1	Original Research Article
2	EXPLORATION OF THE ANTIMICROBIAL PROPERTIES OF FICUS
3	EXASPERATA LEAVES FROM AKURE METROPOLIS.

4

5 Abstract

6 Aim: The study was conducted to explore the antibacterial and antifungal properties of the

7 leaf extracts of *Ficus exasperata*(Sand paper tree)*in vitro*.

8 Study design: Extracts from *Ficus exasperata*leaves were qualitatively screened for the
9 phytochemical constituents, and their *in vitro* antimicrobial potency was evaluated against
10 fourteen (14) fungal and bacterial isolates.

Results: The tested extracts containedtannins, flavonoids, terpenoids, alkaloids and cardiac 11 12 glycosides whereas, saponin, steroids, phlobatannin and anthraquinone were absent. The 13 acetone extract of the leaf demonstrated better antimicrobial activity against 10 of the test 14 organisms. However, the highest antimicrobial activity (31.27mm) was exhibited by the methanol extract against referenced culture of Staphylococcus aureus. In addition, the 15 extracts also displayed better antibacterial than antifungal activity. The minimum inhibitory 16 concentration (MIC) of the extracts ranged between 0.391-1.563mg/mL, with the acetone 17 18 extract displaying lower MIC values.

19 Conclusion: The occurrence of the observed phytochemicals in the extracts of *Ficus* 20 *exasperata*(Sand paper tree)could be involved in the antimicrobial efficacy of the plant. The 21 results from this study thus supports the folkloric use of the plants. Additionally, the plant 22 could also be exploited for the production of drugs especially for staphylococci infections.

23 Keywords: medicinal plants; antimicrobial; phytochemicals; extracts; *Ficus exasperata*

24 Introduction

For ages, mankind has faced a constant battle with infectious diseases. This has led to increased morbidity and mortality especially among population from developing countries. Many populations have adopted the traditional healthcare system as a way of preventing and treating diseases of microbial origin [1]. Traditional medicine remains the most sort after, as it is considered safer, affordable, and readily available [1]. Due to the upsurge in resistance to conventional drugs by microbial agents, novel antimicrobial agents from different biological sources have been sort after and reported to be effective in combating pathogenic organisms. The use of herbal remedies containing plants or part of plants has in recent years gained ground in developed countries [2].Pharmaceutical companies have thus developed new antimicrobial drugs and also improved on the existing ones through the modification of their structures with a view to increasing their efficacy [3].

Ficus exasperata otherwise known as the sandpaper tree is native to tropical Africa [4]. The
leaves of *F. exasperata* have been employed in folkloric medicine for the treatment of various
diseases such as ophthalmic and oral infections, venereal diseases, parasitic infection
(cutaneous, subcutaneous), leprosy, and malaria [5,6]. The study therefore investigates the
claim of the antimicrobial potential of *F. exasperata*, in a bid to develop novel antimicrobials.

41 Materials and Methods

42 Collection and preparation of extracts from leaves Samples

43 The leaves of *F. exasperata* were collected from its tree at a building near Life Spring 44 College, Apatapiti layout, Federal University of Technology, Akure, Ondo State 45 (Latitude:7.289N, Latitude:5.150E) Nigeria in the month of April, 2015. Samples of the 46 leaves were taken to the Department of Crop, Soil and Pest, FUTA for authentication. 47 Afterwards the leaves were cleansed with water, shade dried, grinded and stored in airtight container. Thereafter, the powdered leaves (100g) of *F. exasperata* was weighed separately 48 49 into different plastic containers and 1000mL of 100% acetone and methanol added to the 50 containers for extraction. Aluminium foil was placed on each container before covering. Each solution wasallowed to stand for 3 days with continuous stirring. The extracts were thereafter 51 52 obtained by filtering the solutions through a funnel fitted with a filter paper. The filtrates 53 were thereafterevaporated to dryness at 50 °C in a rotary evaporator (RE-52A; Union 54 Laboratory, England) with 90 rpm under reduced pressure. The obtained concentrated extracts were stored in dark at 4 °C until further analysis. 55

56 Phytochemical screening of leaf extract of Ficus exasperata

The plant extracts were subjected to qualitative phytochemical screening using standardprotocols described by Odebiyi and Sofowora [7], Trease and Evans [8], and Harborne [9].

- 59
- 60
- 61

62 Measurement of antibacterial and antifungal activities of leaf of *Ficus exasperata*

Varying concentrations of the leaf extracts of *F. exasperata*(3.125-100mg/mL) were prepared 63 64 by dissolving different amount of the extracts in 5mL of 30% tween 20. For example, concentrations of 100, 50, and 25mg/mL were prepared by dissolving 500, 250 and 125mg of 65 66 the extracts into 5ml of 30% tween 20 respectively. Afterwards the prepared extracts were 67 sterilized by passing them through a $0.22\mu m$ millipore membrane filter. The agar well 68 diffusion method as described bySchinoret al. [10] was employed in assessing the 69 antimicrobial activity of F. exasperata leaf extracts. A total of 14 clinical and referenced 70 microbial strains wereused for the experiment. The test organisms were obtained from the 71 Pathology and Clinical Laboratory (PATHCARE), Lagos State University Teaching Hospital, 72 Lagos State, Nigeria and the Department of Microbiology, FUTA. Active broth cultures of the test organisms were prepared from stock cultures. To 5ml of nutrient broth 0.2 ml of 73 74 bacterial culture was inoculated and incubated till it reached the turbidity equal to that of the 75 standard 0.5 McFarland solution measured at 600nm which is equivalent to 10° – 10^{8} 76 CFU/ml.Suspensions of fungal spores were prepared from fresh mature (5days) cultures that grew at 26 ± 1°C on a Sabouraud dextrose agar. Spores were rinsed with sterile distilled 77 water. The suspensions were then adjusted to 10⁶ spores per/ml by microscopic enumeration 78 79 with a cell counting hematocytometer. An aliquot of 100µL of bacterial and fungal 80 solutionwas evenly spread on already solidified Mueller Hinton agar plates. Afterwards, 81 wells of 7mm diameter were bored in the solidified Mueller Hinton agarplates using a sterile 82 cork-borer. Thereafter, an aliquot of 100uL of the sterilized extract wasadded into the bored agar wells. The plates were thereafter incubated at 37 °C for 24 hour for bacteria andat 26 ± 83 84 1°C for 48 to 72 hoursfor fungi. The plateswere observed for clear zones of inhibition and the 85 measurements were taken using a ruler calibrated in millimetres. Commercial antifungal 86 drugs (clotrimazole, nystatin and gluseofluvin) and commercial antibacterial drug 87 (ciprofloxacin (10µg), rocephin (25µg)) were used as the positive control, while 30% tween 88 20 was used as the negative control. To determine the minimum inhibitory concentrations (MIC), the agar diffusion method described above was used to screen the antimicrobial effect 89 of the different concentrations of extracts (0.391-100mg/mL). The MIC value was 90 91 determined by establishing visible growth of microorganisms. The boundary dilution without 92 any visible growth was defined as the MIC for the tested microorganism at the given concentration. 93

94

95 Statistical analysis

Experiments were carried out in triplicates were applicable. The results were expressed as
mean ± standard error of three values. Data analysis was carried out using the One Way
Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and treatment means were compared using New Duncan's
Multiple Range Test (SPSS version 16). Differences were considered significantat P<0.05.

100 **Results**

Table 1 shows the presence of tannin, flavonoid, terpenoids, alkaloids and cardiac glycosides
in *F.exasperata*leafextracts, and the absence of saponin, steroids, phlobatannin and
anthraquinone.

104

	Extracts		
Phytochemical	FEM	FEA	
Saponin	-	-	
Tannin	+	+	
Flavonoid	+	+	
Steroids	-	-	
Terpenoids	+	+	
Alkaloids	+	+	
Phlobatannin	-	-	
Anthraquinone	-	-	
Cardiac Glycosides			
Legal test	+	+	
Keller kiliani	+	+	
Salkowski	+	+	
Liberman test	+	+	

Table 1: Qualitative phytochemical screening of *F.exasperata*leafextracts

106

107 KEYS:FEA: Acetone leaf extract of *F. exasperata*; FEM: Methanol leaf extract of *F. exasperata*.
 108 *exasperata*.

109 The antimicrobial activity of the leaf extracts of *F. exasperatas*howed that the acetone leaf 110 extract exhibited better activity against most of the test organisms used for the study (Table 111 2). However, the highest antimicrobial activity (31.27mm) was exhibited by the methanol 112 extract of *F. exasperata*against referenced*Staphylococcusaureus*and this was found to be 113 slightly higher that observed in the acetone extract (29.40mm) against the same organism. In 114 like manner, the leaves extracts displayedbetter antibacterial than antifungal activity. The

- antifungal activity of the acetone extract of the plant was however a better than that of themethanol extract.
- 117 Upon comparison of the activities of the leaf extracts against organism with Gram reaction
- 118 positive and Gram negative bacterial isolates, the Gram positive organism were more
- susceptible than the Gram negative organism in most cases. The extracts antibacterial activity
- 120 was comparatively better than that of the commercial antibacterial drugs in most of the tested
- 121 organisms. Reverse was the casefor the commercial antifungal drugs as they exhibited better
- activity than the extracts. The acetone extract of *F. exasperata* was found to exhibit lower
- 123 minimum inhibitory concentration values than the methanol extracts. The results are
- displayed in Table 3.

Table 2: Antimicrobial activity of leaves extracts of *F. exasperata* and commercial drugs

			Zone	of inhibition (m	<mark>ım)</mark>		
Test Organism	<mark>FEA</mark>	FEM	CPX	R	CLOT	GRIS	NYST
Salmonella Typhi(ATCC 33489)	$15.20 \pm 0.12^{\circ}$	12.43 ± 0.18^{a}	12.27 ± 0.15^{a}	14.30±0.12 ^b	<mark>NT</mark>	NT	<mark>NT</mark>
<i>Salmonella</i> Typhi	$18.43 \pm 0.18^{\circ}$	12.47 ± 0.15^{a}	12.40±0.23 ^a	14.37 ± 0.20^{b}	<mark>NT</mark>	NT	<mark>NT</mark>
Staphylococcus aureus (ATCC 43300)	$29.40 \pm 0.17^{\circ}$	31.27 ± 0.15^{d}	14.40±0.12 ^a	15.50 ± 0.17^{b}	<mark>NT</mark>	<mark>NT</mark>	<mark>NT</mark>
Staphylococcus aureus	27.33 ± 0.24^{b}	$28.40 \pm 0.12^{\circ}$	15.43±0.20 ^d	12.50 ± 0.12^{a}	<mark>NT</mark>	<mark>NT</mark>	<mark>NT</mark>
Escherichia coli (ATCC 35218)	22.20 ± 0.12^{b}	15.53 ± 0.15^{a}	11.20±0.12 ^b	14.27±0.15 ^c	<mark>NT</mark>	<mark>NT</mark>	<mark>NT</mark>
Escherichia coli	17.50 ± 0.26^{ab}	15.60 ± 0.17^{ab}	<mark>12.50±0.23^{ab}</mark>	49.97±36.67 ^a	<mark>NT</mark>	<mark>NT</mark>	<mark>NT</mark>
Pseudomonas aeruginosa(ATCC 27853)	$12.27 \pm 0.15^{\circ}$	15.40 ± 0.12^{b}	15.43±0.15 ^a	<mark>16.33±0.18^b</mark>	<mark>NT</mark>	<mark>NT</mark>	<mark>NT</mark>
Shigelladysenteriae	17.40 ± 0.21^{a}	16.30 ± 0.12^{b}	14.40±0.12 ^b	14.27±0.15 ^c	<mark>NT</mark>	<mark>NT</mark>	<mark>NT</mark>
Bacillus cereus	$15.60 \pm 0.17^{\circ}$	20.40 ± 0.12^{d}	12.33±0.18 ^a	14.53±0.20 ^b	<mark>NT</mark>	<mark>NT</mark>	<mark>NT</mark>
Bacillus subtilis	21.30 ± 0.12^{d}	12.43 ± 0.15^{a}	14.33±0.15 ^b	15.50±0.12 ^c	<mark>NT</mark>	NT	NT
Candida albicans	18.37 ± 0.23^{d}	10.27 ± 0.15^{b}	<mark>NT</mark>	NT	<mark>16.65 ± 0.68°</mark>	<mark>20.50 ± 0.29^e</mark>	6.40 ± 0.21^{a}
Aspergillus niger	15.60 ± 0.17^{b}	3.47 ± 0.20^{a}	<mark>NT</mark>	NT	22.33 ± 0.33^{d}	<mark>21.67 ± 0.33^d</mark>	$17.47 \pm 0.32^{\circ}$
Aspergillus flavus	$12.40 \pm 0.17^{\circ}$	3.30 ± 0.12^{a}	<mark>NT</mark>	NT	25.00 ± 0.15^{e}	9.77 ± 0.15^{b}	$18.73 \pm 0.22^{\circ}$
Aspergillus fumigatus	$13.30 \pm 0.17^{\circ}$	$\frac{5.30 \pm 0.15^{a}}{5.30 \pm 0.15^{a}}$	NT	NT	35.67 ± 0.44^{e}	9.33 ± 0.44^{b}	$20.57 \pm 0.30^{\circ}$

126

127 Each value is expressed as mean \pm standard error (n = 3). Values with different superscript within a row are significantly different at (P=0.05).

128 Keys: FEA: Acetone leave extract of *Ficus exasperata*; FEM: Methanol leave extract of *Ficus exasperata*; CPX: Ciprofloxacin (10µg);

129 **R**:Rocephin (25µg); CLOT: Clotrimazole(1mg/mL);GRIS: Griseofluvin(1mg/mL);NYST: Nystatin(1mg/mL);NT; Not tested.

	MIC (mg/mL)		
Test organisms	FEA	FEM	
Salmonella typhi(ATC 33489)	0.781	0.781	
Salmonella typhi	0.391	1.563	
Staphylococcus aureus(ATC 43300)	0.391	0.781	
Staphylococcus aureus	0.391	1.563	
Escherichia coli (ATC 35218)	0.391	0.781	
Escherichia coli	0.391	0.391	
Pseudomonas aeruginosa(ATC 27853)	0.781	0.781	
Shigelladysenteriae	0.781	1.562	
Bacillus cereus	0.391	0.391	
Bacillus subtilis	0.391	1.562	
Candida albicans	0.391	0.391	
Aspergillus niger	0.391	0.391	
Aspergillus flavus	0.391	1.563	
Aspergillus fumigatus	0.391	1.563	

130 **Table** 3: Minimum inhibitory concentration (mg/ml) of leaf extracts of *Ficus exasperata*

131

132 Keys: FEA: Acetone leave extract of *F. exasperata*; FEM: Methanol leave extract of *Ficus* 133 *exasperata*

134 Discussion

Plants remain an inexhaustible source of novel antimicrobials. Africa with its tropical and subtropical climate is richly blessed with an array of plants that have naturally acquired secondary metabolites in order to survive the harsh environment [1, 11]. Compounds with antimicrobial properties that also offer protection against drug resistant microorganisms have been isolated from medicinal plants [12, 13]. The present study investigated the secondary metabolite profile and antimicrobial efficacy of leaves of *F. exasperata*.

The presence of the observed secondary metabolites in the leaf extracts validates the medicinal potentials of this plants as these compounds have been reported to play a protective role against pathogenic organisms [13]. The absence of saponin, steroids, phlobatannin and anthraquinone in the extracts might be attributed to solubility of the compounds in the extraction solvent used.

The antimicrobial activity of the extracts could be attributed to the observed phytochemicals in the extracts. In addition, the variation observed in the antimicrobial activity of the extracts might be linked to differences in the type and amount of phytochemicals present in the extracts. The structural differences in the cell wall of Gram positive and Gram negative bacteria may account for the higher susceptibility of Gram positive bacteria to the plant extracts. The complexity in the cell wall Gram negative bacteria gives them better buffering capacity thus making their cell wall less impermeable, whereas Gram positive bacteria have only an outer peptidoglycan cell wall which makes them more susceptible [14].

154 The higher antibacterial activity demonstrated by the extracts than antifungal activity is in 155 consonance with findings of several authors [15, 16] that have reported higher sensitivity of 156 bacteria to antimicrobials. The chitinous cell wall of fungi promotes lesser susceptibility to 157 antimicrobials than bacteria [17]. Antibiotics have been mostly reported to produce better 158 performance against microorganisms than plants as a result their higher purity and smaller 159 molecular sizes which aid their penetration into the cell wall of the organisms [18]. The better 160 activity produced by the extract suggests that they can be explored for potent antimicrobial 161 compounds.

162 Conclusion

163 The plant extracts produced an effective performance against the growth of the tested 164 organisms especially *Staphylococcus aureus*. The plant extracts could therefore be exploited 165 for the production of antimicrobial drugs especially for staphylococci infections.

166 **References**

- Mahomoodally MF. Traditional Medicines in Africa: An Appraisal of Ten Potent
 African Medicinal Plants. *Evidence-Based Complementary and Alternative Medicine*,
 2013; Article ID 617459, 14 pages,
- Chintamunnee V, Mahomoodally MF. Herbal medicine commonly used against infectious diseases in the tropical island of Mauritius. *Journal of Herbal Medicine*, 2012; 2:113–125.
- Silva NCC, Fernandes JA. Biological properties of medicinal plants: a review of their
 antimicrobial activity. *The Journal of Venomous Animals and Toxins including Tropical Diseases*, 2010; 16(3): 402-413
- Arbonnier M. Trees, shrubs and lianas of West African dry zones.Margraf
 Publishers, Paris, France; 2004.
- 5. Titanji VP, Zofou D, Ngemenya MN. The antimalarial potential of medicinal plants
 used for the treatment of malaria in Cameroonian folk medicine. *African Journal of Traditional Complementary and AlternativeMedicines*. 2008;5:302-321.

181	6.	Joseph B, Raj SJ. Phytopharmacological and phytochemical properties of three Ficus
182		species - An overview. International Journal of Pharmacy and Biological Sciences,
183		2010; 1:246-253.
184	7.	Odebiyi OO, Sofowora EA. Phytochemical screening of Nigerian medicinal
185		plants.Lloyd. 1978;41(3):234-246.
186	8.	Trease GE, Evans MC. Pharmacognosy (14th ed.). New Delhi, India: Elsevier; 2005.
187	9.	Harborne JB. Phytochemical methods. A guide to modern techniques of plant
188		analysis (3rd ed.). New Delhi: Springer PvtLtd; 2005.
189	10	. Schinor EC, Salvador MJ, Ito IZ, Dias DA. Evaluation of the antimicrobial activity of
190		crude extracts and isolated constituents from Chrestascapigera. Brazilian Journal of
191		Microbiology, 2007; 38 : 145-149.
192	11	Manach C, Scalbert A, Morand C, Rémésy C, Jiménez L. Polyphenols: food sources
193		and bioavailability. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition, 2004; 79(5):727–747.
194	12	Miyasaki Y, Rabenstein JD, Rhea J, Crouch ML, Mocek UM, Kittell PE, et al.
195		Isolation and Characterization of Antimicrobial Compounds in Plant Extracts against
196		Multidrug-Resistant Acinetobacterbaumannii. PLOS ONE, 2013;8(4): e61594.
197	13	ManganyiMC, Regnier T, OlivierEI. Antimicrobial activities of selected essential oils
198		against Fusariumoxysporum isolates and their biofilms. South African Journal of
199		Botany, 2015; 99:115–121.
200	14	. Tadeg H, Mohammed E, Asres K, Gebre-Mariam T. Antimicrobial activities of
201		some selected traditional Ethiopian medicinal plants used in the treatment of skin
202		disorders. Journal of Ethnopharmacology, 2005;100:168-175.
203	15	. Modarresi-Chahardehi A, Ibrahim D, Fariza-Sulaiman S, Mousavi L. Screening
204		antimicrobial activity of various extracts of Urticadioica. Revista de Biología
205		Tropical, 2012; 60(4):1567-1576.
206	16	Momoh AO, Oladunmoye MK, Adebolu TT. Evaluation of the Antimicrobial and
207		Phytochemical Properties of Oil from Castor Seeds (Ricinuscommunis Linn). Bulletin
208		of Environment, Pharmacology and Life Sciences, 2012: 1(10);21-27
209	17	. Madigan MT, Martinko JM. Brock Biology of Microorganisms. New Jersey,
210		USA,Pearson-Prentice Hall; 2006
211	18	Raza MW, Shad A, Pedler SJ, Karamat KA. Penetration and activity of antibiotics in
212		brain abscess. Journal of the College of Physician and Surgeons Pakistan, 2005;
213		15(3):165-167.