International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)
ISSN: 2319-7064
SJIF (2022): 7.942

# Evaluation of in Vitrio Antimicrobial Potential and Phytochemical Composition of Some Medicinial Plants against Pathogenic Microbes in Kashmir, India

**Tahmeena Hassan, Dr R C Swami**

Phd Scholar, Department of Biochemistry at Shyam University Jaipur

**Abstract:** ***Background: With no new antibiotics in the market and the rapid emergence of multi drug resistance, currently there is a crisis type situation in public health. The need to find some alternative sources of antimicrobials is essentially the need of the hour. The current study evaluates the antimicrobial and anti fungal activity of methanolic and aqueous extracts of some traditionally used medicinal plants in Kashmir valley, India Methods: Antibacterial and antifungal assays were performed by agar well diffusion methods. Bacterial strains employed were Bacillis subtilis, Staphylococcus aureus, Klebsiella Pneumonia, Pseudomonas aeruginosa, Proteus vulgaris, and Eschechiae coli. Fungal strains employed were Pencillium chrysogenum, Aspergillus fumigates and Sacchoromyces cerevisiae and Candida Albicans. The qualitative phytochemical screening was performed by using the standard methods. Conclusion: The present study deciphers the antimicrobial potential of the plants which can be harvested for future antimicrobial use.***

**Keywords:** Antimicrobial activity, antibacterial activity, antifungal activity, phytochemical screening, methanol and aqueous extracts.

## 1. Introduction

Pathogenic microbes have always posed serious threats to the health of humans and other animals. In fact infective diseases are the second leading cause of death worldwide (WHO, 2002). However with the discovery of antibiotics in 20$^{th}$ century, scientific community began to synthesize synthetic or semi-synthetic antimicrobial drugs but ironically, the misuse of antibiotics by humans, the employment of antibiotics in veterinary practices and the growing presence of antibiotics in water, soil and food have contributed to the problem of antibiotic resistance [1] Antimicrobial resistance is a serious global challenge and could endanger the lives of future generations. After more than 50 years of widespread use of so called “miracle drugs”, synthetic antibiotics are no longer as effective as they once used to be. Virtually most of the bacterial infections throughout the world are becoming resistant to antibiotics [2]. In general, bacteria have the genetic ability to transmit and acquire resistance to drugs that are used as therapeutic agents [3] As resistance to antibiotics becomes more common there is greater need for alternative treatments. Out of the two million people who acquire bacterial infections in U. S. hospitals each year, 70% of cases now involve strains that are resistant to atleast one drug. In U. K., Methicillin resistant *staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA), which was at low level a decade ago, has now increased to about 50% of all *Staphylococcus aureus* isolates [4]. Antimicrobial resistance occurs due to the excessive use of antimicrobials itself. Since 37 years ago, no new classes of antibiotics were discovered and all antibiotics that entered the markets during this period were modification of existing molecules [5]

The plant kingdom is a treasure house of potential drugs. It is estimated that there are about 2.0 lakh to 5.0 lakh species of plants on earth. Among them only a negligible percentage has been explored for phytochemicals and medicinal properties. In fact only less than 1% of some 250, 000 higher plants have been screened for their phytochemistry or pharmacology. [6] Medicinal plants have been a part of traditional healthcare on all the continents of the world for thousands of years. There is evidence that Neanderthals living 60, 000 years ago in present day Iraq used plants such as hollyhock (*Alcea rosea*) [7] for medicinal purpose. . These plants are still used widely in ethnomedicine around the world. Medicinal plants are rich in a numerous variety of secondary metabolites of antimicrobial properties such as saponins, tannins, alkaloids, alkenyl phenols, glycoalkaloids, flavonoids, sesquiterpenes lactones, terpenoids and phorbol esters [8] [9] Current global drug development program may not be able to provide new effective antibiotics in 10 to 20 years [10] However, medicinal plants are expected to be a better candidate for the development of future antimicrobials. The present study is an attempt to evaluate the phytochemical and antimicrobial potential of some traditionally used medicinal plants in the valley of Kashmir, India

## 2. Materials and Methods

### Collection and identification of plant material

Five medicinal plants were collected from higher reaches of Kashmir Valley, India and identified in the Centre of Plant Taxonomy (COPT), Department of Botany, University of Kashmir. Specimen of each plant is retained in the KASH herbarium of COPT under a specific voucher specimen number. The various plants collected include Fragaria Nubicola, Hedera Nepalensis, Malva Sylvestris, Mariubium Vulgare and Mentha Arvensis.

### Preparation of extracts

Whole plant samples were allowed to shade dry at 30±2°C. The dried plant materials were ground into coarse powder

with the help of grinder and extracted using methanol and water as solvents, extractor (60-80°C). The extracts so obtained were concentrated with the help of rotary evaporator under reduced pressure and solid extracts waere stored in a refrigerator at 4ºc.

**Test micro-organisms**

The Bacterial and fungal strains were obtained from Microbial Type Culture Collection, Institute of Microbial Technology (IMTECH), Chandigarh, India. Six bacterial strains including two Gram positive bacteria namely Staphylococcus aureus (MTCC-2940), Bacillus subtilis (MTCC-441) and four Gram negative bacteria namely Proteus vulgaris (MTCC-426), Klebsiella pneumoniae (MTCC-139), Escherichia coli (MTCC-739), and Pseudomonas aeruginosa (MTCC-424) were employed for antibacterial assay. Four fungal strains, Candida albicans (MTCC-227), Saccharomyces cerevisiae (MTCC-170), Aspergillus fumigatus (MTCC-1811) and Penicillium chrysogenum (MTCC-947) were employed for antifungal assay. Bacterial and fungal strains were maintained by subculturing them on Mueller Hinton Agar and Sabouraud Dextrose Agar respectively after every fifteen days and then stored at 4ºC. Gentamycin discs and Nystatin powder was obtained from EOS Laboratories, India and served as positive controls for antibacterial and antifungal assays respectively.10%Dimethylsulfoxide (DMSO) was used as negative control.

**Antibacterial assay**

Antibacterial assay was performed by Agar well diffusion method as described by Irshad et al [11]with some modifications.100µl of standardized inoculum (0.5 Mc Farland) of each test bacterium was inoculated on molten Mueller Hinton Agar, homogenised and then poured into sterile petri plates to yield a uniform depth of 4mm. The petriplates were allowed to solidify inside the laminar hood. Sterile cork borers of 5mm in diameter were used to make uniform and equidistant wells into each petriplate.100µl of each concentration (10mg/ml, 30mg/ml, 50mg/ml, 80mg/ml and 100mg/ml) of plant extracts, prepared in 10%DMSO were loaded into different peripheral wells. Gentamycin (10µg/disc) disc was placed at the centre of each petriplate and served as positive control, while as 10%Dimethylsulfoxide served as negative control in a separate petri plate. The petri plates were then incubated at 37ºC for 18 to 24 hours in an incubator. The plates were then observed for the zones of inhibition. Antibacterial potential was evaluated by measuring the diameters of zones of inhibition in millimeters (mm) with the help of a standard measuring scale. The lowest concentration of the extract (between the range 10-100mg/ml) which does not permit the growth of test bacteria was considered as minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC).

**Antifungal assay**

Antifungal assay was also performed by the method of agar well diffusion as described by Ahmad et al [12] with some modification 100µl of standardized inoculum (0.5 Mc Farland) of each test fungi were inoculated on sterile molten Sabouraud Dextrose Agar homogenised and poured into a sterile petri plate to yield a uniform depth of 4mm. The petriplates were allowed to solidify inside the laminar hood. Sterile cork borers of 5mm in diameter were used to make five wells at periphery and one well at centre of each petriplate.100µl of each concentration (10mg/ml, 30mg/ml, 50mg/ml, 80mg/ml and 100mg/ml) of plant extract, prepared in 10%DMSO were loaded into five different peripheral wells.100µl of Standard antibiotic Nystatin (0.5mg/ml) was loaded into the central well while as 10%Dimethylsulfoxide alone was used as negative control in a separate petri plate. The plates were then incubated at 32ºC for 24 to 36 hours. After incubation period, the plates were observed for the zones of inhibition. Antifungal potential was evaluated by measuring inhibition zone diameters in millimeters (mm) with the help of standard measuring scale. The lowest concentration of the extract (between the range 10-100mg/ml) that prevented visible growth of test fungi was considered as minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC).

**Minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC)**

The lowest concentration of the extracts (between the range of 10-100 mg/ml) below which no inhibitory zone was observed, was considered as MIC. MIC of many plant extracts was observed within the selected range (10-100mg/ml) (Table 12). However the MIC of most of the plant extracts do not fall within the selected range, thereby indicating their high antimicrobial potential. A thorough analysis of MIC results reveal that certain bacterial and fungal strains are more sensitive to extracts than others are. The increasing order of bacterial sensitivity to the plant extracts follow the pattern-*Klebsiella Pneumoniae<Proteus vulgaris< Staphylococcus aureus<Bacillus subtilis< Escherichia coli <Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. Similarly, the increasing order of fungal sensitivity to the extracts follow the pattern-*Aspergillus fumigatus< Penicillium chrysogenum< Candida albicans<Saccharomyces cerevisiae.*

**Phytochemical screening**

Qualitative phytochemical screening of both the aqueous and methanolic extracts was carried out to know the nature of phytochemicals present in them. Flavonoids were detected by lead acetate test while the rest of phytochemicals were detected by the methods described earlier [13]

**Test for steroids**

To 0.5 ml of solvent extract, 2ml of acetic acid was added and then 2ml of concentrated sulphuric acid was added. Appearance of Blue or green colour or a mixture of these two shades was regarded as positive for the presence of steroidal compounds.

**Test for tannins**

To 5ml of solvent extract, two drops of 5% Fecl3 were added. Production of greenish precipitate indicated the presence of tannins.

**Test for terpenoids**

To 5 ml of solvent extract, 2ml of chloroform was added and then 3ml of concentrated sulphuric acid was added carefully. Appearance of reddish brown colouration of the interface was regarded as positive for the presence of terpenoids.

**Test for flavonoids**
To 2 ml of solvent extract, a few drops of lead acetate solution were added. Formation of yellow coloured precipitate was regarded as positive for the presence of flavonoids.

**Test for alkaloids**
To 2ml of solvent extract, a little amount of picric acid solution was added. Formation of orange colour indicated the presence of alkaloids.

**Test for saponins**
About 1 ml of solvent extract was introduced into a tube containing 1ml of distilled water and the mixture was vigorously shaken for 2 minutes. Formation of froth indicated the presence of saponins.

**Test for anthraquinones**
2ml of solvent extract was added to 10 ml of benzene, and then 0.5ml of ammonia solution was added. The mixture was shaken well. Violet colour in the layer phase indicated the presence of anthraquinones. Test for phenols To 2 ml of solvent extract, 2ml of ferric chloride solution was added. Formation of deep bluish green solution indicated the presence of phenols.

**Test for cardiac glycosides**
To 2ml of solvent extract, 2 ml of glacial acetic acid containing 1 drop of ferric chloride was added. Then 2ml of concentrated sulphuric acid ($H_2SO_4$) was added under layered

## 3. Results Discussion

Pathogenic microorganisms have always posed a serious threat to human health by causing various dreadful diseases like syphilis, malaria, cholera, candidiasis, aspergillosis, and AIDs. The microbes used in the current study are associated with many infections. Proteus vulgaris is an opportunistic pathogen responsible for causing urinary tract infections and wound infections. Escherichia coli is responsible for causing severe cramps and diarrhea. Escherichia coli is also the causative agent of gastrointestinal and urinary tract infections [14] Klebsiella pneumonia is the causative agent of pneumonia, characterized by emission of bloody sputum. Staphylococcus aureus is a common cause of skin infections such as abscesses, respiratory infections such as sinusitis, and food poisoning. Pseudomonas aeruginosa is a causative agent of many nosocomial infections (infections acquired in hospitals). Pseudomonas aeruginosa and Staphylococcus aureus are also associated with dental caries [15]. Bacillus subtilis can sometimes lead to food poisoning. Candida albicans is the causative agent of candidiasis. Aspergillus fumigatus can cause chronic pulmonary infections and allergic bronchopulmonary aspergillosis [16]. Penicillium chrysogenum can cause infection in people with severely suppressed immune systems, like those with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) and characterized by pulmonary infection including pneumonia, localized granulomas, fungus balls, and systemic infection. The airborne asexual spores of Penicillium chrysogenum are important human allergens [17]. While as 1% of all vaginal yeast infections occur due to Saccharomyces cerevisiae [18]. Medicinal plants were the first weapons that the man used against pathogenic microbes. Multiple studies have reported the antimicrobial potential of plants [19-21]. In the current study, almost all the plants were found to possess antimicrobial activity; however the potential varied with the species of plants. Similar results were observed by [22]. This could be due to many factors like soil composition, climate, age and vegetation cycle stage, quality of extracted product [23, 24] According to current study, the pattern of inhibition varied with the type of plant extract and the microorganism used which is in accordance to the results obtained by [14]. Moreover, the type of solvent has an important role in the process of extraction [25, 26]. MIC of most of the plant extracts was not detected within the selected range of 10-100mg/ml which indicates the strong antimicrobial potential of extracts. Besides, MIC results revealed certain important facts regarding the susceptibility (sensitivity) of different microbial strains to various plant extracts. Pseudomonas aeruginosa, a gram –ve bacteria was found most susceptible (sensitive) among all the bacterial strains under study which is in agreement with the results obtained by Kavishankar et al, 2011 [27]. Klebsiella pneumoniae was found as the most resistant bacterial strain. Among fungal strains, Saccharomyces cerevisiae was detected as the most susceptible strain, while Aspergillus fumigatus the most resistant. Medicinal plants are rich sources of therapeutically active compounds but only a small fraction of them have been isolated [28]. Bioprospection of secondary metabolites is an important step in the development of new drugs [29, 30]. Phytochemical analysis revealed the presence of various secondary metabolites like flavonoids, alkaloids, saponins, tannins, anthraquinones, cardiac glycosides, and volatile oils in the plants under study. Many of these phytochemicals act as warriors in the plant defense mechanisms against predation by microorganisms. Phenolic compounds possess anti-microbial activity due to the presence of hydroxl (OH) group (s) in them [31]. Flavonoids are known to be synthesized by the plants in response to microbial infection [32]. Flavonoids are effective against a wide array of microorganisms. Their antimicrobial activity is probably due to their ability to complex with bacterial cell wall and they can also disrupt cell membranes [33, 34]. Tannins posses a wide range of anti-infective activities [35]. Tannins have the ability to complex with proteins through hydrogen bonding, hydrophobic interactions as well as covalent bond formation [36, 37]. Their antimicrobial action may be related to their ability to inactivate microbial adhesins, enzymes, cell envelope transport proteins and also to complex with polysaccharides [38]. Terpenes are effective against bacteria fungi, viruses, and protozoa [39-43]. Multiple studies have proved the antimicrobial potential of alkaloids. Their mechanism of action is attributed to their ability to intercalate with DNA [44-47]. Saponins possess antimicrobial potential due to their ability to insert into lipid bilayer, bind to cholesterol and form cholesterol-saponin complex that can lyse the microbial cell membrane [48] [. In addition, volatile oils, cardiac glycosides and various other phytochemicals have been also found to possess antimicrobial properties. The current study has revealed the presence of various phytochemicals in different plants and it is obvious that the plants may possess the antimicrobial potential due to any of these detected Phytoconstituents. . Conclusion The current study suggests that the plant studied

does contain compounds with antimicrobial properties. However there is need for isolation, purification and structure elucidation of such compounds so that they could be subjected to clinical trials and used as next generation antimicrobial agents. Conflict of interest The authors declare no conflict of interest. Acknowledgement The authors are highly thankful to the department of Clinical Biochemistry, University of Kashmir for providing all the necessary facilities to carry out this valuable research.

## 4. Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## 5. Acknowledgement

The authors are highly thankful to the department of Clinical Biochemistry, University of Kashmir for providing all the necessary facilities to carry out this valuable research.

## References

[1] Moshirfar, M., Mirzaian, G., Feiz, V., Kang, P. C. (2006). Fourth-generation fluoroquinolone-resistant bacterial keratitis after refractive surgery. *J. Cataract Refract. Surg.*32 (3), 515-8.
[2] Jhonson Ap.2015 surveillance of antibiotic resistance. *Phil. trans. R. sac B* 307: 20140080 http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2014.0080
[3] Nascimento, G., Locatelli, P., Freitas, C., and Silva, G. (2000). Antibacterial Activity of plant extracts and phytochemicals on antibiotic resistant bacteria. *Brazilian Journal of Microbiology*.31, 247-256.
[4] Bader, G. N. (2013). Antimicrobial studies of rhizome of *Swertia petiolata*. *J App Pharm. Sci.3* (01), 1-3.
[5] Coates, A., Hu, Y., Bax, R., and Page, C. (2002). The future challenges facing the development of new antimicrobial drugs. *Nature reviews*.1, 895-910.
[6] Petlevski, R., Hadzija, M., Slijepcevic, M., and Juretie, D. (2001). Effect of antidiabetes herbal preparation on serum glucose and fructosamine in NOD mice. *J. f. Ethanopharmacol.7*5, 181-184
[7] Stockwell, C. (1988). Nature's pharmacy, century Hutchinson Ltd., London. United kingdom.
[8] Tiwar, S., and Singh, A. (2004). Toxic and sub-lethal effects of oleadrin on biochemical parameters of freshwater air breathing murrel, Chant punctatus (Bloch.). *Indian J. Exp. Biol*.42, 413-418.
[9] Lewis, K., and Ausubel, F. M. (2006). Prospects of plant derived antibacterials. *Nat. Biotechnol*.24, 1504-1507.
[10] Boucher, H. W., Talbot, G. H., Bradley, J. S., Edwards, J. E., Gilbert, D., Rice, L. B., Scheld. M., Spellberg, B., Bartlett, J. (2009). Bad bugs, no drugs: no ESKAPE! An update from the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin. Infect. Dis*.48 (1), 1-12.
[11] Irshad S, Mahmood M, Parveen F (2012) Invitro antibacterial activities of three medicinal plants using agar well diffusion method. Res J Biol 2 (01): 1-8.
[12] Ahmad N, Amir MK, Ayaz S, Ahmad, Jan A, Ashraf JS, Zuhra F. Antimicrobial profile of the selected medicinal plants. Int J Chem Lif Sci 2012; 01 (02): 1039-1041.
[13] Harborne JB. Methods of extraction and isolation In: Phytochemical Methods. London: Chapman & Hall; 1998.
[14] Aliyu MS, Lawal U Tijjani MB, Doko MHI, Garba I, Kokya HA, Ado SA, Hanwa UA and Ibrahim MM. Phytochemical and Antibacterial Properties of Leaf Extracts of Ipomoea asarifolia. Nigerian Journal of Basic and Applied Science (2011), 19 (2): 236-240
[15] Teh JY, Rawi R, Noor SSM, Taib H, Mohamad S. Invitro antimicrobial effectiveness of herbal based mouthrinses against oral microorganisms. Asian Pacific Journal of Tropical Biomedicine.2015; 5 (5); 370-374.
[16] Segal BH. Aspergillosis. N Engl J Med.2009; 360 (18): 1870-84.
[17] Shen HD, Chou H, Tam MF, Chang CY, Lai HY, Wang SR. Molecular and immunological characterization of Pen ch 18, the vacuolar serine protease major allergen of Penicillium chrysogenum. Allergy.2003; 58 (10): 993-1002
[18] McCullough MJ, Clemons KV, Farina C, McCusker JH, Stevens DA. Epidemiological Investigation of Vaginal Saccharomyces cerevisiae Isolates by a Genotypic Method. Journal of Clinical Microbiology.1998; 36: 557-562
[19] Valsaraj R, Pushpangadan P, Smith UW, Adsersen A, Nyman U. Antimicrobial screening of selected medicinal plants from India. J Ethnopharmacol.1997; 58: 75-83.
[20] Oyeleke SB, Dauda BN, Boye OA. Antibacterial activity of Ficus capensis. Afr J Biotechnol.2000; 7 (10): 1414-1417.
[21] Shilpa BML, Sonia KV, Chetan K, Sukesh K, Chandrasekhar R. Antimicrobial sectrum and phytochemical study of Hopea parviflora Beddome saw dust extract. J Phytol.2009; 1 (6): 469-474.
[22] Gahlaut A and Chhillar AK. Evaluation of antibacterial potential of plant extracts using resazurin based microtiter dilution assay. Int J Pharm PharmaceutSci.5 (2), 372-376: 2013.
[23] Masotti V, Juteau F, Bessiere JM, J Viano. Seasonal and phonological variations of the essential oil from the narrow endemic species Artemisia molinieri and its biological activities. Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry.2003; 51: 7115-7121.
[24] Angioni A, Barra A, Coroneo V, Dessi S, Cabras P. Chemical composition, seasonal variability, and antifungal activity of Lavandula stoechas L. sp. Stoechas essential oils from stem/leaves and flowers. Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry.2006; 54: 4364-4370.
[25] Al-Zubaydi SR, Al-Hmdany MA, Raesan SJ. Antibactrial effect of some medicinal plant extracts against some pathogenic bacteria strains. Journal of Duhok University.2009; 12 (1): 244-249.
[26] Boklari FM. Antifungal activity of some medicinal plants used in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. Mycopathologia.2009; 7 (1): 51-57.
[27] Kavishankar GB, Lakshmidevi N, Mahadeva MS. Phytochemical analysis and antimicrobial properties of selected medicinal plants against bacteria associated

with diabetic patient. International Journal of Pharma and Bio Sciences.2011; 2: 509-518.
[28] Schultes RE. The kingdom of plants Medicines from the Earth, Thomson WAR ed. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co; 1978.
[29] Dionisi HM, Lozada M, Olivera NL (2012) Bioprospection of marine microorganisms: biotechnological applications and methods. Rev Argent Microbiol 44: 49-60.
[30] Benko-Iseppon AM, Crovella S (2010) Ethnobotanical bioprospection of candidates for potential antimicrobial drugs from Brazilian plants: state of art and perspectives. Curr Protein Pept Sci 11: 189-194.
[31] Geissman TA. Flavonoid compounds, tannins, lignins and related compounds, Pyrrole pigments, isoprenoid compounds and phenolic plant constituents, Florkin M and Stotz EH ed. New York: Elsevier; 1963.
[32] Dixon RA, Dey PM, Lamb CJ. Phytoalexins: Enzymology and molecular biology. Adv Enzymol.1983; 55: 1-69.
[33] Cowan MM. Plant products as antimicrobial agents. Clinical Microbiology Reviews.1999; 12 (4): 564-582.
[34] Tsuchiya H, Sato M, Miyazaki T, Fujiwara S, Tanigaki S, Ohyama M, et al.comparative study on the antibacterial activity of phytochemical flavanones against methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus. J Ethnopharmacol.1996; 50: 27-34.
[35] Haslam E. Natural polyphenols (vegetable tannins) as drugs: possible modes of action. J Nat Prod.1996; 59: 205-215.
[36] Habtemariam S, Gray AI, Waterman PG. A new antibacterial sesquiterpene from Premna oligotricha. J Nat Prod.1993; 56: 140-143.
[37] Stern JL, Hagerman AE, Steinberg PD, Mason PK. Phlorotannin-protein interactions. J Chem Ecol.1996; 22: 1887-1899
[38] Ya C, Gaffney SH, Lilley TH, Haslam E. Carbohydrate polyphenol complexation, Chemistry and significance of condensed tannins. Hemingway RW and Karchesy JJ ed. New York: Plenum Press; 1988.
[39] Ahmed AA, Mahmoud AA, Williams HJ, Scott AI, Reibenspies JH, Mabry TJ. New sesquiterpene a-methylene lactones from the Egyptian plant Jasonia candicans. J Nat Prod.1993; 56: 1276-1280.
[40] Barre JT, Bowden BF, Coll JC, Jesus J, Fuente VE, Fuente GC, et al. A bioactive triterpene from Lantana camara. Phytochemistry.1997; 45: 321-324.
[41] Amaral JA, Ekins A, Richards SR, Knowles R. Effect of selected monoterpenes on methane oxidation, denitrification, and aerobic metabolism by bacteria in pure culture. Appl Environ Microbiol.1998; 64: 520-525. Fujioka T, Kashiwada Y. Anti-AIDS agents-Betulinic acid and platanic acid as anti-HIV principles from
[42] Syzigium claviflorum, and the anti-HIV activity of structurally related triterpenoids. J Nat Prod.1994; 57: 243-247.
[43] Vishwakarma RA. Stereoselective synthesis of a-arteether from artemisinin. J Nat Prod 1990; 53: 216-217.
[44] McMahon JB, Currens RJ, Gulakowski RWJ, Buckheit C, Lackman-Smith YF. Michellamine B, a novel plant alkaloid, inhibits human immunodeficiency virusinduced cell killing by at least two distinct mechanisms. Antimicrob Agents Chemother.1995; 39: 484-488.
[45] Omulokoli EB, Khan, Chhabra SC. Antiplasmodial activity of four Kenyan medicinal plants. J Ethnopharmacol.1997; 56: 133-137.
[46] Sethi ML. Inhibition of reverse transcriptase activity by benzophenanthridine alkaloids. J Nat Prod.1979; 42: 187-196.
[47] Phillipson JD, O'Neill MJ. New leads to the treatment of protozoal infections based on natural product molecules. Acta Pharm Nord.1987; 1: 131-144.
[48] Arabski M, Wegierek-Ciuk A, Czerwonka G, Lankoff A, Kaca W. Effects of Saponins against Clinical E. coli Strains and Eukaryotic Cell Line. Journal of Biomedicine and Biotechnology.2012: 1-6. doi: 10.1155/2012/286216.

**Table 1:** Preliminary phytochemical careening of selected medicinal plants

| S. No. | Plant name | Solvents | Alkaloids | Anthraquinone | Cardiac glycoside | Cardenolides | Flavanoids | Phenols | Phlobtannins | Saponins | Steroids | Tannins | Terpenoids | Volatile oils |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1** | ***Portulaca oleraceae*** | Aqueous | - | - | - | + | + | + | - | + | - | + | - | + |
| | | methanol | - | - | + | - | + | - | - | - | - | + | - | + |
| **2** | ***Prunella vulgaris*** | Aqueous | + | + | - | - | + | + | - | + | - | + | + | - |
| | | methanol | - | - | - | - | + | + | - | + | + | + | + | + |
| **3** | ***Rheum spiciformis*** | Aqueous | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| | | methanol | + | + | - | - | + | + | + | + | - | + | - | + |
| **4** | ***Rumex dendatus*** | Aqueous | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| | | methanol | - | + | + | - | + | + | - | + | - | + | + | - |
| **16** | ***Solanum nigrum*** | Aqueous | + | + | + | - | + | + | - | + | - | + | - | + |
| | | methanol | + | - | + | - | + | - | - | + | + | + | + | + |

Note: (-) = Absent, (+) = Present

**Table 2:** Zones of inhibition in millimeter (mm) at five different concentrations of plant extracts against *proteus vulgaris*

| S NO. | Plant name | Plant extract | 10mg/ml | 30mg/ml | 50mg/ml | 80mg/ml | 100mg/ml |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | **Portulaca *oleraceae*** | Aqueous | - | - | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| | | Methanolic | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| 13 | **Prunella *vulgaris*** | Aqueous | 10 | 11 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| | | Methanolic | - | - | 10 | 10 | 11 |
| 14 | **Rheum *spiciformis*** | Aqueous | 11 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 |
| | | Methanolic | **16** | **18** | **20** | **22** | **24** |
| 15 | **Rumex *dendatus*** | Aqueous | 11 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 13 |
| | | Methanolic | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| 16 | **Solanum *nigrum*** | Aqueous | - | 10 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| | | Methanolic | - | - | - | - | 10 |
| | **Positive control: Gentamycin (10µg/disc)** | 25mm | | | | | |

**Table 3:** Zones of inhibition in millimeter (mm) at five different concentrations of plant extracts against *Klebsiella pneumonia*

| | Plant name | Plant extract | 10mg/ml | 30mg/ml | 50mg/ml | 80mg/ml | 100mg/ml |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | **Portulaca *oleraceae*** | Aqueous | - | - | - | - | 12 |
| | | Methanolic | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| 2 | **Prunella *vulgaris*** | Aqueous | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| | | Methanolic | - | 10 | 12 | 13 | 15 |
| 3 | **Rheum *spiciformis*** | Aqueous | 11 | 11 | 13 | 14 | 14 |
| | | Methanolic | 11 | 12 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| 4 | **Rumex *dendatus*** | Aqueous | 13 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 14 |
| | | Methanolic | **14** | **18** | **20** | **22** | **23** |
| 5 | **Solanum *nigrum*** | Aqueous | - | - | - | 11 | 12 |
| | | Methanolic | - | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 |
| | **Positive control: Gentamycin (10µg/disc)** | **25mm** | | | | | |

**Table 4:** Zones of inhibition in millimeter (mm) at five different concentrations of plant extracts against *Bacillus subtilis*

| | Plant name | Plant extract | 10mg/ml | 30mg/ml | 50mg/ml | 80mg/ml | 100mg/ml |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | **Portulaca *oleraceae*** | Aqueous | 10 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 12 |
| | | Methanolic | - | - | - | 8 | 10 |
| 2 | **Prunella *vulgaris*** | Aqueous | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| | | Methanolic | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| 3 | **Rheum *spiciformis*** | Aqueous | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 |
| | | Methanolic | **13** | **15** | **17** | **18** | **19** |
| 4 | **Rumex *dendatus*** | Aqueous | 9 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 15 |
| | | Methanolic | **11** | **13** | **15** | **16** | **18** |
| 5 | **Solanum *nigrum*** | Aqueous | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| | | Methanolic | - | - | - | - | - |
| | **Positive control: Gentamycin (10µg/disc)** | **25mm** | | | | | |

**Table 5:** Zones of inhibition in millimeters (mm) at five different concentrations of plant extracts against *Escherichia coli*

| Plant name | | Plant extract | 10mg/ml | 30mg/ml | 50mg/ml | 80mg/ml | 100mg/ml |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | **Portulaca *oleraceae*** | Aqueous | 11 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 14 |
| | | Methanolic | 11 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 13 |
| 2 | **Prunella *vulgaris*** | Aqueous | 11 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 14 |
| | | Methanolic | 10 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 11 |
| 3 | **Rheum *spiciformis*** | Aqueous | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 14 |
| | | Methanolic | **12** | **12** | **13** | **14** | **15** |
| 4 | **Rumex *dendatus*** | Aqueous | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| | | Methanolic | 12 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 14 |
| 5 | **Solanum *nigrum*** | Aqueous | **12** | **13** | **14** | **15** | **16** |
| | | Methanolic | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| | **Positive control: Gentamycin (10µg/disc)** | **20mm** | | | | | |

**Table 6:** Zones of inhibition in millimeter (mm) at five different concentrations of plant extracts against *pseudomonas aeruginosa*

| | Plant name | Plant extract | 10mg/ml | 30mg/ml | 50mg/ml | 80mg/ml | 100mg/ml |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | **Portulaca *oleraceae*** | Aqueous | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| | | Methanolic | 12 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 |
| 2 | **Prunella *vulgaris*** | Aqueous | 10 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| | | Methanolic | 16 | 17 | 17 | 18 | 18 |
| 3 | **Rheum *spiciformis*** | Aqueous | 11 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 15 |
| | | Methanolic | **13** | **15** | **17** | **19** | **19** |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | **Rumex *dendatus*** | Aqueous | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| | | Methanolic | 13 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 |
| 5 | **Solanum *nigrum*** | Aqueous | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 11 |
| | | Methanolic | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| | **Positive control: Gentamycin (10µg/disc)** | 25mm | | | | | |

**Table 7:** Zones of inhibition in millimeter (mm) at five different concentrations of plant extracts against *Staphylococcus aureus*

| | Plant name | Plant extract | 10mg/ml | 30mg/ml | 50mg/ml | 80mg/ml | 100mg/ml |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | **Portulaca *oleraceae*** | Aqueous | 11 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| | | Methanolic | 11 | 12 | 13 | 15 | 16 |
| 2 | **Prunella *vulgaris*** | Aqueous | - | 13 | 14 | 16 | 17 |
| | | Methanolic | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 15 |
| 3 | **Rheum *spiciformis*** | Aqueous | 11 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| | | Methanolic | **15** | **18** | **21** | **23** | **25** |
| 4 | **Rumex *dendatus*** | Aqueous | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| | | Methanolic | 12 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 18 |
| 5 | **Solanum *nigrum*** | Aqueous | 11 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 15 |
| | | Methanolic | - | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| | **Positive control: Gentamycin (10µg/disc)** | 27mm | | | | | |

**Table 8:** Zones of inhibition in millimeter (mm) at five different concentrations of plant extracts against *Aspergillus fumigatus*

| | Plant name | Plant extract | 10mg/ml | 30mg/ml | 50mg/ml | 80mg/ml | 100mg/ml |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | **Portulaca *oleraceae*** | Aqueous | **-** | **12** | **17** | **19** | **21** |
| | | Methanolic | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 11 |
| 13 | **Prunella *vulgaris*** | Aqueous | 11 | 12 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| | | Methanolic | **17** | **18** | **19** | **20** | **21** |
| 14 | **Rheum *spiciformis*** | Aqueous | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| | | Methanolic | **11** | **13** | **15** | **18** | **20** |
| 15 | **Rumex *dendatus*** | Aqueous | - | - | 9 | 11 | 14 |
| | | Methanolic | **9** | **11** | **14** | **15** | **17** |
| 16 | **Solanum *nigrum*** | Aqueous | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| | | Methanolic | **12** | **13** | **14** | **15** | **17** |
| | **Positive control: nystatin (0.5mg/ml)** | 27mm | | | | | |

**Table 9:** Zones of inhibition in millimeter (mm) at five different concentrations of plant extracts against *Penicillium chrysogenum*

| | Plant name | Plant extract | 10mg/ml | 30mg/ml | 50mg/ml | 80mg/ml | 100mg/ml |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | **Portulaca *oleraceae*** | Aqueous | - | - | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| | | Methanolic | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| 13 | **Prunella *vulgaris*** | Aqueous | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| | | Methanolic | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 |
| 14 | **Rheum *spiciformis*** | Aqueous | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 14 |
| | | Methanolic | 9 | 13 | 15 | 16 | 17 |
| 15 | **Rumex *dendatus*** | Aqueous | - | 8 | 9 | 11 | 13 |
| | | Methanolic | 11 | 13 | 15 | 17 | 18 |
| 16 | **Solanum *nigrum*** | Aqueous | - | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| | | Methanolic | 8 | 10 | 12 | 13 | 15 |
| | **Positive control: nystatin (0.5mg/ml)** | 25mm | | | | | |

**Table 10:** Zones of inhibition in millimeter (mm) at five different concentrations of plant extracts against *Saccharomyces cerevissae*

| | Plant name | Plant extract | 10mg/ml | 30mg/ml | 50mg/ml | 80mg/ml | 100mg/ml |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | **Portulaca *oleraceae*** | Aqueous | 13 | 17 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| | | Methanolic | - | 15 | 16 | 18 | 19 |
| 13 | **Prunella *vulgaris*** | Aqueous | 8 | 10 | 11 | 13 | 14 |
| | | Methanolic | 8 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 15 |
| 14 | **Rheum *spiciformis*** | Aqueous | **17** | **18** | **19** | **21** | **23** |
| | | Methanolic | **20** | **21** | **22** | **23** | **26** |
| 15 | **Rumex *dendatus*** | Aqueous | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| | | Methanolic | 8 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 18 |
| 16 | **Solanum *nigrum*** | Aqueous | 8 | 12 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| | | Methanolic | **14** | **15** | **16** | **18** | **20** |
| | **Positive control: nystatin (0.5mg/ml)** | 30mm | | | | | |

**Table 11:** Zones of inhibition in millimeter (mm) at five different concentrations of plant extracts against *Candida albicans*

| | Plant name | Plant extract | 10mg/ml | 30mg/ml | 50mg/ml | 80mg/ml | 100mg/ml |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | **Portulaca *oleraceae*** | Aqueous | - | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| | | Methanolic | 14 | 15 | 15 | 16 | 17 |
| 2 | **Prunella *vulgaris*** | Aqueous | 11 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 14 |
| | | Methanolic | 13 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 16 |
| 3 | **Rheum *spiciformis*** | Aqueous | - | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| | | Methanolic | 11 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| 4 | **Rumex *dendatus*** | Aqueous | - | 13 | 15 | 16 | 17 |
| | | Methanolic | 13 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| 5 | **Solanum *nigrum*** | Aqueous | **12** | **15** | **17** | **19** | **21** |
| | | Methanolic | **17** | **18** | **19** | **20** | **22** |
| | **Positive control: nystatin (0.5mg/ml)** | 30mm | | | | | |

MIC value below observed range (10-100mg/ml), NA= No Activity, E. C =*Escherichia Coli*, S. A =*Staphyllococcus aureus*, K. P =*Klebsiella Pneumonia*, B. S = *Bacillus Subtillus*, P. A =*Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, P. V = *Proteus vulgaris*, *C. A = Candida albicans*, *P. C = Penicillium chrysogenum*, *A. F = Aspergillus fumigatus*, *S. C = Saccharomyces Cerevisiae*

**Table 12:** MIC values of aqueous and methanolic extracts of plants expressed in mg/ml between the range (10–100) mg/ml

| S. No | Plant name | Solvents | Bacterial strains | | | | | | Fungal strains | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | E. C | K. P | P. A | B. S | P. V | S. A | C. A | P. C | S. C | A. F |
| 1 | *Portulaca oleraceae* | Aqueous | - | 100 | - | - | 50 | - | 30 | 50 | - | 30 |
| | | methanol | - | - | - | 80 | - | - | - | - | 30 | - |
| 2 | *Prunella vulgaris* | Aqueous | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | | methanol | - | 30 | - | - | 50 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 3 | *Rheum spiciformis* | Aqueous | - | - | - | - | - | - | 30 | - | - | - |
| | | methanol | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4 | *Rumex dendatus* | Aqueous | - | - | - | - | - | - | 30 | 30 | - | 50 |
| | | methanol | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | *Solanum nigrum* | Aqueous | - | 80 | - | - | 30 | - | - | - | - | - |
| | | methanol | - | 30 | - | NA | 100 | 30 | - | - | - | - |

**Table 13:** Percentage of relative inhibition zone diameter (%RIZD) of aqueous and methanolic extracts of plant extracts at 100mg/ml

| S. No | Plant name | Solvents | Bacterial strains | | | | | | Fungal strains | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | E. C | K. P | P. A | B. S | P. V | S. A | C. A | P. C | S. C | A. F |
| 12 | *Portulaca oleraceae* | Aqueous | 70.00 | 48.00 | 48.00 | 48.00 | 40.00 | 51.85 | 46.67 | 52.00 | 60.00 | 77.78 |
| | | methanol | 65.00 | 52.00 | 68.00 | 40.00 | 56.00 | 59.25 | 56.67 | 32.00 | 63.33 | 40.74 |
| 13 | *Prunella vulgaris* | Aqueous | 70.00 | 64.00 | 52.00 | 56.00 | 60.00 | 62.96 | 46.67 | 60.00 | 46.67 | 59.25 |
| | | methanol | 55.00 | 60.00 | 72.00 | 56.00 | 44.00 | 55.55 | 53.33 | 68.00 | 50.00 | 77.78 |
| 14 | *Rheum spiciformis* | Aqueous | 70.00 | 56.00 | 60.00 | 68.00 | 68.00 | 51.85 | 50.00 | 56.00 | 53.33 | 55.55 |
| | | methanol | 75.00 | 92.00 | 76.00 | 76.00 | 88.0 | 92.59 | 53.33 | 68.00 | 66.67 | 74.07 |
| 15 | *Rumex dendatus* | Aqueous | 75.00 | 56.00 | 52.00 | 60.00 | 52.00 | 59.25 | 56.67 | 52.00 | 50.00 | 51.85 |
| | | methanol | 70.00 | 64.00 | 72.00 | 72.00 | 64.00 | 66.67 | 30.00 | 72.00 | 60.00 | 62.96 |
| 16 | *Solanum nigrum* | Aqueous | 75.00 | 48.00 | 44.00 | 52.00 | 48.00 | 55.55 | 70.00 | 52.00 | 76.67 | 59.25 |
| | | methanol | 65.00 | 40.00 | 56.00 | 0.00 | 40.00 | 51.85 | 73.33 | 60.00 | 86.67 | 62.96 |