

SAUDI FOLK MEDICINE: PHYTOCHEMICAL AND ANTIMICROBIAL SCREENING

A. KHATIBI, A.H. SHAH, A.M. AGEEL, M.S. AHMAD,
M.A. AL-YAHYA and M. TARIQ

*Research Centre, College of Pharmacy, P.O. Box 2457,
King Saud University, Riyadh-7145/. Saudi Arabia*

ABSTRACT

Plants of 25 families, encompassing 30 species were selected on the basis of their folklore uses and literature data for the present screening. Besides phytochemical screening the plant extracts were prepared and tested for their antimicrobial activity. The result of the testing showed that about 77% of these plants exhibited some level of antibacterial activity. The most common chemical constituents found in these plants were sterols and/or triterpenes, flavonoids, alkaloids and tannins. Volatile oils, volatile bases, saponins, coumarins, anthraquinones and cardiac glycosides were also detected.

Introduction

During the last few decades a number of investigators conducted several surveys for antimicrobial substances from plants and showed that antibiotics is not uncommon among higher plants (Al-Shamma and Mitscher 1979; Malcolm and Sofowora 1969; Bhkuni et al. 1974; Leven et al. 1979; Farouk et al. 1983). In many cases chemical studies lead to the isolation of compounds responsible for the antimicrobial activity.

As a part of our work on the 'Saudi Folk Medicine Project' which covers a diversity of topics, we recently reported the anti-microbial activity of thirty-two plants (Shah et al. 1988). In this communication we wish to report our findings on the antimicrobial and preliminary phytochemical screening of other plants commonly used in Saudi folk medicine.

Materials and Methods

The plant materials were collected by the field survey team of our project and identified by the plant Taxonomy unit of our college. The dried plant materials were crushed and extracted with 95% ethanol. The solvent was evaporated in vacuum at low temperature and the crude extract thus obtained was used for the antimicrobial testing (Mitscher et al. 1972). In the case of *C ommiphora molmol*, *Eerula asafoetida* and *Viola odorata*, however, water extracts were used.

Table 1: Organisms used in the screening of the sample for antimicrobial activity.

No.	Organism	NCTC No.*	Classification
1.	<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>	6571	Gram positive
2.	<i>Bacillus subtilis</i>	10400	– do –
3.	<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>	10662	Gram negative
4.	<i>Proteus vulgaris</i>	4635	– do –
5.	<i>Escherichia coli</i>	10418	– do –
6.	<i>Candida albicans</i>	3153	Yeast
Mycological reference Laboratory School of Tropical Medicine & Hygiene, London.			
7.	<i>Shigella flexneri</i>	Lab. strain King Khalid University Hospital	Gram negative
8.	<i>Shigella sonnei</i>	– do –	– do –
9.	<i>Shigella boydia</i>	– do –	– do –

*National collection type culture (NCTC).

Antimicrobial screening:

The plant extracts were tested by ager dilution method at a concentration of 3 mg, 2 mg and 1 mg for the antibacterial and antifungal activity as described earlier (Mitscher et al. 1972, Shah et al. 1988) against the organisms mentioned in Table I. Plants showing activity at 1 mg/ml concentration were further studied on lower dilutions to determine their MICs.

Phytochemical screening:

The presence or absence of alkaloids, flavonoids, tannins, cardiac glycosides, saponins, coumarins, anthraquinones, glucosinolates, cyanogenic glycosides, sterols and/or riterpenes, volatile oils and volatile bases was checked according to the standard procedures (Farnsworth 1966, Al-Yahya 1985).

Results and Discussion

The result of our present studies are presented in Table-2, arranged alphabetically according to their families with their botanical names, plant parts, their uses and results of the screening tests.

Table 2: (Cont'd)

Botanical	Part used	Uses	Chemical constituents	Antimicrobial activity (MIC) mg/ml									
				S.a.	B.s.	Ps.a.	Pr.v.	E.c.	Sh.f.	Sh.s.	Sh.b.	C.a.	
<i>Lauraceae</i>													
Cinnamomum zeylanicum Breyn.	Bark	Expectorant diarrhoea, Colds	FD, TN, CN, SL/TP, VO	3	1	0	2	2	2	3	2	1	
<i>Leguminosae</i>													
Cassia fistula L.	Fruit (W.E.)	Skin diseases and boils.	AL, FD, AQ, TN, SL/TP	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Indigofera spinosa Forssk	A.P.	Eczema	FD, TN, SP, SL/TP	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Trigonella anguina Del.	A.P.	Bronchitis	AL, FD, TN, VB, SL/TP, SP,	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<i>Liliaceae</i>													
Aloe vera L.	W.P.	Skin diseases, leprosy.	TN, AQ, SP, SL/TP	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<i>Lythraceae</i>													
Lawsonia inermis L.	Leaves	Leprosy, Sore throat, skin diseases	FD, TN, AQ, SL/TP	1	0.5	2	1	3	3	3	3	2	
<i>Malvaceae</i>													
Malva parviflora L.	W.P.	Cough	CG, FD, CN, SL/TP, TN.	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<i>Meliaceae</i>													
Azadirachta indica A. Juss	Leaves	Sphillis, eye diseases wounds, leprosy	AL, CG, VO, TN, ST/TP.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<i>Molluginaceae</i>													
Mullugo cerivana (L.) Ser.	A.P.	Antiseptic	AL, FD, CN, TN, SL/TP	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<i>Papaveraceae</i>													
Papaver somniferum L.	Seed	Cough, dysentery, diarrhoea	AL, FD, TN, SL/TP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<i>Portulacaceae</i>													
Portulaca quadrifolia L.	W.P.	Skin diseases	AL, TN, CG, SL/TP.	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	

Table 2: (Cont'd)

Botanical	Part used	Uses	Chemical constituents	Antimicrobial activity (MIC) mg/ml								
				S.a.	B.s.	Ps.a.	Pr.v.	E.c.	Sh.f.	Sh.s.	Sh.b.	C.a.
<i>Rhamnaceae</i>												
Zizyphus spina christi, (L.)Willd.	Fruit	Bronchitis, Skin infection	FD, VO, SP, SL/TP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Salvadoraceae</i>												
Salvadora persica L.	A.P.	Leprosy, Gonorrhoea	FD, TN, SL/TP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Solanaceae</i>												
Solanum nigrum L.	A.P.	Expectorant, eczema, syphilis	AL, FD, TN, VB, SL/TP.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Tamaricaceae</i>												
Tamarix nilotica (Ehrenb.) Bge.	A.P.	Sore throat, dysentery, diarrhoea, antiseptic.	AL, CG, FD, SP, TN,SL/TP.	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Typhaceae</i>												
Typha domingensis Pers.	A.P.	Antimicrobial	FD, CN, SL/TP	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Umbelliferae</i>												
Anethum graveolus L.	Seeds	Abscess.	AL, FD, TN, SL/TP, VO.	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Cuminum cyminum L.	Seeds	Leprosy, leucoderma	FD, CN, SL/TP, VO.	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Ferula asafoetida	Seeds (W.E.)	Antimicrobial	FD, TN, CN, SL/TP	+++	+++	0	+++	0	0	0	0	+++
<i>Violaceae</i>												
Viola odorata L.	A.P.	Expectorant	FD, TN, SL/TP	+++	+	0	0	+	+	0	0	0

+* = 10% of extract in the media was active.; +++ = 5% of extract in the media was active.

AP = aerial part; WP = whole plant; W.E. = water extract; AL = alkaloids; FD = flavonoids; SL/TP = sterols/triterpenes; CN = coumarins; AQ = anthraquinones; VO = volatile oils; VB = volatile bases; TN = tannins; CG = cardiac glycosides; SP = saponins; GL = glucosinolates; S.a. = Staphylococcus aureus; B.s. = Bacillus subtilis; Ps.a. = Pseudomonas aeruginosa; Pr.v. = Proteus vulgaris; E.c. = Escherichia coli; Sh.f. = Shigella flexneri; Sh.s = Shigella fleneri; Sh.s = Shigella sonnei; Sh.b. = Shigella boydia; C.a = Candida albicans.

The preliminary phytochemical screening revealed that the 30 plants belonging to 25 families selected for the present antimicrobial screening are rich in different active phytochemical constituents. Most of the plants were found to contain sterols/triterpenes (96%), tannins (83%) and flavonoids (83%). Alkaloid test was positive in 50% of the plants while coumarins in 27%, saponins 23%, cardiac glycosides 20% and anthraquinones (10%) were observed. Volatile oils were detected in about 30%, volatile bases 13% and glucosinolates 3% of the plants.

The results of the antimicrobial screening were encouraging as about 77% of the plants showed antimicrobial activity. It is evident that the gram-positive organisms, *S. aureus* and *B. subtilis* showed higher sensitivity to most of the extracts. Among the gram-negative bacteria the growth of *Pr. vulgaris* was inhibited by about 23% of the extracts. *E. coli* was affected by *L. inermis*, *C. molmol*, *V. odorata* and *C. zeylanicum* while the growth of *Pr. aeruginosa* was inhibited by *L. inermis* only. It is interesting to note that all the three *Shigella* strains were inhibited by *L. inermis*, *C. molmol* and *C. zeylanicum*.

These results add support to the claimed folklore use of these plants for some of the mentioned therapeutic purposes. The detailed fractionation, isolation of the active constituents and their toxicity studies are however, necessary to justify the safe use of these herbal drugs.

Acknowledgement

We are thankful to Mr. Mustafa O. Khalid for his assistance and King Abdulaziz City for Science and Technology, Riyadh for the financial support.

References

- Al-Shamma, A., Mitscher, L.A. (1979). *J. Nat. Prod.* 42, 633.
Al-Yahya, M.A. (1985). *Fitoterapia* 3, 179.
Bhakuni, D.S. Bittner, M., Marticorena, C., Silva, M., Weld, E., Melo, M.E., Zemelman, R. (1974). *J. Nat. Prod.* 37, 621.
Farnsworth, N. (1966). *J. Pharm. Sci.* 55, 225.
Farouk, A., Bashir A.K., Salih, A.K.M. (1983). *Fitoterapia* 1, 3.
Leven, M., Berghe, D.A.V., Mertens, F., Vlietinck, A., Lammens, E. (1979). *Planta Med.* 36, 311.
Malcolm, S.A. Sofowora, E.A. (1969). *J. Nat. Prod.* 32, 512.
Mitscher, L.A., Lou, R., Bathala, M.S., Klu, W.N, Beal, I.L., White, R. (1972). *J. Nat. Prod. (Lloydia)* 35, 157.
Shah, A.H., Khatibi, A., Aged, A.M., Tanira, M.O.M. (1988). *Pak. J. Pharm. Sci.* 1, 53.