\_Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)

## ANTIMICROBIAL ACTIVITY OF METHANOL EXTRACTS AND FRACTIONS OF THE LEAF AND STEM BARK OF VITEX DONIANA SWEET (LAMIACEAE)

#### Anze S.P.G<sup>1</sup>, Lamsing N<sup>2</sup>, Ugwoke C.E.C<sup>1</sup>, Ezugwu C.O<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Pharmacognosy and Environmental Medicine, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Nigeria.
<sup>2</sup> Department of Pharmaceutical Microbiology, University of Jos, Nigeria.

**ABSTRACT:** The objective of this study was to investigate the antimicrobial activity of leaves and stem bark of Vitex doniana Sweet (Lamiaceae) in vitro on clinical isolates of Bacillus subtilis, Escherichia coli, Pseudomonas aeruginosa, Staphylococcus aureus and Candida albicans. Fresh dried leaves and stem bark of Vitex doniana were extracted by cold maceration which yielded a mucilaginous methanol extract. Fractionation of the crude extract was done with hexane, ethyl acetate, butanol and water in that order. Phytochemical analysis and lethality tests (LD<sub>50</sub>) were carried out using standard procedures. Antimicrobial activity of the extracts and fractions at 50, 100, 200 and 400 mg/ml were evaluated using the agar well diffusion method. Phytochemical analysis revealed the presence of alkaloids, saponins, tannins, flavonoids, carbohydrates, steroids, cardiac glycosides. Lethality was not observed in the mice even at 5000 mg/kg. Results showed significant (P < 0.05) antimicrobial activity as well as a broad spectrum activity. This study therefore supports claims by traditional health practitioners.

KEYWORDS: Vitex Doniana, Antimicrobial, Bacteriostatic, Phytochemical, Acute Toxicity

### **INTRODUCTION**

The acceptance of traditional medicine as an alternative form of health care, and the development of microbial resistance to the available antibiotics has led researchers to investigate the antimicrobial activity of medicinal plants (Lis-Balchin and Deans, 1996; Maoz and Neeman, 1998; Hammer *et al.*, 1999). Antimicrobial susceptibility tests are used to determine which specific antibiotics a particular bacteria or fungus is sensitive to. Antimicrobial susceptibility tests can guide the physician in drug choice and dosage for difficult-to-treat infections (Levinson, 2010). Common methods used in the evaluation of the antibacterial and antifungal activities of plant extracts and essential oils, include the agar diffusion method (paper disc and well), the dilution method (agar and liquid broth) (Yagoub, 2008; Okigbo *et al.*, 2009; El-Mahmood, 2009; Aiyegoro *et al.*, 2009), and the turbidimetric and impedimetric monitoring of microbial growth (Rios and Recio, 2005). These methods are simple to carry out under laboratory conditions.

The output from antimicrobial susceptibility testing is either in the form of a zone size (in  $\mu$ g/ml) or MIC, which is the lowest concentration of drug that inhibits the growth of the organism. For certain infections, it may be important to know the concentration of drug that actually kills the organism rather than just inhibiting its growth; this concentration is called the minimal bactericidal concentration (MBC). Bactericidal antibiotics usually have an MBC equal or very similar to the MIC, whereas bacteriostatic antibiotics usually have an MBC significantly higher than the MIC (NCCLS, 1998; Levinson, 2010). It is worthy of note that antimicrobial activity results of the same plant part tested most of the time varied from

Vol 5, No.1, pp.14-21, April 2017

\_Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)

researcher to researcher. This is possible because concentration of plant constituents of the same plant organ can vary from one geographical location to another depending on the age of the plant, differences in topographical factors, the nutrient concentrations of the soil, extraction method, as well as method used for antimicrobial study (James, 2012).

*Vitex doniana* is a tree that is well adapted to the tropical climate but occur in temperate zones (Padamalatha *et al.*, 2009; David, 2008). It belongs to the family Lamiaceae and is commonly called black plum, African oak, prune fingerleaf, Vitex (Glew *et al.*, 1997; Aigbokhan, 2014). Various parts of the plant are used in diverse ways both for food and therapeutic purposes. Some of such ailments are commonly caused by regular pathogenic microorganisms and include *Bacillus subtilis, Escherichia coli, Pseudomonas aeruginosa, Staphylococcus aureus* and *Candida albicans*. Against the backdrop of growing drug resistance and increasing search for newer drugs with reduced (or no) side effects and enhanced pharmacological activity, it is pertinent to establish a scientific backing for claimed potency of herbals in disease management.

## METHODOLOGY

### Plant Collection, Identification and Preparation

The fresh leaves and bark of *Vitex doniana* were collected in the month of June 2015 from Eha-Alumona, Nsukka Local Government Area, Enugu State, Nigeria.

They were identified and authenticated by Mr A.O. Ozioko of the International Centre for Ethnomedicine and Drug Development, InterCEDD. It was also authenticated at the department of Plant Science and Technology, University of Jos, by the taxonomist, Mr. Agyeno Otuwose. A voucher specimen was deposited with a voucher specimen sample Number UJH15000239.

The plant specimens were washed under running tap water to remove soil and extraneous materials, dried in shade or sun (at a low intensity) for 120 hr (Mukherjee, 2002). They were powdered and stored in airtight containers until required for use.

### Source of Microorganisms

Pure cultures of clinical isolates of *Bacillus subtilis*, *Escherichia coli*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, and *Candida albicans were* obtained from the microbiology unit of the Central Diagnostic Laboratory, National Veterinary Research Institute (NVRI), Vom, Jos, Plateau State. These were sub-cultured and re-identified to ensure the purity of the isolates. The inoculum size of each test strain was standardized according to the *National Committee for Clinical Laboratory Standards* (NCCLS, 1998).

### Extraction

A 500 g of the powdered leaf and 1000 g of the powdered stem bark were macerated with 80 % methanol: 2.5 and 5 litres respectively. The residue was rinsed and filtered repeatedly with fresh solvents to attain some level of exhaustive extraction; as judged by loss of colour of the filtrate (Sofowora, 2008). The collective filtrate was evaporated to dryness using a rotary vacuum evaporator at a controlled temperature of  $40 - 45^{\circ}$ C. The extracts were transferred into sterile sample containers and preserved in a refridgerator at 4°C.

## Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)

# Fractionation

For both leaf and stem bark, 100 g each of the crude extract was initially dissolved in a methanol: water (80:20) v/v mixture and sequentially extracted with solvents of increasing polarity starting with n-hexane, followed by chloroform, ethyl acetate, butanol and ended with water as prescribed by Harborne (1998). For each fractionation step, extraction was performed with the solvent until judged by loss of colour of the filtrate. The separated organic layers were concentrated in a rotary evaporator, except for water that was evaporated using a freeze dryer. The dried fractions were weighed and kept in sterile sample containers and preserved in a refridgerator.

# **Phytochemical Screening**

Preliminary qualitative chemical tests were carried out using standard methods (Brain and Turner, 1975; Harborne, 1998; Evans, 2002). Crude extracts and fractions were screened for the presence of alkaloids, saponins, flavonoids, tannins, cardiac glycosides, anthraquinones and carbohydrates.

# **Acute Toxicity Studies**

The Lorke's method (Lorke 1983) and Duffus modules (Duffus, 1993) were used. Administration of extracts was oral using a feeding needle (Hassan *et al.*, 2007).

# **Antimicrobial Assay**

The extracts and fractions were evaluated for antimicrobial activity using the agar well diffusion method (Okeke *et al.*, 2001). Nutrient agar plates and nutrient broth (Oxoid) were used. 0.5 McFarland turbidity standard (CLSI, 2006) was used to prepare the organisms. 8mm diameter cork borer was used; 2mg/ml Gentamycin and Fluconazol were reference standards for bacteria and *C. albicans*. Extracts and fractions were reconstituted in normal saline to obtain concentrations (mg/ml) of 50, 100, 200, and 400. Incubation was at 37° C for 24 hours. The Inhibition Zone Diameter (IZD) was measured to the nearest mm. The MIC was determined using the turbidity method according to the *National Committee for Clinical Laboratory Standards* NCCLS, (1998). The MBC or MFC was also determined according to standard (NCCLS, 1998).

## **Statistical Analysis**

All values were expressed as mean  $\pm$  S.E.M. (Standard Error of Mean). Statistical significance was determined using the Kruskal-Wallis test for independent samples and the Wilcoxon paired sample test for related samples. Values with P < 0.05 were considered significant.

Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org) **RESULTS** 

| Plant part | Extraction solvent | Yield (g) | Percentage Yield (%) |  |  |
|------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------------|--|--|
|            |                    |           |                      |  |  |
| Leaf       | Methanol (80%)     | 157.15    | 31.43                |  |  |
|            | n-hexane           | 7         | 7                    |  |  |
|            | Ethyl acetate      | 13.5      | 13.5                 |  |  |
|            | Butanol            | 16        | 16                   |  |  |
|            | Water              | 17        | 17                   |  |  |
| Stem bark  | Methanol (80%)     | 83.1      | 8.31                 |  |  |
|            | n-hexane           | 4.5       | 4.5                  |  |  |
|            | Ethyl acetate      | 10.5      | 10.5                 |  |  |
|            | Butanol            | 9         | 9                    |  |  |
|            | Water              | 31        | 31                   |  |  |

## **Table 1: Yield of Extraction and Fractionation**

# Table 2: Result of Phytochemical Screening

|               |     |     | Le  | eaf |    |    | Stem bark |     |     |     |  |  |
|---------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|-----------|-----|-----|-----|--|--|
| Constituents  | CE  | HF  | EAF | BF  | WF | CE | HF        | EAF | BF  | WF  |  |  |
| Alkaloids     | +   | _   | _   | _   |    | ++ | _         | ++  | +   | +   |  |  |
| Saponins      | +   | _   | +   | +++ | +  | +  | _         | +   | ++  | +   |  |  |
| Tannins       | +++ | _   | ++  | +++ | ++ | ++ | _         | +   | +++ | +++ |  |  |
| Flavonoids    | +++ | +   | +++ | +++ | ++ | ++ | _         | +++ | +   | +   |  |  |
| Carbohydrates | ++  | +   | _   | ++  | +  | ++ | +         | ++  | ++  | ++  |  |  |
| Steroids      | ++  | +++ | _   | _   | _  | ++ | +++       | +   | _   | _   |  |  |

Key:

- : Absent

+ : Slightly Present

++ : Present

+++: More present

Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)

| ORGANISMS                 |     |      |      |     |    | CON  | CENT | RAT  | IONS | (mg/m | 1)   |                   |             |               |             |
|---------------------------|-----|------|------|-----|----|------|------|------|------|-------|------|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
|                           | 50  | 100  |      |     |    | 200  |      |      | 400  |       |      | Standard (2mg/ml) |             |               |             |
|                           | MCE | BF   | EAF  | MCE | BF | EAF  | MCE  | BF   | EAF  | MCE   | BF   | EAF               | FLUC<br>GEN | CONAZ<br>FAMY | COL/<br>CIN |
| Candida<br>albicans       | 0   | 0    | 0    | 0   | 0  | 9    | 0    | 9.5  | 11   | 0     | 12   | 13                | 26          | 26.5          | 26          |
| Bacillus subtilis         | 0   | 13   | 20   | 0   | 16 | 22.5 | 0    | 18.5 | 25   | 10    | 21   | 27                | 30.5        | 30            | 30.5        |
| Pseudomonas<br>aeruginosa | 0   | 10.5 | 15.5 | 0   | 14 | 18.5 | 0    | 17   | 21   | 0     | 19   | 23                | 32          | 30.5          | 31          |
| Escherichia<br>coli       | 0   | 0    | 18   | 0   | 11 | 21   | 0    | 13   | 24   | 0     | 15.5 | 26                | 30          | 30            | 30.5        |
| Staphylococcus<br>aureus  | 0   | 13   | 20   | 0   | 16 | 22   | 9.5  | 18   | 24   | 14    | 20.5 | 25                | 29          | 28.5          | 28          |
| Key:                      |     |      |      |     |    |      |      |      |      |       |      |                   |             |               |             |

# Table 3: Antimicrobial Effect of Methanol Crude Extract and Fractions of Vitexdoniana Leaf determined from the Mean of Inhibition Zone Diameter using AgarWell Diffusion Method

MCE: Methanol Crude Extract

BF: Butanol Fraction

EAF: Ethyl Acetate Fraction

Diameter of cork borer used: 8mm

Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)

|        | 10                                      |  | CON  | CENT   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |   |
|--------|---|--|--|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|---|
|        | 10                                      |  |  |  | KAII  | ONS (   | mg/ml  | )   |   |  |   |   |
|        | 100 200                                 |  |  |  |   |   | 400  | )   | Standard (2mg/ml)   |  |   |   |
| EAF    | F MCE                                   | BF   | EAF  | MCE  | BF  | EAF   | MCE  | BF  | EAF   | FLUO<br>GEN  | CONAZ<br>TAMY(  | OL/<br>CIN  |
| 12.5   | 15.5                                    | 15   | 15   | 18   | 18  | 18  | 21   | 21.5  | 22  | 25.5   | 26.5  | 26  |
| 5 18.5 | 0                                       | 19   | 21   | 14   | 21  | 23.5  | 16.5   | 23.5  | 26  | 31   | 30  | 30.5  |
| 11     | 0                                       | 17.5   | 14   | 12.5   | 20  | 17  | 15   | 22  | 20  | 32.5   | 30.5  | 31  |
| 17     | 10.5                                    | 13.5   | 20   | 15   | 17  | 22  | 20   | 20  | 24  | 30   | 30  | 30  |
| 18     | 14                                      | 18   | 20.5   | 16.5   | 20.5  | 23  | 19   | 23  | 25  | 28.5   | 28.5  | 28  |
|        | EAF<br>12.5<br>5 18.5<br>11<br>17<br>18 | EAF MCE<br>12.5 15.5<br>5 18.5 0<br>11 0<br>17 10.5<br>18 14 | EAF MCE BF<br>12.5 15.5 15<br>5 18.5 0 19<br>11 0 17.5<br>17 10.5 13.5<br>18 14 18 | EAF       MCE       BF       EAF         12.5       15.5       15       15         5       18.5       0       19       21         11       0       17.5       14         17       10.5       13.5       20         18       14       18       20.5 | EAF       MCE       BF       EAF       MCE         12.5       15.5       15       15       18         5       18.5       0       19       21       14         11       0       17.5       14       12.5         17       10.5       13.5       20       15         18       14       18       20.5       16.5 | EAFMCEBFEAFMCEBF12.515.515151818518.501921142111017.51412.5201710.513.520151718141820.516.520.5 | EAF       MCE       BF       EAF       MCE       BF       EAF         12.5       15.5       15       15       18       18       18         5       18.5       0       19       21       14       21       23.5         11       0       17.5       14       12.5       20       17         17       10.5       13.5       20       15       17       22         18       14       18       20.5       16.5       20.5       23 | EAFMCEBFEAFMCEBFEAFMCE12.515.5151518181821518.501921142123.516.511017.51412.52017151710.513.5201517222018141820.516.520.52319 | EAFMCEBFEAFMCEBFEAFMCEBFEAFMCEBF12.515.51515181818182121.5518.501921142123.516.523.511017.51412.5201715221710.513.520151722202018141820.516.520.5231923 | EAFMCEBFEAFMCEBFEAFMCEBFEAFMCEBFEAF12.515.51515151818182121.522518.501921142123.516.523.52611017.51412.520171522201710.513.520151722202418141820.516.520.523192325 | EAF       MCE       BF       EAF       MCE       BF       EAF       MCE       BF       EAF       MCE       BF       EAF       FLUe         12.5       15.5       15       15       15       18       18       18       21       21.5       22       25.5         5       18.5       0       19       21       14       21       23.5       16.5       23.5       26       31         11       0       17.5       14       12.5       20       17       15       22       20       32.5         17       10.5       13.5       20       15       17       22       20       20       24       30         18       14       18       20.5       16.5       23       19       23       25       28.5 | EAF       MCE       BF       EAF       MCE       BF       EAF       MCE       BF       EAF       MCE       BF       EAF       FLUCONAZ         12.5       15.5       15       15       15       18       18       18       21       21.5       22       25.5       26.5         5       18.5       0       19       21       14       21       23.5       16.5       23.5       26       31       30         11       0       17.5       14       12.5       20       17       15       22       20       32.5       30.5         17       10.5       13.5       20       15       17       22       20       24       30       30         18       14       18       20.5       16.5       23       19       23       25       28.5       28.5 |

# Table 4: Antimicrobial Effect of Methanol Crude Extract and Fractions of Vitex

Key:

MCE: Methanol Crude Extract

BF: **Butanol Fraction** 

EAF: Ethyl Acetate Fraction

Diameter of cork borer used: 8mm

### DISCUSSION

The result of phytochemical analysis agrees with previous analyses ((Arokiyaraj et al., 2009; Agbede and Ibitoye, 2007; Ejikeme and Henrietta, 2010; Adejumo et al., 2013). These indicate a dominance of polar secondary metabolites and negligible steroidal components. An  $LD_{50} >$ 5000 mg/kg implies that the plant is safe for consumption. This is particularly interesting as per the search for newer drugs with little or no side effects. The varying degrees of antimicrobial activity may be due to the different solvents adopted for extraction and fractionation (Freiburghausa et al., 1996). The ability of the extracts to inhibit the growth of the pathogens might be as a result of the presence of bioactive substances such as alkaloids, saponins, tannins, flavonoids, cardiac glycosides, steroids, etc. (Elujoba, 1996; NCCLS, 1998), which acted in synergy (Elujoba, 1996; NCCLS, 1998; Kilani, 2006). The leaf crude extract was more or less inactive but the fractions exhibited antimicrobial activity. This may be due to antagonism among the phytochemicals in the crude extract, which were separated by fractionation. This result agrees with earlier findings (Ejikeme and Henrietta, 2010; Kilani,

International Journal of Physical and Human Geography

Vol 5, No.1, pp.14-21, April 2017

Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)

2006) using a different approach. The Plant parts inhibited both gram positive and gram negative bacteria, and pathogenic yeast. *Vitex doniana* Sweet could therefore be said to be a broad spectrum antibiotic plant (Todar, 2005). The Minimum Inhibitory Concentrations and Minimum Bactericidal or Fungicidal Concentrations shows that at least 50 mg/ml of the plant extract and /or fractions is necessary for the observed antimicrobial activity. Statistical analysis showed that the test organisms were generally equally affected in terms of zone diameter of inhibition (IBM SPSS Statistics 21).

## REFERENCES

- Adejumo A.A., Alaye S.A., Ajagbe R.O., Abi E.A. and Adedokun, F.T (2013). Nutritional and Antinutritional Composition of Black Plum (*Vitex Doniana*). *Journal of Natural Sciences Research*. **3**(12): 144.
- Agbede J.O. and Ibitoye A.A (2007). Chemical Composition of Black plum (*Vitex doniana*); an Underutilized Fruit. *J. Food Agric. Env.* **5**(2): 95 96.
- Aigbokhan E.I (2014). Annotated Checklist of Vascular Plant of Southern Nigeria- A Quick Reference Guide to the Vascular Plants of Southern Nigeria: A Systematic Approach. Uniben Press, Benin City. P. 346.
- Aiyegoro O.A., Afolayan A.J. and Okoh A.I (2009). *In vitro* Antibacterial Activities of Crude Extracts of the Leaves of *Helichrysum longifolium* in Combination with Selected Antibiotics. *African Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmacology*. 3(6): 293 – 300.
- Arokiyaraj k, Perinbam P, Agastian R, Mohan K. (2009). Phytochemical Analysis and Antibacterial Activity of *Vitex agnus-castus*. *International Journal of Green Pharmacy*.
  34: 162 – 164.
- Brain K.R. and Turner T.D (1975). The Practical Evaluation of Phyto-Pharmaceuticals. 1<sup>st</sup> Edition. Wright-Science Technical, Bristol. P. 144.
- Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, CLSI (2006). Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing. Sixteenth Informational Supplement M100 – S16. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, Wayne, PA.
- David J.M (2008). Mabberley's Plant-Book. 3rd Edition. Cambridge University Press, UK.
- Duffus J.H (1993). Glossary for Chemists in Terms Used in Toxicology. *Pure Appl. Chem.* **65**: 2003 2122.
- Ejikeme N. and Henrietta O.U (2010). Antimicrobial Activities of Leaf of *Vitex doniana* and *Cajanus cajan* on Some Bacteria. *Researcher*. **2**(3): 37 47.
- El-mahmood M.A (2009). Efficacy of Crude Extracts of Garlic (Allium sativum Linn.) Against Nosocomial Escherichia coli, Staphylococcus aureus, Streptococcus pneumonia and Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Journal of Medicinal Plants Research. 3(4): 179 – 185.
- Elujoba A.A (1996). Standardization of Phytomedicines: Proceedings on an International Workshop on Commercial Production of an Indigenous Plant, Lagos. Nigeria. 19.
- Evans W.C (2002). Pharmacognosy. 14<sup>th</sup> Edition. W.B. Saunders Ltd., London. Pp. 32 33, 95 99, 191 194, 224 227, 232 233, 245, 293, 334 335, 340 344, 512, 542 578.
- Freiburghausa F., Kaminsky R., Nkunya M.H.H. and Brun R (1996). Evaluation of African Medicinal Plants for their *in vitro* Trypanocidal Activity. J. Ethnopharmacol. 55: 1 – 11.

\_Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)

- Glew R.H., Vanderjagt D.J., Lockett C., Grivetti L.E., Smith G.C., Pastuszyn A. and Millson M (1997). Amino Acid and Mineral Composition of 24 Indigenous Plants in Burkina-Faso. J. Food Comp. Anal. 10(3): 205 – 217.
- Hammer K.A., Carson C.F. and Riley T.V (1999). Antimicrobial Activity of Essential Oils and Other Plant Extracts. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*. **86**: 985 990.
- Harborne J.B (1998). Phytochemical Methods: A Guide to Modern Technique of Plant Analysis. 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. Chapman and Hall Publishers, London. 51 59, 279.
- Hassan S.W., Umar R.A., Dabai Y.U., Ebbo A.A. and Faruk U.Z (2007). Antibacterial, Phytochemical and Toxicity Studies of *Pteridium aquilinum* L. (Dennstaedtiaceae) in Rabbits. *Journal of Pharmacology and Toxicology*. 2: 168–175.
- James H.D (2012). Phytochemicals: Extraction Methods, Basic Structures and Mode of Action as Potential Chemotherapeutic Agents, Phytochemicals - A Global Perspective of their Role in Nutrition and Health. Dr Venketeshwer Rao (Ed.) InTech Europe. University Campus STeP Ri Slavka Krautzeka 83/A 51000 Rijeka, Croatia. ISBN: 978-953-51-0296-0
- Kilani A.M (2006). Antibacterial Assessment of Whole Stem bark of *Vitex trifoliata* against some *Enterobacteriaceae*. *African Journal of Biotechnology*. **5**: 958 959.
- Levinson W (2010). Antimicrobial Drugs: Resistance. In: Levinson W, ed. *Review of Medical Microbiology and Immunology*. 11<sup>th</sup> Edition. McGraw-Hill, New York. Chapter 11.
- Lis-Balchin M. and Deans S.G (1996). Antimicrobial Effects of Hydrophilic Extracts of *Pelargonium species* (Geraniacee). Lett. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*. 23: 205 – 207.
- Lorke D (1983). A New Approach to Practical Acute Toxicity Testing. *Arch. Toxicol.* **54**: 275 87.
- Maoz M. and Neeman I (1998). Antimicrobial Effects of Aqueous Plant Extracts on the Fungi *Microsporum canis* and *Trichophyton rubrum* and on Three Bacterial species. Lett. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*. **26**: 61 63.
- Mukherjee P.K (2002). Quality Control of Herbal Drugs: An Approach to Evaluation of Botanicals. 1st Edition. Business Horizon Publications, New Delhi, India. Pp. 185 – 186, 193, 541 – 542.
- National Committee for Clinical Laboratory Standard, NCCLS (1998). Methods for Dilution in Antimicrobial Susceptibility Test. *Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing*. **15**(14): 100 56. Villanova.
- Okeke M.I., Ireogbu C.U., Eze E.N., Okoli A.S. and Esimone C.O (2001). Evaluation of Extracts of the Roots of *Landolphia owemience* for Antibacterial Activity. *J Ethnopharmacology*. **18**: 119 127.
- Okigbo R.N., Anuagasi C.L., Amadi J.E. and Ukpabi U.J (2009). Potential Inhibitory Effects of Some African Tuberous Plant Extracts on *Escherichia coli, Staphylococcus aureus* and *Candida albicans. International Journal of Integrative Biology*. **6**(2): 91 99.
- Padamalatha K., Jayaram K., Rajau N.L., Prasad M.N.V. and Arora R (2009). Ethnopharmacology and Biotechnological Significance of *Vitex. Global Sci. Books* 3(1): 6 - 14.
- Rìos J.L. and Recio M.C (2005). Medicinal Plants and Antimicrobial Activity. *Journal of Ethnorpharmacology*. **1**: 80 84.
- Sofowora A.E (2008). Medicinal Plants and Traditional Medicine in Africa. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Spectrum Books Limited, Spectrum House, Ring Road Ibadan, Nigeria. Pp 79 – 81, 200, 208.
- Todar K (2005). Antimicrobial Agents Used in the Treatment of Infectious Diseases. Department of Bacteriology, University of Wisconsin Madison. 1 8.

International Journal of Physical and Human Geography

Vol 5, No.1, pp.14-21, April 2017

Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)

Yagoub S.O (2008). Antimicrobial Activity of *Tamarindus indica* and *Adansonia digitata* Extracts Against *E. coli* Isolated from Urine and Water Specimens. *Research Journal of Microbiology*. 3(3): 193 – 197.