

1 **Effect of growth regulators on direct shoot formation from leaf explant and antioxidant**
2 **activity of *in situ* and *in vitro* plants of *Cadaba fruticosa*- an endemic medicinal plant**

3 **Abstract**

4 The present study aimed to develop an efficient simple and reproducible *in vitro*
5 propagation technique for an multipurpose endangered medicinal plant *Cadaba fruticosa*(L.)
6 Druce. Multiple shoot formation was observed from the surface sterilized leaf segments of
7 mature plant through direct regeneration on **Murashige and Skoog medium** containing 13.32
8 μ M benzyl amino purine (BAP), 1.16 μ M kinetin (KIN) and 1.35 μ M α naphthalene acetic
9 acid (NAA). The *in vitro* regenerated shoots were rooted in MS medium supplemented with
10 NAA (2.68 μ M) with 95% response. The plantlets were successfully hardened in the
11 decomposed coir waste and compost combination with 85% survival rate. Antioxidant
12 activity of the ***in vivo*** leaf and *in vitro* plants through DPPH and FRAP assay confirmed the
13 similarity.

14 **Keywords:** *Cadaba fruticosa*, Benzyl amino purine, *in vitro* regeneration, naphthalene acetic
15 acid, **kinetin**, DPPH and FRAP.

16 **1. INTRODUCTION**

17 Medicinal plants play an important role in human life to control diseases since time
18 immemorial. The World Health Organization has estimated that up to 80% of people still rely
19 on herbal remedies for their health care [1]. Pharmaceutical industries collect plant materials
20 from wild strands resulting in indiscriminate large-scale exploitation of this natural resources.
21 Moreover no significant endeavor is being made for the cultivation and replenishment of the
22 wild stock. Therefore, now there is an urgency to conserve wild populations for future uses
23 and at the same time, produce enough planting materials by adopting improved and efficient
24 propagation approaches including mass cultivation of these species [2].

25
26 Though India has rich biodiversity and one among the twelve mega diversity centre, the
27 growing demand is putting a heavy strain on the existing resources causing a number of
28 species to be either threatened or endangered category. Global concern about the loss of
29 valuable genetic resources. Within past decade several conservation strategies were
30 developed [3,4] mainly in the terms of *in situ* and *ex situ* conservation.

Advances in biotechnology, especially *in vitro* culture techniques and molecular biology, provide some important tools for conservation and management of plant genetic resources. Plant tissue culture is an alternative method of commercial propagation and is being used widely for the commercial propagation of a large number of plant species, including many medicinal plants. Cultivation of medicinal plants is also difficult due to lack of standardized agronomic practices for the most species and unavailability of source plant materials. So *in vitro* regeneration is an efficient means of *ex situ* conservation of plant diversity [5,6] because with this technology many endangered species can be quickly propagated and preserved from a minimum of plant material and with little impact on wild population. Moreover this technique has the unique advantage of propagation of the desired taxon, independent of season, reproductive barriers, germination hurdles and so on [7]. In fact *in vitro* propagation and cryopreservation of medicinal plants help us to conserve biodiversity.

Cadaba fruticosa (L.) Druce or the Indian **Cadaba is a shrub or small tree**, it is a member of the Capparaceae family and commonly known as 'vizhuthi' in Tamil and 'Capper bush' in English. The shrub is widely distributed in the Indian subcontinent and is commonly used in Siddha medicine in the northern districts of Tamilnadu. A rare plant species *Cadaba fruticosa* has been locally used to treat by the indigenous people since time immemorial and needs immediate attention for conservation. Some of these are believed to promote positive health and maintain organic resistance against infection by re-establishing body equilibrium and conditioning the body tissues. The folk use of plants in medicinal value is an important part of the health care system [8]. The leaf juice is used internally to treat diarrhoea, dysentery and general weakness and also used as an anti-allergic, antidote, antiscorbutic, hypoglycemic and anti-helminthic herbal drug [9,10]. Further leaf extracts possesses antimicrobial activity [11] and used in traditional medicine to treat syphilis and gonorrhea [12], anti-pyretic activity [13], anti-diabetic activity [10]. Literature survey reveals that there is only one report on tissue culture of *Cadaba fruticosa* through nodal culture [14]. In spite of the high demand and pharmacological importance, there are not any conventional methods known for propagation of *C. fruticosa*. Due to ineffective pollination the seed setting is very poor [15]. For the first time we report an efficient, simple and reproducible micropropagation protocol from leaf explant of *Cadaba fruticosa* (L.) Druce.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. Plant collection and authentication

66 The plants of *Cadaba fruticosa* were collected along with areal part like node and leaves from
67 the foothills of Western Ghats, Coimbatore throughout the year. Tamilnadu, identified by
68 Botanical Survey of India. Plant identification reference number is
69 BSI/SRC/5/23/2015/Tech/931 (Fig 1A).

70 2. 2. Plant sterilization and media preparation

71 Leaf parts were collected and washed by tap water with Tween 20 (5% v/v) for 5 minutes
72 and then surface sterilized with 70% alcohol for 30 seconds followed by mercuric chloride
73 (0.12 % w/v) solution for 3 minutes. The segments were washed thoroughly with sterile
74 distilled water before cutting into 1 cm appropriate size explants.

75 The culture medium [16] was fortified with 30g/l sucrose, solidified with 0.8% (w/v)
76 agar (Hi-Media, Mumbai). The pH of the medium was adjusted to 5.8 before autoclaving. All
77 the cultures were incubated in sterile culture room at 25±2 °C with 16/8 h photoperiod under
78 white florescent light (60µE²/S irradiance) and with 60 -70 % relative humidity.

79 2.3. Induction of multiple shoots

80 For culture establishment, MS medium were supplemented with various cytokinins, viz.,
81 Benzyl amino purine (BAP 2.22 -13.32 µM), alone or with Kinetin (KIN 1.16 µM),
82 Thidiazuron (TDZ 1.135 µM) and auxin like naphthalene acidic acid (NAA 1.135 µM) in
83 combination. All the cultures were sub-cultured on the fresh medium after 15 to 20 days (All
84 the chemicals used in this experiment was obtained from Hi-Media, Mumbai).

85 2.4. Induction of root

86 Micropropagated shoots were transferred to MS medium with different concentrations of
87 NAA, IAA and IBA along with activated charcoal (2 g/l) for rooting. All the cultures were
88 incubated under the same conditions as during plantlets regeneration. After a month, the
89 percentage of plantlets inducing root, mean number of roots per shoot, mean root length were
90 evaluated (Table 2).

91 2. 5. Acclimatization

92 The rooted shoots with 5.5 cm length were washed to remove the adhering gel, and 20
93 planted in net pot, containing various potting material (Table 3). After 10 days, 20 plantlets
94 were transferred to pots containing organic manure, red soil and forest humus (1:1:1). The
95 survival rate of regenerated plants were recorded one month after transfer to pots. Each

96 experiment was repeated at least three times with 10 replicates for each treatment. Data were
97 analyzed and recorded.

98 **2. 4. Extract preparation**

99 A 100 g of *C. fruticosaleaf* and fifty days old *in vitro* plantlets were subjected to cold
100 extraction using successive method like low polar solvent to high polar solvent such as
101 petroleum ether, chloroform, ethyl acetate, ethanol and methanol (Each 500 ml). Each plant
102 extracts collected and evaporated in room temperature and finally stored for further study.

103 **2. 5. Antioxidant activity**

104 **2. 5. 1. 2,2-Diphenyl-1-Picrylhydrazyl (DPPH) radical scavenging activity**

105 DPPH radical is scavenged by antioxidants through the donation of a proton forming the
106 reduced DPPH. The color change from purple to yellow after reduction can be quantified by
107 its decrease in absorbance at wavelength 517 nm [17].

108
109 Various concentrations (1 mg/ml to 5 mg/ml) of ethanol and methanol extracts of the
110 samples (4.0 ml) were mixed with 1.0 ml of methanol solution containing DPPH radicals,
111 resulting in the final concentration of DPPH being 0.2 mM. The mixture were shaken
112 vigorously and left to stand for 30 min, and the absorbance was measured at 517 nm.
113 Ascorbic acid was used as control. The percentage of inhibition in DPPH radical scavenging
114 activity was calculated as follows;

115
$$\% \text{ Inhibition} = \frac{A_0 - A_1}{A_0} \times 100$$
 (A₁ – sample value and A₀ – control value)

117 **2. 4. 2. Ferric Reducing Ability of Plasma (FRAP) assay**

118 The total antioxidant potential of sample was determined using ferric reducing ability of
119 plasma FRAP assay as a measure of antioxidant power. FRAP assay measures the change in
120 absorbance at 593 nm owing to the formation of a blue colored Fe II-tripyridyltriazine
121 compound from colorless oxidized Fe III form by the action of electron donating
122 antioxidants [18].

123
124 The stock solution of 10 mM 2,4,6-tripyridyl-s-triazine (TPTZ) in 40 mM HCl, 20
125 mM FeCl₃.6H₂O and 0.3 M acetate buffer (pH 3.6) was prepared. The FRAP reagent
126 contained 2.5 ml TPTZ solution, 2.5 ml ferric chloride solution and 25 ml acetate buffer. It
127 was freshly prepared and warmed to 37°C. Then, 900 µl FRAP reagent was mixed with 90 µl
128 water and 30 µl test sample/methanol/ethanol/standard antioxidant solution. The reaction

mixture was then incubated at 37°C for 30 minutes and the absorbance was recorded at 593 nm. An intense blue colored complex were formed when ferric tripyridyltriazine (Fe^{3+} -TPTZ) complex were reduced to ferrous (Fe^{2+}) form. The absorption at 540 nm was recorded. The calibration was plotted with absorbance at 593 nm vs concentration of ferrous sulphate in the range 0.1 mM both aqueous and ethanol solutions. The concentrations of FeSO_4 were in turn plotted against concentration of standard antioxidants L-ascorbic acid.

3. RESULTS

3. 1. Shoot formation

In our experiments, we used young tender green leaf explants obtained from wild plant for efficient shoot regeneration. After ten days the explant began to expand and start producing shoot primordia without callus formation. After 8-9 weeks of culture significant differences were observed among the treatments for percentage of explants forming shoots. Multiple shoot formation was achieved using different concentration and combination of BAP, TDZ, KIN and NAA for leaf explant. The maximum shoot sprouting frequency is 68.92% was observed on MS basal medium augmented with 13.32 μM BAP, 1.16 μM KIN and 1.35 μM NAA (Table 1; Fig 1A, B, C). The highest number of shoots per explants in initiation (15.98 ± 0.13) and in subculture (36.01 ± 0.14) with a mean shoot length (6.98 ± 0.34) was obtained in MS medium with BAP (13.32 μM), KIN (1.16 μM) and NAA (1.35 μM) (Table 1 and Fig 1D,E,F,G,H,I).

Table 1. Effect of BAP, TDZ, NAA and KIN on initiation and multiple shoot induction from leaf explants of *Cadaba fruticosa* cultured on MS medium

S.NO	BAP μM	TDZ μM	KIN μM	μM NAA	Shoot sprouting frequency %	Shoot No/explant	Shoot No/explants subculture	Shoot length (cm)
1	2.22	-	1.16	1.135	30.17 ± 0.19	5.04 ± 0.10	18.96 ± 0.13	6.05 ± 0.13
2	4.44	-	1.16	1.135	45.84 ± 0.25	12.93 ± 0.10	19.01 ± 0.10	6.41 ± 0.10
3	6.66	-	1.16	1.135	43.17 ± 0.16	9.98 ± 0.12	22.01 ± 0.14	6.25 ± 0.07
4	8.88	-	1.16	1.135	38.92 ± 0.16	10.03 ± 0.12	25.05 ± 0.13	6.28 ± 0.06
5	11.10	-	1.16	1.135	51.94 ± 0.11	11.96 ± 0.13	28.01 ± 0.11	6.45 ± 0.09
6	13.32	-	1.16	1.135	68.92 ± 0.10	15.98 ± 0.13	36.01 ± 0.14	6.98 ± 0.14
1	2.22	-	1.16	-	31.95 ± 0.12	08.01 ± 0.11	20.00 ± 0.15	5.01 ± 0.14
2	4.44	-	1.16	-	35.16 ± 0.12	10.10 ± 0.21	21.05 ± 0.13	5.03 ± 0.08
3	6.66	-	1.16	-	58.11 ± 0.10	11.01 ± 0.11	19.06 ± 0.14	4.06 ± 0.09

4	8.88	-	1.16	-	23.16 ± 0.11	12.03 ± 0.17	21.01 ± 0.14	4.36 ± 0.08
5	11.10	-	1.16	-	47.09 ± 0.09	13.78 ± 0.21	15.98 ± 0.11	5.18 ± 0.09
6	13.32	-	1.16	-	36.07 ± 0.12	14.03 ± 0.12	29.91 ± 0.20	4.54 ± 0.06
1	2.22	1.135	-	-	49.06 ± 0.14	08.05 ± 0.13	18.01 ± 0.11	7.47 ± 0.12
2	4.44	1.135	-	-	35.08 ± 0.11	10.12 ± 0.14	17.05 ± 0.13	6.47 ± 0.08
3	6.66	1.135	-	-	42.12 ± 0.14	11.90 ± 0.19	20.68 ± 0.19	6.28 ± 0.09
4	8.88	1.35	-	-	35.17 ± 0.13	12.13 ± 0.16	21.95 ± 0.11	5.38 ± 0.08
5	11.10	1.35	-	-	28.29 ± 0.13	12.43 ± 0.12	24.98 ± 0.09	5.17 ± 0.07
6	13.32	1.35	-	-	33.18 ± 0.12	13.13 ± 0.14	26.96 ± 0.12	4.85 ± 0.06
Basal medium	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

150

Values are mean ± SEM of three samples

151



Figure 1. *In vitro* propagation of *Cadaba fruticosa*

152

153 **Figure 1. *In vitro* propagation of *Cadaba fruticosa* - A: Habit with flower. B, C& D:**

154 **Direct shoot initiation from leaf explants on MS medium with BAP (13.32 μM), KIN**

(1.16 μ M) and NAA (1.35 μ M). E&F: Different stages of shoot development on the same medium. G, H& I: Multiplication of shoots after subculture on the same medium.

3. 2. Root formation

In vitro developed shoots obtained from leaf explants were excised and inoculated on MS medium supplemented with different concentration of NAA, IAA and IBA for root induction. The root formation was observed after 10-15 days of inoculation maximum root induction response of 95% was obtained on MS medium supplemented with 2.68 μ M/l NAA and well developed plantlets were observed after 22-24 days (Table 2). The other auxins IAA and IBA also induced roots but not effective like NAA.

Table 2. Effect of auxins on root formation of *Cadaba fruticosa* in MS medium

S. No	NAA (μ M)	IAA (μ M)	IBA (μ M)	Response %	Mean number of root / shoot	Mean root length (cm)
1.	2.68	-	-	95	4.55 $\pm$ 0.71	5.5 $\pm$ 1.28
2 .	5.36	-	-	80	3.20 $\pm$ 0.58	5.0 $\pm$ 1.39
3 .	8.04	-	-	40	1.70 $\pm$ 0.32	3.0 $\pm$ 0.85
4 .	10.72	-	-	28	1.20 $\pm$ 0.31	2.0 $\pm$ 0.47
5 .	13.40	-	-	19	1.15 $\pm$ 0.28	2.0 $\pm$ 0.56
6..	-	2.86	-	55	3.38 $\pm$ 1.12	4.2 $\pm$ 0.32
7.	-	5.72	-	48	3.19 $\pm$ 0.32	3.5 $\pm$ 2.17
8.	-	8.58	-	41	2.95 $\pm$ 2.14	3.2 $\pm$ 4.29
9.	-	11.44	-	38	2.01 $\pm$ 0.31	2.8 $\pm$ 5.01
10.	-	14.30	-	27	1.63 $\pm$ 3.31	2.3 $\pm$ 0.96
11.	-	-	2.46	53	3.51 $\pm$ 0.41	4.1 $\pm$ 1.56
12.	-	-	4.92	46	3.10 $\pm$ 2.11	3.8 $\pm$ 3.21
13.	-	-	7.38	43	2.37 $\pm$ 0.34	3.5 $\pm$ 1.42
14.	-	-	9.84	39	1.72 $\pm$ 4.21	2.7 $\pm$ 3.16
15.	-	-	12.30	32	1.36 $\pm$ 0.18	1.6 $\pm$ 1.83
16.	Basal medium	-	-	-	-	-

Values are mean $\pm$ SEM of three samples

3. 3. Acclimatization

The regenerated plantlets of *Cadaba fruticosa* were successfully hardened in net pots containing different potting media. Among the different potting media tried, the percentage of

171 plant survival rate was high (85%) in decomposed coir waste and compost combination
172 (Table 3).

173 **Table 3. Acclimatization of *Cadaba fruticosa***

S. No	Soil combinations	Number of the plant hardening	Number of the plant survive	Percentage of plant survive
1.	Garden soil	20	15	75
2.	Vermiculite	20	16	80
3.	Decomposed coir waste	20	16	80
4.	Decomposed coir waste : Compost	20	17	85

174
175 **3. 4. Antioxidant**

176 The antioxidant activity of *C. fruticosa* *in vivo* leaf and *in vitro* plant ethanol and methanol
177 extracts were assessed by DPPH and FRAP. Both the extracts had significant scavenging
178 activity with increasing concentration of extracts from 1.0 mg/ml to 5.0 mg/ml. The data
179 observed from different concentration of the extracts through DPPH are shown in the table 4.
180 Highest scavenging activity *in vivo* leaf and *in vitro* plant ethanol and methanol extracts was
181 58.22 ± 0.23 , 55.34 ± 0.38 , 53.15 ± 0.60 and 52.60 ± 0.27 respectively against the control
182 (63.55 ± 0.40). The IC_{50} value of the extracts was 4.25 ± 1.27 , 4.13 ± 0.28 , 4.77 ± 2.01 and
183 4.88 ± 1.16 respectively against the control ascorbic acid ($3.98.99 \pm 0.23$) (Fig 2). The DPPH
184 scavenging activity was almost equal with *in vitro* plant extracts.

185 **Table 4. Antioxidant activity (DPPH) of *in vivo* leaf and *in vitro* plant ethanol and**
186 **methanol extracts of *C. fruticosa***

S. No.	Samples	% inhibition				
		1(mg/ml)	2 (mg/ml)	3 (mg/ml)	4 (mg/ml)	5 (mg/ml)
1.	<i>In vivo</i> ethanol extract	11.31 ± 0.75	23.42 ± 0.70	35.16 ± 0.60	47.20 ± 0.30	58.22 ± 0.23
2.	<i>In vitro</i> ethanol extract	10.45 ± 0.48	22.27 ± 0.50	33.36 ± 0.78	45.39 ± 0.27	55.34 ± 0.38
3.	<i>In vivo</i> methanol extract	9.21 ± 0.15	19.40 ± 0.22	27.40 ± 0.50	39.20 ± 0.33	53.15 ± 0.60

4.	<i>In vitro</i> methanol extract	9.32±0.76	20.23±0.83	31.23±0.59	42.38±0.28	52.60±0.27
5.	Standard (Ascorbic acid)	18.20±0.44	27.10±0.32	38.22±0.42	50.12±0.30	63.55±0.40

187

188

The experiment was conducted in triplicates (n=3)

189

Ferric reducing power of the *C. fruticosa* extracts are presented in the table 5. Decrease in the

190

absorbance was found with increasing concentration of the extract as showed in the table

191

5. The absorbance is 0.85±0.20, 0.81±0.39, 0.79±0.30 and 0.77±0.49 at the concentration

192

2.5 mg/ml, whereas the standard ascorbic acid absorbance is 0.89±0.30 respectively in *in*

193

vivo leaf and *in vitro* plant ethanol and methanol extracts. The absorbance of both the plant

194

samples are almost equal.

195

196

Table 5. Antioxidant activity (FRAP) of *in vivo* leaf and *in vitro* plant ethanol and

197

methanol extracts of *C. fruticosa*

S. No.	Samples	Absorbance at 593 nm				
		0.5 (mg/ml)	1 (mg/ml)	1.5 (mg/ml)	2 (mg/ml)	2.5 (mg/ml)
1	<i>In vivo</i> ethanol extract	0.38±0.20	0.52±0.33	0.60±0.20	0.72±0.30	0.85±0.20
	<i>In vitro</i> ethanol extract	0.35±0.30	0.45±0.28	0.58±0.40	0.69±0.50	0.81±0.39
2	<i>In vivo</i> methanol extract	0.30±0.40	0.46±0.10	0.55±0.22	0.67±0.22	0.79±0.30
	<i>In vitro</i> methanol extract	0.29±0.30	0.42±0.30	0.53±0.30	0.65±0.38	0.77±0.49
3	Standard (Vitamin C)	0.40±0.10	0.55±0.20	0.64±0.15	0.76±0.55	0.89±0.30

198

199

The experiment was conducted in triplicates (n=3).

200


201

202

203

204

Figure 2. Inhibition concentration value (IC₅₀ value) of antioxidant assay (DPPH) of *in vivo* leaf and *in vitro* plant ethanol and methanol extracts of *C. fruticosa*



4. DISCUSSION

Plant tissue culture can produce the plantlets with similar valuable natural metabolites like the wild plants. The secondary metabolites obtained from tissue culture plants could be a substitute for the natural metabolites and this will reduce the pressure on the collection of wild plants. In the present study also we compared the antioxidant activity of both natural and tissue cultured plants. The standardization of medium for regeneration of plantlets is a major steps in plant tissue culture. Here, we defined such a system for *C. fruticosa* using different growth regulators, for achieving maximum regeneration from leaf explant without callus formation. The type, concentration and combinations of plant growth regulators also have a strong effect on plantlets induction and multiplication of many medicinal plants [19,20,21,22,23].

This study has presented 68.92% regeneration at BAP (13.32 μ M), KIN (1.16 μ M) and NAA (1.35 μ M), because there is a combination relationship among the BAP, KIN and NAA. The result of shoot sprouting frequency (68.92%) and mean number of shoots per explant (15.98) in initiation and in subculture (36.01) with 6.98 cm shoot length showed that this is the best protocol for *C. fruticosa* regeneration. Because to our knowledge there is no report on direct shoot formation of this plant from leaf explant.

The natural plant metabolites have protective, disease preventive or act as a defense mechanism for plants. The role of antioxidant is to prevent damage to the cell against

chemical reaction involving free radicles[24].The synthetic antioxidant used in food is having carcinogenic potential [25]. This will leads to find out and replace the synthetic food additives with natural plant antioxidant [26]. The DPPH is a model system, which is widely used to test the plant extract for its scavenging activity [27]. The DPPH radical scavenging activity of the extracts showed concentration depended scavenging activity. The present study results were confirmed by the earlier studies on methanolic leaf extracts of *C. fruticosa*[28]. The extracts of *in vivo* leaf and *in vitro* plants inhibition activity was similar. Antioxidant potential of medicinal plants is measured by reducing power assay [29]. In our study *in vivo* leaf, *in vitro* plant ethanol and methanol extracts at various concentrations showed dose-dependent reducing power. The results agreed with the earlier report on *C. fruticosa* methanolic leaf extract [28] and *C. farinose* ethyl acetate and aqueous fraction[30].

The DPPH and FRAP assay results in this study shows that the *in vivo* leaf and *in vitro* plant ethanol and methanol extracts of *C. fruticosa* are a source of natural antioxidant. Due to the similar activity of the *in vivo* leaf and *in vitro* plant, instead of collecting the wild plant, micro propagated plants can be used for the pharmaceutical purpose. By using the tissue culture plant the conservation of *C. fruticosa* is possible.

5. CONCLUSION

An efficient simple and reproducible micropropagation system of *C. fruticosa* was reported for the first time from leaf explants. The best regeneration was achieved in an appropriate medium MS+ BAP (13.32 μ M), KIN (1.16 μ M), NAA (1.35 μ M). Micropropagated shoots were rooted in medium MS+ NAA (2.28 μ M) and with good survival rate (95%). The present protocol, could be of great value for commercial purpose, conservation and extraction of bio active compounds.The result of antioxidant activity recorded that the ethanol and methanol extracts of both *in vivo* leaf and *in vitro* plant confirmed the similarity. This study provide a basic for isolation and evaluation of bioactive compounds and their efficiency from *in vitro* plant.

CONSENT

It is not applicable.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

It is not applicable.

REFERENCES

1. AfolayanAJ,Adebola PO. *In vitro* propagation: A biotechnological tool capable of solving the problem of medicinal plants decimation in SouthAfr African JBiotechnol.2004: 3; 683-687.
2. Bohidar S, Thirunavoukkarasu M, Rao TV. Effect of plant growth on *in vitro* micropropagation of Garden Rue (*Rutagraveolens* L.). InterJ Integr Biology. 2008;3(1); 36-37.
3. Engelmann F, Engels JMM. Technologies and strategies for *ex situ* conservation. In Engels, JMM, Ramanatha Rao V, Brown AHD,Jackson MT. (eds) Managing Plant Genetic Diversity. Wallingford and Rome, CAB International and IPGRI.2002:89-104.
4. PaunescuA.Strategii de conservare a biodiversității. In Biodiversitatea de la ConcepteFundamentale la AplicațiiBiotehnologice, Ed Acad RomBucurești, 2006: 120-126.
5. Krogstrup P, BaldurssonS,Norgard JV. Ex situ genetic conservation by use of tissue culture. Opera Bot.1992: 113; 49-53.
6. Fay MF. In what situation is *in vitro* cultureappropriate to plant conservation. Bio Diversity Conservation.1994: 3;176-183
7. Anuradha T, Pullaiah T. Direct shoot regeneration from cotyledonary node and cotyledonary explants of *Murraya koenigii*Spreng. J Indian Bot Soc.2001: 80; 299-300.
8. ShashikanthJ, MohanCH,Ramachandra ReddyP. A Potent Folklore Medicinal Plant: *Cadaba fruticosa* (L.) Druce. Research and Reviews: Journal of Botanical Sciences.2014: 3(3); 30.
9. Sankaranarayanan.Ethanobotanical study of medicinal plants used by traditional users in Villupuram district of Tamil Nadu, India. J Med Plants Res. 2010: 4(12); 1089-1101.
10. Arokiyaraj S, Radha R, Martin S, Perinbam K. Phytochemical analysis and anti-diabetic activity of *Cadaba fruticosa* R.Br. Indian Journal of Science and Technology. 2008: 1(6); 1-4.
11. Chatterjee TK. Handbook of Laboratory Mice and Rats, 1st ed., Chatterjee Publications, Calcutta. Pg.1993: 151.

12. Rao KP, Sreeramulu SH. Ethanobotany of selected medicinal plants of Srikakulam district, Andhra Pradesh. *Ancient Sci Life*. 1985; 4(4): 238-244.
13. Mythreyi R, Sasikala E, Geetha A, Madhavan V. Antipyretic activity of leaves of *Cadaba fruticosa* (L.) Druce. *Pharmacologyonline*. 2008; 3; 136-142.
14. DeepikaLodha, Ashok Kumar Patel, Shekhawat NS. A high-frequency *in vitro* multiplication, micromorphological studies and *ex situ* rooting of *Cadaba fruticosa* (L.) Druce (Bahuguni): a multipurpose endangered medicinal shrub. *PhysiolMolBiol Plants*. 2015; 21(3); 407-415.
15. Alurin RJS. Studies on pollination in India: a review, *ProcNatlAcadSci India*. 1990; 56; 375-388.
16. MurashigeT, SkoogFA. Revised medium from rapid growth and bioassays tobacco tissue cultures. *Plant Physiol*. 1962; 15; 473-497.
17. Shimada K, Fujikawa K, Yahara K, Nakamura T. Antioxidative properties of xanthan on the autoxidation of soybean oil in cyclodextrin emulsion. *J Agric Food Chem*. 1992;40; 945-8.
18. Benzie IFF, Strain JJ. Ferric reducing ability of plasma (FRAP) as a measure of antioxidant power: The FRAP assay. *Anal Biochem*. 1999;239; 70.
19. Lodha D, Rathore N, Kataria V, ShekhawatNS. *In vitro* propagation of female *Ephedra foliate* Boiss and Kotschy ex Boiss: an endemic and threatened Gymnosperm of the Thar Desert. *PhysiolMolBiol Plant*. 2014; 20; 375–383.
20. Zhang A, Wang H, Shao Q, Xu M, Zhang W, Li M. Large scale *in vitro* propagation of *Anoectochilus roxburghii* for commercial application: pharmaceutically important and ornamental plant. *Ind Crop Prod*. 2015; 70; 158–162.
21. Abbas H, Qaiser M. *In vitro* conservation of *Cadaba heterotricha* stocks, an endangered species in Pakistan. *Pak J Bot*. 2010; 42; 1553–1559
22. KalimuthuK, PrabakaranR, SasikalaT. *In vitro* propagation of *Boucerosia truncatocoronata*: An endemic, medicinally important plant *International Journal of Bio-Technology and Research*. 2013; 3(3); 53-60.
23. KalimuthuK, PrabakaranR, PaulsamyS, JeyaramanS. Micropropagation and Microtuberization of *Ceropegia pusilla* Wight and Arn an endangered medicinal plant. *European Journal of Medicinal Plants*. 2014; 4(1); 64-74.
24. Madavi DL, Salunkhe DK. Toxicological aspects of food antioxidants, In *Food antioxidants*. editors Madavi DL, Deshpande SS, Salunkhe DK. New York, Marcel Dekker Inc. 1995: 267.

- 327 25. Gülçin I, Elmastaş M, Aboul-Enein HY. Determination of antioxidant and radical
328 scavenging activity of basil (*Ocimum basilicum*) assayed by different methodologies,
329 Phytother Res.2007: 21;354-361.
- 330 26. Jayaprakash GK, Jaganmohan Rao L. Phenolic constituents from lichen
331 *Parmotrema stipitatum*(Nyl.) Hale and their antioxidant activity *Zeitschrift für*
332 *Naturforschung*. 2000;55;1018-1022.
- 333 27. Kadam Balaji, Manasa G, Amarendra Reddy A, Nagaraju M, Srikanth T, Saarang
334 Ramesh. Evaluation of *in vitro* antioxidant and cytotoxicity activity of aqueous extract
335 of *Pergularia daemia*. *Sch Acad J Pharm*. 2013: 2(2); 125-129.
- 336 28. Udhaya Lavanya B, Akalya JL, Srujana KSL, Evan Prince Sabina, Devi Rajeswari V.
337 Appraisal of the *in vitro* antibacterial and antioxidant potential of the leaf extracts of
338 *Cadaba fruticosa*. *Asian Journal of Pharmaceutical and Clinical Research*. 2014: 7; 2.
- 339 29. Katalinic V, Milos M, Kulisic T, Jukic M. Screening of 70 medicinal plant extracts
340 for antioxidant capacity and total phenols. *Food Chem*. 2006: 94; 550-557.
- 341
- 342 30. Umesh BT, Hemlatha S, Modi A. Pharmacognostic of root of *Cadaba farinos* Forsk.
343 *Int J Pharma and Biosci*. 2010: 1(2); 1-13.