

# Evaluation of a phytogenic product from two western herbal medicines to replace an antimicrobial growth promoter in poultry production

**Ilse van Heerden**

BSc (Agric) Hons Plantpathology, MSc (Agric) Plantpathology

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

**Philosophiae Doctor**

In the Phytomedicine Programme  
Department of Paraclinical Sciences  
Faculty of Veterinary Science  
University of Pretoria

Promoter: Prof J.N. Eloff  
Co-Promoter: Dr. J. Picard, Dr. S.P.R. Bisschop

November 2009

## Declaration

The experimental work described in this thesis was conducted in the department of Paraclinical Sciences, Faculty of Veterinary Science, University of Pretoria, Phytomedicine Programme under the supervision of Professor J.N. Eloff, Dr J. Picard and Dr S.P.R. Bisschop.

These studies are the result of my own investigations, except where the input of others is acknowledged and have not been submitted in any other form to another University.

---

Ilse van Heerden

## Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge everybody who contributed to this PhD study. I hope to express my most sincere gratitude and appreciation:

Prof. Eloff, my promoter, who guided me through my studies. Thank you for your patience, enthusiasm and expert advice.

Dr. Jackie Picard, my co-promoter. She has been instrumental in providing assistance with most of my experiments including the chicken experiment as well as editing the final document. Thank you for permitting me to work in your well-organized lab. Without your knowledge, support, time and guidance this study would not have been possible.

Dr. Shahn Bisschop, my co-promoter. I am grateful for your expert assistance in designing the chicken experiment, post-mortem evaluations and execution of time consuming and laborious lesion scoring of the intestines of chickens.

Antonette van Wyk, who assisted me with the *in vivo* chicken study. I am in debt for all your support, organization and help with executing the laborious tasks during this experiment.

Dr. Peter Smith, who assisted with the lesion scoring and port-mortem evaluations as well as generously sharing his knowledge.

Mr. Gideon Masibe, Dr. D.G. Bwala, Dr. Mohammed Suleiman, Mr. Reckson Ramuageli, Mr. William Mokgojane, Dr. Ponman Solomon and Dr. A.R. Jambalang. It would have been impossible to complete work in the chicken experiment without your assistance.

Janet Greyling and Eric Kapp and other staff at the Microbiology laboratory. Your friendly support and expertise was crucial for completing the microbiology experiments in this study.

Prof. Vinny Naidoo, for helping me with the chicken studies' statistics..

Tharien de Winnaar, for friendship and emotional support as well as sorting out all the administrative issues.

Gabrielle Würger, Lita Pouw, Dr. Lyndy McGaw and Dr IO Ademola for continuous support and friendship

Prof. Marion Meyer for confirming the identity of the isolated compound with NMR analysis

The National Research Foundation for providing funds.

Prof. Philip Kerr for editing the final document.

Kobus de Jager for helping me with the computer programmes.

All my colleagues at the phytomedicine department for inspiration, encouragement, motivation, assistance and hospitality.

Linda Gouws and Joné van der Wissel whose enthusiasm and motivation inspired me to finish this study.

My husband Cobus and my children Christian and Carmen for continuous support.

## Abstract

# Evaluation of a phytogetic product from two western herbal medicines to replace an antimicrobial growth promoter in poultry production

Ilse van Heerden

Promoter: Prof. J.N. Eloff

Co-promoter: Dr. J. Picard

Co-promoter: Dr. S.P.R. Bisschop

Antimicrobial growth promoters (AGPs) are substances that are added to feed in sub-therapeutic levels in intensive animal production to improve weight gain and conversion of feed (FCR) into body mass. AGPs have been used widely as growth promoters in broiler and pig production under high-density growth conditions. Despite the observed efficacy, the use of AGPs has been criticized due to its possible role in the development of antibiotic resistance in human pathogens. Directive 183/2003 of the European Parliament, issued in 2003, banned the use of all antibiotic agents as growth promoters in the European Union from 2006. The new context caused an increase in the search for alternative growth promoters.

The aim of this study was to produce a commercially viable prophylactic antibacterial phytogetic product from *Ginkgo biloba* and *Hypericum perforatum* with a low potential to develop resistance, as an alternative to AGPs in poultry production.

The first objective of this study based on earlier results of the Phytomedicine Programme, was to evaluate the activity and potentize extracts from *Ginkgo biloba* and *Hypericum perforatum* for optimal activity against relevant bacterial pathogens. Extracts of ethyl acetate (EA), hexane, dichloromethane (DCM) and acetone (in order of activity) from a direct extraction procedure of powdered *G. biloba* leaves were active against *Enterococcus faecalis*, *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Clostridium perfringens*. The EA, hexane and DCM extracts were 2 to 3 times more active than the acetone extract (average total activity 1728 ml/g dry extract for the 3 pathogens). The DCM-, EA-, acetone- and hexane extracts (in order of activity) from the direct extraction procedure from *H. perforatum* were only active against *C. perfringens* with the first three extracts having a total activity of between 1026 and 1333 ml/g dry material and the hexane extract a total activity of 333 ml/g dry material. The spectrum of activity of *G. biloba* corresponds to that of Zn-bacitracin, which is commonly used as an antibiotic growth promoter in the poultry industry.

The second objective in this study was to combine extracts or fractions of extracts of *G. biloba* and *H. perforatum* to optimise activity against selected bacterial pathogens. A synergistic effect could be observed when combining

a ratio of 1:5 of *G. biloba*: *H. perforatum* (hexane extracts) or 1:15 (acetone extracts) against *E. faecalis* while only an indifferent (neutral) effect was observed against *C. perfringens*.

After elucidation of the quantitative and qualitative aspects involved in the antimicrobial activity, the major antibacterial compound from *G. biloba* was isolated and characterized as ginkgolic acid (C<sub>17:1</sub>). It was also determined whether activity against *E. faecalis* and *C. perfringens* in an extract or fraction of and extract of *G. biloba* can be attributed only to ginkgolic acid or whether synergism or other interactions also play a role in the antibacterial activity. It was shown that synergistic interactions are at play between constituents in the hexane and EA fraction, with the last mentioned fraction not containing any ginkgolic acid. These results support the use of the whole extract as opposed to isolated compounds as antimicrobial agents against pathogenic organisms.

Two important pharmacodynamic parameters were investigated i.e. resistance development to a hexane extract and the isolated ginkgolic acid from *G. biloba* against *E. faecalis* and secondly the time-kill dynamics of this hexane extract over 24 h against *E. faecalis*. The bactericidal nature of the hexane extract from *G. biloba* as well the absence of decreased susceptibility to this extract (and the isolated ginkgolic acid) in the resistance studies against *E. faecalis* indicate that this extract has potential to be exploited as a alternative to AGPs in the poultry industry.

The final objective was to determine the effect of extracts of *G. biloba* alone or in combination with *H. perforatum* extracts on the performance of broiler chickens over a 35 day period. The effect of these extracts on *C. perfringens* in the intestine of broilers was also investigated. No significant differences were found with relation to any of the production parameters studied (FCR, live weight or % survival) although a trend towards more favourable European Performance Efficiency Factor index values were observed for treatments containing *G. biloba* (5% improvement) or a combination of *G. biloba* and *H. perforatum* (2.1% improvement) compared to the untreated control. Similarly, Zn-Bacitracin resulted in a 5.5% improvement compared to the untreated control. There was a general trend (not statistically significant, P=0.05) towards a reduction in *C. perfringens* scores in the feed supplemented with *G. biloba*- in combination with *H. perforatum* extract which can probably be ascribed to the direct antimicrobial effect. The rate of colonization was however too low to cause infection probably due to lack of virulence of the *C. perfringens* challenge and the absence of predisposing factors due to the hygienic growth conditions used. It is necessary for an effective disease model to be developed in order for the efficacy of any new treatment method to be properly evaluated. Such a model will require a much higher incidence of disease and reproducibility than was achieved in this project.

The safety of using extracts of *G. biloba* with ginkgolic acid as the prime antibacterial compound was considered. The active dose was at least 42 times lower than safe dosage recommended in the literature. The combination of extracts of *G. biloba* and *H. perforatum* holds promise as a potential growth promoter in poultry production.

Better results may be achieved if potentized extracts are used and compared with Zn-Bacitracin and a negative control under industrial growth conditions where the birds are stressed and natural infections would take place.

## Table of contents

DECLARATION	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	III
ABSTRACT	V
TABLE OF CONTENTS	VIII
LIST OF TABLES	XII
LIST OF FIGURES	XIV
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	XVI
1 GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 History of Antibiotic growth promoters (AGPs)	1
1.2 Mode of action	1
1.3 The problem with AGPs	1
1.4 Consequences of banning AGPs for Animal Productivity and Health	3
1.5 Alternatives to AGPs	3
1.6 Characteristics of acceptable alternatives	3
1.6.1 Efficacy	3
1.6.2 Safety and acceptability to regulatory agencies	4
1.6.3 Ease of use	4
1.6.4 Economic considerations	4
1.7 Plant extracts: A viable option for replacing AGPs?	4
1.8 Do <i>Ginkgo biloba</i> and <i>Hypericum perforatum</i> leaf extracts have potential to be developed in AGPs?	6
1.8.1 <i>Ginkgo biloba</i>	7



1.8.2	<i>Hypericum perforatum</i>	8
1.9	Background on development of extracts of <i>G. biloba</i> and <i>H. perforatum</i>	8
1.10	Expansion of the work of Ntloedibe (2005) and Chikoto (2006)	9
1.11	Aim of this study	10
1.12	Objectives	11
1.13	References	12
2	ACTIVITY OF EXTRACTS AND FRACTIONS OF EXTRACTS OF <i>G. BILOBA</i> AND <i>H. PERFORATUM</i> ALONE OR IN COMBINATION ON BACTERIAL PATHOGENS	19
2.1	Introduction	19
2.2	Materials and methods	20
2.2.1	Plant collection	20
2.2.2	Plant extraction procedure	20
2.2.2.1	Serial extraction	20
2.2.2.2	Direct extraction	21
2.2.2.3	Solvent-solvent fractionation	21
2.2.3	Phytochemical analysis	21
2.2.4	Biological assays	22
2.2.4.1	Microorganisms used	22
2.2.4.2	Microdilution assay	22
2.2.4.3	Bioautography	23
2.2.5	Synergy / antagonistic interactions between extracts of <i>G. biloba</i> and <i>H. perforatum</i>	23
2.3	Results and Discussion	25
2.3.1	Extraction and phytochemical analysis	25
2.3.2	Biological assays	30
2.3.3	Synergistic / antagonistic interaction between extracts of <i>G. biloba</i> and <i>H. perforatum</i>	32
2.4	Conclusions	41
2.5	References	43



3	ACTIVITY OF ANTIMICROBIAL COMPOUND ISOLATED FROM <i>GINKGO BILOBA</i>	46
3.1	Introduction	46
3.2	Materials and methods	47
3.2.1	Plant collection	47
3.2.2	Isolation and identification of active compound	47
3.2.2.1	Column Chromatography	47
3.2.2.2	Structure elucidation	47
3.2.3	Plant extracts	47
3.2.4	Extraction of plant material	48
3.2.4.1	Direct extraction	48
3.2.4.2	Solvent-solvent extraction	48
3.2.5	Microdilution assay	48
3.2.6	Determination of the concentration of the isolated compound by use of a bioautography method	49
3.2.7	Synergy / antagonistic interactions between fractions of the acetone extract of <i>G. biloba</i>	49
3.3	Results and discussion	50
3.3.1	Isolation and antibacterial activity of ginkgolic acid from <i>Ginkgo biloba</i> leaf extracts	50
3.3.2	Determination of the concentration and total activity contribution of ginkgolic acid in the various extracts or fractions of extracts of <i>G. biloba</i>	54
3.3.3	Synergy / antagonistic interaction between fractions of the acetone extract of <i>G. biloba</i>	56
3.4	Conclusions	59
3.4	Acknowledgements	59
3.5	References	60
4	PHARMACODYNAMIC ASPECTS OF HEXANE EXTRACT AND GINKGOLIC ACID FROM <i>G. BILOBA</i> USING <i>E. FAECALIS</i>	64
4.1	Introduction	64
4.2	Materials and methods	65
4.2.1	Ginkgolic acid	65
4.2.2	Preparation of hexane extract from <i>G. biloba</i>	65
4.2.3	Preparation of <i>E. faecalis</i> inoculum	66
4.2.4	<i>In vitro</i> emergence of resistance studies	66
4.2.5	Time –kill methodology	66



4.3	Results and discussion	67
4.4	Conclusion	71
4.5	References	72
5	<b>GINKGO BILOBA AND HYPERICUM PERFORATUM EXTRACTS USED AS GROWTH PROMOTERS IN BROILERS</b>	74
5.1	Introduction	74
5.2	Materials and methods	75
5.2.1	Experimental design	75
5.2.2	Experimental animals and housing	75
5.2.3	Feed and feeding	76
5.2.4	Challenge with <i>C. perfringens</i>	78
5.2.4.1	Preparation of inoculum	78
5.2.4.2	Inoculation of chickens	78
5.2.5	Collection of samples	78
5.2.5.1	Necrotic enteritis lesion scoring	78
5.2.5.2	Microbial scoring	79
5.2.6	Statistical analysis	80
5.3	Results and discussion	82
5.3.1	Mortality	82
5.3.2	Lesion scores	83
5.3.3	Microbial scores	84
5.3.4	Live body mass	88
5.3.5	Feed conversion ratios	89
5.3.6	European Performance Efficiency Factor index	90
5.4	Conclusions	91
5.5	Acknowledgements	91
5.6	References	92
6	<b>GENERAL CONCLUSIONS</b>	97
6.1	References	100

## List of Tables

Table 1.1. Some physical, nutritional and metabolic effects ascribed to AGPs (modified from Rosen,1995) ...	2
Table 1.2. Effect of phytobiotic feed additives on production performance in poultry (adapted from Windisch <i>et al.</i> , 2008).....	5
Table 1.3. Mean live body mass (g) (each pen analysed as an experimental unit) of <i>C. perfringens</i> challenged broiler chickens fed different combinations of feed additives (Chikoto, 2006). ....	9
Table 2.1. Bacterial isolates used as test organisms .....	22
Table 2.2. Minimum inhibitory concentrations (MIC's) (mg/ml) and total activity (TA) of extracts (ml/g dry plant material) or fractions of extracts (ml/g dry extract) of <i>G. biloba</i> and <i>H. perforatum</i> .....	33
Table 2.3. The bioautographic qualitative inhibition of bacterial growth by extracts from different extraction procedures of <i>G. biloba</i> or <i>H. perforatum</i> separated by TLC with EMW as eluent: Rf values of active components.....	35
Table 2.4. FIC's of hexane fractions from <i>G. biloba</i> and <i>H. perforatum</i> to show synergistic (red) or additive (blue) effects of combinations against <i>E. faecalis</i> .....	38
Table 2.5. FIC's of acetone extracts from <i>G. biloba</i> and <i>H. perforatum</i> to show additive (blue) or indifferent (yellow) effects of combinations against <i>E. faecalis</i> .....	39
Table 2.6. FIC's of hexane fractions from <i>G. biloba</i> and <i>H. perforatum</i> to show indifferent (yellow) effects of combinations against <i>C. perfringens</i> .....	40
Table 2.7. FIC's of acetone fractions from <i>G. biloba</i> and <i>H. perforatum</i> to show indifferent (yellow) effects of combinations against <i>C. perfringens</i> .....	41
Table 3.1. <sup>1</sup> H NMR data for isolated compound and ginkgolic acid (C <sub>17:1</sub> ).....	51
Table 3.2. Percentage of total activity (TA) ascribed to ginkgolic acid (GA) in extracts or fractions of extracts of <i>G. biloba</i> against <i>E. faecalis</i> and <i>C. perfringens</i> .....	55
Table 3.3. Raw data and FIC's of combined hexane- and EA fractions from <i>G. biloba</i> to show synergistic (red) or additive (blue) effects against <i>E. faecalis</i> . ....	57
Table 3.4. Raw data and FIC's of combined hexane- and EA fractions from <i>G. biloba</i> to show synergistic (red) or additive (blue) effects against <i>C. perfringens</i> .....	58
Table 4.1. Susceptibility of <i>E. faecalis</i> against hexane extract and ginkgolic acid from <i>G. biloba</i> and gentamycin .....	67
Table 5.1. Summary of the experimental design.....	75
Table 5.2. Composition of broiler grower feed. ....	77



Table 5.3. Percentage survivors of broiler chickens fed different combinations of feed additives .....	83
Table 5.4. Mean microbial scores of <i>C. perfringens</i> on plates (cultures) and slides (smears) from the intestines of challenged broilers fed different feed additives .....	86
Table 5.5. Mean live body mass (g) on days 13, 20, 27 and 35 (each chicken analysed as an experimental unit) of <i>C. perfringens</i> challenged broiler chickens fed different feed additives. ....	89
Table 5.6. Feed conversion ratios (FCR) of broilers challenged with <i>C. perfringens</i> and fed different feed additives. ....	90
Table 5.7. European Performance efficacy index (EPEF) of broilers challenged with <i>C. perfringens</i> and fed different feed additives.....	90

## List of Figures

Figure 2.1. Serially extracted <i>G. biloba</i> extracts sprayed with p-anisaldehyde (left) and vanillin (right) with mobile phase BEA (top), CEF (middle) and EMW (bottom).....	26
Figure 2.2. <i>G. biloba</i> extracts/fractions from the direct- and solvent-solvent extraction procedures sprayed with p-anisaldehyde (left) and vanillin (right) with mobile phase BEA (top), CEF (middle) and EMW (bottom) .....	27
Figure 2.3. Serially extracted <i>H. perforatum</i> extracts sprayed with p-anisaldehyde (left) and vanillin (right) with mobile phase BEA (top), CEF (middle) and EMW (bottom).....	28
Figure 2.4. <i>H. perforatum</i> extracts/fractions from direct- and solvent-solvent separation procedures sprayed with p-anisaldehyde (left) and vanillin (right) with mobile phase BEA (top), CEF (middle) and EMW (bottom) .....	29
Figure 2.5. Hexane fraction of <i>G. biloba</i> from the solvent-solvent extraction procedure (left) and from the direct extraction procedure (right) sprayed with vanillin with mobile phase DCM: methanol (9:1)	30
Figure 2.6. Hexane extract and fraction of <i>G. biloba</i> from the solvent-solvent extraction procedure (left) and from direct extraction procedure (right) sprayed with <i>S. aureus</i> and mobile phase DCM: Methanol (19:1) .....	31
Figure 2.7. <i>G. biloba</i> extracts sprayed with <i>S. aureus</i> with mobile phases BEA (top), CEF (centre) and EMW (bottom) .....	36
Figure 2.8. <i>H. perforatum</i> extracts (see below) sprayed with <i>S. aureus</i> with mobile phases BEA (top), CEF (centre) and EMW (bottom) .....	37
Figure 2.9. Effect of combining hexane fractions of <i>G. biloba</i> and <i>H. perforatum</i> on <i>E. faecalis</i> (using % Stimulation equation from section 2.2.5.1).....	38
Figure 2.10. Effect of combining acetone fractions of <i>G. biloba</i> and <i>H. perforatum</i> on <i>E. faecalis</i> (using % Stimulation equation from section 2.2.5.1).....	39
Figure 2.11. Effect of combining hexane fractions of <i>G. biloba</i> and <i>H. perforatum</i> on <i>C. perfringens</i> (using % Stimulation equation from section 2.2.5.1).....	40
Figure 2.12. Effect of combining acetone fractions of <i>G. biloba</i> and <i>H. perforatum</i> on <i>C. perfringens</i> (using % Stimulation equation from section 2.2.5.1).....	41
Figure 3.1. Ginkgolic acid, a 6-alkylsalicylic (anacardic) acid with C <sub>17:1</sub> alkyl substituent. ....	50
Figure 3.2. <sup>1</sup> H NMR data for isolated compound GbHK001. ....	53
Figure 3.3. Bioautogram of <i>G. biloba</i> extracts (1-6) and different concentrations of the isolated ginkgolic acid (GA) (7-11) sprayed with <i>S.aureus</i> with mobile phase DCM:methanol (19:1). ....	54
Figure 3.4 Effect of combining hexane and EA fractions of <i>G. biloba</i> on <i>E. faecalis</i> . ....	57
Figure 3.5. Effect of combining hexane and EA fractions of <i>G. biloba</i> on <i>C. perfringens</i> . ....	58

Figure 4.1. Selection of resistant strain (C) from plate representing the highest concentration of test substance, with A–F in order from the highest to the lowest concentration. ....	68
Figure 4.2. <i>E. faecalis</i> streaked out on McConkey agar (left) and BTA (middle) and inoculated into Aesculin-broth (right) to confirm identity. ....	68
Figure 4.3. Increase in <i>E. faecalis</i> resistance to Gentamicin developed within 7 passages (left) compared to no resistance development to hexane extract of GB (right). ....	69
Figure 4.4. Death kinetics of <i>E. faecalis</i> with exposure to different concentrations of hexane extract of <i>G. biloba</i> as seen over a 24 h period. ....	70
Figure 4.5. Percentage viability ((Log cfu in treatment/log cfu in control) X100) of <i>E. faecalis</i> exposed to different concentrations of hexane extract of <i>G. biloba</i> over 24 h. ....	70
Figure 5.1. Broiler facility where challenged treatments were kept. ....	80
Figure 5.2. Day old chicks' beaks are being dipped in water to ensure swallow reflex is intact. ....	80
Figure 5.3. Heater hanging from the roof. ....	81
Figure 5.4. Day old chicks in and around the feeding tray and water fountain. ....	81
Figure 5.5. Nine day old chicks around tube feeder. ....	81
Figure 5.6. Cages (each cage represent one treatment replicate). ....	81
Figure 5.7. Oral gavage of 15 day old chicken with <i>C. perfringens</i> . ....	81
Figure 5.8. Section of intestine of a chick where a sample were taken for smears and culturing of <i>C. perfringens</i> . ....	82
Figure 5.9. Cumulative mortality associated with different treatments after challenge with <i>C. perfringens</i> . ....	83
Figure 5.10. Smear (left) and culture (right) scores of <i>C. perfringens</i> indicating colonization of intestines of broiler fed different feed additives. ....	86
Figure 5.11. Slide showing a low concentration of <i>C. perfringens</i> (score = 1) . ....	87
Figure 5.12. Slide showing high concentrations of <i>C. perfringens</i> (score = 4). ....	87

## List of Abbreviations

AGP	Antibiotic growth promoter
ANOVA	Analysis of variance
ATCC	American Type Culture Collection
AUCC	Animal Use and Care Committee
BCA	Blood Columbia Agar
BEA	Benzene/ ethanol/ ammonium hydroxide
BHI	Brain-heart-infusion
BTA	Blood Tryptose Agar
CEF	Chloroform/ ethyl acetate/ formic acid
DCM	Dichloromethane
EA	Ethyl acetate
EMW	Ethyl acetate/ methanol/ water
EPEF	European Performance Efficacy Index
FCR	Feed conversion ratio
FIC	Fractional inhibitory concentration
FOS	Fructo-oligosaccharides
GA	Ginkgolic acid
GIT	Gastro-intestinal tract
GOS	Gluco-oligosaccharides
GRAS	Generally regarded as safe
GRE	Glucopeptide resistant enterococci
HEN	Hen's egg test
INT	<i>p</i> -iodonitrotetrazolium violet
MEDUNSA	Medical University of Southern Africa
MH	Müller Hinton
MIC	Minimum inhibitory concentration
MOS	Manno-oligosaccharides
MRSA	Methicillin resistant <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>
NE	Necrotic enteritis
NMR	Nuclear Magnetic resonance
OD	Optical Density
P	Passage
PAF	Platelet activity factor
SANS	South African National Standards





SEM	Standard error of Mean
SJW	St. Johns wort
TA	Total activity
TLC	Thin Layer Chromatography
UV	Ultra Violet light
VRE	Vancomycin resistant <i>Enterococcus</i>
Zn-Bacitracin	Zinc-Bacitracin