

# Comparison of Fresh with Dry Extracts for Antibacterial Activity of *Vigna radiata* L. on Pathogenic Bacteria

Ali Abdul Hussein S. AL-Janabi

Iraq, University of Karbala, College of Applicable medical sciences, Dept. of Clinical laboratory

## ABSTRACT

**Introduction:** *Vigna radiata* L. is common vegetable plant cultivated all of the world. It's belonging to the family Leguminosae (Fabaceae). **Methods:** To investigate for antibacterial activity of *Vigna radiata*, fresh and dried extracts of plant parts were tested on five strains of bacteria using standard well agar diffusion method. **Results:** Dried extracts showed more effective action on tested bacteria than of fresh extracts. Extracts prepared from dried stem and root exhibited better antibacterial activities than those prepared from fresh plant. Furthermore, there was no difference in the activity of ethanolic and aqueous extracts on isolated bacteria. Both of gram positive and negative bacteria showed approximately the same ratio of susceptibility to each part of plant. **Conclusions:** *V. radiata* has a potential antibacterial activity on clinically isolated bacteria. Dried extracts showed more effective action on tested bacteria than fresh extracts.

**Key words:** aqueous extract, ethanolic extract, *Vigna radiata*, bacteria

## INTRODUCTION

For testing antimicrobial activity of any suggesting plant, preparation of extract from fresh parts is preferred due to retain the components of plant in active state.<sup>[1]</sup> This is not always available because selected plants needed to collect from so far distance from the place of actually extraction work. Thus, plant must be dried until extraction time.

Many studies are designed to compare between antimicrobial activities of fresh and dry plant. Results are variable to determine which state of plant is effective against organisms. Pepelnjak et al<sup>[2]</sup> found that extracts prepared from fresh leaves of *Pelargonium radula* have significant higher antimicrobial activity than those prepared from dried leaves. Fresh fruit shell of Pomegranate is also has antibacterial effect on the bacterium *Ralstonia solanacearum* than dry fruit shell.<sup>[3]</sup> Whereas, Goyal et al<sup>[4]</sup> demonstrated that dry powder extracts of all *Catharanthus roseus* parts showed more antibacterial activity than extracts prepared from fresh parts.

*Vigna radiata* L. or also called mungbean is belonging to the family Leguminosae (Fabaceae). It is very important economic plant through its contents of valuable nutrients. Furthermore, *V. radiata* facilitates the nitrogen fixation in soil by producing nodules on its root in combines with *Rhizobium*.<sup>[5]</sup> However, *V. radiata* contains within its species many genotypes resistance to bacterial infection.<sup>[6]</sup>

To determine the variation between antibacterial activity of fresh and dry parts of *Vigna radiata*, extracts of these plant parts was tested on many bacteria. Furthermore, this study tried to detect the differences between the activity of fresh and dry plant against bacteria.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Plant preparation

Seeds of *Vigna radiata* L. (Fabaceae) were obtained from institute of agriculture of Karbala province (Iraq). Cultivation was performed in prepared field with suitable soil during July to August 2009. Mature plants were harvested and washed under running tap water. Root nodulation and damaged parts were removed. Plant materials (leaves, stem, and root) were separated and washed once again with distilled water.

### Plant extracts

Extraction was performed by two different modes: (1) Extraction of fresh plant materials without drying and (2) Extraction after each plant part was air-dried

#### Address for correspondence:

Ali Abdul Hussein S. AL-Janabi,  
Address for correspondence: College of Applicable medical  
sciences, University of Karbala, Iraq,  
E-mail: aljanabi\_bio@yahoo.com

DOI: \*\*\*\*

under room temperature. The 20 g of grounded plant part was extracted in electrical blender with 100 ml of ethyl alcohol (70%) for obtaining ethanolic extract and with sterilize distilled water for obtaining aqueous extract for 5 min and left for 1 h. Extracts were filtered through sterilized gauze and concentrated to dryness at room temperature.

### Test organisms

Tested pathogenic bacteria were clinically isolated from AL-Hussein general hospital in August 2009. Five strains of bacteria were isolated. Strains were diagnosed using API 20 system (Biomérieux, Netherlands-France). The isolated bacteria were: *E. coli*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, *Proteus vulgaris*, and *Bacillus subtilis*.

### Antibacterial assay

Standard culture of bacteria for antibacterial assay was prepared by culturing of isolated bacteria in Mueller-Hinton broth (HiMedia, Mumbai-India) to become equivalent to 0.5 MacFarland standard (reading to  $1 \times 10^8$  cfu/ml) and diluted 1:10.

All extracts were sterilized by sterile membrane syringe filter (pore size 0.45  $\mu$ m, manufactured by Pall Life Science). Well agar diffusion recommended by NCCLS<sup>[7]</sup> was used. A well of 6 mm was performed in plate with Mueller-Hinton agar (HiMedia, Mumbai-India) inoculated with isolated bacterial strains. Various concentrations (3.125, 6.25, 12.5, 25, 50 mg/ml) of fresh and dried extracts were prepared in sterilize distilled water. Each well filled with 50  $\mu$ l of specific concentration of extract. Cefotaxime sodium (30  $\mu$ g) supplied by Kon'Tam pharmaceuticals co. Zhongshan-China and distilled water were used as controls.

### Determination of Minimum Inhibitory Concentration (MIC)

MICs were determined as described by NCCLS.<sup>[7]</sup> Crude extracts were twofold diluted in Mueller-Hinton broth for bacteria. A 100  $\mu$ l of each dilution was dispensed in well of microdilution plates (96-wells). Well was inoculated with 50  $\mu$ l of previously prepared standard culture of bacteria. The inoculated plates were incubated at 35°C for 24 h and examined for visible growth in order to determine MIC. The previous controls were also included.

**Table 1: Antibacterial activity of fresh parts of *V. radiata* on isolated bacteria by well agar diffusion method**

| Plant parts | Extract type | Concen. (mg/ml) | Zone of inhibition (mm) |                |                      |                    |                    |
|-------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------------------|----------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
|             |              |                 | <i>S. aureus</i>        | <i>E. coli</i> | <i>K. pneumoniae</i> | <i>B. subtilis</i> | <i>P. vulgaris</i> |
| Leaves      | Ethanolic    | 50              | –                       | 14*            | –                    | 19*                | 16*                |
|             |              | 25              | –                       | 12*            | –                    | 18*                | 16*                |
|             |              | 12.5            | –                       | –              | –                    | 15*                | 14*                |
|             |              | 6.25            | –                       | –              | –                    | 13                 | –                  |
|             |              | 3.125           | –                       | –              | –                    | –                  | –                  |
|             | aqueous      | 50              | –                       | 15*            | –                    | 17*                | 18*                |
|             |              | 25              | –                       | 12*            | –                    | 16*                | 15*                |
|             |              | 12.5            | –                       | 11             | –                    | 16*                | 11                 |
|             |              | 6.25            | –                       | –              | –                    | 10                 | –                  |
|             |              | 3.125           | –                       | –              | –                    | –                  | –                  |
| Stem        | Ethanolic    | 50              | –                       | –              | –                    | –                  | –                  |
|             |              | 25              | –                       | –              | –                    | –                  | –                  |
|             |              | 12.5            | –                       | –              | –                    | –                  | –                  |
|             |              | 6.25            | –                       | –              | –                    | –                  | –                  |
|             |              | 3.125           | –                       | –              | –                    | –                  | –                  |
|             | Aqueous      | 50              | 15*                     | 17*            | –                    | 20*                | 22*                |
|             |              | 25              | –                       | 16*            | –                    | 20*                | 19*                |
|             |              | 12.5            | –                       | 9              | –                    | 18*                | 15*                |
|             |              | 6.25            | –                       | –              | –                    | 13                 | 11                 |
|             |              | 3.125           | –                       | –              | –                    | 10                 | –                  |
| Root        | Ethanolic    | 50              | –                       | 13*            | –                    | –                  | –                  |
|             |              | 25              | –                       | 11             | –                    | –                  | –                  |
|             |              | 12.5            | –                       | –              | –                    | –                  | –                  |
|             |              | 6.25            | –                       | –              | –                    | –                  | –                  |
|             |              | 3.125           | –                       | –              | –                    | –                  | –                  |
|             | Aqueous      | 50              | –                       | –              | –                    | –                  | –                  |
|             |              | 25              | –                       | –              | –                    | –                  | –                  |
|             |              | 12.5            | –                       | –              | –                    | –                  | –                  |
|             |              | 6.25            | –                       | –              | –                    | –                  | –                  |
|             |              | 3.125           | –                       | –              | –                    | –                  | –                  |
| Cefotaxime  |              | 30 $\mu$ g/ml   | 27                      | 22             | –                    | 34                 | 21                 |

\* Significant differences ( $P < 0.05$ ) between parts of plant and cefotaxime

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/2496075>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/2496075>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)