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ABSTRACT
The pentacyclic triterpene α,β-aminyrin is a promising bioactive natural product. Supercritical fluid extraction and fractionation are used to obtain pentacyclic triterpenes compounds from dried rosemary leaves. Experiments were conducted at 50°C and 180 bar, and the fractionation of the extract was accomplished in two separators. The shift to a diffusion-controlled regime occurred when 65% of the total oil was extracted. The moments analysis of kinetic curves indicated that the contribution of the axial dispersion, the external transfer and the internal transfer were 9.16%, 80.24% and 10.58%, respectively. The overall extraction curve was represented using three mathematical models.

INTRODUCTION
The pentacyclic triterpenes compounds are characterized by their wide range of pharmacological activities.¹ The pentacyclic triterpene α,β-aminyrin has been identified in several plants and the pure compounds have shown anti-inflammatory,²⁻³ anti-microbial,⁴ antifungal,⁵ antiinceptive,⁶ hepatoprotective and anti-allergic,⁷ and neuropathic and inflammatory pain,⁸ and other interesting biological activities. Amyrins are also involved in the biosynthetic pathways of other biologically active compounds such as avenacine, centellosides, glycyrrhizin or ginsenosides.⁹ The development of biotransformation systems to convert amyrins into these or other compounds would open new ways for using this genus, and were isolated for the first time by Sendra and other interesting bioactive compounds typical of the Mediterranean region, which is widely spread in Algeria. Amyrins have been reported as constituents of this genus, and were isolated for the first time by Sendra et al.¹² from Rosmarinus officinalis L. However, there are few studies reporting the isolation of amyrin from rosemary.¹³⁻¹⁴ On the other hand, the occurrence of betulinic, oleanolic and ursolic acids and betulin and rofficeronein rosemary leaves is well documented.¹⁵⁻¹⁸ There are other triterpenoids that are also present in rosemary leaves and should be investigated. Recently, Zhang et al.¹⁹ reported the isolation of two new triterpenoids glycosides from the aerial parts of rosemary, named as officino-terpenosides and whose molecular formulas are C₃₆H₅₈O₁₁ and C₄₂H₆₈O₁₅.

The extraction of triterpenes is traditionally performed by maceration and soxhlet extraction. These techniques require a long time and large volumes of organic solvents. In the last few years, alternative techniques such as supercritical fluid extraction and fractionation, and ultrasound- and microwave-assisted extraction, have increased the efficiency of the extraction processes.

The SC-CO₂ extraction and fractionation of rosemary leaves to produce phenolic diterpenes compounds have been widely studied and reported in the literature.²⁰⁻²⁴ However, the SC-CO₂ extraction and fractionation of rosemary leaves to recover α- and β-aminyrin have not been reported. It has been reported that the higher pressure and/or higher CO₂ density (above 500 kg/m³) were favourable for the isolation of high molecular compounds like diterpenes, triterpenes, esters and waxes.²⁵⁻²⁷ To design an extraction plant, it is necessary to have reliable mass-transfer models that will allow the determination of optimum operating conditions.²⁸ Many studies have been published and were intended for modelling supercritical extraction using the empirical
kinetic equations.\textsuperscript{29,30} Heat transfer analogy of a single sphere cooled in a fluid medium.\textsuperscript{31} The extraction process was also modelled by integrating the differential mass balances in the solid and fluid phases.\textsuperscript{32,33} To facilitate the choice of model for supercritical fluid extraction (SFE), Sovova\textsuperscript{34} proposed the characteristic times of four single extraction steps: internal diffusion, external mass transfer, hypothetical equilibrium extraction without mass transfer resistance and displacement of the solution from the extractor. Povh et al.\textsuperscript{35} proposed another approach to simplify the evaluation of experimental extraction curves by dividing the curves of several straight sections and calculated the mass transfer coefficients and equilibrium concentrations from their slopes and endpoints.

In this work, we reported SC-CO\textsubscript{2} extraction and online fractionation in a two-step depressurization of rosemary oil to recover the pentacyclic terpene. In addition, the contribution of different mass transfer resistances was investigated and three models were employed to interpret the experimental data.

**Materials and methods**

**Material**

Aerial parts of rosemary were obtained from plant culture of the Biology Institute, Algiers. They were air-dried at ambient temperature (22°C) for 15 days and stored in dark at room temperature. Dry solid weight was determined by the oven drying method at 105°C for 24 h; the water content was 9.63%. The dried plants were ground by a coffee grinder and sieved. The mean particle average size was 437.5µm, and the particle void fraction was 0.53.

**Supercritical extraction and online fractionation procedure**

The experiments were carried out in a supercritical fluid extractor described previously.\textsuperscript{36} The extraction column was filled with 7.4 g of plant particles placed between layers of glass beads. Fractionation was achieved in two different separators (S1 and S2), with independent control of temperature and pressure. The extractions were performed at a pressure constant of 180 bar and a temperature constant of 50°C. Fractionation of the extract was accomplished maintaining S1 at 40 bar and 0°C and S2 at 25 bar and 20°C. Further, the CO\textsubscript{2} flow rate was set to 1 g/min. The major fraction was recovered in S1 and was solid and pasty. On the other hand, a small amount of oily liquid was recovered in the second separator. The extracts were collected at any time by a valve located at the base of the separator; oleoresin extracted was weighed immediately after collection. Bulk density of the milled rosemary was 300 kg/m\textsuperscript{3}, and the bed void fraction was 0.52. Extractions were performed at least in triplicate and the results shown are the average of all the extractions.

**GC-MS analysis**

Oleoresin content was determined using a Hewlett-Packard HP 5973 MSD mass spectrometer interfaced with an HP-6890 gas chromatograph with an HP-5 MS capillary column (30 m x 0.32 mm I.D., film thickness 0.25 µm). Carrier gas: helium; injector and detector temperatures, 250°C. Oven temperature programming was 60°C for 8 min increased at 2°C/min to 280°C and held at 280°C for 30 min; sample injections (1 µL) were performed in splitless mode (1:30); ionization energy, 70 eV; temperatures for the transference line and the ionic source were set at 280°C and 230°C, respectively. The mass spectrometer was used in the total ion current (TIC) mode. Identification of compounds was then performed by comparison of mass spectra and retention indices obtained with those of mass spectra libraries (Wiley 7N. and NIST 02.) or with those reported in the literature and using authentic standards: α-pinene, 1,8 cineole, camphor and borneol (Aldrich Algérie) when it was possible. The identifications were confirmed by comparison of their retention indices with those of authentic compounds or with the literature data.\textsuperscript{37} The relative percentage of each extract constituent was expressed as percentage with peak area normalization.

**HPLC analysis**

The analysis of the sample was performed using a high performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) instrument (Agilent 1100 Series, Agilent Technologies) with a diode-array detector (DAD) and a Zorbax SB C18 (3.5 µm, 4.6 x150 mm Agilent) column. The mobile phases used were methanol with 0.1% phosphoric acid (solvent A) and water with 0.1% phosphoric acid (solvent B). The following linear gradient was applied: 0 min, 40% B; 10 min, 50% B; 15 min, 60% B; 25 min; 60% B; 30 min, 40% B; this last composition was kept until the end of the chromatographic development. The injection volume was 5 µL and the column temperature was 30°C. The detection was accomplished by using a DAD system Varian storing the signal at wavelengths of 240, 280, 285 and 330 nm. Among the main compounds present in rosemary extract, carnosic acid was identified with regard to pure standard (Biochim Algeria); the other compounds have been identified on the basis of references in the literature.\textsuperscript{38}
Mathematical modelling

Characteristic times of extraction steps

The distribution of the solute within the solid and the analysis of characteristics time can help in understanding where mass transfer resistances are located. The extractable substances may be free on the surface of the solid material or inside the structure of the material itself. Thus, mass transfer resistances due to the specific location of the compounds to be extracted are different (external or internal).

The different characteristic times are determined as follows:[14]:

**The characteristic time of displacement** of the fluid from the extractor is the residence time ($t_r$)

$$ t_r = \frac{Y}{q} \tag{1} $$

where $q$ is the specific flow rate (kg (kg plant)$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$) and $Y$ is the solvent-to-solid mass ratio in the extractor and is given by the following expression:

$$ Y = \frac{\rho_f \epsilon_l}{\rho_s (1 - \epsilon_l)} \tag{2} $$

where $\rho_f$ is the solvent density (kg m$^{-3}$), $\rho_s$ is the apparent particle density (kg m$^{-3}$) and $\epsilon_l$ is the bed void fraction.

**The characteristic time of external mass transfer** ($t_{EMT}$) is

$$ t_{EMT} = \frac{\epsilon_l}{k_f a_p} = \frac{\epsilon_l}{1 - \epsilon_l} \frac{\lambda}{k_i} \tag{3} $$

where $k_f$ is the mass transfer coefficient in the fluid phase (ms$^{-1}$), $a_p$ is the specific surface area (m$^{-2}$) and $\lambda$ is the volume/surface ratio of the particle ($= R / 3$ for spherical particles).

**The characteristic time of internal mass transfer** ($t_{IMT}$) is

$$ t_{IMT} = \frac{1 - \epsilon_i}{k_i a_p} = \frac{\lambda}{k_i} \tag{4} $$

where $k_i$ is the mass transfer coefficient in the solid phase (ms$^{-1}$). For a spherical particle of radius $R$ ($k_i = 5D_e / R$), $D_e$ is the effective internal diffusivity (m$^2$s$^{-1}$).

For predicting the external mass transfer coefficient $k_f$ we used the correlation equation of Mongkolkha jornsilp et al.:[39] which is valid over an Re range from 0.1689 to 1.2913 and Sc from 6 to 25:

$$ Sh = 0.135 \text{Re}^{0.5} \text{Sc}^{-0.33} \tag{5} $$

where $Sh$ is the Sherwood number, $Sc$ is the Schmidt number and $Re$ is the Reynolds number.

The binary diffusion coefficient $D_{12}$ (m$^2$s$^{-1}$) of the extract in the solvent was estimated according to Sun and Chen:[40]:

$$ D_{12} = 1.2310^{-14} \frac{T}{\mu_{\text{solute}}^{0.796} \mu_{\text{solvent}}^{0.503}} \tag{6} $$

where $\mu_{\text{solvent}}$ is the CO$_2$ viscosity and the critical volume ($V_c$) was estimated by Joback's method,[41] simplifying the extract as consisting of amyrin (pseudo-solute).

The effective internal diffusivity was estimated by the correlation proposed by Wakao and Smith:[42]:

$$ D_e = \frac{\epsilon_l^2}{\epsilon_p} D_{12} \tag{7} $$

where $\epsilon_p$ is the particle void fraction.

Contribution of mass transfer resistances

The approximate additivity of the effects of axial dispersion and mass transfer resistance was first deduced by Van Deemter et al.[43] According to Ruthven,[44] the same conclusion may be reached in a simple way from moments analysis and lead to Eq. (8) as the definition of an overall effective rate coefficient ($k$) incorporating the effects of both axial dispersion and mass transfer resistances:

$$ \frac{1}{k} = \frac{D_{ax}}{u_i} \left( (1 - \epsilon_i) / \epsilon_i \right) + \frac{R}{3k_f} + \frac{R^2}{15\epsilon_p D_e} \tag{8} $$

where $D_{ax}$ is the axial dispersion (m$^2$s$^{-1}$). For predicting the axial dispersion coefficient, we used the correlation equation of Funazukuryi,[45] which is valid for ReSc $> 0.3$:

$$ D_{ax} = (1.317)(\epsilon_i \text{ReSc})^{1.392} \left( \frac{D_{12}}{\epsilon_i} \right) \tag{9} $$

Modelling

Mathematical models available in the literature were used in the modelling of the extraction curves of rosemary oil. The experimental data were correlated using three models based on differential mass balance equations: (1) the Sovova model,[53] (2) the logistic model presented by Martinez et al.[46] and (3) the desorption model proposed by Tan and Liou.[47]

The broken and intact cells (BIC) model developed by Sovova assumes that the extractible oil content ($x_p$) is divided into accessible oil ($x_{ap}$), or free oil from the broken solid particles, and inaccessible oil ($x_k$), oil content trapped inside the un-ruptured solid structure. The model parameters were used to determine the duration of constant extraction rate ($t_{cER}$), the hardly accessible solute ($x_k$), and the volume of the mass transfer coefficients in the fluid phase ($k_f a_p$) and solid phase ($k_i a_p$).

Martinez’s model was originally conceived to consider the SFE extracts as mixtures of multiple compounds, to deal with the fact that each solute can have its own...
interactions with the solvent and then be extracted at different times. The particularity of the logistic model was the definition of the interfacial mass-transfer term, which was described by one of the solutions from the logistic equation. The logistic model has two adjustable parameters $b_i$ and $t_m$. No physical meaning was attributed to the first one ($b_i$), while the second one ($t_m$) was described as the time in which the extraction rate reaches its maximum value. [46]

The Desorption model of Tan and Liou [47] assumes that the interfacial mass transfer of the extraction is well described by a first-order kinetic expression, whose parameter $k_d$ is the desorption constant and the adjustable parameter.

The goodness of these models fitting to experimental data was assessed considering the percent average absolute relative deviation (AARD (%)), calculated as follows:

$$AARD = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left| \frac{y_i - y_{\text{mod},i}}{y_i} \right| \times 100$$

where $n$ is the number of experimental points, $y_i$ is the yield determined by experimental point $i$ and $y_{\text{mod},i}$ is the yield obtained by the model in point $i$.

**Results and discussions**

**Analysis of rosemary extract**

The GC/MS analysis of the rosemary extract (S1+S2) (Table 1) led to the separation and identification of the majority of the constituents; overall, 27 compounds were identified belonging to five representative classes of constituents: monoterpenes, sesquiterpenes, diterpenes, waxes and pentacyclic triterpenes. The extract contains a complex mixture of 21.84% of monoterpenes, 7.56% of sesquiterpenes, 18.29% of diterpenes, 0.41% of waxes, 2.65% of tocopherol and 46.48% of triterpenes. It was found to be composed mainly of pentacyclic triterpenes (45.22%), followed by oxygenated monoterpenes (21.26%), diterpene (18.29%) and sesquiterpenes hydrocarbons (4.33%). The major compounds that were identified were β-amyrrin (25.83%), α-amyrrin (19.39%), carnosol derivative (18.29%), verbenone (6.24%), camphor (5.11%), borneol (4.33%) and trans-caryophyllene (3.01%).

The results showed that the fractionation leads to recovering in the separator 1 the compounds amyrin and carnosol derivative from rosemary leaves. To our knowledge, no study upon the isolation and quantification of amyrins of SFE extracts of rosemary has yet been proposed. On the other hand, in this study carnosol derivative was identified instead of carnosic acid and carnosol, which are commonly found in rosemary extract due to their thermal conversion during gas chromatography analysis. [48,49] Indeed, the HPLC analysis of the SFE extract gave a total of 10 peaks, where only four peaks have been identified: vanillic acid, caffeic acid, carnosol and carnosic acid. Carnosic acid represents 40% and the carnosol 18% of the total extract area. This composition showed no great difference with the ones reported for a supercritical rosemary extract. [50] Genena et al. [51] reported that isocarnosol was the main diterpene (31.73%) identified by GC/MS in SFE of rosemary at 200 bar and 50°C. We should note that under these conditions and without fractionation no pentacyclic triterpenes were extracted from rosemary. It can also be noted that the oxygenated monoterpenes were present in larger amounts in this extract; as reported by several authors, the supercritical extraction gives an extract rich in oxygenated monoterpenes compounds.

**Analysis of kinetic data**

Figure 1 shows the kinetic curves presenting the average and the standard deviation of the mass of the

---

**Table 1. Results of GC-MS analysis of the chemical composition of rosemary fraction (S1+S2) isolated at 180 bar and 50°C.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Retention time (min)</th>
<th>Percentage area (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monoterpenes hydrocarbons</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α-Pinene</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β-Ocimene</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oxygenated monoterpenes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,8-Cineole</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α-Thujone</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Octanone</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysanthenone</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camphor</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borneol</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Pinanone</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α-Terpinol</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veblenone</td>
<td>14.82</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endo-bornyl acetate</td>
<td>18.86</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sesquiterpenes hydrocarbons</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α-Farnesene</td>
<td>23.48</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans-caryophyllene</td>
<td>25.90</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α-Humulene</td>
<td>27.89</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencene</td>
<td>29.50</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α-Copaene</td>
<td>32.31</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oxygenated sesquiterpenes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryophyllene-oxide</td>
<td>35.41</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α-Bisabolol</td>
<td>35.90</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diterpenes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnosol derivative</td>
<td>58.93</td>
<td>18.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waxes</td>
<td>1-Octadecanol</td>
<td>82.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Octadecane,1-(ethenyloxy)-</td>
<td>89.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Triterpenes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squalene</td>
<td>89.35</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β-amyrrin</td>
<td>103.40</td>
<td>25.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α-amyrrin</td>
<td>104.65</td>
<td>19.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α-Tocopherol</td>
<td>99.06</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not identified components</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identified components</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>97.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tentative identification.
extract in each separator (S1 and S2) and the mass of the mixture of extracts S1 and S2. The total extraction yield obtained in the two separators is 1.38% (wt), of which 74.60% (wt) is recovered in the first separator and 25.39% (wt) in the second separator.

As can be deduced from Fig. 1, the rosemary plant material was not completely exhausted during the 4.5 h of extraction. Fornani et al.\[52\] reported that an extraction time of 4.5 h was insufficient to extract all extractable material present in rosemary leaves.

In addition, this figure indicates two different extraction rate periods. The first part of the curve is a straight line and, therefore, corresponds to a constant extraction rate period, this part of the process can be due to the desorption of the solute compounds which are readily available at the interface solid/fluid and are easily extracted in the earlier stages. The second part of the curve is around 3 h, which corresponds to the transition period; in this phase the solute inside the solid starts to be extracted and the readily accessible solute continues to be extracted. Besides, the observation of the experimental curve indicates the absence of the third period, corresponding to the disappearance of the accessible solute and the extraction of the hardly accessible solute. In this case the applied extraction time might have been insufficient to reach the diffusion-controlled period.

Experimental results also suggest that about 50% of the available oil is adsorbed on the surface. Indeed, the leaves of aromatic herbs of the Lamiaceae family, such as rosemary (Rosmarinus officinalis), produce superficial oils that are stored in abundant secretory cells called glandular trichomes or glands.\[53,54\]

The analysis of different characteristics times shows that the value of \(t_{EMT}\) (25.70 s) being important as compared to \(t_r\) (79.04 s) confirms that external mass transfer resistance cannot be neglected. On the other hand, the characteristic time of internal mass transfer (\(t_{IMT}\)) is equal to 1.66 s, which confirms that internal diffusion limitation seems not to be present in these operating conditions. The moments analysis provides a better appreciation of the contribution of each mass transfer resistance in the SFE of rosemary; thus, from Eq. (8), the contribution of the axial dispersion, the external transfer and the internal transfer were found to be 9.16%, 80.24% and 10.58%, respectively. Therefore, the axial dispersion and the internal mass transfer have a minor influence compared to the external mass transfer. This observation has an important implication on the choice of the model for modelling the supercritical extraction.

Modelling of the extraction curve

The experimental and modelled curves are illustrated in Fig. 2. The adjustable parameters and the AARD calculated for the applied models are presented in Table 2.

The analysis of the AARD values, as well as the visual observation of Fig. 2, indicated that all models apparently perform similarly, and they represent the data adequately. However, the model of Sovova provided the best fit with the experimental data shown by the AARD of 2.68% (Table 2) and it is more convenient because it provides a realistic description of the vegetable structure.

In the model of Sovova the pseudo-solubility of the extract in SC-CO\(_2\) was estimated as the slope of the first part of the extraction curve. The initial mass of the extractable solute in the solid substratum was considered as the asymptotic value for large extraction times.

The adjusted value of the hardly accessible solute \(x_K\) obtained represents half of the initial mass of the extractable solute; this result denotes that 50% of the solute remained outside the solid particle and the other 50%
remained inside the solid. The CER period was short ($t_{\text{CER}} = 6235.6$ s) compared with the falling extraction rate (FER) period ($t_{\text{FER}} = 13600$ s). Similar results were obtained by García-Risco et al.\(^{55}\) The time at which the solute was extracted from the ruptured cells was completed at around 3.5 h. The observation of the experimental curve shape confirms these results.

The overall extraction curve (OEC) is characterized by the convective mass transfer between the solid material surface and the fluid phase in the first linear portion (CER period) and by both convective mass transfer and diffusion in the solid in the transition phase (FER period). However, the shift to a diffusion-controlled regime occurred when 65% of the total oil was extracted, this value east of 44% in the study conducted by Coello et al.\(^{56}\) The adjusted values of the fluid-phase mass transfer coefficient ($k_{\text{ap}}$) obtained by Sovova’s model are higher than the ($k_{a}\_p$) values, indicating that the effect of the convection mechanism is higher than the diffusion mechanism. García-Risco et al.\(^{55}\) have simulated rosemary SC-CO₂ extraction carried out in a pilot-scale plant of 2 L capacity and processing 0.6 kg of milled rosemary leaves. Their results show that the $k_{\text{ap}}$ value ($3.5 \times 10^{-3}$ s⁻¹) and the $k_{a}\_p$ value ($3.0 \times 10^{-5}$ s⁻¹) are quite in agreement with the values for the low-scale case reported in this work and the previous one.\(^{56}\) However, the $k_{a}\_p$ value reported by Carvalho et al.\(^{57}\) is one order of magnitude lower.

The value of $k_f$ calculated from the estimated parameter $k_{a}\_p$ (fitting parameter) was five times lower than predicted by Eq. (5). This may be due to the fact that the $k_f$ estimated value does not take into account the resistances to mass transfer within the solid. In addition, the specific interfacial area ($a_p$) is often considered as the geometrical surface area ($a_p = 6(1-\varepsilon_i)/d_p$); in our view this overestimation is valid if all parts of the surface of the particles are exposed to mass transfer. Or if this is not the case, this effect can be represented by defining the effective surface area per unit volume by using $a_e$ instead of $a_p$ and establishing a surface area factor $F$ ($a_e/F$) in the expression of the overall mass transfer coefficient $k_a$; in this work, the value of the surface area factor $F$ was 0.18. Marrone et al. (1998)\(^{58}\) reported that an assumption that the solid particles were spherical was often used, and although spheres have the smallest surface area-to-volume ratio among regular geometric shapes, not all of the external surface of the particles is fully available for extraction due to tight packing in low-porosity beds. Also, Del Valle et al.\(^{59}\) reported that the smaller best-fit $k_f$ values than the predictions of the literature correlations are probably due to a combination of several factors, including underestimation of the contribution of internal (solid phase) mechanisms to the total resistance to mass transfer, overestimation of the mass transfer area, underestimation of solvent flow heterogeneity effects and underestimation of natural convection effects.

The $t_m$ parameter for the logistic model was defined as the time when the extraction rate reaches its maximum value. In our experiments, the $t_m$ value is negative; this result indicates that in this case this parameter has no physical meaning, although Martinez et al.\(^{60}\) reported that the negative value indicates that the extraction rate decreases with the maximum value at the initial time of the extraction. Also, according to Domingues et al.\(^{61}\) the negative value may also indicate that the extraction rate was maximum at $t = 0$. When applying this model to the usual OEC shapes, many authors\(^{61–63}\) have obtained negative values for $t_m$ and therefore no physical meaning could be associated with this parameter. Although the logistic model may give good fits in some particular cases, it does not provide any phenomenological information regarding the SFE process; thus the absence of physical meaning turned it into an empirical model.

The model developed by Tan and Liou presents a good fit to experimental data. This model assumes that the desorption process takes place at the solid–fluid interface and that it can be described using a first-order reaction kinetics. Therefore, it should be used with vegetable material with relatively high desorption constants; this is not the case for SFE from rosemary leaves (Table 2). In addition, the desorption model does not include a factor describing the different mass transfer resistances, which makes its applications limited.

### Conclusions

The results indicated that the SCCO₂ fractionation employed to extract bioactive triterpene compounds from rosemary leaves was useful as a selective method.

### Table 2. Kinetic models parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SFE Conditions</th>
<th>BIC model</th>
<th>Desorption model</th>
<th>Logistic model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$P = 180$ bar</td>
<td>$t_{\text{CER}} = 2194.59$ s</td>
<td>$k_d = 5.66 \times 10^{-3}$ s⁻¹</td>
<td>$b = 1.00 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T = 50^\circ$C</td>
<td>$k_{\text{ap}} = 3.6 \times 10^{-3}$ s⁻¹</td>
<td>$\text{AARD} = 4.63%$</td>
<td>$t_m = -5695.00$ s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{\text{sep1}} = 0^\circ$C</td>
<td>$k_{\text{ap}} = 3.37 \times 10^{-5}$ s⁻¹</td>
<td>$\chi_f = 0.0099$ g/g</td>
<td>$\text{AARD} = 4.32%$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{\text{sep2}} = 20^\circ$C</td>
<td>$\chi_f = 0.0068$ g/g</td>
<td>$\text{AARD} = 2.68%$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to obtain the triterpenes compounds as α and β amyrin. Data showed that the selectivity recovery of pentacyclic triterpene can be optimized by adjusting the pressure and temperature in the separators. Analysis of kinetic data indicated the presence of two different extraction rate periods, and the absence of the third period corresponding to the diffusion-controlled step. The characteristic times of extraction steps and the moments analysis have shown that axial dispersion and internal mass transfer have a minor influence compared to the external mass transfer in SFE of rosemary oil. The overall extraction curves were fitted to the models of Sovova, Martínez and Tan and Liou. The logistic model led to a negative value of the time ($t_m$) in which the extraction rate reaches its maximum value and therefore no physical meaning could be associated with this parameter. Also, the model developed by Tan and Liou presented a good fit to experimental data. However, it should be used with vegetable material with relatively high desorption constants; this is not the case for SFE from rosemary leaves. Finally, Sovova’s model provided the best fit and a good physical description of the mass transfer phenomena in SFE of rosemary oil.
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