

**Evaluation of Antibacterial Activity of Zobo and Bay leaf  
Extracts on Enteropathogenic Bacteria**

**ABSTRACT**

**Aim:** The antibacterial activity of Bay leaf (*Laurus nobilis*) and Zobo leaf (*Hibiscus sabdariffa*) extracts on enteropathogenic bacteria was investigated

**Study design:** the study utilized well in agar diffusion to investigate the antimicrobial properties of the extracts.

**Place and Duration of Study:** Department of Microbiology, Rivers State University and the study was carried out in August, 2018 to October, 2018.

**Methodology:** Faecal samples were collected from a medical laboratory and inoculated on eosin methylene blue and mannitol salt agar plates for *E. coli* and *S. aureus* using standard microbiological techniques. The bacterial isolates were subjected to biochemical and molecular (PCR) identification so as to ascertain the distinctiveness of the isolates. Hot water and absolute alcohol were used as the extracting solvents. Concentrations of the extracted solvents was tested against *E. coli* and *S. aureus* using the well in agar method.

**Results:** The result showed that both hot aqueous and alcoholic extracts of Bay leaf (*Laurus nobilis*) showed no sensitivity against the tested bacteria, whereas the extracts of hot dry aqueous and alcohol of Zobo leaf (*Hibiscus sabdariffa*) showed remarkable zones of inhibition against the tested bacteria. The zones of inhibition in the dry hot aqueous extract of zobo leaf with concentrations of 0.25 µg/ml, 0.125 µg/ml and 0.063 µg/ml were 31.3±0.1, 25.6±1.2 and 10.0±0.0, respectively. The minimal inhibitory concentration of the dry hot aqueous of zobo extract was observed at 0.063 µg/ml for *Escherichia coli*, while zones of inhibition of 33.3±0.0, 30.1±0.3, 17.2±1.0 and 15.0±0.1 mm were recorded from the dry alcoholic extract of zobo leaf on *Escherichia coli* given similar concentrations and the MIC was observed at the 0.031 µg/ml concentration. The result also showed that out of the four concentrations of the dry hot aqueous extract, only the 0.25 µg/ml concentration was able to show 14.2±0.0 mm inhibition on *Staphylococcus aureus*, while the concentrations of 0.25 µg/ml and 0.125 µg/ml were the only two concentrations of the dry alcohol that showed levels of sensitivity with zone diameters of 29.3±1.0 and 25.2±0.0, respectively.

**Conclusion:** The plant extracts of zobo leaves which displayed remarkable activity at fairly-low concentrations could be recommended for use against similar bacteria. Thus, investigation and adoption of plant extracts in modern medicine should be encouraged as this may be the break through needed to combat the ever-increasing resistance to commonly used antibiotics.

10  
11 *Keywords:* antimicrobial properties, *Laurus nobilis*, *Hibiscus sabdariffa*, enteropathogenic  
12 *bacteria*

13  
14  
15 **1. INTRODUCTION**

16  
17 For decades, plants have been the mainstay of traditional medical practice and have  
18 remained an inestimable source of natural health products for humans, particularly in the last  
19 few decades, with more thorough researches having being carried out to explore natural

20 therapies [1]. The use of herbs in the treatment of diseases has become widespread and is  
21 increasingly achieving popularity worldwide not only due to their continuous usage in  
22 developing countries for primary health care of the poor, but also in societies where  
23 conventional medicine is prevalent in their health care system [2]. Approximately eighty  
24 percent of the world's population practises herbal medicine, which may explain the constant  
25 rise in the annual global market value of these herbal remedies estimated at over US \$60  
26 billion currently [3]. Presently, the use of medicinal plants alongside western medicine is of  
27 great significance in the Nigerian health care system, a type of health care referred to as  
28 "herbalism" [4]. Due to the constant rise in sophistication across the world, it is essential to  
29 refer to herbal medical practice as alternative or complimentary medicine, so as to appeal to  
30 large populations of people regardless of their cultures and/or religions [5].  
31 Medicinal plants contain certain substances which possess the healing properties known as  
32 "phytochemicals" [6]. Phytochemicals are non-nutritive, biologically active chemical  
33 compounds occurring naturally in these plants, which confer the characteristic colour, aroma  
34 and flavour to them and in some cases, constitute their natural defence mechanisms [7, 8].  
35 Phytochemicals are chiefly categorized into two broad groups namely: primary constituents  
36 and secondary metabolites [9]. Primary constituents include proteins, amino acids, common  
37 sugars and chlorophyll, whereas, secondary constituents include glycosides, alkaloids,  
38 phenolic compounds, flavonoids, saponins, essential oils, tannins and terpenoids [9]. At  
39 present, many countries have shown a stepwise increase in their employment of  
40 phytochemicals for pharmaceutical uses [2]. It has been reported by the World Health  
41 Organization (WHO) that medicinal plants would serve as the best source of varieties of  
42 drugs [10]. Nearly eighty percent of individuals, particularly in developed countries, engage  
43 in traditional medicine, which makes use of compounds gotten from medicinal plant parts [3].  
44 Recently, numerous studies have been conducted in various countries to demonstrate the  
45 efficiency and significance of various crude plant extracts and phytochemicals of known  
46 antimicrobial characteristics in modern therapeutic care [11]. Hence, many plants have found  
47 usefulness in medical practice by virtue of their respective antimicrobial properties which are  
48 conferred upon them by the secondary metabolites they synthesize [11]. Due to the  
49 constantly rising incidence of new and re-emerging infectious diseases, there is a pressing  
50 need to find new antimicrobial agents with varying chemical structures and newer  
51 mechanisms of action [12]. This is also necessitated by some of the adverse side effects  
52 associated with certain antibiotics as well as the increasing development of resistance to the  
53 antibiotics currently in use [12]. As such, necessary actions must be taken to prevent  
54 excessive and unnecessary intake of antibiotics, to better comprehend the various genetic  
55 antibiotic resistance mechanisms and to enable further researches in the development of  
56 newer drugs [13]. There are various means of treating and controlling the infections caused  
57 by Multi-Drug Resistant (MDR) bacteria. One of such means is by isolating active  
58 phytochemicals in plants that can help stop the transmission of infection [2]. Thus, the aim of  
59 this study is to investigate the antibacterial activity of zobo and bay leaf extracts commonly  
60 used in Nigeria against some human enteropathogenic bacteria.

## 61 62 **2. MATERIAL AND METHODS**

### 63 **2.1 Sample Collection**

64 Bay leaf (*Laurus nobilis*), and Zobo leaf (*Hibiscus sabdariffa*) were bought from the  
65 Rumuokoro Slaughter Market which is one of the major markets in Port Harcourt City Local  
66 Government Area, Rivers State. The samples were taken to the Botany Department of the  
67 Rivers State University for identification before being taken to the Microbiology Laboratory  
68 for preparation.

#### 69 70 **2.1.1 Preparation of Samples**

71 The plant samples were shade dried at room temperature (30-35 °C) for eight (8) days. After  
72 which, they were pulverized into fine powder using a mortar and pestle which has been  
73 sterilized using ethanol (99.9 %) and cotton wool.

74

#### 75 **2.1.2 Extraction of extract**

76 Hot distilled water and ethanol were used for extraction. For the hot distilled water extraction,  
77 fifty grams (50g) of the powdered samples were transferred in to sterile beakers containing  
78 200ml each of sterile distilled water (which was sterilized by autoclaving at 121 °C for 15  
79 minutes) and labelled accordingly. While in the ethanol extraction, fifty grams (50g) of the  
80 powdered samples were transferred into sterile conical flasks containing 200ml ethanol  
81 (99.9%). The samples were swirled and allowed to stand for 72 hours. Both samples were  
82 sieved using filter paper. The filtrates obtained were evaporated to dryness using the water  
83 bath and the residues were stored in sterile containers for further use.

84

#### 85 **2.1.3 Test for Sterility of Extracts**

86 The sterility of the extracts was determined by streaking them on MacConkey and nutrient  
87 agar plates. plates were later incubated for 24-48 hours at 37 °C. The absence of microbial  
88 growth after incubation showed that the extracts were not contaminated (i.e. were sterile)  
89 [14].

90

#### 91 **2.1.4 Preparation of Various Concentrations from the Extracts**

92 The extracts were diluted into four (4) concentrations (0.25 µg/ml to 0.031µg/ml) using the  
93 two-fold dilution method described by Obire and Ogbonna [15]. One gram of extract was  
94 diluted into 2ml of the sterile diluent and a step-wise 2-fold dilution was carried out to  
95 achieve the required concentrations.

96

### 97 **2.4 Microbiological Analysis**

98

#### 99 **2.4.1 Isolation and Identification**

100 Twenty stool samples were collected in sterile bottles from a medical laboratory and  
101 transferred to the Microbiology Laboratory of the Rivers State University for analysis. The  
102 stool samples were analyzed according to the methods described by Cheesbrough [16]. The  
103 stool samples were moistened in normal saline and were streaked on the surface of Eosin  
104 methylene blue (EMB) agar and Mannitol salt agar (MSA) plates and incubated at 37 °C for  
105 24 hours. Discrete colonies on the respective plates were isolated and streaked on fresh  
106 nutrient agar plates until pure isolates were obtained and preserved in agar slants. Isolates  
107 were identified by their colonial morphology microscopy, biochemical test and molecular  
108 methods.

109

#### 110 **2.4.2 Characterization of bacterial isolates**

111 The bacterial isolates were characterized using the methods described by Cheesbrough [16]  
112 and further confirmation of isolates was done using the Bergy's manual of determinative  
113 bacteriology. The biochemical tests adopted include catalase, motility, sugar fermentation,  
114 citrate utilization, oxidase, MRVP and Indole. Further confirmation of the isolates was carried  
115 out using molecular (genomic) characterization.

116

#### 117 **2.5 Antimicrobial Susceptibility Test of the Extracts**

118 The Well in agar diffusion method was used. The standardized inoculum was swabbed on  
119 the surface of the Mueller-Hinton agar plates and were allowed to dry. A sterile 6mm well  
120 borer was used to bore holes on the surface of the seeded plates. The holes were bored in  
121 such a way that each hole did not get to the bottom of the agar so as to prevent leakage.  
122 The already prepared extracts at different concentrations were then transferred into the

123 holes, after which plates were incubated at 37 °C for 18-24 hours without inverting the  
 124 plates.

125

126 **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

127

128 After the mega blast for the search of highly similar sequences of the already obtained 16S  
 129 rRNA sequences from the NCBI data base, the 16S rDNA of the isolates showed a  
 130 percentage similarity to other species at 99%. The evolutionary distances which was  
 131 computed with the Jukes-Cantor method were in agreement with the phylogenetic placement  
 132 of the 16s rDNA of the isolates as presented in Fig. 1. Four bacterial isolates belonging to  
 133 *Escherichia coli*, *Enterobacter xiangfangensis*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Staphylococcus*  
 134 *aureus* were identified. The percentage yield of the plant extract using the different solvents  
 135 are presented in Table 1.  
 136



137

138

139

140

141 Fig 1: Phylogenetic tree showing the evolutionary distance between the bacterial isolates

142

143 **Table 1: Percentage yield of crude extracts**

Medicinal plant	Extracting solvent	Type of extract	Colour extract	of	Weight macerated sample	of	Weight extract used	of	Percentage yield of extract (%)
-----------------	--------------------	-----------------	----------------	----	-------------------------	----	---------------------	----	---------------------------------

(g)						
Bay leaf	Hot water	DHA	Light green	50	5.2	10.4
	Alcohol	DA	Light green	50	4.91	9.82
Zobo leaf	Hot water	DHA	Red	50	5.0	10
	Alcohol	DA	Red	50	5.1	10.2

144 DHA: dry hot aqueous, DA: dry alcohol

145

146 **Table 2: Zones of inhibition (mm) of the different extracts of Bay leaf**

Bacterial isolates	Type of extract	Inhibitory zone diameters(mm) at Various concentrations of extracts				MIC (µg/ml)
		0.25 µg/ml	0.125 µg/ml	0.063 µg/ml	0.031 µg/ml	
<i>Escherichia coli</i>	DHA	0.0±0.0	0.0±0.0	0.0±0.0	0.0±0.0	0.0
<i>Escherichia coli</i>	DA	0.0±0.0	0.0±0.0	0.0±0.0	0.0±0.0	0.0
<i>Staphylococcus aureus.</i>	DHA	0.0±0.0	0.0±0.0	0.0±0.0	0.0±0.0	0.0
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>	DA	0.0±0.0	0.0±0.0	0.0±0.0	0.0±0.0	0.0

147 DHA: dry hot aqueous, DA: dry alcohol

148

149 **Table 3: Zones of inhibition (mm) of the different extracts of Zobo leaf**

Bacterial isolates	Type of extract	Inhibitory zone diameters(mm) at Various concentrations of extracts				MIC (µg/ml)
		0.25 µg/ml	0.125 µg/ml	0.063 µg/ml	0.031 µg/ml	
<i>Escherichia coli</i>	DHA	31.3±0.1	25.6±1.2	10.0±0.0	0.0±0.0	0.063
<i>Escherichia coli</i>	DA	33.3±0.0	30.1±0.3	17.2±1.0	15.0±0.1	0.031
<i>Staphylococcus sp.</i>	DHA	14.2±0.0	0.0±0.0	0.0±0.0	0.0±0.0	0.25
<i>Staphylococcus sp.</i>	DA	29.3±1.0	25.2±0.0	0.0±0.0	0.0±0.0	0.125

150 DHA: dry hot aqueous, DA: dry alcohol

151

### 152 Susceptibility of the test organisms to *Laurus nobilis*

153 The susceptibility of the antimicrobial activity of Bay leaf is presented in Table 2. The result  
 154 showed that both the dry hot aqueous and dry alcohol extracts of *Laurus nobilis*  
 155 demonstrated no inhibitory activity on the test organisms. Thus, the findings in this study do  
 156 not agree with previous studies which has demonstrated the antimicrobial property of bay  
 157 leave extracts (*Laurus nobilis*) on *E. coli*, *Staphylococcus sp.*, *Salmonella sp.*, *Pseudomonas*  
 158 *sp.*, *Shigella sp.* and *Klebsiella* [17, 18, 19, 20, 21].

159

### 160 Susceptibility of the test organisms to Zobo leaf (*Hibiscus sabdariffa*)

161 The result of the zones of inhibition of the Zobo leaf (*Hibiscus sabdariffa*) extract is  
 162 presented in Table 3. From the results, both dry hot aqueous and dry alcoholic extracts of  
 163 *Hibiscus sabdariffa* both demonstrated remarkable inhibitory activity on the growth of the test  
 164 bacterial isolates. For the dry hot aqueous extracts, the zones of inhibition in the extract  
 165 concentrations of 0.25 µg/ml, 0.125 µg/ml and 0.063 µg/ml were 31.3±0.1, 25.6±1.2 and  
 166 10.0±0.0 respectively for *Escherichia coli*. The least concentration which represented the  
 167 MIC was noted in the 0.063 µg/ml. whereas higher zones of inhibition were recorded from

168 the alcoholic extract on *Escherichia coli* given similar concentrations and the MIC was  
169 observed at the 0.031 µg/ml concentration. The result also showed that out of the four  
170 concentrations of the dry hot aqueous extract, only the 0.25 µg/ml concentration was able to  
171 show 14.2±0.0 mm inhibition on *Staphylococcus aureus*, while the concentrations of 0.25  
172 µg/ml and 0.125 µg/ml were the only two concentrations of the dry alcohol that showed  
173 levels of sensitivity with zone diameters of 29.3±1.0 and 25.2±0.0, respectively. The  
174 antimicrobial activities of zobo leaf extracts have been reported by previous studies [22, 23,  
175 24, 25, 26, 27]. In the study of Salem *et al* [22], it was shown to inhibit *S. aureus*, *K.*  
176 *pneumoniae* and *E. coli*, at minimum concentrations ranging from 0.30 to 1.30±0.2mg/ml for  
177 the three organisms. In the study done by Higginbotham *et al* [28], *E. coli* and *S. aureus*  
178 were inhibited at concentrations of both 40 and 60mg/ml, while in the study carried out by Al-  
179 Hashimi [27], aqueous and ethanolic extracts of *H. sabdariffa* caused growth inhibition of *E.*  
180 *coli*, *S. aureus* and *P. aeruginosa*, with inhibitory zone diameters ranging within 17 and  
181 46mm for all three organisms. Results from the study of Saeidi *et al* [23] showed that *H.*  
182 *sabdariffa* extracts inhibited growth of *E. coli*, *Shigella sp.* and *S. aureus* at concentrations of  
183 1.25-20mg/ml, while the study of Nwaiwu *et al* [25] showed that it inhibited *Salmonella sp.*,  
184 *Shigella sp.* and *Enterobacter sp.* each at 200mg/ml. Results similar to those obtained from  
185 this study were also seen in that of Panaitescu and Lengyel [24] in which *H. sabdariffa*  
186 extracts were found to inhibit growth in *E. coli*, *S. typhi*, *K. pneumoniae* and *S. aureus* used in  
187 the study. Inhibitory concentrations were 4, 10, 20 and 100% respectively, while inhibitory  
188 zone diameters ranged within 0.1 and 5.0mm. The work of Jantrapanukorn *et al* [26] showed  
189 that it caused inhibition in *S. typhi*, *S. paratyphi A*, *S. flexneri*, *S. boydii*, *S. dysenteriae* and  
190 *S. sonnei* at a minimum concentration of 3.125mg/ml. The results of this study also agreed  
191 with those of Sekar *et al* [29], [30], [31] in which *E. coli*, *P. aeruginosa*, *S. aureus*, *S. enterica*  
192 and *K. pneumoniae* were all inhibited.

193

#### 194 **4. CONCLUSION**

195

196 The emergence and re-emergence of antibiotic-resistant organisms has become a serious  
197 problem in clinical practice due to the fact that some common antibiotics in use no longer  
198 demonstrate any significant effects on these organisms. This research was carried out in a  
199 bid to discover novel means of combating this public health scourge, as medicinal plants  
200 apparently offer promising solutions to this problem. Interestingly, the plant extracts of zobo  
201 leaves displayed remarkable activity at fairly-low concentrations, whereas extracts of bay  
202 leaf were completely not sensitive against the bacterial isolates. This means that in the  
203 nearest future, these common medicinal plants will have a place in modern medical practice.

204

#### 205 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

206

207 No competing interest exist between authors

208

209

210

#### 211 **REFERENCES**

212

213 1. Sanjoy, P, Yogeshwer, S. Herbal Medicine: Current Status and the Future: Asian  
214 Pacific Journal of Cancer Prevention. 2002; 4(4):281-288.

215 2. Ekor, M. The Growing Use of Herbal Medicines: Issues Relating to Adverse  
216 Reactions and Challenges in Monitoring Safety: Frontiers in Pharmacology. 2014; 4:  
217 177.

218 3. Tilburt, J.C, Kaptchuk, T.J. Herbal Medicine Research and Global Health: An Ethical  
219 Analysis: Pubmed, World Health Organization. 2008; Vol 24 (8):594-599.

- 220 4. Amegbor, PM. Health-Seeking Behavior in Asikuma-Odoben-Brakwa District: A  
221 Pluralistic Health Perspective, 2014,1:1-2.
- 222 5. Erci, B. Medical Herbalism and Frequency of Use: A compendium of Essays on  
223 Alternative Therapy. 2012; 195.
- 224 6. Webb, D. Phytochemicals' Role in Good Health: Today's Dietician. 2013; 15 (9): 70
- 225 7. Liu, R.H; Health Benefits of Fruits and Vegetables are from Additive and Synergistic  
226 Combinations of Phytochemicals: American Journal of Clinical Nutrition. 2003; 78  
227 (3): 517-520.
- 228 8. Ugbogu, A.E, Akubugwo, E.I, Iweala, E.J, Uhegbu, F.O, Chinyere, G.C, Obasi, N.A.  
229 Role of Phytochemicals in Chemoprevention of Cancer: A Review: International  
230 Journal of Pharmaceutical and Chemical Sciences. 2013; 2(2):567-575.
- 231 9. Zeb, A, Sadiq, A, Ullah, F, Ahmad, S, Ayaz, M. Phytochemical and Toxicological  
232 Investigations of Crude Methanolic Extracts, Subsequent Fractions and Crude  
233 Saponins of *Isodon rugosus*: Journal of Biological Research. 2014; 47(57):1-6.
- 234 10. Selvamohan, T; Ramadas, S; Kishore, S.K; Antimicrobial Activity of Selected  
235 Medicinal Plants against Some Selected Human Pathogenic Bacteria: Advances in  
236 Applied Science Research. 2012; 3(5):3374-3381.
- 237 11. Pan, S, Zhou, S, Gao, S, Yu, Z, Zhang, S, Tang, M, Sun, J, Ma, D, Han, Y, Fong, W,  
238 Ko, K. New Perspectives On How To Discover Drugs from Herbal Medicines: CAM's  
239 Outstanding Contribution To Modern Therapeutics: Journal of Evidence-Based  
240 Complementary and Alternative Medicine. 2013; 1: 1.
- 241 12. Cowan, M.M. Plant Products as Antimicrobial Agents: Journal of the American  
242 Society for Microbiology, Clinical Microbiology Reviews. 1999; 12 (4): 564-582.
- 243 13. Ventola, C.L. The Antibiotic Resistance Crisis: Causes and Threats: Journal of  
244 Pharmacy and Therapeutics. 2015; 40(4): 277-283.
- 245 14. Nester MT, Nester EW, Roberts CE, Pearsall NN, Anderson DG. Microbiology- A  
246 Human Perspective. New York: WCB/McGraw-Hill Book Company. 1998.
- 247 15. Obire O, Ogbonna, S. (2017). Antimicrobial activity of some seed extracts on  
248 bacteria and fungi isolated from maize slurry in Port-Harcourt metropolis. In: Press
- 249 16. Cheesbrough, M; Microbiological Test: District Laboratory Practice in Tropical  
250 Countries. 2000; 1-226.
- 251 17. Chahal, K.K, Kaur, M, Bhardwaj, U, Singla, N, Kaur, A. A Review on Chemistry and  
252 Biological Activities of *Laurus nobilis* L. Essential Oil: Journal of Pharmacognosy and  
253 Phytochemistry. 2017; 6(4):1153-1161.
- 254 18. Kota, C.S, Paladi, S. Evaluation of Antibacterial Activity of *Syzygium aromaticum*,  
255 *Laurus nobilis* and *Cuminum cyminum* Extracts and Their Combination: International  
256 Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences and Research. 2013; 4(12): 4745-4748.
- 257 19. Malti, J.E, Amarouch, H. Antibacterial Effect, Histological Impact and Oxidative  
258 Stress Studies from *Laurus nobilis* Extract: Journal of Food Quality. 2009; (32): 190-  
259 208.
- 260 20. Millezi, F.A, Caixeta, D.S, Rossoni, D.F, Cardoso, M, Piccoli, R.H. In Vitro  
261 Antimicrobial Properties of Plant Essential Oils *Thymus vulgaris*, *Cymbopogon*  
262 *citratu*s and *Laurus nobilis* against Five Important Foodborne Pathogens: Journal of  
263 Food Science and Technology. 2010; 15(5): 3378-3383.
- 264 21. Sedef, N.E, Karagozlu, N, Karakaya, S, Sahin, S. Antioxidant and Antimicrobial  
265 Activities of Essential Oils Extracted from *Laurus nobilis* L. Leaves by Using Solvent-

- 266 Free Microwave and Hydrodistillation: Journal of Food and Nutrition Sciences. 2014;  
267 5(1): 97-106.
- 268 22. Salem, M.Z, Olivares-Perez, J, Salem, A.Z. Studies on Biological Activities and  
269 Phytochemical Composition of Hibiscus Species- A Review: Life Science Journal.  
270 2014; 11(5): 1-8.
- 271 23. Saeidi, S, Bokaeian, M, Shiekh, M, Shahi, Z. Antimicrobial Activity of Hibiscus  
272 sabdariffa Extract Against Human Pathogen: International Journal of Advanced  
273 Biological and Biomedical Research. 2014; 2(2): 433-439.
- 274 24. Panaitescu, M, Lengyel, E. Monitoring the Antibacterial Activity of Hibiscus  
275 sabdariffa Extracts: Journal of the Management of Sustainable Development, Sibiu,  
276 Romania. 2017; 9(1): 31-40.
- 277 25. Nwaiwu, N.E, Mshelia, F, Raufu, I.A. Antimicrobial Activities of Crude Extracts of  
278 Moringa oleifera, Hibiscus sabdariffa and Hibiscus esculentus seeds against some  
279 enterobacteria: Journal of Applied Phytotechnology in Environmental Sanitation.  
280 2012; 1(1): 11-16.
- 281 26. Jantrapanukorn, B, Pongpraritt, S, Powthong, P, Pheungphu, T. The Study of  
282 Antibacterial Activity in Enteric Pathogens of Roselle (*Hibiscus sabdariffa* Linn.) by  
283 Broth Micro-dilution Method: Journal of Applied Pharmaceutical Sciences. 2017;  
284 7(5): 119-122.
- 285 27. Al-Hashimi, AG. Mahmood, SA. (2016). The Nutritional Value and Antioxidant  
286 Activity of Bay Leaves (*Laurus nobilis* L.). Basrah Journal of Veterinary Research,  
287 15(2): 246-260.
- 288 28. Higginbotham, L.N; Burris, K.P; Zivanovic, S; Davidson, M.P; Stewart, N.C;  
289 Antimicrobial Activity of Hibiscus sabdariffa Aqueous Extracts Against *Escherichia*  
290 *coli* O157:H7 and *Staphylococcus aureus* in a Microbiological Medium and Milk of  
291 Various Fat Concentrations: Journal of Food Protection. 2014; 77(2): 262-268.
- 292 29. Sekar, M, Hashim, H.N, Fadzil, F.S, Sukaini, S.S, Zukhi, N.N, Nadzri, M.N, Abdullah,  
293 M.S. Antibacterial Activity of the Methanolic Extract of Hibiscus sabdariffa Leaves  
294 and Fruits: British Microbiology Research Journal. 2015; 5: 1-6
- 295 30. Sulaiman, F.A, Kazeem, M.O, Waheed, M.A, Temowo, S.O, Azeez, I.O, Zubair, F.I,  
296 Adeyemi, T.A, Nyang, A, Adeyemi, S.O. Antimicrobial and Toxic Potential of  
297 Aqueous Extracts of *Allium sativum*, *Hibiscus sabdariffa* and *Zingiber officinale* in  
298 Wistar rats: Journal of Taibah University for Science. 2014; 8(1): 315-322.
- 299 31. Garbi, M.I, Saleh, M, Badri, A.M, Ibrahim, T.I, Mohammed, S.F, Alhassan, M.S,  
300 Elshikh, A.A, Kabbashi, A.S. Antibacterial Activity, Phytochemical Screening and  
301 Cytotoxicity of Hibiscus sabdariffa (calyx): Journal of Advancement in Medicinal  
302 Plant Research. 2016; 4(4): 116-121.