

# A RATIONAL IN VITRO EVALUATION OF 53 MEDICINAL PLANTS USED IN THE TREATMENT OF DIARRHOEA AND THE POTENTIAL USE OF *DEINBOLLIA OBLONGIFOLIA* (SAPINDACEAE) EXTRACTS

**Gabriele Würger**

Mag. Med. Vet. (Veterinärmedizinische Universität Wien)

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



UNIVERSITEIT VAN PRETORIA  
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA  
YUNIBESITHI YA PRETORIA

Promoter: Prof J.N. Eloff

Co-promoter: Dr L.J. McGaw

December 2010

## DECLARATION

This represents an experimental record for the work carried out in the Department of Pharmacology, University of Pretoria, under the supervision of Prof. J.N. Eloff and Dr L.J. McGaw.

I, the undersigned Gabriele Würger, present this document as my authentic material and acknowledge that it has not been submitted in any other form to any other institution. I also acknowledge that I have consulted many publications in compiling this work and the references are all listed.

---

Gabriele Würger

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank firstly Prof. J.N. Eloff and Prof. Botha as well as the University of Pretoria for the opportunity to do my research at the Phytomedicine Programme at the Department of Pharmacology of the University of Pretoria. A special word of thanks goes to Prof. J.N. Eloff for his help and guidance, his personal involvement and his invaluable support as my supervisor.

Secondly, Dr L.J. McGaw for all your help with the laboratory work and writing up and most importantly for always having an open ear for me throughout the duration of this research. I am very happy that our professional relationship has evolved into a true friendship that I will cherish forever.

To my friends that I made here in South Africa, especially to TharienDeWinnaar, Tshepiso Makhafola and Dr IlsevanHeerden for your support, that did not waiver, even if times were strenuous.

And most importantly to my family: Thank you for all your love, support and never ending trust in me. Without you, this thesis would never have been possible and I will be eternally grateful, especially to my dad, for providing me with the proper financial means to be able to carry out my research in a different country and so fulfil one of my biggest dreams.

Lastly, I would like to dedicate this thesis to my mother Mag. DoritWürger, who passed away mere months after I received the confirmation that I will be doing my Postgraduate degree in South Africa. You have and will always be my inspiration to strive further in life and to make my dreams come true.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Abbreviations	xii
List of Figures	xv
List of Tables	xxiv
Abstract	xxvii
Chapter 1. Introduction and objectives	1
1.1 Literature review	1
1.1.1 Importance of diarrhoea in animal production	2
1.1.2 Medicinal plants	3
1.1.3 Sources of antimicrobial activity in plants	4
1.1.4 Plant extracts and their effects	4
1.1.5 Aim	6
1.1.6 Objectives	6
Chapter 2. Seasonal variation in antibacterial activity of five selected plant species	7
2.1 Introduction	7
2.2 Materials and methods	9
2.2.1 Plant collection	9
2.2.2 Extraction	9
2.2.3 TLC fingerprinting	10
2.2.4 Bacterial cultures	10
2.2.5 Bioautographic assays	10
2.2.6 Microdilution assays	11
2.2.7 Total activity	12
2.2.8 Tannin assays	12

2.3 Results and discussion	13
2.3.1 Quantity extracted	13
2.3.2 TLC fingerprinting	15
2.3.3 Bioautographic assays	17
2.3.4 Microdilution assays	19
2.3.5 Tannin assays	25
2.4 Conclusions	31

### Chapter 3. Antibacterial screening of *Combretum molle* leaf extracts to detect possible

intraspecies variation	33
3.1 Introduction	33
3.2 Materials and methods	34
3.2.1 Plant collection	34
3.2.2 TLC fingerprinting	34
3.2.3 Bioautographic assays	34
3.2.4 Total Activity	34
3.2.5 Microdilution assays	34
3.2.6 Tannin assays	34
3.3 Results and discussion	34
3.3.1 Quantity extracted	34
3.3.2 TLC fingerprinting and Bioautographic assays	35
3.3.3 Microdilution assays	38
3.3.4 Tannin assays	42
3.4 Conclusions	45

### Chapter 4. A proposal for prioritising plant species to be investigated for treating

diarrhoea in animals	46
----------------------	----

4.1 Introduction	46
4.2 Materials and methods	47
4.2.1 Collection and preparation of plant material	47
4.2.2 Extraction	48
4.2.3 TLC fingerprinting	48
4.2.4 Bioautographic assays	48
4.2.5 Total activity	49
4.2.6 Microdilution assays	49
4.2.7 Tannin assays	49
4.3 Results and discussion	49
4.3.1 Quantity extracted	49
4.3.2 Microdilution and tannin assays	51
4.3.3 Parameters for the selection of the plant species for further investigation	56
4.3.4 Bioautographic assays and TLC fingerprinting	59
4.4 Conclusions	63
Chapter 5. Cytotoxicity of the five chosen extracts	65
5.1 Introduction	65
5.2 Materials and methods	66
5.2.1 Cell culture	66
5.2.2 Counting of cells and preparation of plates	66
5.2.3 MTT assay working method	66
5.3 Results and discussion	67

5.3.1 Determination of the LC <sub>50</sub> values of the five different plant extracts	67
5.4 Conclusion	71
Chapter 6. Potentization of <i>Deinbollia oblongifolia</i> and <i>Spirostachys africana</i>	
extracts	72
6.1 Introduction	72
6.2 Materials and methods	72
6.2.1 Mass extraction	73
6.2.2 Solvent-solvent fractionation	74
6.2.3 TLC fingerprinting and bioautographic assays	76
6.2.4 Minimum inhibitory concentration determination	76
6.2.5 Cytotoxicity assays	76
6.2.5.1 Cell culture	76
6.2.5.2 Counting of cells and preparation of plates	76
6.2.5.3 MTT-assay working method	76
6.3 Results and discussion	76
6.3.1 Mass extraction	76
6.3.2 Solvent-solvent fractionation	77
6.3.3 Minimum inhibitory concentration	78
6.3.4 TLC fingerprinting and bioautographic assays	79
6.3.5 Cytotoxicity assays	80
6.4 Conclusion	81

Chapter 7. Isolation of active compounds from <i>Deinbolliaoblongifolia</i>	83
7.1 Introduction	83
7.2 Materials and methods	84
7.2.1 Preparation of the bulk extract	84
7.2.2 Solvent-solvent fractionation	84
7.2.3 Column chromatography	85
7.2.4 Thin Layer Chromatography	85
7.2.5 Purification of column fractions	86
7.2.6 Preparative thin layer chromatography	86
7.2.7 Minimum Inhibitory concentration	86
7.2.8 Cytotoxicity of the isolated compound	86
7.2.9 Identification of purified active compound	86
7.2.9.1 Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy	86
7.3 Results and discussion	87
7.3.1 Thin layer chromatography and bioautography of the fractions resulting from column chromatography	87
7.3.2 Preparative thin layer chromatography	88
7.3.3 Minimum inhibitory concentration	89
7.3.4 Cytotoxicity of the isolated compound	89
7.3.5 Identification of the purified active compound	90
7.4 Conclusions	93



Chapter 8. Efficacy of the potentized extract of <i>Deinbollia oblongifolia</i> against different <i>E. coli</i> strains	94
8.1 Introduction	94
8.2 Materials and methods	94
8.2.1 Bacterial cultures	94
8.2.2 Minimum inhibitory concentration determination	94
8.2.3 Bioautographic assays	94
8.3 Results and discussion	95
8.3.1 Minimum inhibitory concentration	95
8.3.2 Bioautographic assays	95
8.4 Conclusions	99
Chapter 9. Acute, subacute and larval toxicity of the extract of <i>Deinbollia oblongifolia</i> and its chloroform fraction	101
9.1 Introduction	101
9.2 Materials and methods	101
9.2.1 General overview of the study design	101
9.2.1.1 Study design	101
9.2.1.2 Trial animals	101
9.2.1.3 Study termination	102
9.2.1.4 Collection and storage of samples	102
9.2.1.5 Measurements and observations	102
9.2.2 Acute toxicity	103

9.2.3 Subacute toxicity	104
9.2.4 Larval assay	105
9.3 Results and discussion	106
9.3.1 Acute toxicity study	106
9.3.2 Subacute toxicity study	112
9.3.3 Larval assay	115
9.4 Conclusions	116
Chapter 10. General conclusions	117
10.1 Introduction	117
10.2 Evaluate the magnitude of seasonal variation in the antibacterial activity	118
10.3 Evaluate the genetic and geographic variation in antibacterial activity	118
10.4 Verify the efficacy of selected plant extracts used traditionally to treat diarrhoea and develop a ranking system	119
10.5 Select species to be used for further analysis	119
10.6 Determine the <i>in vitro</i> cytotoxicity	120
10.7 Potentize the activity of two extracts	120
10.8 Isolate and characterise the active compound	120
10.9 Determine the acute and subacute toxicity in <i>in vivo</i> tests	121
10.10 Test the efficacy of the potentized extract in <i>in vivo</i> feeding experiments	121
10.11 Recommend further steps in the development of a model	121
Chapter 11. References	123

Appendix A	130
Appendix B	136

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

A/G	Albumin/Globulin ratio
ALP	Alkaline Phosphatase
ALT	Alanine aminotransferase
AST	Aspartate aminotransferase
BEA	Benzene/Ethanol/Ammonia
C	crude extract
Ca	Calcium
CEF	Chloroform / Ethyl acetate/ Formic acid
CF	Chloroform Fraction of <i>Deinbollia oblongifolia</i>
CNMR	Carbon nuclear magnetic resonance
COSY	Correlated spectroscopy
Crea	Creatinine
CSIR	Council for Scientific and Industrial Research
DB	<i>Deinbollia oblongifolia</i> n-butanol fraction
DC	<i>Deinbollia oblongifolia</i> chloroform fraction
DEPT	Distortionless enhancement by polarization transfer
DH	<i>Deinbollia oblongifolia</i> hexane fraction
DO	<i>Deinbollia oblongifolia</i>
DM	<i>Deinbollia oblongifolia</i> 35% water in methanol fraction
DMSO	Dimethyl sulfoxide
DW	<i>Deinbollia oblongifolia</i> water fraction
EA	Ethyl acetate
<i>E. coli</i>	<i>Escherichia coli</i>
EMW	Ethyl acetate/Methanol/Water
F	Fraction
GGT	Gamma glutamyl transferase
GLOB	Globulin
H	Hexane

HMBC	Heteronuclear bond correlation
HMQC	Heteronuclear multiple quantum correlation
HNMR	Proton nuclear magnetic resonance
INT	p-Iodonitrotetrazolium violet
K	Potassium
LC <sub>50</sub>	Lethal celltoxicity
MEM	Minimum essential medium
MIC	Minimum Inhibitory Concentration
MTT	3-(4,5-dimethylthiazol)-2,5-diphenyl tetrazolium bromide
Na	Sodium
NIR	Near-Infrared Reflectance
NMR	Nuclear magnetic resonance
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
P.a.	<i>Peltophorum africanum</i>
R <sub>f</sub>	Retention factor
<i>S. aureus</i>	<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>
SB	<i>Spirostachys africana</i> n-butanol fraction
SC	<i>Spirostachys africana</i> chloroform fraction
SD	Standard Deviation
SH	<i>Spirostachys africana</i> hexane fraction
SI	Selectivity Index
SM	<i>Spirostachys africana</i> 35% water in methanol fraction
SW	<i>Spirostachys africana</i> water fraction
TA	Total activity
T.e.	<i>Trichillia emetica</i>
TLC	Thin Layer Chromatography
TSP	Total serum protein
Urea	Urea

UV

Ultraviolet

WHO

World Health Organization

Z.m.

*Ziziphus mucronata*

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1: *Acacia karroo*

Figure 2.2: *Acacia sieberiana* var. *woodii*

Figure 2.3: *Peltophorum africanum*

Figure 2.4: *Trichilia emetica*

Figure 2.5: *Ziziphus mucronata*

Figure 2.6: Average yield of *Acacia karroo* with acetone extraction

Figure 2.7: Average yield of *Acacia sieberiana* var. *woodii* with acetone extraction

Figure 2.8: Average yield of *Peltophorum africanum* with acetone extraction

Figure 2.9: Average yield of *Trichilia emetica* with acetone extraction

Figure 2.10: Average yield of *Ziziphus mucronata* with acetone extraction

Figure 2.11: Chromatograms of monthly samples of five species collected during December and January EMW

Figure 2.12: Chromatograms of monthly samples of five species collected during June and July EMW

Figure 2.13: Chromatograms of monthly samples of five species collected during December and January CEF

Figure 2.14: Chromatograms of monthly samples of five species collected during June and July CEF

Figure 2.15: Chromatograms of monthly samples of five species collected during December and January BEA

Figure 2.16: Chromatograms of monthly samples of five species collected during June and July BEA

Figure 2.17: Bioautography of monthly samples from December and January against *E. coli* (CEF)

Figure 2.18: Bioautography of monthly samples from June and July against *E. coli* (CEF)

Figure 2.19: Bioautography of monthly samples from December and January against *S. aureus* (CEF)

Figure 2.20: Bioautography of monthly samples from June and July against *S. aureus* (CEF)

Figure 2.21: Activity of *A. karroo* against *E. coli*

Figure 2.22: Activity of *A. karroo* against *S. aureus*

Figure 2.23: Activity of *A. sieberiana* against *E. coli*

Figure 2.24: Activity of *A. sieberiana* against *S. aureus*

Figure 2.25: Activity of *P. africanum* against *E. coli*

Figure 2.26: Activity of *P. africanum* against *S. aureus*

Figure 2.27: Activity of *T. emetica* against *E. coli*

Figure 2.28: Activity of *T. emetica* against *S. aureus*

Figure 2.29: Activity of *Z. mucronata* against *E. coli*

Figure 2.30: Activity of *Z. mucronata* against *S. aureus*

Figure 2.31 A: Comparison between tannin content and activity against *E. coli* for *Acacia karroo*

Figure 2.31 B: Correlation between tannin content and activity against *E. coli* in *Acacia karroo*

Figure 2.32 A: Comparison between tannin content and activity against *S. aureus* for *Acacia karroo*

Figure 2.32 B: Correlation between tannin content and activity against *S. aureus* in *Acacia karroo*

Figure 2.33 A: Comparison between tannin content and activity against *E. coli* for *Acacia sieberiana* var. *woodii*

Figure 2.33 B: Correlation between tannin content and activity against *E. coli* in *Acacia sieberiana* var. *woodii*

Figure 2.34 A: Comparison between tannin content and activity against *S. aureus* for *Acacia sieberiana* var. *woodii*

Figure 2.34 B: Correlation between tannin content and activity against *S. aureus* in *Acacia sieberiana* var. *woodii*

Figure 2.35 A: A: Comparison between tannin content and activity against *E. coli* for *Peltophorum africanum*

Figure 2.35 B: Correlation between tannin content and activity against *E. coli* in *Peltophorum africanum*



Figure 2.36 A: Comparison between tannin content and activity against *S. aureus* for *Peltophorum africanum*

Figure 2.36 B: Correlation between tannin content and activity against *S. aureus* in *Peltophorum africanum*

Figure 2.37 A: Comparison between tannin content and activity against *E. coli* for *Trichilia emetica*

Figure 2.37 B: Correlation between tannin content and activity against *E. coli* in *Trichilia emetica*

Figure 2.38 A: Comparison between tannin content and activity against *S. aureus* for *Trichilia emetica*

Figure 2.38 B: Correlation between tannin content and activity against *S. aureus* in *Trichilia emetica*

Figure 2.39 A: Comparison between tannin content and activity against *E. coli* for *Ziziphus mucronata*

Figure 2.39 B: Correlation between tannin content and activity against *E. coli* in *Ziziphus mucronata*

Figure 2.40 A: Comparison between tannin content and activity against *S. aureus* for *Ziziphus mucronata*

Figure 2.40 B: Correlation between tannin content and activity against *S. aureus* in *Ziziphus mucronata*

Figure 3.1: *Combretum molle*

Figure 3.2: Average yield of acetone extraction of 42 different *Combretum molle* samples

Figure 3.3: *Combretum molle* Waterberg EMW

Figure 3.4: *Combretum molle* Waterberg EMW against *E. coli*

Figure 3.5: *Combretum molle* Waterberg EMW against *S. aureus*

Figure 3.6: *Combretum molle* Waterberg CEF

Figure 3.7: *Combretum molle* Waterberg CEF against *E. coli*

Figure 3.8: *Combretum molle* Waterberg CEF against *S. aureus*

Figure 3.9: *Combretum molle* Waterberg BEA

Figure 3.10: *Combretum molle* Waterberg BEA against *E. coli*

Figure 3.11: *Combretum molle* Waterberg BEA against *S. aureus*

Figure 3.12: *Combretum molle* Onderstepoort EMW

Figure 3.13: *Combretum molle* Onderstepoort EMW against *E. coli*

Figure 3.14: *Combretum molle* Onderstepoort EMW against *S. aureus*

Figure 3.15: *Combretum molle* Onderstepoort CEF

Figure 3.16: *Combretum molle* Onderstepoort CEF against *E. coli*

Figure 3.17: *Combretum molle* Onderstepoort CEF against *S. aureus*

Figure 3.18: *Combretum molle* Onderstepoort BEA

Figure 3.19: *Combretum molle* Onderstepoort BEA against *E. coli*

Figure 3.20: *Combretum molle* Onderstepoort BEA against *S. aureus*

Figure 3.21: *Combretum molle* SANBI Pretoria Botanical Garden EMW

Figure 3.22: *Combretum molle* SANBI Pretoria Botanical Garden EMW against *E. coli*

Figure 3.23: *Combretum molle* SANBI Pretoria Botanical Garden EMW against *S. aureus*

Figure 3.24: *Combretum molle* SANBI Pretoria Botanical Garden CEF

Figure 3.25: *Combretum molle* SANBI Pretoria Botanical Garden CEF against *E. coli*

Figure 3.26: *Combretum molle* SANBI Pretoria Botanical Garden CEF against *S. aureus*

Figure 3.27: *Combretum molle* SANBI Pretoria Botanical Garden BEA

Figure 3.28: *Combretum molle* SANBI Pretoria Botanical Garden BEA against *E. coli*

Figure 3.29: *Combretum molle* SANBI Pretoria Botanical Garden BEA against *S. aureus*

Figure 3.30: *Combretum molle* Magaliesberg EMW

Figure 3.31: *Combretum molle* Magaliesberg EMW against *E. coli*

Figure 3.32: *Combretum molle* Magaliesberg EMW against *S. aureus*

Figure 3.33: *Combretum molle* Magaliesberg CEF

Figure 3.34: *Combretum molle* Magaliesberg CEF against *E. coli*

Figure 3.35: *Combretum molle* Magaliesberg CEF against *S. aureus*

Figure 3.36: *Combretum molle* Magaliesberg BEA

Figure 3.37: *Combretum molle* Magaliesberg BEA against *E. coli*

Figure 3.38: *Combretum molle* Magaliesberg BEA against *S. aureus*

Figure 3.39: *Combretum molle* Lowveld Botanical Garden Nelspruit EMW

Figure 3.40: *Combretum molle* Lowveld Botanical Garden Nelspruit EMW against *E. coli*

Figure 3.41: *Combretum molle* Lowveld Botanical Garden Nelspruit EMW against *S. aureus*

Figure 3.42: *Combretum molle* Lowveld Botanical Garden Nelspruit CEF

Figure 3.43: *Combretum molle* Lowveld Botanical Garden Nelspruit CEF against *E. coli*

Figure 3.44: *Combretum molle* Lowveld Botanical Garden Nelspruit CEF against *S. aureus*

Figure 3.45: *Combretum molle* Lowveld Botanical Garden Nelspruit BEA

Figure 3.46: *Combretum molle* Lowveld Botanical Garden Nelspruit BEA against *E. coli*

Figure 3.47: *Combretum molle* Lowveld Botanical Garden Nelspruit BEA against *S. aureus*

Figure 3.48: NIR spectrum of *Combretum molle* collected at SANBI Pretoria Botanical Garden

Figure 3.49: Comparison of the activity of the different *Combretum molle* samples against *E. coli* and their tannin content

Figure 3.50: Correlation of the activity against *E. coli* and the tannin content of the different *Combretum molle* samples

3.51: Comparison of the activity of the different *Combretum molle* samples against *S. aureus* and their tannin content

3.52: Correlation of the activity against *S. aureus* and the tannin content of the different *Combretum molle* samples

Figure 4.1: Average percentage extracted from 53 selected plants species

Figure 4.2: Comparison of the activity of the 53 different plant samples against *E. coli* and their tannin content

Figure 4.3: Comparison of the activity of the 53 different plant samples against *S. aureus* and their tannin content

Figure 4.4: *Acacia sieberiana* var. *woodii* EMW

Figure 4.5: *Acacia sieberiana* var. *woodii* EMW against *E. coli*

Figure 4.6: *Acacia sieberiana* var. *woodii* EMW against *S. aureus*

Figure 4.7: *Acacia sieberiana* var. *woodii* CEF

Figure 4.8: *Acacia sieberiana* var. *woodii* CEF against *E. coli*

Figure 4.9: *Acacia sieberiana* var. *woodii* CEF against *S. aureus*

Figure 4.10: *Acacia sieberiana* var. *woodii* BEA

Figure 4.11: *Acacia sieberiana* var. *woodii* BEA against *E. coli*

Figure 4.12: *Acacia sieberiana* var. *woodii* BEA against *S. aureus*

Figure 4.13: *Albizia adianthifolia* EMW

Figure 4.14: *Albizia adianthifolia* EMW against *E. coli*

Figure 4.15: *Albizia adianthifolia* EMW against *S. aureus*

Figure 4.16: *Albizia adianthifolia* CEF

Figure 4.17: *Albizia adianthifolia* CEF against *E. coli*

Figure 4.18: *Albizia adianthifolia* CEF against *S. aureus*

Figure 4.19: *Albizia adianthifolia* BEA

Figure 4.20: *Albizia adianthifolia* BEA against *E. coli*

Figure 4.21: *Albizia adianthifolia* BEA against *S. aureus*

Figure 4.22: *Deinbollia oblongifolia* EMW

Figure 4.23: *Deinbollia oblongifolia* EMW against *E. coli*

Figure 4.24: *Deinbollia oblongifolia* EMW against *S. aureus*

Figure 4.25: *Deinbollia oblongifolia* CEF

Figure 4.26: *Deinbollia oblongifolia* CEF against *E. coli*

Figure 4.27: *Deinbollia oblongifolia* CEF against *S. aureus*

Figure 4.28: *Deinbollia oblongifolia* BEA

Figure 4.29: *Deinbollia oblongifolia* BEA against *E. coli*

Figure 4.30: *Deinbollia oblongifolia* BEA against *S. aureus*

Figure 4.31: *Spirostachys africana* EMW

Figure 4.32: *Spirostachys africana* EMW against *E. coli*

Figure 4.33: *Spirostachys africana* EMW against *S. aureus*

Figure 4.34: *Spirostachys africana* CEF

Figure 4.35: *Spirostachys africana* CEF against *E. coli*

Figure 4.36: *Spirostachys africana* CEF against *S. aureus*

Figure 4.37: *Spirostachys africana* BEA

Figure 4.38: *Spirostachys africana* BEA against *E. coli*

Figure 4.39: *Spirostachys africana* BEA against *S. aureus*

Figure 4.40: *Tetradenia riparia* EMW

Figure 4.41: *Tetradenia riparia* EMW against *E. coli*

Figure 4.42: *Tetradenia riparia* EMW against *S. aureus*

Figure 4.43: *Tetradenia riparia* CEF

Figure 4.44: *Tetradenia riparia* CEF against *E. coli*

Figure 4.45: *Tetradenia riparia* CEF against *S. aureus*

Figure 4.46: *Tetradenia riparia* BEA

Figure 4.47: *Tetradenia riparia* BEA against *E. coli*

Figure 4.48: *Tetradenia riparia* BEA against *S. aureus*

Figure 5.1: Linear regression curve and equation for one of the *Tetradenia riparia* samples

Figure 5.2: Toxicity of *Acacia sieberiana* var. *woodii* extract

Figure 5.3: Toxicity of *Albizia adianthifolia* acetone extract

Figure 5.4: Toxicity of *Deinbollia oblongifolia* extract 1<sup>st</sup> experiment

Figure 5.5: Toxicity of *Deinbollia oblongifolia* extract

Figure 5.6: Toxicity of *Spirostachys africana* extract

Figure 5.7: Toxicity of *Tetradenia riparia* extract

Figure 6.1: Representation of solvent-solvent fractionation procedure (Suffness and Douros, 1979)

Figure 6.2: Chromatograms EMW

Figure 6.3: Bioautography against *E. coli* EMW

Figure 6.4: Chromatograms CEF

Figure 6.5: Bioautography against *E. coli* CEF

Figure 6.6: Chromatograms BEA

Figure 6.7: Bioautography against *E. coli* BEA

Figure 6.8: Toxicity of the chloroform fraction of *Deinbollia oblongifolia*

Figure 6.9: Toxicity of the chloroform fraction of *Spirostachys africana*

Figure 7.1: *Deinbollia oblongifolia*

Figure 7.2: Distribution of *Deinbollia oblongifolia*

Figure 7.3: Chromatograms 10% EA / 10% H

Figure 7.4: Bioautography 10 % EA / 90 % H against *E. coli*

Figure 7.5 A: Chromatograms combined fractions 10 % EA / 90 % H

Figure 7.5 B: Chromatograms combined fractions EMW

Figure 7.5 C: Chromatograms combined fractions CEF

Figure 7.5 D: Chromatograms combined fractions BEA

Figure 7.5 E: Bioautography combined fractions 10 % EA / 90 % H against *E. coli*

Figure 7.6: Chromatograms of compound

Figure 7.7: Bioautographies compound against *E. coli*

Figure 7.8: Cytotoxicity of isolated compound

Figure 8.1 A: Bioautography against B 1279 for C, CF and GB2 EMW

Figure 8.1 B: Bioautography against B 1279 for C, CF and GB2 CEF

Figure 8.1 C: Bioautography against B 1279 for C, CF and GB2 BEA

Figure 8.2 A: Bioautography against B 1295 for C, CF and GB2 EMW

Figure 8.2 B: Bioautography against B 1295 for C, CF and GB2 CEF

Figure 8.2 C: Bioautography against B 1295 for C, CF and GB2 BEA

Figure 8.3 A: Bioautography against B 1297 for C, CF and GB2 EMW

Figure 8.3 B: Bioautography against B 1297 for C, CF and GB2 CEF

Figure 8.3 C: Bioautography against B 1297 for C, CF and GB2 BEA

Figure 8.4 A: Bioautography against B 1314 for C, CF and GB2 EMW

Figure 8.4 B: Bioautography against B 1314 for C, CF and GB2 CEF

Figure 8.4 C: Bioautography against B 1314 for C, CF and GB2 BEA

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: MIC values of monthly samples against *E. coli* after 60 min and 120 min

Table 2.2: MIC values of monthly samples against *S. aureus* after 60 min and 120 min

Table 2.3: Results of tannin assays for extracts prepared from leaf material collected monthly (results for average square diameter of zone are not given since the average equivalent gallic acid translated 1:1 to this value)

Table 3.1: MIC values of 42 different *Combretum molle* samples against *E. coli* after 60 min and 120 min

Table 3.2: MIC values of 42 different *Combretum molle* samples against *S. aureus* after 60 min and 120 min

Table 3.3: Results of tannin assays of 42 different *Combretum molle* samples (results for average square diameter of zone are not given since the average equivalent gallic acid translated 1:1 to this value)

Table 4.1: Selected plants for screening (Hutchings *et al.*, 1996; Bossard, 1993; Bryant, 1966)

Table 4.2: Percentage of plant material extracted with acetone, experiment repeated

Table 4.3: MIC values after 60 and 120 min against *E. coli*. Each value represents the average of 9 determinations

Table 4.4: MIC values after 60 and 120 min against *S. aureus*. Each value represents the average of 9 determinations

Table 4.5: Tannin contents for the 53 selected plant species

Table 4.6: Ranking of the extracts based on the formula developed

Table 5.1: LC<sub>50</sub> and SI values of the different species

Table 6.1: Fraction masses and percentages of *Deinbollia oblongifolia*

Table 6.2: Fraction masses and percentages of *Spirostachys africana*

Table 6.3: MIC values of the fractions of *Deinbollia oblongifolia* against *E. coli*

Table 6.4: MIC values of the fractions of *Spirostachys africana* against *E. coli*



Table 6.5: LC<sub>50</sub> and SI of the chloroform fractions

Table 7.1: Fractions with their corresponding solvent systems

Table 8.1: MIC values in mg/ml ( $\pm$  SD) of the crude extract (C), the chloroform fraction (CF) and the pure compound (GB2) isolated from *Deinbollia oblongifolia* after 60 or 120 minutes incubation against four strains of pathogenic bacteria

Table 9.1: Dosing regimen, clinical signs and macroscopic lesions and percentage of body weight gained or lost during the trial in animals dosed with *Deinbollia oblongifolia*

Table 9.2: Dosing regimen, clinical signs and macroscopic lesions and percentage of body weight gained or lost during the trial in animals dosed with the chloroform fraction of *Deinbollia oblongifolia*

Table 9.3: Dosing regimen, clinical signs and macroscopic lesions in animals dosed with *Deinbollia oblongifolia*

Table 9.4: Dosing regimen, clinical signs and macroscopic lesions in animals dosed with the chloroform fraction of *Deinbollia oblongifolia*

Table 9.5: Dosing regimen, clinical signs and macroscopic lesions in animals dosed with the solvent control acetone

Table 9.6: Clinical chemistry parameters of rats dosed with 5 mg/kg of the crude extract of *Deinbollia oblongifolia*

Table 9.7: Clinical chemistry parameters of rats dosed with 20 mg/kg of the crude extract of *Deinbollia oblongifolia*

Table 9.8: Clinical chemistry parameters of rats dosed with 50 mg/kg of the crude extract of *Deinbollia oblongifolia*

Table 9.9: Clinical chemistry parameters of rats dosed with 50 mg/kg of the chloroform fraction of *Deinbollia oblongifolia*

Table 9.10: Clinical chemistry parameters of rats dosed with 125 mg/kg of the chloroform fraction of *Deinbollia oblongifolia*

Table 9.11: Clinical chemistry parameters of rats dosed with 300 mg/kg of the chloroform fraction of *Deinbollia oblongifolia*

Table 9.12: Clinical chemistry parameters of rats dosed with the pure solvent (Acetone)

## ABSTRACT

Antibiotic Feed Additives (AFA) have been used to prevent many bacterial infections during weaning of livestock. The use of these AFA's resulted in the development of multiresistant bacterial strains and was therefore banned by the European Union. The United States also restricted the use of these feed additives considerably. Many scientists have started to search for alternatives in the prophylactic and therapeutic treatment of bacterial infections. Plants have been used traditionally by resource poor people all over the world to treat many infections. Diarrhoea not only causes many problems in the high intensity production of livestock but also leads to many human deaths. A large number of plants have been used to treat diarrhoea in humans and animals. Several authors have selected one or two species based on traditional use to evaluate in depth. In this project several different relevant parameters of 53 plant species used traditionally to treat diarrhoea were investigated in order to develop a model that would identify the species with the highest chance of delivering a useful antibacterial product.

Antibacterial activities against two pathogens important in diarrhoea (*Staphylococcus aureus* and *Escherichia coli*) were positive parameters in selecting species. Because tannins frequently have antibacterial activity, but are not useful as prophylactic agents due to their effect on production, high tannin content was considered to be a negative indication. Cellular toxicity was also used as a negative parameter at a later stage.

In addition to the *in vitro* assays there are also other parameters to be investigated to evaluate the potential use of plants. The influence of season of collection was determined on the antibacterial activity and tannin content of acetone leaf extracts of five plant species traditionally used to treat diarrhoea. They were *Acacia karoo*, *Acacia sieberiana* var. *woodii*, *Peltophorum africanum*, *Trichillia emetica* and *Ziziphus mucronata*.

The antibacterial activity varied depending on the season of collection with the best activity generally in the months of late summer to autumn (January to April). The activity of *Acacia karoo* against *E. coli* was best in the month of April (MIC = 0.11 mg/ml (TA = 332 ml/g)) and against *S. aureus* in the month of March (MIC = 0.06 mg/ml (TA = 334 ml/g)). *Acacia sieberiana* subsp. *woodii* extracts had the best activity against *E. coli* (MIC = 0.10 mg/ml (TA = 303 ml/g)) in March against *S. aureus* in April (MIC = 0.08 mg/ml (TA = 303 ml/g)). *Peltophorum africanum* extracts were most active against *E. coli* in February (MIC = 0.05 mg/ml (TA = 1188 ml/g)) and against *S. aureus* in February and March (MIC = 0.04 mg/ml (TA = 1188 ml/g and 1075 ml/g)). *Trichillia emetica* extracts were generally not very active against the bacterial strains (best activity: MIC = 0.22 mg/ml (TA = 74 ml/g) against *E. coli* in May and MIC = 0.28 mg/ml (TA = 26 ml/g) against *S. aureus* in December). *Ziziphus mucronata* was most active

against both bacterial strains and in May (*E. coli*: MIC = 0.10 mg/ml (TA = 589 ml/g); *S. aureus*: MIC = 0.04 mg/ml (TA = 1099 ml/g)). The tannin content varied in the extracts as well. The antibacterial activity however did not seem to be directly correlated to the tannin content.

Another important parameter in the use of plant species is to determine the interspecies variation of plants based on genetic or environmental influences. Leaves from 42 plants of *Combretum molle* were collected at different locations during the same season. The average MIC against *E. coli* was 0.227 mg/ml. The low standard deviation of 0.07 indicates that there was very little variation in activity. The average value against *S. aureus* was 0.399 mg/ml with a slightly higher standard deviation of 0.16. However due to the fact that the samples from different areas extracted different amounts, the total activity varied. The tannin assays revealed that there was with one exception no correlation between the antibacterial activity and the tannin content. So it can be safe to assume that genetic variation does not influence the activity too much at least in *C. molle* leaves

Fifty three plant species traditionally used to treat diarrhoea in published literature were then ranked using a novel system in order to determine which species had the most potential value. Ranking was based on the lowest MIC value against *E. coli*, lower activity against *S. aureus* (to limit selecting for general metabolic toxins), low tannin concentration and high extract yield.

From this ranking, five plants were chosen to investigate their potential value further: *Acacia sieberiana* var. *woodii* (*E. coli*: MIC = 0.13 mg/ml, TA = 108 ml/g; *S. aureus*: MIC = 0.13 mg/ml, TA = 108 ml/g; Yield = 14 mg), *Albizia adianthifolia* (*E. coli*: MIC = 0.14 mg/ml, TA = 239 ml/g; *S. aureus*: MIC = 0.04 mg/ml, TA = 765 ml/g; Yield = 34 mg), *Deinbollia oblongifolia* (*E. coli*: MIC = 0.17 mg/ml, TA = 158 ml/g; *S. aureus*: MIC = 0.08 mg/ml, TA = 338 ml/g; Yield = 27 mg), *Spirostachys africana* (*E. coli*: MIC = 0.13 mg/ml, TA = 300 ml/g; *S. aureus*: MIC = 0.09 mg/ml, TA = 438 ml/g; Yield = 38 mg) and *Tetradenia riparia* (*E. coli*: MIC = 0.09 mg/ml, TA = 214 ml/g; *S. aureus*: MIC = 0.13 mg/ml, TA = 149 ml/g; Yield = 20 mg). None of the plants contained any tannin.

The next step towards the recommendation of a plant for the development of a commercial product was to evaluate the cytotoxicity of the selected five species. The following values were obtained: *Acacia sieberiana* var. *woodii* LC<sub>50</sub> = 0.026 mg/ml, *Albizia adianthifolia* LC<sub>50</sub> = 0.068 mg/ml, *Deinbollia oblongifolia* LC<sub>50</sub> = 0.078 mg/ml, *Spirostachys africana* LC<sub>50</sub> = 0.025 mg/ml and *Tetradenia riparia* LC<sub>50</sub> = 0.028 mg/ml.

*Deinbollia oblongifolia* (for its low LC<sub>50</sub> value) and *Spirostachys africana* (for its good antibacterial activity and total activity) were potentized by removing inactive compounds through solvent-solvent fractionation. The antibacterial activity against *E. coli* was increased this way (MIC = 0.08 mg/ml for

*Deinbollia oblongifolia* (chloroform fraction) and MIC = 0.08 mg/ml for *Spirostachys africana* (chloroform fraction)) The LC<sub>50</sub> values for both chloroform fractions were determined (LC<sub>50</sub> = 0.188 mg/ml for *Deinbollia oblongifolia* and LC<sub>50</sub> = 0.062 mg/ml for *Spirostachys africana*). The selectivity index (SI) was also determined and proved that the potentization was indeed successful (*Deinbollia oblongifolia* SI = 2.35 compared to a value of 0.45 for the crude extract; *Spirostachys africana* SI = 0.78 compared to a value of 0.19 for the crude extract). Based on these values, the chloroform fraction of *Deinbollia oblongifolia* was chosen as the less toxic one with similar activity and a higher selectivity index to be worked on further. One of the active compounds was isolated and evaluated for its activity against *E. coli* (MIC = 0.74 mg/ml) The LC<sub>50</sub> value of 0.042 mg/ml indicated that the activity of the extract was a result of synergism rather than being due to a single active compound (the selectivity index (SI) was 0.06 compared to the values of 0.45 for the crude and 2.35 for the potentized extract).

The plant extracts should of course be as effective against pathogenic strains as they were against the ATCC strains and so the extracts and pure compound of *Deinbollia oblongifolia* were tested for their activity against four different pathological *E. coli* strains. The results showed that the crude extract and the fraction were as active as in the preliminary screening results against only one of the four pathological strains. The pure compound on the other hand was more active against all four pathological strains than against the ATCC strain.

The next step was to test the safety of the extracts of *Deinbollia oblongifolia* in mammals. Unfortunately neither the crude extract nor the chloroform fraction of *Deinbollia oblongifolia* could be used safely in a living organism or in an isolated organ study. A part of the problem may have been caused by the vehicle used in the study despite reports in the literature that an acetone water mixture is safe to use.

In general all the species investigated had good antibacterial activity against *E. coli* this supports the traditional use of these species although we used acetone as extractant rather than the water used traditionally. There were major differences in antibacterial activity over a season indicating that mature leaves were more active than young leaves before senescence started. At least in the case of *Combretum molle* there was little difference in the antibacterial activity of many plants collected at different locations during the same season.

The results obtained in this study could be useful in further studies to develop extracts that can be used to control diarrhoea in animals. Possibly more emphasis should be put on the difference in activity towards *E. coli* and *S. aureus* to eliminate the presence of general metabolic toxins. Such an approach would lead to a different priority order for species to examine. A major first step would probably be to test the *in vitro* and *in vivo* toxicity of selected species.