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

Abstract

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

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

1. INTRODUCTION

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

Though India has rich biodiversity and one among the twelve mega diversity centre, the growing demand is putting a heavy strain on the existing resources causing a number of species to be either threatened or endangered category. Global concern about the loss of valuable genetic resources. Within past decade several conservation strategies were 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 unavailable 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 shrubor 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]. Literatures 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 in effective 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

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

2. 2. Plant sterilization and media preparation

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

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

2.3. Induction of multiple shoots

For culture establishment, MS medium were supplemented with various cytokinins, viz., Benzyl amino purine (BAP2.22 -13.32 µM), alone or with Kinetin (KIN1.16 µM), Thidiazuron (TDZ1.135 µM) and auxin like naphthalene acidic acid (NAA1.135 µM) in combination.All the cultures were sub-cultured on the fresh medium after 15 to 20 days (All the chemicals used in this experiment was obtained from Hi-Media, Mumbai).

2.4.Induction of root

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

2. 5. Acclimatization

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

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

2. 4. Extract preparation

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

2. 5. Antioxidant activity

2. 5. 1. 2,2-Diphenyl-1-PicrylhyDrazyl (DPPH) radical scavenging activity

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

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

% Inhibition = A_0- A_1/A_0 X 100(A_1 – sample value and A_0 – control value)

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

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

The stock solution of 10 mM 2,4,6-tripyridyl-s-triazine (TPTZ) in 40 mMHCl, 20 mM$FeCl_3.6H_2O$ and 0.3 M acetate buffer (pH 3.6) was prepared. The FRAP reagent contained 2.5 ml TPTZ solution, 2.5 ml ferric chloride solution and 25 ml acetate buffer. It was freshly prepared and warmed to 37°C. Then, 900 µl FRAP reagent was mixed with 90 µl water and 30 µl test sample/methanol/ethanol/standard antioxidant solution. The reaction

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

135 **3. RESULTS**

136 **3. 1. Shoot formation**

137 In our experiments, we used young tender green leaf explants obtained from wild plant for
138 efficient shoot regeneration. After ten days the explant began to expand and start producing
139 shoot primordia without callus formation. After 8-9 weeks of culture significant differences
140 were observed among the treatments for percentage of explants forming shoots. Multiple
141 shoot formation was achieved using different concentration and combination of BAP, TDZ,
142 KIN and NAA for leaf explant. The maximum shoot sprouting frequency is 68.92% was
143 observed on MS basal medium augmented with 13.32 µM BAP, 1.16 µM KIN and 1.35 µM
144 NAA (Table 1; Fig 1A, B, C). The highest number of shoots per explants in initiation
145 (15.98±0.13) and in subculture (36.01±0.14) with a mean shoot length (6.98±0.34) was
146 obtained in MS medium with BAP (13.32 µM), KIN (1.16 µM) and NAA (1.35 µM) (Table 1
147 and Fig 1D,E,F,G,H,I).

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

BAP µM	TDZ µM	KIN µM	µM NAA	Shoot sprouting frequency %	Shoot No/explant	Shoot No/explants subculture	Shoot length (cm)
2.22	-	1.16	1.135	30.17 ± 0.19	5.04 ± 0.10	18.96 ± 0.13	6.05 ± 0.13
4.44	-	1.16	1.135	45.84 ± 0.25	12.93 ± 0.10	19.01 ± 0.10	6.41 ± 0.10
6.66	-	1.16	1.135	43.17 ± 0.16	9.98 ± 0.12	22.01± 0.14	6.25 ± 0.07
8.88	-	1.16	1.135	38.92 ± 0.16	10.03 ± 0.12	25.05 ± 0.13	6.28 ± 0.06
11.10	-	1.16	1.135	51.94 ± 0.11	11.96 ± 0.13	28.01 ± 0.11	6.45 ± 0.09
13.32	**-**	**1.16**	**1.135**	**68.92± 0. 10**	**15.98 ± 0.13**	**36.01 ± 0.14**	**6.98 ± 0.14**
2.22	-	1.16	-	31.95±0. 12	08.01 ± 0.11	20.00 ± 0.15	5.01 ± 0.14
4.44	-	1.16	-	35.16 ± 0.12	10.10 ± 0.21	21.05 ± 0.13	5.03 ± 0.08
6.66	-	1.16	-	58.11 ± 0.10	11.01 ± 0.11	19.06 ± 0.14	4.06 ± 0.09

8.88	-	1.16	-	23.16 ± 0.11	12.03 ± 0.17	21.01 ± 0.14	4.36 ± 0.08
11.10	-	1.16	-	47.09 ± 0.09	13.78 ± 0.21	15.98 ± 0.11	5.18 ± 0.09
13.32	-	1.16	-	36.07 ± 0.12	14.03 ± 0.12	29.91 ± 0.20	4.54 ± 0.06
2.22	1.135	-	-	49.06 ± 0.14	08.05 ± 0.13	18.01 ± 0.11	7.47 ± 0.12
4.44	1.135	-	-	35.08 ± 0.11	10.12 ± 0.14	17.05 ± 0.13	6.47± 0.08
6.66	1.135	-	-	42.12 ± 0.14	11.90 ± 0.19	20.68 ± 0.19	6.28 ± 0.09
8.88	1.35	-	-	35.17 ± 0.13	12.13 ± 0.16	21.95 ± 0.11	5.38 ± 0.08
11.10	1.35	-	-	28.29 ± 0.13	12.43 ± 0.12	24.98 ± 0.09	5.17 ± 0.07
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 µM) and NAA (1.35 µM). 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 µM/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

NAA (µM)	IAA (µM)	IBA (µM)	Response %	Mean number of root / shoot	Mean root length (cm)
2.68	**-**	**-**	**95**	**4.55 ± 0.71**	**5.5 ± 1.28**
5.36	-	-	80	3.20 ± 0.58	5.0 ± 1.39
8.04	-	-	40	1.70 ± 0.32	3.0 ± 0.85
10.72	-	-	28	1.20 ± 0.31	2.0 ± 0.47
13.40	-	-	19	1.15 ± 0.28	2.0 ± 0.56
-	2.86	-	55	3.38±1.12	4.2±0.32
-	5.72	-	48	3.19±0.32	3.5±2.17
-	8.58	-	41	2.95±2.14	3.2±4.29
-	11.44	-	38	2.01±0.31	2.8±5.01
-	14.30	-	27	1.63±3.31	2.3±0.96
-	-	2.46	53	3.51±0.41	4.1±1.56
-	-	4.92	46	3.10±2.11	3.8±3.21
-	-	7.38	43	2.37±0.34	3.5±1.42
-	-	9.84	39	1.72±4.21	2.7±3.16
-	-	12.30	32	1.36±0.18	1.6±1.83
Basal medium	-	-	-	-	-

Values are mean ± 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 plant survival rate was high (85%) in decomposed coir waste and compost combination (Table 3).

Table 3. Acclimatization of *Cadaba fruticosa*

Soil combinations	Number of the plant hardening	Number of the plant survive	Percentage of plant survive
Garden soil	20±0.23	15±0.11	75±0.21
Vermiculite	20±0.19	16±1.24	80±0.05
Decomposed coir waste	20±1.08	16±0.09	80±0.18
Decomposed coir waste : Compost	20±0.26	17±0.16	85±0.19

3. 4. Antioxidant

The antioxidant activity of *C. fruticosain situ* leaf and *in vitro* plant ethanol and methanol extracts were assessed by DPPH and FRAP. Both the extracts had significant scavenging activity with increasing concentration of extracts from 1.0 mg/ml to 5.0 mg/ml. The data observed from different concentration of the extracts through DPPH are shown in the figure 2. Highest scavenging activity *in situ*leaf and *in vitro* plant ethanol and methanol extracts was 58.22±0.23, 55.34±0.38, 53.15±0.60 and 52.60±0.27 respectively against the control (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 4.88±1.16 respectively against the control ascorbic acid (3.98.99±0.23) (Fig 4). The DPPH scavenging activity was almost equal with *in vitro* plant extracts.

Figure 2. Antioxidant activity (DPPH) of *in situ*leaf and *in vitro* plant ethanol and methanol extracts of *C. fruticosa*



Ferric reducing power of the *C. fruticosa* extracts are presented in the figure 3.Decrease in the absorbance was found with increasing concentration of the extract as showed in the figure 3.The absorbance is 0.85±0.20, 0.81±0.39, 0.79±0.30 and 0.77±0.49 at the concentration 2.5 mg/ml, whereas the standard ascorbic acid absorbance is 0.89±0.30 respectively in *in situ* leaf and *in vitro* plant ethanol and methanol extracts. The absorbance of both the plant samples are almost equal.

Figure 3. Antioxidant activity (FRAP) of *in situ*leaf and *in vitro* plant ethanol and methanol extracts of *C. fruticosa*



209 **Figure 4. Inhibition concentration value (IC_{50} value) of antioxidant assay (DPPH) of *in***
210 ***situ*leaf and *in vitro* plant ethanol and methanol extracts of *C. fruticosa***



211
212

213 **4. DISCUSSION**

214 Plant tissue culture can produce the plantlets with similar valuable natural metabolites like
215 the wild plants. The secondary metabolites obtained from tissue culture plants could be a
216 substitute for the natural metabolites and this will reduce the pressure on the collection of
217 wild plants. In the present study also we compared the antioxidant activity of both natural and
218 tissue cultured plants. The standardization of medium for regeneration of plantlets is a major
219 steps in plant tissue culture. Here, we definedsuch a system for *C. fruticosa* using different
220 growth regulators, for achieving maximum regeneration from leaf explant without callus
221 formation. The type, concentration and combinations of plant growth regulators also have a
222 strong effect on plantlets induction and multiplication of many medicinal plants
223 [19,20,21,22,23].

224 This study has presented 68.92% regeneration at BAP (13.32 µM), KIN (1.16 µM) and NAA
225 (1.35 µM), because there is a combination relationship among the BAP, KIN and NAA. The
226 result of shoot sprouting frequency (68.92%) and mean number of shoots per explant
227 (15.98)in initiation and in subculture (36.01) with 6.98 cm shoot length showed that this is
228 the best protocol for *C. fruticosa* regeneration. Because to our knowledge there is no report
229 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 wildly 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 situ* 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 situ* 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 situ* 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 situ* 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 µM), KIN (1.16 µM), NAA (1.35 µM). Micropropagated shoots were rooted in medium MS+ NAA (2.28 µM) 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 situ* 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 biodiversităţii. In Biodiversitatea de la ConcepteFundamentale la AplicaţiiBiotehnologice, Ed Acad RomBucureşti, 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 BoissandKotschy 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 *Anoectochilusroxburghii* 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 *Boucerosiatruncato-coronata:* 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.
25. Gülçin I, Elmastaş M, Aboul-Enein HY. Determination of antioxidant and radical scavenging activity of basil (*Ocimumbasilicum*) assayed by different methodologies, Phytother Res.2007: 21;354-361.
26. Jayaprakash GK, Jaganmohan Rao L. Phenolic constituents from lichen *Parmotremastuppeum*(Nyl.) Hale and their antioxidant activity*Zeitschrift fur Naturforschung*. 2000:55;1018-1022.
27. KadamBalaji, Manasa G, Amarender Reddy A, Nagaraju M, Srikanth T, Saarangi Ramesh. Evaluation of *in vitro* antioxidant and cytotoxicity activity ofaqueous extract of *Pergulariadaemia.*SchAcad J Pharm. 2013: 2(2); 125-129.
28. UdhayaLavinya B, Akalya JL, Srujana KSL, Evan Prince Sabina, Devi Rajeswari V. Appraisal of the *in vitro* antibacterial and antioxidant potential of the leaf extracts of *Cadaba fruticosa*. Asian Journal of Pharmaceutical and Clinical Research. 2014: 7; 2.
29. Katalinic V, Milos M, Kulisic T, Jukic M. Screening of 70 medicinal plant extracts for antioxidant capacity and total phenols. Food Chem. 2006: 94; 550-557.
30. Umesh BT, Hemlatha S, Modi A. Pharmacognostic of root of *Cadaba fariosaforsk*. Int J Pharma and Biosci. 2010: 1(2); 1-13.