The ash content of the honey samples was within the permissible limit (0.6%) from nectariferous plants [21]. Ash content of honey is an indication of the mineral concentration [38]. Quantitatively the ash content of honey is dependent on the soil properties and climatic factors of the honey region of origin. It is also used as quality index for determination of the botanical origin of honey [39]. The study showed that the honey samples contained a considerable percentage of protein in the range of 0.76 ± 0.01 in honey from Ezinifite II to 1.67 ± 0.01 in honey sample from Ezinifite I. This range is considerably higher than the rough limit of 0.5 g /100 g of blossom honey, but far below the recommended daily intake of protein [40]. Protein is a very important dietary component, the presence of which may lead to a food to be considered not only as possible source of protein but an essential dietary product. Honey protein is mostly derived from enzymes introduced into the honey by the honeybees such as diastase, invertase, glucose oxidase, catalase and amino acids [1]. Pollen grains which are ever present in considerable quantity and diversity in honeys have been reported to be rich protein natural foods of bees; hence they are important sources of protein in honey. Considerable literature on the physicochemical components of honey in Nigeria and other regions have reported considerable but variable quantity of protein in honey produced from both wild and domestic apiary [40,34,15].

Studies have shown that about 80% honey is composed of sugars; and of this glucose and fructose constitute the highest proportion of the sugar components. In the present study, the percentage concentration of glucose and fructose is high and in conformity with the general observation regarding their dominant percentage proportion in comparison to other sugars in honeys (Table 3). Similar findings have been reported in honey samples from Nigeria [1,41], Turkey [42], Egypt [43] and Tunisia [3]. The sum of glucose and fructose in a honey is an important factor for assessing honey quality. According to Codex Alimentarius Commission [21]

and EU Council [22] regarding good quality honey, the sum of glucose and fructose must be equal or higher than 60 g/100 g of honey. However, not all the honey samples met the limits of recommended international standard.

The samples from Alor, Ukpok and Osumenyi did not meet the minimum limit set by codex. but for honey samples from Ezinifite I, Nnokwa, Nnobi and Ezinifite II the sum of glucose and fructose were within the acceptable international standard (Table 3). These findings are comparable to those reported by other authors [42,44]. The low values obtained in the sum of glucose and fructose in honey samples from Alor, Ukpok and Osumenyi may be attributed to the nature of nectar sugars, types of enzymes deposited by the honeybees and the extent of maturity of the honey samples prior to their harvest. In the assessment of good quality honey, it is expected that the value of fructose should be greater than that of glucose [45]. This is in conformity with the results of the present study. This factor also become valuable when considering the fructose/glucose ratio which is an important criterion when considering the crystallization rate of the honey. The study showed that the ratio of fructose/glucose in all the samples were within the range of 1.0 to 1.45 acceptable optimum limit [1,46]. Honey within such fructose/glucose ratio range has very low rate of crystallization and therefore remains in liquid form. Equally influencing the rate of honey crystallization is the glucose/water ratio balance. High glucose and lower water ratio leads to high rate of crystallization, while the reverse leads to low rate of crystallization [47].

The sucrose content of the analyzed honey samples varied from 1.11 ± 0.01 in honey sample from Osumenyi to 2.04 ± 0.02 in honey sample from Ezinifite II (Table 3). According to laid down international honey standard, the sucrose content of a good quality honey should not exceed 5 g/100 g of honey [21,22]. This indicates that sucrose content of all the honey samples were within the acceptable limits of international standard. It has also been pointed out that even in honey that contains an active sucrose converting enzymes, the sucrose level can never be zero [48]. The findings in this study is comparable to that published by Aljohar, et al. [6], Czipa, et al. [49] and Njokuocha [27]. But the percentage values of sucrose in this study was lower than that reported by Aino [12], Nweze, et al. [44] and Boussaid, et al. [3].

Table 1. The dominant pollen types in the honey samples according to the percentage frequency (Predominant pollen = $\geq 45\%$; secondary pollen = 16 – 44%; important minor pollen = 3 – 15%; minor pollen = ≤ 3)

| Family | Taxon | % frequency of dominant pollen types in the honey samples/location | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|----------|-------------|--------|------|-------|--------------|
| | | Ukpor | Osumenyi | Ezinifite 1 | Nnokwa | Alor | Nnobi | Ezinifite 11 |
| Anacardiaceae | <i>Lannea</i> sp. | 2.0 | 1.0 | 6.0 | 0 | 22.2 | 18.0 | 5.88 |
| | <i>Mangifera indica</i> | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.25 |
| Arecaceae | <i>Elaeis guineensis</i> | 2.0 | 0 | 0 | 23.2 | 0 | 0 | 3.42 |
| Chrysobalanaceae | <i>Parinari</i> sp. | 0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Combretaceae/ Melastomataceae | | 64 | 11.6 | 18.0 | 2.0 | 36 | 36.0 | 10.97 |
| Euphorbiaceae | <i>Alchornea cordifolia</i> | 2.0 | 1.0 | 0 | 8.4 | 0 | 3.6 | 0 |
| Fabaceae | <i>Azelia Africana</i> | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.34 |
| | <i>Prosopis Africana</i> | 2.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6.5 | 0 |
| | <i>Piliostigma thonningii</i> | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 |
| | <i>Pterocarpus</i> sp. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23.52 |
| | <i>Senna</i> sp. | 0 | 7.0 | 2.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hymenocardiaceae | <i>Hymenocardia acida</i> | 4.0 | 72.0 | 54.0 | 0 | 16.0 | 2.8 | 7.55 |
| Hypericaceae | <i>Psorospermum</i> sp. | 0 | 0 | 2.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18.27 |
| Irvingiaceae | <i>Irvingia gabonensis</i> | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Moraceae | | 0 | 1.0 | 0 | 4.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Myrtaceae | <i>Syzygium guineense</i> | 2.0 | 0 | 0 | 6.0 | 0 | 10.2 | 0 |
| Phyllanthaceae | <i>Phyllanthus muellerianus</i> | 2.9 | 0 | 0 | 2.7 | 11.6 | 12.3 | 2.67 |
| Rubiaceae | <i>Crossopteryx febrifuga</i> | 0 | 0 | 2.0 | 0 | 8.0 | 4.1 | 0 |
| | <i>Nauclea latifolia</i> | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rutaceae | <i>Citrus sinensis</i> | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.5 | 0 | 0 |
| Sapindaceae | <i>Allophyllus</i> sp. | 0 | 0 | 5.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 2. Proximate composition of the honey samples from Anambra State (Mean \pm standard deviation)

| Source location | Parameters | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| | Moisture (%) | Crude protein (%) | Ash (%) | pH | Free acidity (Meq/kg) |
| Ukpor | 15.63 \pm 0.03 | 1.63 \pm 0.01 | 0.56 \pm 0.01 | 3.4 \pm 0.2 | 40.10 \pm 0.01 |
| Osumenyi | 16.29 \pm 0.01 | 1.58 \pm 0.02 | 0.59 \pm 0.02 | 3.5 \pm 0.1 | 35.0 \pm 2 |
| Ezinifite I | 15.78 \pm 0.01 | 1.67 \pm 0.01 | 0.86 \pm 0.02 | 3.7 \pm 0.2 | 37.0 \pm 1 |
| Nnokwa | 16.22 \pm 0.01 | 1.5 \pm 0.01 | 0.53 \pm 0.01 | 3.6 \pm 0.1 | 15.0 \pm 2 |
| Alor | 17.51 \pm 0.02 | 1.54 \pm 0.02 | 0.56 \pm 0.01 | 3.3 \pm 0.2 | 40.1 \pm 0.02 |
| Nnobi | 17.63 \pm 0.01 | 1.49 \pm 0.01 | 0.51 \pm 0.01 | 3.7 \pm 0.1 | 31.0 \pm 0.8 |
| Ezinifite II | 16.43 \pm 0.01 | 0.76 \pm 0.01 | 0.06 \pm 0.01 | 3.5 \pm 0.1 | 0.05 \pm 0.02 |

Table 3. The sugar and carbohydrate content of the honey samples from Anabra State

| Source location | Parameters 0 | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|
| | Glucose (g/100 g) | Fructose (g/100 g) | Fructose + glucose | Fructose/ Glucose ratio | Glucose/ Water ratio | Sucrose (g/100 g) | HMF (mg/100 g) | Carbohydrate (%) |
| Ukpor | 25.26 ± 0.01 | 26.78 ± 0.01 | 52.04 ± 0.05 | 1.06 0 ± 0.03 | 1.62 ± 0.01 | 1.21 ± 0.01 | 0.38 ± 0.02 | 82.51 ± 0.01 |
| Osumenyi | 25.41 ± 0.01 | 26.35 ± 0.03 | 51.76 ± 0.02 | 1.04 ± 0.01 | 1.56 ± 0.01 | 1.11 ± 0.01 | 0.43 ± 0.02 | 80.69 ± 0.01 |
| Ezinifite I | 27.41 ± 0.02 | 33.49 ± 0.02 | 60.9 ± 0.08 | 1.22 ± 0.01 | 1.74 ± 0.01 | 1.90 ± 0.01 | 0.43 ± 0.02 | 81.69 ± 0.01 |
| Nnokwa | 30.01 ± 0.01 | 31.27 ± 0.02 | 61.28 ± 0.02 | 1.04 ± 0.01 | 1.85 ± 0.01 | 1.90 ± 0.05 | 0.43 ± 0.02 | 81.75 ± 0.01 |
| Alor | 28.03 ± 0.02 | 28.46 ± 0.01 | 56.49 ± 0.01 | 1.02 ± 0.01 | 1.6 ± 0.08 | 1.64 ± 0.02 | 0.58 ± 0.01 | 80.39 ± 0.02 |
| Nnobi | 27.11 ± 0.01 | 34.97 ± 0.01 | 62.08 ± 0.02 | 1.29 ± 0.01 | 1.54 ± 0.01 | 1.77 ± 0.01 | 0.52 ± 0.01 | 80.37 ± 0.01 |
| Ezinifite II | 36.22 ± 0.02 | 43.87 ± 0.02 | 80.09 ± 0.01 | 1.21 ± 0.01 | 2.21 ± 0.04 | 2.04 ± 0.02 | 3.89 ± 0.02 | 82.75 ± 0.01 |

HMF is one of the important quality criterion used in determining the freshness and purity of honey. It is an indication of overheating or exposure to high temperature and poor storage condition such as prolonged storage under high temperature. The results of the present study showed that the HMF values of the honey samples is very low ranging from 0.38 ± 0.02 in Ukpor sample to 3.89 ± 0.02 in Ezinifite 11 sample. These results are below the limits of 40 mg/kg set by Codex Alimentarius Commission [21] for honeys from tropical areas like Nigeria. This shows that the honey samples analyzed in this study may be regarded as being fresh and pure. This finding compared favourably with those of Aljohar, et al. [6], Czipa, et al. [49] and Njokuocha [27]. However, the HMF values are lower compared to the higher values reported by Njokuocha and Osayi [15] and Boussaid, et al. [3]. HMF is formed during acid-catalyzed breakdown of hexose and decomposition of 3-deoxosone in Maillard reaction [50].

There is correlation between HMF formation and some honey characteristics such as pH, free acid content, total acidity, lactone and mineral contents as well as floral sources of the honey [51]. Important factors that leads to the HMF formation are heating of sugars from breakdown of hexoses under acidic condition at high temperatures and from oligo- and polysaccharides that can produce hexoses when hydrolyzed [52]. Under certain conditions, HMF may have positive or negative effect on human health. The consumption of HMF in honey and other food products may cause mutagenic, genotoxic, organotoxic, DNA damaging and enzyme inhibiting effects [53]. But where HMF occurs in the form of 5-sulfoxymethylfurfural it has such benefits as anti-oxidative, anti-allergic, anti-inflammatory and anti-sickling effects, among others on human health [54,55,56].

Of all the components of honey, carbohydrate constitutes the highest percentage, comprising about 95-98% of dry weight of honey [1,42]. Fructose and glucose are the main constituents of carbohydrate found in honey. At least about 22 more complex sugars are present in small amount in honeys, and they include monosaccharide, disaccharides, trisaccharides and oligosaccharides formed during the process of honey ripening by the interactions of honeybee enzymes, acids and temperature [57]. The carbohydrate content of the honey samples analyzed in this study ranged from 80.37% to 82.75% in honey samples from Nnobi and

Ezinifite II respectively. Similar findings have been reported by Buba, et al. [1].

4. CONCLUSION

The analysis of the honey samples revealed that the honey samples are fresh and genuine based on the values of the tested chemical parameters which were within the limits of international acceptable limits. The pollen spectrum of the honey samples indicated that the honeys were formed from diverse plants sources, although three of the honey samples (from Ukpor, Osumenyi and Ezinifete) are monofloral, while four samples (from Nnokwa, Alor, Nnobi and Ezinifite II), are multifloral honeys. The common honey plants identified almost across the samples includes *Hymenocardia acida*, Combretaceae/Melastomataceae, *Lannea* sp., *Alchornea cordifolia* and *Phyllanthus muellerianus*.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I thank sincerely Ibe, Chizoba A., Nweze, Everestus O. and Okoloji, Chinyere I. for making the honey samples used for this study available and their other roles in the success of this study. This research work was not sponsored.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Author has declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Buba F, Gidado A, Shugaba A. Analysis of Biochemical composition of honey sample from North-East Nigeria. *Biochemistry and Analytical Biochemistry*. 2013;2(3):139. Doi: 10.4172/2161-1009.1000139
2. AOAC. Official methods analysis of the Association of Official Analytical Chemists. 18th Edition, Association of Official Analytical Chemists (AOAC), Maryland, USA; 2005.
3. Boussaid A, Chouaibi M, Rezig L, Hellal, R, Donsi F, Ferrari G, Hamdi S. Physicochemical and bioactive properties of six honey samples from various floral origins from Tunisia. *Arabian Journal of Chemistry*. 2018;11:265–274.
4. Alvarez-Suarez J, Tulipani RS, Bertoli E, Battino M. Contribution of honey innutrition and human health: A review. *Mediterranean Journal of Nutrition and Metabolism*. 2010; 3:15–23.

5. Battino M, Alvarez-Suarez JM, Giampieri F. Honey as a source of dietary antioxidants: Structures, bioavailability and evidence of protective effects against human chronic diseases. *Curriculum Medical Chemistry*. 2013;20:621–638.
6. Aljohar HI, Maher HM, Albagami J, Al-Mehaizie M, Orfali R, Orfali R, Alrubia S. Physical and chemical screening of honey samples available in the Saudi market: An important aspect in the authentication process and quality assessment. *Saudi Pharmaceutical Journal*. 2018;26:932–942.
7. Hussein S, Yusoff K, Makpol S, Yusof Y. Antioxidant capacities and total phenolic content increase with gamma irradiation in two types of Malaysian honey. *Molecules*. 2011;16(19):6378–6395.
8. Francisco JH, Terrab A, Gonzalez AG, Diez MJ. Characterization of Moroccan unifloral honeys using multivariate analysis. *Journal of European Food Research and Technology*. 2003;218:88–95.
9. De Alda-Garcilope C, Gallego-Picó A, Bravo-Yagüe JC, Garcinuño-Martínez RM, Fernandez-Hernando P. Characterization of Spanish honeys with protected designation of origin “Miel de Granada” according to their mineral content. *Food Chemistry*. 2012;135:1785–1788.
10. La Serna Ramos IE, Gómez Ferreras C. An example of the role of exotic flora in the geographical characterization of honey: *Schinus molle* L. in the Canary Islands (Spain). *Grana*. 2011;50:136–149.
11. Adekanmbi OH, Walter OJ, Ikegbunam NC. Pollen analysis and heavy metals detection in honey samples from southern Nigeria. *World News of Natural Sciences*. 2019;26:176–190.
12. Aina DO. Pollen and physicochemical characterization of honey samples from Ankpa Local Government Area of Kogi State, Nigeria. *FUTO Journal Series (FUTOJNLS)*. 2016;2(2):160–172.
13. Kayode J, Oyeyemi SD. Pollen analysis of *Apis mellifera* honey collected from Nigeria. *American Journal of Agriculture and Forestry*. 2014;2(5):226–231. DOI: 10.11648/j.ajaf.20140205.13
14. Njokuocha RC, Nnamani NA. Palynological analysis of seven samples of honey from the rainforest-savannah vegetation of east-middle belts of Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Botany*. 2009;22(1):189–202.
15. Njokuocha RC, Osayi EE. Physicochemical assessment and pollen analysis of honey from Nsukka, Enugu State, Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Botany*. 2015;28(1):95–107.
16. Stanimirova I, Ustun B, Cajka T, Riddelva K, Hajslova J, Buydens LMC, Walczak B. Tracing the geographical origin of honey based on volatile compounds profiles assessment using pattern recognition techniques. *Food Chemistry*. 2010;118:171–176.
17. Zakaria A, Shakaff AYM, Masnan MJ, Ahmad MN, Adom AH, Jaafar MN, Ghani SA, Abdullah AH, Aziz AHA, Kamarudin LN, Subari N, Fikri NA. A biomimetic sensor for the classification of honeys of different floral origin and the detection of adulteration. *Sensor*. 2011;11:7799–7822.
18. Nwakpu PE, Iyaka SA, Okwuru VM. Microscopical analysis and quality status of honey from southeastern Nigeria. *Journal of Agriculture and Social Research (JARS)*. 2007;7(2):46–57.
19. Nwoko CIA, Nkwoada AU, Ubeh EO, Njoku A. Characterization of selected honey in South-East Nigeria: Theoretical translation. *International Journal of Environment, Agriculture and Biotechnology*. 2017;2(2):695–700. DOI:10.22161/ijeab/2.2.16
20. Obiegbuna J, Osajiele B, Ishiwu CN. Quality evaluation of Awka market honey and honey from beekeepers in two floral regions of Anambra State, Nigeria. *American Journal of Food Science and Technology*. 2017;5(4):149–155. DOI: 10.12691/ajfst-5-4-5
21. Codex Alimentarius Commission Revised codex standard for honey. *Codex STANS 12-1981, Riv.1(1987). Rev.2(2001); FAO/WHO*.
22. EU Council. Council Directive 2001/110/EC of 20 December, 2001 relating to honey. *Official Journal of the European Commission*. 2002;L10:47–52.
23. Moore PD, Webb JA. An illustrated guide to pollen analysis. 1st Edition, Hodder and Stoughton, London. 1978;133.
24. Bonnefille R, Riolett G. *Pollen de Savanes d’Afrique Orientale*. Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris. 1980;144.
25. Y’bert JP. *Atlas de Pollen de Cote D’Ivoire*. Official de la Recherche Scientifique et Technique Outremer, Paris; 1979.
26. APLF. *Pollen et Spore d’Afrique Tropicale*. Traux et Documents de Geographic

- Tropicale, CEGET, Association des Planetariums de Langue Francaise (APLF), Talence 16. 1974;283.
27. Njokuocha RC. Melissopalynological and biochemical evaluation of the authenticity of *Apis mellifera adansonii* honeys obtained from five states of Nigeria. *Animal Research International*. 2019;16(3):3463–3477.
 28. Steentoft M. Flowering plants in West Africa. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. 1988;344.
 29. Agwu COC, Njokuocha RC. Pollen analysis of honey and the biological effects of honey as a rooting medium. *Nigerian Journal of Botany*. 2004;17:74–82.
 30. Njokuocha RC, Ekweozo RCC. Pollen contents of commercial honeys of Opi, Nsukka, Enugu State, Nigeria. *Plant Product Research Journal*. 2007;11:5–11.
 31. Louveaux J, Maurizio A, Vorwohl G. Methods of melissopalynology. *Bee World*. 1978;59:139–157.
 32. Keay RWJ, Onochie CFA, Stanfield DP. *Nigerian Trees*. Federal Government of Nigeria Press, Lagos. 1964;1&2.
 33. Okereke CN, Nnabude PC, Mbaekwe EI, Ekwealor KU, Uhuo CA, Nwanchor KC. The use of ecological methods in vegetative studies of plant species and abundance in south-eastern, Nigeria. *African Journal of Plant Sciences*. 2014;8(9):441–449.
Doi: 10.5897/AJPS2014.1201
 34. Ndife J, Abioye L, Dandago M. Quality assessment of Nigerian honey sourced from different floral locations. *Nigerian Food Journal*. 2014;32(2):48–55.
 35. Azonwade FE, Paraiso A, Dossa CPA, Dougnon VT, N'tcha C, Mousse W, Baba-Moussa L. Physicochemical characteristics and microbiological quality of honey produced in Benin. *Journal of Food Quality*. 2018;2018:1–13.
 36. Cimpoi C, Hosu C, Miclaus V, Puscas A. Determination of the floral origin of some Romanian honeys on the basis of physical and biochemical properties. *Spectrochimica Acta-Part A: Molecular and Biomolecular Spectroscopy*. 2013;100:149–154.
 37. Ajlouni S, Sujirapinyokul P. Hydroxymethylfurfuraldehyde and amylase contents in Australian honey. *Food Chemistry*. 2010;119:1000–1005.
 38. Anyansola AA, Banjo AD. Physicochemical evaluation of authenticity of honey marketed in southwestern Nigeria. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*. 2011;1(12):3339–3344.
 39. Vanhanen LP, Emmertz A, Savage GP. Mineral analysis of mono-floral New Zealand honey. *Food Chemistry*. 2011;128(1):236–240.
 40. Bogdanov S, Jurendic T, Sieber R, Gallmann P. Honey for nutrition and health: A review. *Journal of the American College Nutrition*. 2008;27(6):677–689.
Doi: 10.1080/07315724.2008.10719745
 41. Lawal OO, Oboh EO, Basse SC, Obeten OO. Composition of sugars in honey produced in the South-South and South-West regions of Nigeria. *International Journal of Sciences*. 2017;6(8):179–184.
 42. Can Z, Yildiz O, Sahin H, Turumtay EA, Silici S, Kolayli S. An investigation of Turkish honeys: Their physico-chemical properties, antioxidant capacities and phenolic profiles. *Food Chemistry*. 2015;180:133–141.
 43. El Sohaimy SA, Masry SHD, Shehat MG. Physicochemical characteristics of honey from different origin. *Annals of Agricultural Science*. 2015;60(2):279–287.
Doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2015.10.015
 44. Nweze JA, Okafor JI, Nweze EI, Nweze JE. Evaluation of physicochemical and antioxidant properties of two stingless bee honeys: A comparison with *Apis mellifera* honey from Nsukka, Nigeria. *BMC Research Notes*. 2017;10:566.
Doi: 10.1186/s13104-017-2884-2
 45. Zafar A, Safdar M, Siddiqui N, Mumtaz A, Hameed T, Sial MU. Chemical analysis and sensory evaluation of branded honey collected from Islamabad and Rawalpindi market. *Journal of Agricultural Research*. 2008;2:86–91.
 46. Ma Y, Zhang B, Li H, Li Y, Li J, Wang H, Deng Z. Chemical molecular dynamics analysis of crystallization properties of honey. *International Journal of Food Properties*. 2017;20(4):725–733.
Doi: 10.1080/10942912.2016.1178282
 47. Bhandari B, D'Arcy B, Kelly C. Rheology and crystallization of kinetics of honey: Present status. *International Journal of Food Properties*. 1999;2(3):217–226.
DOI: 10.1080/10942919909524606
 48. White JW, Doner LW. Honey composition and properties: *Beekeeping in the United States*. Agricultural Handbook. 1980;335: 82–91.
 49. Czipa N, Phillips CJC, Kovacs B. Composition of acacia honeys following

- processing, storage and adulteration. Journal of Food Science and Technology. 2019;56(3):1245-1255.
Doi.org/10.1007/s13197-019-03587-y
50. Fallico B, Arena E, Zappala M. Degradation of 5-Hydroxymethylfurfural in honey. Journal of Food Science. 2008;73: C625–C631.
51. Shapla UM, Solayman Md, Alam N, Khalil Md I, Gan SH. 5-Hydroxymethylfurfural (HMF) levels in honey and other food products: Effects on bees and human health. Chemistry Central Journal. 2018; 12:35.
Doi.org/10.1186/s13065-018-0408-3
52. Arribas-Lorenzo G, Morales FJ. Estimation of dietary intake of 5-Hydroxymethylfurfural and related substances from coffee to Spanish population. Food and Chemical Toxicology. 2010;48:644-649.
53. Høie AH, Svendsen C, Brunborg G, Glatt H, Alexander J, Meini W, Husøy T. Genotoxicity of three food processing contaminants in transgenic mice expressing human sulfotransferases IA1 and IA2 as assessed by the in vivo alkaline single cell gell electrophoresis assay. Environmental Molecular Mutagenesis. 2015;56:709–714.
54. Abdulmalik O, Safo MK, Chen Q, Yang J, Brugnara C, Ohene-Frempong K, Abraham DJ, Asakura T. 5-hydroxymethyl-2-furfural modifies intracellular sickle haemoglobin and inhibits sickling of red blood cells. British Journal of Haematology. 2005;128 (4):552–561.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2141.2004.05332.x
55. Kitts DD, Chen XM, Jing H. Demonstration of antioxidant and anti-inflammatory bioactivities from sugar-amino acid Maillard reaction products. Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry. 2012;60: 6718–6727.
56. Zhao L, Chen J, Su J, Li L, Hu S, Li B, Zhang X, Xu Z, Chen T. *In vitro* antioxidant and antiproliferative activities of 5-hydroxymethylfurfural. Journal of Agriculture and Food Chemistry. 2013;61 (44):10604-11.
DOI: 10.1021/jf403098y
57. Ball DW. The chemical composition of honey. Journal of Chemical Education. 2007;84(10):1643–1646.

© 2019 Njokuocha; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<http://www.sdiarticle4.com/review-history/53233>