

TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE NUMBER
Table of contents.....	141
List of Tables.....	142
Abstract.....	143
Keywords.....	143
8.1 Introduction.....	144
8.2 Materials and methods.....	146
8.2.1 Plant material.....	146
8.2.2 Preparation of extract	146
8.2.3 Test bacterial strains.....	147
8.2.4 Antibiotics used in this study.....	147
8.2.5 Sensitivity testing of the crude plant extracts.....	148
8.2.6 Determination of minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs).....	148
8.2.7 Antibiotic-extract combination experiment.....	149
8.2.7.1 The time-kill method.....	149
8.2.7.2 The checkerboard method.....	150
8.2.8 Data analysis.....	150
8.3 Results	151
8.4 Discussion.....	153
8.5 Conclusion.....	156
References.....	158

LIST OF TABLES

Table 8.1: Antibacterial activity profile of crude extracts of the leaves of <i>H. longifolium</i>	162
Table 8.2: The minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) of the extracts and the antibiotics.....	163
Table 8.3: <i>In vitro</i> antibacterial activity of extracts-antibiotic combinations by time-Kill method.....	164
Table 8.4: <i>In vitro</i> antibacterial activity of extracts-antibiotic combinations by checkerboard method.....	165
Table 8.5: Comparison of results by time kill and checkerboard methods.....	166

ABSTRACT

This study has been done to evaluate the interactions between acetone, chloroform, ethyl acetate and methanol extracts of *Helichrysum longifolium* in combination with six first-line antibiotics comprising of penicillin G sodium, amoxicillin, chloramphenicol, oxytetracycline, erythromycin and ciprofloxacin using both the time-kill and the checkerboard methods and against a panel of bacterial isolates comprised of referenced, clinical and environmental strains. The time-kill method revealed the highest bactericidal activity exemplified by a 6.7 Log₁₀ reduction in cell density against *Salmonella* sp. when the extract and penicillin G are combined at $\frac{1}{2} \times \text{MIC}$. Synergistic response constituted about 65%, while indifference and antagonism constituted about 28.33% and 6.67% in the time kill assay, respectively. The checkerboard method also revealed that the extracts improved bactericidal effects of the antibiotics. About 61.67% of all the interactions were synergistic, while indifference interactions constituted about 26.67% and antagonistic interactions was observed in approximately 11.66%.

These findings suggest that the crude extracts of the leaves of *H. longifolium* could be potential source of broad spectrum antibiotics resistance modifying compounds.

Key words: Synergism, antibiotics, extracts, checkerboard, time-kill

8.1 INTRODUCTION

Microbial infections represent the world's leading cause of pre-mature death and our well being depends on the production of new clinically useful antibiotics to curtail and/or eradicate pathogens in our communities (Hugo and Russell, 2003). For over a decade, the pace of development of new antimicrobial agents has slowed down while the prevalence of resistance has grown at an astronomical rate. The rate of emergence of antibiotic resistant bacterial is not matched by the rate of development of new antibiotics to combat them (Prescott and Klein, 2002). Today, multiple antibiotic resistance among bacterial pathogens is a major public health problem worldwide (Deguchi, T *et al.*, 1998). It is making a growing number of infections difficult to treat and nosocomial infections more rampant and deadly (Tzouveleakis, LS *et al.*, 1998). Usually, infections resulting from strains that are resistant to main groups of antibiotics like the β -lactams and aminoglycosides are treatable with vancomycin, chloramphenicol or other antibiotics (Hugo and Russell, 2003). But resistance has been developed to these drugs over the years. In particular infections due to *Staphylococcus aureus* have continued to be a major source of morbidity and mortality in hospitals and these organisms are now exhibiting multi-drug resistance to commonly used antibiotics, hence a significant cause of concern among physicians (Luck, CP *et al.*, 1998; Tzouveleakis, TS *et al.*, 1998). The presence of efflux pumps and multidrug resistance (MDR) proteins in antibiotic resistant organisms contribute significantly to the intrinsic and acquired resistance in these pathogens (Oluwatuyi, M *et al.*, 2004). The discovery and development of new compounds that either block or circumvent resistance mechanisms could improve the containment, treatment, and eradication of these strains (Oluwatuyi, M *et al.*, 2004; Sibanda and Okoh, 2008).

Combination therapy can be used to expand the antimicrobial spectrum, to prevent the emergence of resistant mutants, to minimize toxicity, and to obtain synergistic antimicrobial activity (Pankey and Ashcraft, 2005).

There are indications that some herbal materials can act as antibiotic resistant inhibitors (Gibbons, S *et al.*, 2003; Sibanda and Okoh, 2008; Yam, TS *et al.*, 1998). Combinations of some herbal materials and different antibiotics might affect the inhibitory effect of these antibiotics (Sato, Y *et al.*, 2004). A few studies such as Braga, LC *et al.* (2005), Dickson, RA *et al.* (2006) and Gibbons, S *et al.* (2003) have reported that plant extracts can enhance the *in vitro* activity of certain antibiotics against strains of MDR *Staphylococcus aureus* and other pathogens.

A number of compounds with an *in vitro* activity of reducing the MICs of antibiotics against resistant organisms have also been isolated from plants. Polyphenols (epicatechin gallate and catechin gallate) have been reported to reverse β -lactam resistance in Methicillin Resistant *S. aureus* (MRSA) (Stapleton, PD *et al.*, 2004). Diterpenes, triterpenes, alkyl gallates, flavones and pyridines have also been reported to have resistance modulating abilities on various antibiotics against resistant strains of *S. aureus* (Marquez, B *et al.*, 2005; Oluwatuyi, M *et al.*, 2004; Shibata, H *et al.*, 2005 and Smith, ECJ *et al.*, 2007).

Helichrysum longifolium is a plant that has shown potential as a source of chemotherapeutic compounds (Dilika, F *et al.*, 1997; Mathekga, 2001). The leaves are heated over very hot ash before being used to bandage circumcision wounds (Dilika, F *et al.*, 1997; Mathekga, 2001). Phytochemical studies have revealed that the plant is rich in flavonoids and other water soluble

polyphenolic compounds (Lourens, ACU *et al.*, 2008). While the antibacterial potentials of *H. longifolium* extracts have previously been studied, the interactions between the extracts of this plant and antibiotics have not been documented, especially with regards to its potential as a source of resistance modulating compounds. In this paper, I report the effect of combinations between the extracts of *H. longifolium* and some antibiotics on their antibacterial efficacies.

8.2 MATERIALS AND METHODS

8.2.1 Plant material

Leaves of *H. longifolium* were collected in December 2007 from a farm at Kidd's Beach Eastern Cape Province of South Africa. The plant materials were compared with the voucher specimen earlier collected from the same spot and deposited at the Griffin's Herbarium of the plant science the building of the University of Fort Hare in Alice. The plant materials were later confirmed by the curator of the Herbarium to be *H. longifolium*. The leaves were rinsed with water, air-dried, pulverized in a mill (CHRISTY LAB MILL, Christy and Norris Ltd; Process Engineers, Chelmsford, England) and stored in an air-tight container for further use.

8.2.2 Preparation of extract

A 135 g weight of the pulverized leaves of the plant were cold extracted in five different flasks using acetone, chloroform, ethyl acetate, methanol and water respectively, with occasional shaking (Okeke, MI *et al.*, 2001). Each was then filtered (using WHATMANN'S no 1 filter

paper) and the filtrates were concentrated to dryness *in vacuo* at 40 °C using a rotary evaporator (LABOROTA 4000-EFFICIENT, Heidolph, Germany), while the aqueous extract was freeze-dried (SAVANT REFRIGERATED VAPOR TRAP, RVT4104, USA).

8.2.3 Test bacterial strains

The bacterial isolates used in this study included reference strains obtained from the South African Bureau of Standard (SABS) *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* ATCC 19582, *Staphylococcus aureus* ATCC 6538, *Bacillus cereus* ATCC 10702, *Bacillus pumilus* ATCC 14884, *Proteus vulgaris* ATCC 6830, *Acinetobacter calcaoceticus anitratus* CSIR; clinical isolates obtained from wound sepsis *Staphylococcus aureus* OKOH1; and environmental strains *Shigella flexneri*, *Salmonella* sp., *Micrococcus kristinae*. The inocula of the test organisms were prepared using the colony suspension method (EUCAST, 2000). Colonies picked from 24 h old cultures grown on nutrient agar were used to make suspension of the test organisms in saline solution to give an optical density of approximately 0.1 at 600_{nm}. The suspension was then diluted 1:100 by transfer of 0.1 mL of the bacterial suspension to 9.9 mL of sterile nutrient broth to give approximately 1×10^5 cfu/mL bacteria.

8.2.4 Antibiotics used in this study

The following antibiotics were used in this study: penicillin G sodium, amoxicillin, chloramphenicol, oxytetracycline, erythromycin all Duchefa product and ciprofloxacin (Fluka).

8.2.5 Sensitivity testing of the crude plant extracts.

The sensitivity testing of the crude extract of the plant was determined using agar-well diffusion method as described by Irobi, NO *et al.* (1994) with modifications. The bacterial isolates were first grown in nutrient broth for 24 h to prepare bacterial suspension as described above. The bacterial suspension (0.1 mL) was inoculated into molten Mueller-Hinton agar medium at 50 °C and then poured into sterile Petri dish, the plate was allowed to set and wells were then bored into the agar medium using a sterile 6 mm cork borer. The wells were later filled up with the extract (0.2 mL) at a concentration of 5 mg/mL taking care to prevent spillage onto the surface of the agar medium. The plates were allowed to stand on the laboratory bench for 1 h to allow proper diffusion of the extract into the medium and then incubated at 37 °C for 24 h after which they were observed for zones of inhibition. Tetracycline and ampicillin at concentrations of 1 mg/mL and 10 µg/mL respectively were used as controls.

8.2.6 Determination of the minimum inhibitory concentrations (MIC)

The minimum inhibitory concentrations (MIC) of the antibiotics and plant extracts were determined using the standard method of the European Committee for Antimicrobial susceptibility Testing (EUCAST, 2000). Dilutions of the antibiotics, ranging from 0.00-0.824 mg/mL in nutrient agar (Biolab) were prepared by incorporating the antibiotic stock solution into molten agar at 50 °C. Dilutions of the extract ranging from 0.05-5 mg/mL were also prepared and incorporated into molten nutrient agar (Biolab) at 50 °C and poured into sterile plates. The plates were allowed to set and then streaked with standardized inocula of the test bacteria. Plates were

incubated at 37 °C for 24 h under aerobic conditions. The MIC was defined as the lowest concentration of the antibiotic or extracts that completely inhibited visible growth of the test organism.

8.2.7 Antibiotic-extract combination experiment

8.2.7.1 The time-kill method

The effect of combinations of the crude extracts and antibiotics was evaluated using time-kill assay method (Pankey and Ashcraft, 2005). Controls consisting of nutrient broth incorporated with the extract and the respective antibiotic without the test organism at the test concentrations were included in each experiment. The test and control flasks were inoculated with each test standardized organism to a final inoculum density of approximately 10^5 cfu/mL. Immediately after inoculation, aliquots (100 µL) of the negative control flasks were taken, serially diluted in sterile physiological saline and plated on nutrient agar in order to determine the zero hour counts. The test flasks were incubated at 37 °C with shaking at 120 rpm. After 24 h of incubation, samples were taken from control and each test flasks. The samples from the test flask were transferred to a recovery medium containing 3% "Tween-80" to neutralize the effects of the crude extracts and antibiotics carry-overs from the test suspensions. Both samples from the recovery medium and the control flasks were then serially diluted in sterile physiological saline and plated on nutrient agar in duplicates. The plates were incubated at 37 °C for 24 h; numbers of colonies were enumerated and expressed as $\log_{10}$.

8.2.7.2 The checkerboard method

The assay was done as described by (Mandal, S *et al.*, 2004). Plates were inoculated with standardized cultures by streaking in duplicates and incubated for 24 h at 37 °C after which the MIC values were estimated.

The fractional inhibitory concentration (FIC) was derived from the lowest concentration of antibiotic and extract combination permitting no visible growth of the test organisms on the plates (Mandal, S *et al.*, 2004).

The FIC value for each agent was calculated using the formula:

$$\text{FIC (antibiotic)} = \text{MIC of antibiotic in combination} / \text{MIC of antibiotic alone}$$

$$\text{FIC (extract)} = \text{MIC of extract in combination} / \text{MIC of extract alone}$$

The interactions between the antibiotics and the extracts were assessed in terms of the FIC indices calculated using the formula:

$$\text{FIC Index} = \Sigma \text{FIC} = \text{FIC (antibiotic)} + \text{FIC (plant extract)}$$

8.2.8 DATA ANALYSIS

The means of the two methods (checkerboard and time-kill) were compared using independent t test of significance ($P < 0.05$).

8.3 RESULTS

The extraction gave 6, 6.2, 4, 8.2 and 10 g yields for the acetone, chloroform, ethyl acetate, methanol and aqueous crude extracts, respectively. The results of these experiments revealed that crude extracts of the leaves of *Helichrysum longifolium* exhibited antibacterial activities against the test bacterial isolates comprising of both Gram-negative and Gram-positive bacteria made up of clinical, environmental and standard strains, at a screening concentration of 5 mg/mL (Tables 8.1). Zones of inhibition ranged from 18 mm to 29 mm for the acetone extract, 16 mm to 30 mm for chloroform extract, 18 mm to 20 mm for ethyl acetate extract and from 20 mm to 29 mm for the methanol extract. The aqueous extract exhibited no antibacterial activity against all the test isolates. Chloroform extract gave least activity with an inhibition zone diameter (IZD) of 16 mm against *Micrococcus kristinae*. Interestingly however, the same chloroform extract gave the highest antibacterial activity against *Bacillus pumilus* (ATCC 14884) with zones of inhibition of 30 mm diameter. The antibiotics, tetracycline and ampicillin yielded zones of inhibition of 15-30 mm and 13-30 mm respectively.

The MICs of the crude extracts and the antibiotics varied between 1 µg/mL and 5.0 mg/mL (Table 8.2). Specifically, the MICs ranged from 0.5 to 5.0 mg/mL for the acetone extract; 0.1 to 1.0 mg/mL for chloroform extract; 0.5 to 5.0 for methanol extract and it was 5.0 mg/mL for the ethyl acetate extract on the two isolates that were susceptible. For the standard antibiotics, the ranges were 0.001 to 0.512 mg/mL for penicillin G, erythromycin and amoxycillin; 0.001 to 0.004 mg/mL for ciprofloxacin; 0.001 to 0.128 mg/mL for chloramphenicol; 0.001 to 0.256

mg/mL for oxytetracycline. The lowest MIC value (0.1 mg/ml) for the extracts was exhibited by the chloroform extract against *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* ATCC 19582 (Table 8.2).

The time-kill data on the effects and interactions of the extracts and the antibiotics singly and in combinations are shown in Table 8.3. The interactions were considered synergistic if there was a decrease of $\geq 2 \log_{10}$ cfu/mL in colony counts after 24 h by the combination compared to the most active single agent (Pankey and Ashcraft, 2005). Additivity or indifference was described as a $< 2 \log_{10}$ cfu/mL change in the average viable counts after 24 h for the combination, in comparison with the most active single drug. Antagonism was defined as a $\geq 2 \log_{10}$ cfu/mL increase in colony counts after 24 h by the combination compared with that by the most active single agent alone (Lee, JY *et al.*, 2006). The extracts showed ability to improve the bactericidal effect of the antibiotics on both Gram-positive and Gram-negative organisms. The highest bactericidal activity with a 6.7 $\log_{10}$ reduction in cell density was produced by the combination of plant extract and Penicillin G against *Salmonella* sp. (environmental strain).

Synergy rate of 90% (Extract + Amoxycillin), 80% (Extract + Penicillin G; Extract + Chloramphenicol), 50% (Extract + Ciprofloxacin), 60% (Extract + Erythromycin) and 30% (Extract + Oxytetracycline) were observed on all the test isolates. Overall, synergistic response constituted about 65%, while indifference and antagonism constituted about 28.33% and 6.67% respectively of all manner of combinations of extract and antibiotics against all test organisms using the time kill method.

Table 8.4 shows the interactions of the extract-antibiotic combinations using the checkerboard method, combinations were classified as synergistic, if the FIC indices were < 1 , additive if the

FIC indices were = 1, indifferent if the FIC indices were between 1 and 2 and antagonistic if the FIC indices were >2 (Kamatou, ADM *et al.*, 2006). Where more than one combination resulted in a change in the MIC value of the extract or antibiotic, the FIC value was expressed as the average of the individual FIC values (Pankey and Ashcraft, 2005). About 61.67% of all the interactions were synergistic, while indifference interactions constituted about 26.67% and antagonistic interactions was observed in approximately 11.66%. A comparison of the data for the time kill and checkerboard methods (Table 8.5) revealed that the degree of agreements between the two methods ranges from 50% to absolute agreement (100%).

7.4 DISCUSSION

From this study, *H. longifolium* extracts inhibited the growth of the pathogens tested and these include *P. aeruginosa* known to cause burn wound infections and urinary tract infections, as well as *S. aureus* the causative agent of most skin infections and septicaemia. This findings support the use of *H. longifolium* in the treatment of diseases caused by these pathogens among other pathogens that are susceptible to the antibacterial activity of this plant. The extracts showed broad spectrum activity against both Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacterial strains. The aqueous extract used in our investigations did not show activity against any of the test organisms suggesting that the active constituents of the *H. longifolium* leaves are not water soluble. The time kill assay was used to assess the effect of combinations of the extracts of *H. longifolium* leaves and antibiotics. Synergy was detected for combinations involving all the antibiotics. Since synergy was not specific to any class of antibiotics in this experiment, it is likely that the target

for this interaction was genetic, hence there is need to establish the molecular basis of this interaction.

The synergy against *Proteus vulgaris* ATCC 6830, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* ATCC 19582 and *Acinetobacter calcaoceticus anitratus* CSIR is noteworthy as these bacteria were resistant to penicillin G, chloramphenicol, amoxycillin, oxytetracycline, ciprofloxacin and erythromycin with MIC values much higher than their predicted breakpoints. Although the level of antibiotic potentiation was low as not to lead to a restoration of susceptibility (lowering the MIC values to below the breakpoint values) the results seem promising considering that crude extracts were used. The potentiation is likely to have been much more pronounced if pure compounds were used. In order to confirm a result of synergy by the time-kill method, chequerboard kinetic studies were as well performed with the crude extracts in combinations against the test bacteria. The method also revealed the ability of the extract to improve the bactericidal effects of the antibiotics on both Gram negative and Gram positive bacteria. The results corroborate the time-kill data; however there are some degree of negligible discrepancies, which indicated overall agreement of between 50% and 100%.

Antimicrobial combinations are used frequently in the clinic to provide broad-spectrum coverage until the causative pathogens are isolated and identified (Rybak and McGrath, 1996). In the clinical setting, combination therapy is most often given empirically without the use of *in vitro* synergy data, as there is a lack of clinical data to correlate the results with patient outcome (Rybak and McGrath, 1996). Although a number of methods are available for evaluating the antimicrobial effect of antibiotics when they are used in combination, the time-kill assay and the

agar dilution checkerboard are preferred methods especially in combinations involving crude plant extracts as they provides detailed information on the bactericidal activity of the antibiotic combination (Darwish, RM *et al.*, 2002), correlates well with cure in animal models (Chadwick, EG *et al.*, 1986) and are better able to predict the outcome of antibiotic treatment (Johnson, 1999).

The use of plants to heal diseases, including infectious ones has been extensively applied by people. Data from the literature as well as our results reveal the great potential of plants for therapeutic treatment, in spite of the fact that they have not been completely investigated. Therefore, more studies need to be conducted to search for new compounds. Once extracted, and before being used in new therapeutic treatments, they should have their toxicity tested *in vivo*. Bioassays (Carvalho, V *et al.*, 1988; Nascimento, SC *et al.*, 1990) have demonstrated the toxicity of extracts from different plants.

The antimicrobial and resistance modulating potentials of naturally occurring flavonoids and polyphenolic compounds have been reported in other studies such as Cushnie and Lamb, (2005) and Sato, Y *et al.* (2004). Some of these compounds like polyphenols have been shown to exert their antibacterial action through membrane perturbations. This perturbation of the cell membrane coupled with the action of β -lactams on the transpeptidation of the cell membrane could lead to an enhanced antimicrobial effect of the combination (Esimone, CO *et al.*, 2006). It has also been shown that some plant derived compounds can improve the *in vitro* activity of some peptidoglycan inhibiting antibiotics by directly attacking the same site (i.e. peptidoglycan) in the cell wall (Zhao, WH *et al.*, 2001). Our study revealed the importance of plant extracts

when associated with antibiotics to control resistant bacteria, which are becoming a threat to human health. Furthermore, in a few cases, these plant extracts and antibiotics in combinations were active against antibiotic resistant bacteria under very low concentration, thus minimizing the possible toxic effects.

The detection of synergy in this experiment demonstrates the ability of this plant as a potential source of antibiotic resistance modifying compounds. Hence, bioassay guided fractionation of this extracts needs to be done, in a bid to isolate and identify the compound(s) responsible for the synergism. Finally, an elucidation of the mechanisms of action of the compounds must be followed by toxicity and *in vivo* studies to determine the therapeutic applicability of such compounds in combination therapy, which are subject of ongoing investigation in our group.

8.5 CONCLUSION

Plant extracts have great potential as antimicrobial compounds. The synergistic effect from the association of antibiotic with plant extracts against resistant bacteria leads to new choices for the treatment of infectious diseases. This study has shown that crude extracts of the leaves of *H. longifolium* exhibits potentials of synergy in combination with some antibiotics against pathogenic bacteria often presenting with problems of drug resistance. This synergistic attributes of crude extracts of *H. longifolium* leaves and antibiotics demonstrates the potential of this plant as a candidate of antibiotic resistance modifying compounds.

REFERENCES

- Braga LC, Leite AAM, Xavier KGS, Takahashi JA, Bemquerer MP, Chartone-Souza E, Nascimento AMA (2005).** Synergic interaction between pomegranate extract and antibiotics against *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Can. J. Microbio.* 51:541-547.
- Carvalho V, Melo VM, Aguiar A, Matos FS (1988).** Toxicity evaluation of medicinal plant extracts by the brine shrimp (*Arthenus salina* Leah) bioassay. *Ciência e Cul.* 40:1109-1111.
- Chadwick EG, Shulman ST, Yogev R (1986).** Correlation of antibiotic synergy *in vitro* and *in vivo*: use of an animal model of neutropenic gram-negative sepsis. *J. Infect. Dis.* 154:670-675.
- Cushnie TPT, Lamb AJ (2005).** Antimicrobial activity of flavonoids. *Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents* 26:343-356.
- Darwish RM, Aburjai T, Al-Khalil S, Mahafzah A (2002).** Screening of antibiotic resistant inhibitors from local plant materials against two different strains of *Staphylococcus aureus*. *J. Ethnopharm.* 79:359-364.
- Deguchi T, Kawamura T, Yasuda M, Nakano M, Fakuda H, Kato H, Kato N, Okano Y, Kawado Y (1998).** *In vivo* selection of *Klebsiella pneumoniae* strains with Enhanced Quinolone Resistance during Flouroquinolone Treatment of Urinary Tract Infection. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemoth.* 41:1609-1611.
- Dickson RA, Houghton PJ, Hylands PJ, Gibbons S (2006).** Antimicrobial, resistance-modifying effects, antioxidant and free radical scavenging activities of *Mezoneuron benthamianum* Baill, *Securinega virosa* Roxb. and Wlld. and *Microglossa pyrifolia* Lam. *Phytother Res.* 20:41-45.

- Dilika F, Afolayan AJ, Meyer JJM (1997).** Comparative antibacterial activity of two *Helichrysum* species used in male circumcision in South Africa. *S. Afr. J. Bot.* 63:158–159.
- Esimone CO, Iroha IR, Ibezim, EC, Okeh CO, Okpana EM (2006).** *In vitro* evaluation of the interaction between tea extracts and penicillin G against *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Afr. J. Biotechnol.* 5: 1082-1086.
- European Committtee for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing (EUCAST) (2000).** Determination of minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) of antibacterial agents by agar dilution. *Clin. Micro. Inf.* 6:509-515.
- Gibbons S, Oluwatuyi M, Veitch NC, Gray AI, (2003).** Bacterial resistance modifying agents from *Lycopus europaeus*. *Phytochemistry* 62:83-87.
- Hugo WB, Russell AD (2003).** *Pharmaceutical Microbiology*; 6th ed. Blackwell Science Publsihers, Oxford, United Kingdom. pp 91-129.
- Irobi ON, Moo-Young M, Anderson WA, Daramola SO (1994).** Antimicrobial activity of the bark of *Bridelia ferruginea* (Euphorbiaceae). *Int. J. Pharmacog.* 34:87-90.
- Johnson CC (1999).** *In vitro* testing: correlation between bacterial susceptibility, body fluid levels, and effectiveness of antibacterial therapy. In: Lorain, V. (Ed.), *Antibiotics in laboratory medicine*. The Williams Wilkins, Baltimore, MD, pp 813-834.
- Kamatou GPP, Viljoen AM, van Vuuren SF, van Zyl RL (2006).** *In vitro* evidence of antimicrobial synergy between *Salvia chamelaeagnea* and *Leonotis leonurus*. *S. Afr. J. Bot.* 72:634-636.
- Lee JY, Oh WS, Ko KS, Heo ST, Moon CS, Ki HK, Kiem S, Peck KR, Song JH (2006).** Synergy of arbekacin-based combinations against vancomycin hetero-intermediate *Staphylococcus aureus*. *J. Korean Med. Sci.* 21:188-192.

- Lourens ACU, Viljoen AM, Van Vuuren SF (2008).** South African *Helichrysum* species: A review of the traditional uses, biological activity and Phytochemistry. *J. Ethnopharmacol.* 119:630-652.
- Luck CP, Wenchel H, Helbig J (1998).** Nosocomial pneumonia caused by Three Genetically Different Strains of *Legionella pneumophila* and Detection of These Strains in the Hospital Water Supply. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* 36:1160-1163.
- Mandal S, Mandal MD, Pal NK (2004).** Evaluation of combination effect of ciprofloxacin and cefazolin against *Salmonella enterica* serovar *typhi* isolates by *in vitro* methods. *Calicut Medical Journal.* 2(2):e2.
- Marquez B, Neuville L, Moreau NJ, Genet JP, Santos AF, Andrade MCC, Sant' Ana AEG (2005).** Multidrug resistance reversal agent from *Jatropha elliptica*. *Phytochemistry* 66:1804-1811.
- Mathekga ADM (2001).** Antimicrobial Activity of *Helichrysum* Species and the Isolation of a New Phloroglucinol from *Helichrysum caespitium*. PhD dissertation. University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa.
- Nascimento SC, Chiappeta A, Lima RMOC (1990).** Antimicrobial and cytotoxic activities in plants from Pernambuco, Brazil. *Fitoterapia.* 61:353-355.
- Okeke MI, Iroegbu CU, Eze EN, Okoli AS, Esimone CO (2001).** Evaluation of the root of *Landolphia owerrience* for antibacterial activity. *J. Ethnopharmacol.* 78:119-127.
- Oluwatuyi M, Kaatz GW, Gibbons S (2004).** Antibacterial and resistance modifying activity of *Rosmarinus officinalis*. *Phytochemistry.* 65:3249-3254.

- Pankey G, Ashcraft D, Patel N (2005).** *In vitro* Synergy of Daptomycin plus Rifampin against *Enterococcus faecium* Resistant to both Linezolid and Vancomycin. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.*, 49:5166-5168.
- Prescott H, Klein JO (2002).** Microbiology 6th ed. Macgraw Hill Publishers, USA. pp 808-823.
- Rybak MJ, McGrath BJ (1996).** Combination antimicrobial therapy for bacterial infections Guidelines for the clinician. *Drugs*. 52:390-405.
- Sato Y, Shibata H, Arai T, Yamamoto A, Okimura Y, Arakaki N, Higuti T (2004).** Variation in synergistic activity by flavone and its related compounds on the increased susceptibility of various strains of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* to β -lactam antibiotics. *Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents* 24:226-233.
- Shibata H, Kondo K, Katsuyama R, Kawazoe K, Sato Y, Murakami K, Takaishi Y, Arakaki N, Higuti T (2005).** Alkyl Gallates, Intensifiers of β -Lactam Susceptibility in Methicillin- Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* 49:549-555.
- Sibanda T, Okoh AI (2008).** *In vitro* evaluation of the interactions between acetone extracts of *Garcinia kola* seeds and some antibiotics. *Afr. J. Biotech.* 7: 1672-1678.
- Smith ECJ, Williamson EM, Wareham N, Kaatz GW, Gibbons S (2007).** Antibacterials and modulators of bacterial resistance from the immature cones of *Chamaecyparis lawsoniana*. *Phytochemistry*. 68(2):210-217.
- Stapleton PD, Shah S, Anderson JC, Hara Y, Hamilton-Miller JMT, Taylor PW (2004).** Modulation of β -lactam resistance in *Staphylococcus aureus* by catechins and gallates. *Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents*. 23(5):462-467.
- Tzouvelekis LS, Tzelepl E, Prinarakis E, Gazouli M, Katrahoura A, Glakkoup P, Paniara O, Legakis NJ (1998).** Sporadic Emergence of *Klebsiella pneumonia* strains Resistant to

Cafepime and Cefpirome in Greek Hospitals. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* 36:266-268.

Yam TS, Hamilton-Miller JM, Shah S (1998). The effect of a component of tea (*Camellia sinensis*) on methicillin resistance, PBP2' synthesis, and beta-lactamase production in *Staphylococcus aureus*. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* 42:211-216.

Zhao WH, Hu ZQ, Okubo S, Hara Y, Shimamura T (2001). Mechanism of synergy between Epigallocatechin gallate and β -Lactams against methicillin resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* 45:1737-1742.

Table 8.1. Antibacterial activity profile of crude extracts of the leaves of *H. longifolium*.

Bacterial isolates	Zones of inhibition (mm)**						
	Acetone	Aqueous	Chloroform	Ethyl-acetate	Methanol	Tetracycline	Ampicillin
	Extract	Extract	Extract	Extract	Extract	(1 mg/mL)	(10 µg/mL)
	(5 mg/mL)	(5 mg/mL)	(5 mg/mL)	(5 mg/mL)	(5 mg/mL)		
<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>							
ATCC 19582	0 ± 0.0	0 ± 0.0	18 ± 2.0	0 ± 0.0	22 ± 0.0	23 ± 1.3	14 ± 0.0
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>							
ATCC 6538	23 ± 0.2	0 ± 0.0	17 ± 0.4	0 ± 0.0	25 ± 0.1	20 ± 1.0	24 ± 0.3
<i>Bacillus cereus</i>							
ATCC 10702	29 ± 0.5	0 ± 0.0	17 ± 0.7	20 ± 1.2	22 ± 0.1	15 ± 0.9	13 ± 1.0
<i>Bacillus pumilus</i>							
ATCC 14884	22 ± 0.0	0 ± 0.0	30 ± 0.0	18 ± 1.4	29 ± 0.5	28 ± 0.0	23 ± 1.6
<i>Proteus vulgaris</i>							
ATCC 6830	0 ± 0.0	0 ± 0.0	22 ± 0.8	0 ± 0.0	22 ± 0.0	20 ± 1.0	24 ± 0.3
<i>Acinetobacter calcoaceticus</i>							
anitratus CSIR	18 ± 1.6	0 ± 0.0	0 ± 0.0	0 ± 0.0	27 ± 0.9	19 ± 0.4	17 ± 0.4
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>							
OK1 [†]	20 ± 0.5	0 ± 0.0	0 ± 0.0	0 ± 0.0	20 ± 1.4	28 ± 0.0	23 ± 1.6
<i>Shigella flexneri</i> [§]							
	0 ± 0.0	0 ± 0.0	0 ± 0.0	0 ± 0.0	22 ± 0.3	30 ± 0.9	28 ± 0.0
<i>Salmonella sp</i> [§]							
	0 ± 0.0	0 ± 0.0	0 ± 0.0	0 ± 0.0	27 ± 1.4	22 ± 0.6	30 ± 0.9
<i>Micrococcus kristinae</i> [§]							
	25 ± 0.2	0 ± 0.0	16 ± 0.4	0 ± 0.0	22 ± 0.5	17 ± 1.2	13 ± 1.6

§ = Environmental strain; † = Clinical isolates; ** = Mean of three replicates; NA= No activity.

Table 8.2. The minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) of the extracts and the antibiotics.

Test isolate	Minimum inhibitory concentrations (mg/mL)**									
	Acetone	Chloroform	Ethyl-acetate	Methanol	PEN G	ERY	AMX	CIP	CHL	OXT
	Extract	Extract	Extract	Extract						
<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>										
ATCC 19582	ND	0.1	ND	5.0	0.512	0.256	0.512	0.001	0.128	0.008
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>										
ATCC 6538	1.0	1.0	ND	5.0	0.001	0.008	0.002	0.004	0.002	0.004
<i>Bacillus cereus</i>										
ATCC 10702	0.5	1.0	5.0	5.0	0.002	0.001	0.004	0.001	0.002	0.001
<i>Bacillus pumilus</i>										
ATCC 14884	1.0	1.0	5.0	5.0	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.002	0.004	0.002
<i>Proteus vulgaris</i>										
ATCC 6830	ND	0.5	ND	0.5	0.001	0.512	0.002	0.001	0.008	0.016
<i>Acinetobacter calcaoceticus</i>										
anitratus CSIR	5.0	ND	ND	1.0	0.512	0.032	0.256	0.002	0.064	0.256
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>										
OK1 [‡]	5.0	ND	ND	1.0	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.004	0.001
<i>Shigella flexineri</i> [§]										
ND	ND	ND	ND	5.0	0.008	0.064	0.002	0.001	0.004	0.001
<i>Salmonella</i> sp [§]										
ND	ND	ND	ND	5.0	0.004	0.128	0.001	0.001	0.004	0.002
<i>Micrococcus kristinae</i> [§]										
5.0	1.0	ND	0.5	0.001	0.032	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.001

§ = Environmental strain; ‡ = Clinical isolates; ** = Mean of three replicates; ND= Not determined; PEN G= Penicillin G sodium; ERY= Erythromycin; AMX= Amoxycillin; CIP= Ciprofloxacin; CHL= Chloramphenicol; OXT= Oxytetracycline.

Table 8.3. *In vitro* antibacterial activity of extracts-antibiotic combinations by Time-Kill method.

ISOLATES	EXT + PEN G	EXT + ERY	EXT + AMX	EXT + CIP	EXT + CHL	EXT + OXT
<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> ATCC 19582	-3.19(S) ²	-3(S) ²	-3.19(S) ²	-3.19(S) ²	-3.19(S) ²	-0.91(I) ²
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> ATCC 6538	-3.7(S) ¹	0(I) ¹	-3.5(S) ¹	0.26(I) ¹	2.85(A) ¹	0.58(I) ¹
<i>Bacillus cereus</i> ATCC 10702	-3(S) ³	-3.2(S) ³	-3(S) ³	-3.87(S) ³	-4(S) ³	-3.92(S) ³
<i>Bacillus pumilus</i> ATCC 14884	-6(S) ³	-5.32(S) ³	-5(S) ³	-3(S) ³	-3(S) ³	0(I) ³
<i>Proteus vulgaris</i> ATCC 6830	-3(S) ²	-5.84(S) ²	-3(S) ²	-4.18(S) ²	-5.12(S) ²	-1.9(I) ²
<i>Acinetobacter calcaoceticus</i> <i>anitratus</i> CSIR	0(I) ⁴	-4(S) ⁴	-3.21(S) ⁴	0(I) ⁴	-3(S) ⁴	0(I) ⁴
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> OK1 [†]	0(I) ¹	-2.3(I) ¹	2.95(A) ¹	-1.4(I) ¹	-3.9(S) ¹	-4.6(S) ¹
<i>Shigella flexineri</i> [§]	-3(S) ²	2.41(A) ²	-3(S) ²	-3.87(S) ²	-3.47(S) ²	-3.51(S) ²
<i>Salmonella</i> sp [§]	-6.7(S) ²	0(I) ²	-5.23(S) ²	0(I) ²	1.85(I) ²	0(I) ²
<i>Micrococcus kristinae</i> [§]	-3.3(S) ⁴	-4(S) ⁴	-3(S) ⁴	-0.66(I) ⁴	-4(S) ⁴	-0.82(I) ⁴

1= Acetone extract; 2= Methanol extract; 3= Ethyl acetate extract; 4= Chloroform extract; § = Environmental strain; † = Clinical isolates; PEN G= Penicillin G sodium; ERY= Erythromycin; AMX= Amoxycillin; CIP= Ciprofloxacin; CHL= Chloramphenicol; OXT= Oxytetracycline; A= Antagonism; S= Synergism; I= Indifference.

Table 8.4. *In vitro* antibacterial activity of extracts-antibiotic combinations by Chequerboard method.

ISOLATES	EXT + PEN G	EXT + ERY	EXT + AMX	EXT + CIP	EXT + CHL	EXT + OXT
<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> ATCC 19582	-3(S) ²	-3(S) ²	-1.19(I) ²	-3(S) ²	-3.19(S) ²	3.1(A) ²
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> ATCC 6538	-3.3(S) ¹	0(I) ¹	-4.5(S) ¹	3.26(A) ¹	3(A) ¹	0(I) ¹
<i>Bacillus cereus</i> ATCC 10702	-3(S) ³	-3(S) ³	-3(S) ³	-3(S) ³	-3(S) ³	-3(S) ³
<i>Bacillus pumilus</i> ATCC 14884	-3(S) ³	-3.2(S) ³	-4.1(S) ³	-3.3(S) ³	0(I) ³	3.3(A) ³
<i>Proteus vulgaris</i> ATCC 6830	-3(S) ²	-5(S) ²	-3(S) ²	-3.41(S) ²	-3(S) ²	0(I) ²
<i>Acinetobacter calcaoceticus</i> <i>anitratus</i> CSIR	0(I) ⁴	-6(S) ⁴	-3(S) ⁴	0(I) ⁴	-3(S) ⁴	0(I) ⁴
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> OK1 [♣]	0(I) ¹	-0.91(I) ¹	4(A) ¹	-0(I) ¹	-3(S) ¹	-6(S) ¹
<i>Shigella flexineri</i> [§]	-3(S) ²	4(A) ²	-3(S) ²	-3(S) ²	-3(S) ²	-3(S) ²
<i>Salmonella</i> sp [§]	-7(S) ²	0(I) ²	-3(S) ²	0.96(I) ²	3(A) ²	0(I) ²
<i>Micrococcus kristinae</i> [§]	-5.3(S) ⁴	-3(S) ⁴	-3(S) ⁴	-0.71(I) ⁴	-3(S) ⁴	0(I) ⁴

1= Acetone extract; 2= Methanol extract; 3= Ethyl acetate extract; 4= Chloroform extract; § = Environmental strain; ♣ = Clinical isolates; PEN G= Penicillin G sodium; ERY= Erythromycin; AMX= Amoxycillin; CIP= Ciprofloxacin; CHL= Chloramphenicol; OXT= Oxytetracycline; A= Antagonism; S= Synergism; I= Indifference.

Table 8.5. Comparison of results by time kill and checkerboard methods.

NO OF TEST STRAINS OUT OF TOTAL OF TEN												
ACTIVITY	EXT + PEN G		EXT + ERY		EXT + AMX		EXT + CIP		EXT + CHL		EXT + OXT	
	<u>TK</u>	<u>CB</u>	<u>TK</u>	<u>CB</u>	<u>TK</u>	<u>CB</u>	<u>TK</u>	<u>CB</u>	<u>TK</u>	<u>CB</u>	<u>TK</u>	<u>CB</u>
Synergy	8	8	6	6	9	8	5	5	8	7	3	3
Antagonism	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	0	2
Indifference	2	2	3	3	0	1	5	4	1	1	7	5
Means (Tables 8.3 & 8.4)	-3.19	-3.06	-2.53	-2.01	-2.92	-2.38	-1.99	-1.22	-2.49	-1.52	-1.44	0.04

EXT = extract; PEN = penicillin G; ERY = erythromycin; AMX = amoxicillin;

CIP = ciprofloxacin; CHL = chloramphenicol; OXT = oxytetracycline;

TK = time kill; CB = checkerboard; *Mean values for each of the methods from tables 8.3 & 8.4 was significant (P<0.05).