

1 **PHYTOCHEMICAL SCREENING AND ANTIMICROBIAL ACTIVITY OF THE ROOT**  
2 **AND STEM BARK EXTRACT OF *FICUS SYCOMORUS* ON SOME SELECTED**  
3 **MICRO-ORGANISMS**  
4

5 **Abstract**

6 This study was conducted to carryout preliminary phytochemical analysis and *in vitro*  
7 antimicrobial activities of aqueous and ethanolic root and stem bark extracts of *Ficus sycomorus*.

8 Qualitative phytochemical analysis for tannins, saponin, terpenoids, flavonoids, alkaloids,  
9 glycosides, steroids, phenols, and reducing sugar was done using standard methods , the  
10 antimicrobial activities of the extracts were tested against four micro- organisms; *Escherichia*  
11 *coli*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Shigella dysenterae*, and *Salmonella typhi*. Agar well diffusion  
12 method was used for the antimicrobial studies. Phytochemical screening of both root and stem  
13 bark aqueous extracts showed the presence of tannin, saponin, terpenoid, flavonoid , alkaloids,  
14 glycoside, steroid, reducing sugar, and phenol. Glycoside was not detected in both the aqueous  
15 and ethanolic extracts of the root bark. The result of the antimicrobial studies showed that the  
16 aqueous root extract have higher antimicrobial activity ranging from (2-12 mm) on the tested  
17 microorganisms than aqueous stem bark extract (3-9 mm), while for ethanol extract both stem  
18 and root bark extract has almost the same effect or antimicrobial activity on the tested pathogens  
19 ranging from (2-15 mm) which is having higher activity compared to the aqueous extracts. The  
20 Minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) and Minimum bactericidal concentration (MBC) of  
21 both the extracts were found to be 50 mg/mL and 100 mg/mL respectively. From this study, it  
22 can therefore be concluded that, the root and stem bark extract is a potential antimicrobial agents  
23 which support the claim of the traditional users of this plant in herbal medicine for the treatment  
24 of diseases that are of microbial origin.

25 **Key words:** *Ficus sycomorus*, *Escherichia coli*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Shigella dysenterae*,  
26 and *Salmonella typhi*, *phytochemical screening and antimicrobial activity*.

27 **INTRODUCTION**  
28

29 Nature has been a source of medicinal agents for thousands of years and an impressive number  
30 of modern drugs have been isolated from natural sources (Cragg and Newman, 2001). At least

31 12000 of such compounds have been isolated so far, a number estimated to be less than 10% of  
32 the total (Tapsell, 2006, Lai and, Roy, 2004). Chemical compounds in plants mediates their  
33 effects on human body through processes identical to those we already understood for their  
34 chemical compound in conventional drugs in terms of how they work. This enables herbal  
35 medicines to have beneficial pharmacology, but also gives them the same potential as  
36 pharmaceutical drugs to cause side effects (Tapsell, 2006, Lai and Roy 2004) .

37 Plant lives longer than every other living things due to their ability to synthesized  
38 phytochemicals in their cells which serve as strong antifungal, antibacterial and antimicrobial  
39 agents, as a result of this, their susceptibility to diseases attack to some extent is low as compared  
40 to other living things (personal contact,15<sup>th</sup>,January 2016).

41 This research work was carried out to study the Phytochemical screening and *in vitro* anti-  
42 microbial activities of root and stem bark extract of *Ficus sycomorus* on some selected micro  
43 organisms.. *Ficus sycomorus* is a common savannah tree that grows or can be found almost  
44 everywhere. It is called in English Language as “Wild fig” “sycamore fig”, or common cluster  
45 fig. Spanish call it “sicomoro”. The Sukur people call it “Dashakwai” , Tiv people called it  
46 “Tur”, in Hausa it is known as “Baure”, Kilba and Marghi people called it “Kamda” , in Fali  
47 Language is called “Boduven” and Gude call it “Bodeva” (personal contact,15<sup>th</sup>,January 2016). It  
48 grows in high water table areas, it can be found along water courses such as streams, rocky  
49 places, swamps and water holes (Orwa *et al*, 2009). The sycamore fig is sensitive to frost but can  
50 withstand some cold. The root and stem-bark of *Ficus sycomorus* are said to be used as herb in  
51 Northern Nigeria for treatment of diseases like diarrhea, dysentery, cough, soar throat, chest  
52 diseases, and infertility and as antidote for snake.

53 The relevance of this plant in traditional medicine is as a result of the secondary metabolites such  
54 as glycosides, reducing sugar, phenols, saponins, steroids, tannins, alkaloids, terpenoids and  
55 flavonoids which they have been screened to contain. Also referred to as phytochemicals, they  
56 are reported to possess inhibitory activities against the growth and disease inducing activities of  
57 some pathogenic microorganisms (Hassan, 2005; Oyeleke *et al.*, 2008; Sandabe *et al.*, 2006;  
58 Solomon-Wisdom *et al.*, 2011 Stary, 1998; Udobi *et al.*, 2008).

59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### **Sample Collection and identification of plant material.**

Plant roots and stem-barks of the plant *Ficus Sycomorus* were collected from Sukur Kingdom in Madagali Local Government Area, Adamawa State, Nigeria. It was identified and authenticated by a Botanist from the Department of Biological Sciences, Adamawa State University, Mubi.

Sampling was carried out in the month of May from the tree.

### **Sample preparation**

The root or Stem-barks (cut into small pieces) washed with water and rinsed with distilled water and then dried in the shade for two weeks. The dried samples was grinded by wooden mortar and pestle and sieve using clean Kitchen sieve to obtain a fine powder and was stored in a tight container until required for use.

### **Extraction**

#### **Aqueous extraction**

For the aqueous extraction, decoction procedure was used. Two hundred grams (200 g) each of the root and stem bark powder (separately) were weighed and soaked in 1000mLs of distilled water in a beaker and heated to boil. It was left to cool and then filtered using sterile filter paper (Whatman No 1) into a clean conical flask. The filtrate was concentrated on a water bath at a temperature of sixty degree Celsius (60°C). The final yield of the extracts was then stored in a refrigerator until the onset of the experiments (Fatofe et al., 1993).

#### **Ethanol Extraction**

Maceration method of extraction as described by Fatofe et al., (1993) was adopted in this study. Two hundred grams (200 g) for each of the root and stem bark powdered material was weighed and soaked in 1000 mL of 70% ethanol and left for 24 hours .Thereafter, it was decanted. The procedure was repeated with another 1000 mL to ensure complete extraction of the active ingredient .The extracts was filtered and evaporated to dryness on a water bath at a temperature of sixty degree Celsius (60°C).The dried extract was then weighed and stored in tightly closed bottles in a refrigerator until required.

### **Qualitative Phytochemical analysis.**

87 The qualitative phytochemical screening of the samples was carried out as described by  
88 Harborne (1973), Nweze *et al.*, (2004) and Senthilkumar and Reetha, (2009) with slight  
89 modification. The root or stem bark extracts was screened for carbohydrates, alkaloids,  
90 flavonoids, steroids, phenols and tannins, saponin, glycosides, and proteins.

#### 91 **Test for Tannins**

92 To 1 mL of plant extract, 2 mL of 5 % ferric chloride was added. Formation of dark blue or  
93 greenish black indicates the presence of tannins.

#### 94 **Test for Saponins**

95 To 1 mL of plant extract, 5-10 mL of distilled water was added and shaken in a graduated  
96 cylinder for 15 min. Formation of 1 cm layer of foam indicates the presence of Saponins.

#### 97 **Test for Terpenoids**

98 To 5mL of aqueous extract of each plant sample was mixed with 2mL of  $\text{CHCl}_3$  in a test tube  
99 and then 3mL of concentrated  $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4$  will carefully be added to the mixture to form a layer. An  
100 interface with a reddish brown coloration will indicate that terpenoids constituent is present.

#### 101 **Test for Flavonoids**

102 i) To 2 mL of plant extract 1 mL of 1N aqueous NaOH solution was added and observed for the  
103 formation of yellow-orange colouration.  
104 ii) 2 mL of plant extract was treated with 4 drops of concentrated sulphuric acid and observed for  
105 the formation of orange colour.

#### 106 **Test for Alkaloids**

107 To 2 mL of plant extract, 2 mL of concentrated hydrochloric acid was added. Then 3 drops of  
108 Mayer's reagent was added. Presence of green colour or white precipitate indicates the presence  
109 of alkaloids.

#### 110 **Test for glycosides**

111 To 2 mL of plant extract, 1 mL of glacial acetic acid and 5% ferric chloride was added. To these  
112 3 drops of concentrated sulphuric acid was added. Presence of greenish blue colour indicates the  
113 presence of glycosides.

#### 114 115 116 **Test for Steroids**

117 To 1 mL of plant extract, equal volume of chloroform and 3 drops of concentrated sulphuric acid  
118 was added. Formation of brown ring indicates the presence of steroids.

#### 119 **Test for phenols**

120 To 1 mL of the extract, 2 mL of distilled water followed by 5 drops of 10% ferric chloride was  
121 added. Formation of blue or green colour indicates presence of phenols.

#### 122 **Test for reducing Sugar**

123 To 2 mL of plant extract, 1 mL of Molisch reagent and 4 drops of concentrated sulphuric acid  
124 was added. Formation of purple or reddish ring indicates the presence of carbohydrates.

125

#### 126 **Antimicrobial Analysis**

127 Antimicrobial test; *E.Coli*, *Shigella dysentrae*, *Salmonella typhi* and *Staphylococcus aureus* were  
128 used in this study. The microorganisms were obtained at the microbiology laboratory of  
129 Modibbo Adama University of Technology, (MAUTECH) Yola.

#### 130 **Preparation of inoculants and inoculation( using Agar Well Diffusion method)**

131 The method described in the National committee for Clinical Laboratory Standard (1997) was  
132 used. This was determined by dispensing 10 mL of nutrient agar into a sterile Petri dish and  
133 shaken for evenly distribution and allowed to solidify.

134 Five wells, 4mm each in diameter were created using cork borer and a wire loop was used to  
135 pick the microorganism from the culture plate and smeared into the Petri dish containing the  
136 solidified nutrient agar and the well was filled with the drops of the extract and a standard drug  
137 (tetracycline capsule 100 µg/mL) to compare the activity of the extracts with various  
138 concentration of 100, 50, 25 and 12.5 mg/mL .

139 A candle light was used to sterilize the wire loop after picking the microorganisms from the plate  
140 to avoid contamination of the medium during the process of inoculation of the organisms. Then it  
141 was allowed to stand for 1hr diffusion at room temperature and was then incubated for 24-48 hrs  
142 at room temperature 37 °C. The zones of inhibitions developed were measured using a  
143 transparent ruler in (mm) and the zone of inhibition for each concentration were measured and  
144 recorded.

145 **Media preparation**

146 Thirty eight gram (38g) of Mueller Hinton agar was weighed using weighing balance and was  
147 dissolved in 1000 mL of distilled water in a conical flask by swirling. The flask was covered  
148 with cotton wool and the flask content was autoclaved at 121°C for 15 minutes in an autoclave. It  
149 was holed down to about 45°C after which it was dispensed into Petri dishes aseptically and was  
150 then allowed to gelled.

151 **Determination of the Minimum Inhibitory Concentration (MIC)**

152 The minimum inhibitory concentration of the extract was evaluated by the method described by  
153 Greenwood (1989).

154 The extract concentration were serially diluted with distilled water to various concentrations of  
155 100, 50, 25and 12.5mg/mL. The extract and the nutrient agar broth were mixed in the sterile test  
156 tube; the cultured medium was added to each test tube and incubated for 24hrs at 37°C .The  
157 lowest zones of inhibition for all the tested organisms showing no visible growth of bacterial was  
158 taken as the MIC.

159 **Minimum Bactericidal Concentration (MBC).**

160 The minimum bactericidal concentration (MBC) was determined after the minimum inhibitory  
161 concentration (MIC) was obtained. This was carriedout by selecting the test tube that shows no  
162 growth during the MIC determination. A loopful from the test tube containing the media and the  
163 extract were inoculated into a sterile nutrient broth media. This was further incubated for another  
164 24-48 hrs at 37°C for bacteria, after which was examined for bacteria for any microbial growth.  
165 The lowest concentration at which no growth was observed on the plate was taken as the MBC.

166

167

168

169

170 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

171 **Table 1:** Percentage yield of the root and stem extracts

| Extract | Initial weight | YIELD(g) | %     |
|---------|----------------|----------|-------|
| ERE     | 150.00g        | 11.00g   | 7.33  |
| ESBE    | 150.00g        | 16.00g   | 10.67 |
| ARE     | 200.00g        | 12.23g   | 6.12  |
| ASBE    | 200.00g        | 11.16g   | 5.58  |

172 Key:

173 ERBE-----Ethanol Root Extract

174 ESBE-----Ethanol Stem Bark Extract

175 ARBE-----Aqueous Root Extract

176 ASBE-----Aqueous Stem Bark Extract

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188 **Table 2: Qualitative Phytochemical analysis of the root and stem bark extract of**

189 ***Ficus sycomorus***



|                       |    |   |   |   |    |
|-----------------------|----|---|---|---|----|
| <i>Salmonella spp</i> | 12 | 7 | 5 | R | 13 |
| <i>Shigella spp</i>   | 10 | 9 | 7 | 4 | 13 |

214

Key:

215

**Resistant---- R**

216

**Aqueous Root bark Extract----- ARBE**

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

**Table 4: Zone of inhibition in (mm) of Aqueous stem bark extract (ASBE) against**

239

**Opportunistic Pathogen**

| <b>Name of Organism</b> | <b>Concentration mg/mL</b> |    |    |      |                       |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|----|----|------|-----------------------|
|                         | 100                        | 50 | 25 | 12.5 | Tetracycline(Control) |

|                         |   |   |    |   |    |
|-------------------------|---|---|----|---|----|
| <i>S. aureus</i>        | 9 | 6 | 4  | 3 | 7  |
| <i>Escherichia coli</i> | R | R | 10 | 4 | 11 |
| <i>Salmonella spp</i>   | 7 | 5 | 4  | 3 | 8  |
| <i>Shigella spp</i>     | 9 | 6 | 5  | 4 | 10 |

240

241 **Key: Resistant----- R                      Aqueous stem bark extract ----ASBE**

242 **Table 5: Zone of Inhibition in (mm) of Ethanol stem bark extract (ESBE) against**  
 243 **Opportunistic Pathogens**

244

| Name of Organism        | Concentration mg/mL |    |    |      |                       |
|-------------------------|---------------------|----|----|------|-----------------------|
|                         | 100                 | 50 | 25 | 12.5 | Tetracycline(Control) |
| <i>S. aureus</i>        | 6                   | 5  | 4  | 2    | 10                    |
| <i>Escherichia coli</i> | 15                  | 9  | 3  | 2    | 12                    |
| <i>Salmonella spp</i>   | 10                  | 6  | 5  | 3    | 11                    |
| <i>Shigella spp</i>     | 5                   | 4  | 10 | 5    | 16                    |

245

246 **Key: Ethanol stems bark extract----- ESBE**

247

248

249

250

251

252 **Table 6: Zone of Inhibition (mm) of Ethanol root bark Extract (ERBE) against**  
 253 **Opportunistic Pathogens.**

254

255

**Key: Ethanolic root bark extract----- ERBE**

| S/No. | Name of Organism        | Concentration mg/mL |    |    |      | Tetracycline(Control) |
|-------|-------------------------|---------------------|----|----|------|-----------------------|
|       |                         | 100                 | 50 | 25 | 12.5 |                       |
|       | <i>S. aureus</i>        | 6                   | 5  | 4  | 2    | 10                    |
|       | <i>Escherichia coli</i> | 15                  | 9  | 3  | 2    | 12                    |
|       | <i>Salmonella spp</i>   | 10                  | 5  | 6  | 3    | 11                    |
|       | <i>Shigella spp</i>     | 10                  | 5  | 5  | 4    | 16                    |

256

257 **Table 7:** The Result of Minimum Inhibitory Concentration (MIC) of both aqueous and ethanol  
 258 extracts of root and stem bark of *Ficus sycomorus*

259

260

261

| Microorganism                | MIC (mg/mL) |    |    |      |
|------------------------------|-------------|----|----|------|
|                              | 100         | 50 | 25 | 12.5 |
| <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> | -           | -  | +  | +    |
| <i>Escherichia coli</i>      | -           | -  | +  | +    |
| <i>Salmonella spp</i>        | -           | -  | +  | +    |
| <i>Shigella spp</i>          | -           | -  | +  | +    |

262

263

264

265

266 **Table 8:** The Result of Minimum Bactricidal Concentration (MBC) of both aqueous and ethanol  
 267 extracts of root and stem bark of *Ficus sycomorus*

268

269

270

| Microorganism                | MBC (mg/mL) |    |    |      |
|------------------------------|-------------|----|----|------|
|                              | 100         | 50 | 25 | 12.5 |
| <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> | -           | +  | +  | +    |
| <i>Escherichia coli</i>      | -           | +  | +  | +    |
| <i>Salmonella spp</i>        | -           | +  | +  | +    |
| <i>Shigella spp</i>          | -           | +  | +  | +    |

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

+ = Growth ; - = No growth

## DISCUSSIONS

285 Tables 3 – 6 above, is the result of the zones of inhibition of the different extracts (ARBE,  
286 ASBE, ESBE and ERBE) against the tested pathogens, it showed that the extracts have dose  
287 dependent antimicrobial activities against the pathogens at various concentrations used in this  
288 study. It was noticed that the extract was more effective at concentration of 100 mg/mL, but the  
289 effectiveness increases as the concentration increases. The highest activity was shown by the  
290 ESBE and ERBE at 100 mg/mL (15mm) against *E. Coli*. Although most of the extracts at the  
291 various concentrations used showed activity against the pathogens, it was observed on the  
292 general that the extracts are more effective at 100 mg/mL on *E.Coli*, which showed similar  
293 activity with the standard drug (Tetracycline at 100µg/mL) used. At lower concentrations, the  
294 extracts seem to show more activity against shigella dysentriae as seen in tables 3 - 6.

295 From table 3, it is revealed that the zones of inhibitions of the extract (ARBE) against the tested  
296 pathogens showed that the extract has antimicrobial activities against the pathogens at various  
297 concentrations respectively. It was noticed that the extract was very effective at a concentration  
298 of 100 mg/mL, the effectiveness increases as the concentration increases. The control was more  
299 effective on *E.coli* with (20 mm). Table 4 shows the zones of inhibitions of the aqueous stem  
300 bark extract (ASBE) on the microorganisms. The result shows that the extract was effective at  
301 different concentrations with various zones of inhibitions as the concentration increases.  
302 However, *E.coli* was resistant against the extract at higher concentration of 100 mg/mL and 50  
303 mg/mL but effective at lower concentration 25 mg/mL and also the control which has the  
304 highest zone of inhibition (11mm) on *E.coli*. From table 5, the ethanol stem bark extract (ESBE)  
305 also showed considerable antimicrobial activities on the tested clinical isolates at various  
306 concentrations used. The result shows that at a higher concentration the extract was active  
307 against the clinical isolates or pathogens but more effective on *Shigella* at lower concentration  
308 (25 mg/mL) with zone of inhibition 10 mm, also the control was more effective with the highest  
309 zone of inhibition 16 mm. This extract show more activity against *E.coli* than the control drug at  
310 100 mg/mL with 15 mm zone of inhibition. From table 6 the results of ethanol root extract  
311 (ERBE) against the pathogens also shows that the antimicrobial potential of the extract increases  
312 considerably as the concentration increases.

313 The result of the antimicrobial activity of root and stem bark extracts in this study is similar to  
314 that of , Abdullahi, 2014, Adeshina et al., (2010) and Bello et al., (2013) who asserted that many

315 plants have been reported for therapeutic purposes because of the chemical compounds  
316 synthesized in these plants. Hence, the observed antimicrobial activity of the root and stem bark  
317 extracts against the test organisms in this study may be due to the presence of phytochemical  
318 components. The findings demonstrated that the stem and root bark extract were sensitive to all  
319 the tested organisms and thus showed that the extract contained potential antimicrobial agents  
320 such as tannin, saponin, alkaloid, glycosides as secondary metabolite responsible for curing  
321 various sicknesses .The presence of tannin in all the extract could be probably responsible for  
322 the observed antimicrobial activity. The claim of literature that *F. sycomorus* has antimicrobial  
323 activity is hereby verified. The anti-microbial activity of the extracts, both the ethanol and  
324 aqueous of root and stem have shown a reasonable zone of inhibition to the concentration from  
325 12.5 – 100 mg/mL and the control drug (Tetracycline) at 100 µg/mL concentration. However,  
326 the ASBE extracts of *F. sycomorus* was observed to be less potent against the tested clinical  
327 isolate respectively.

328  
329 Tables 7 and 8, shows the Minimum Inhibitory Concentration (MIC) and Minimum Bactericidal  
330 Concentration (MBC) of the extracts. The result has shown that the MIC for all extracts of root  
331 and stem bark was 50 mg/mL. At this concentration, the extract was able to inhibit the growth of  
332 microorganisms. The result also revealed that the MBC was at 100 mg/mL these means that at  
333 this concentration the extract was able to kill the bacteria completely. This result is similar to the  
334 work of (Abdullahi, 2014) who reported that the Minimum Inhibitory Concentration (MIC) and  
335 Minimum Bactericidal Concentration (MBC) of the aqueous and ethanolic root and stem bark  
336 extracts of *Ficus sycomorus* extracts ranged from 3.125 mg/mL to 100 mg/mL. This result  
337 therefore suggests that the extracts are more of bacteriostatic.

338

339

340

341

342

## Conclusions

343 Phytochemicals such as tannins, saponin, terpenoids, flavonoids, alkaloids, glycosides, steroids,  
344 phenols and reducing sugars were all found to be present in both the aqueous extracts of roots  
345 and stem bark of *Ficus sycomorus*.

346 From the studies of the antimicrobial activities, the research revealed that, for aqueous stem and  
347 root bark, ARBE had more antimicrobial potentials against the selected pathogens than the  
348 ASBE, but for ethanol stem and root bark both have almost the same inhibitory activities on the  
349 tested pathogens.

350 From the research, it was noticed that both the root and stem bark have antimicrobial inhibitory  
351 potentials on the tested pathogens. This validates the claim of the traditional users who used it to  
352 treat diseases of microbial origin. Therefore, it can be used for therapeutic purposes.

353

354

355

356

#### REFERENCES

357

358

359 Abdullahi M. (2014). Susceptibility Profiles of Some Bacteria Isolated From Stool of Diarrhoeal  
360 Patients to the Stem and Root Barks Extracts of *Ficus Sycomorus* Linn ( Moraceae).  
361 M.Sc. Thesis Submitted to the School of Postgraduate Studies, Ahmadu Bello  
362 University, Zaria.

363

364 Adeshina, G.O., Okeke C. L. E., Osuagwu N.O. and Ehinmidu, J.O. (2010). Preliminary in-vitro  
365 antibacterial activities of ethanolic extracts of *Ficus sycomorus* Linn and *Ficus*  
366 *platyphylla* (Moraceae) *African Journal of Microbiology Research* Vol. 4(8) pp 598-601.

367

368 Fatope, M.O., Ibrahim H. and Takada Y. (1993). Screening for higher plants reported as pesticides  
369 using the brine shrimp lethally Assay. *International Journal of Pharmacology*

370

11(6): 250-254.

371

*Gachathi, F. N. Kikuyu*(1989). *botanical dictionary of plant names and uses*.

372

373 Gelfand M, Mavi S, Drummond RB, Ndemera B. (1985). *The traditional medicinal practitioner*  
374 *in Zimbabwe*, Mambo Press. 411

- 375 Hedberg, I. & Staugard, F(1989). *Traditional medicine in Botswana, Traditional medicinal*  
 376 *plants*. The Nordic School of Public Health. Stockholm, Ipelegeng Publishers.
- 377 Heine, B. & Brenzinger, J (1988) . *Plant concepts and plant use. An ethnobotanical survey of the*  
 378 *semi-arid and arid lands of East Africa*. Part 4: Plant of Boran (Ethiopia and Kenya). B  
 379 and G. Saarbrucken, Verlag Breitenbach Publishers,  
 380
- 381 Heine, B. & Heine, I (1989). *Plant concepts and plant use. An ethnobotanical survey of the semi-*  
 382 *arid and arid lands of East Africa*. Part 1: Plants of the Camus (Kenya), B and G.  
 383 Saarbrucken, Verlag Breitenbach Publishers, Pp.104.
- 384 Hartmann T, Ober D. F.(2006). Tissues distribution and biosynthesis of 1,2-saturated  
 385 pyrrolizidine alkaloids in phalaenopsis hybrids.
- 386  
 387 Hassan, S.W., Lawal M., Muhammad, B.Y., Umar, R.A., (2007). Antifungal activity and  
 388 phytochemical analysis of Column Chromatographic fractions of stem bark extracts of  
 389 *Ficus syncomorus* L (Muraceae). *Journal of Plant Sciences*. 2(2): 209-215.  
 390
- 391  
 392 Lai P.K. and Roy J., (2004). Antimicrobial and chemopreventive properties of herbs and  
 393 spices. *Current Medicinal Chemistry*, 11(11): 1451-1460
- 394 Landal DL, Galbreath kc, Heidtmk, Brown TD(2010).( Environmental chemistry and  
 395 toxicology of mercury.4607-4612
- 396 Maydell H.J (1998). Trees and shrubs of Sahel, their characteristics and uses. Gesdtschaft, fur,  
 397 Germany 105-110.
- 398 Malgras, D (2008). Prelude medicinal plants database, metafro, Avalaible  
 399 in: [www.metafro.be/prelude/view\\_symptom](http://www.metafro.be/prelude/view_symptom)
- 400 National Committee for Clinical Standards. Reference method for both dilution antifungal  
 401 susceptibility testing of yeast Approved Standard M27-APA: National Committee for  
 402 Clinical Laboratory Standards Wayne 1997.
- 403 Onyeyili, P. A.; Akiniyi, I. A. & Yakubu, T. U. (1998). Sedative, Anticonvulsant and muscle  
 404 relaxant effect of *Ficus plantyphilla* stem bark extract in rats. *West African Journal of*  
 405 *Biological Science*.

- 406 Orwa C, A Mutua, Kindt R, Jamnadass R, S Anthony. 2009 Agroforestry Database: a tree  
 407 reference and selection guide Version 4.0  
 408 <http://www.worldagroforestry.org/sites/treedbs/treedatabases.asp>).  
 409
- 410 Osadebe PO, Ukwueze SE (2004). A comparative study of the phytochemical and potentials of  
 411 five Eastern Nigeria mistletoes. *Journal of Ethnopharmacology*, 126(2): 287–293.  
 412
- 413 Oyeleke, S. B., Dauda, B. E. N., Boye, O. A. (2008): Antibacterial activity of *Ficus capensis*.  
 414 *Afr. J. Biotechnol.* 7: 1414 - 1417.
- 415 Pakia, M. & Cooke, J. A. (2003) The ethnobotany of Midzichenda tribes of the coastal forest  
 416 areas in Kenya: 2. Medicinal plant uses. *South African Journal*  
 417 *Of Botany*, 69-95.
- 418 Rhen T, Cidlowski. (2005). Anti-inflammatory action of glucocorticoid. *Engl Journal of*  
 419 *medicine*.
- 420 Russel, A.D. (1998). Types of Antibiotics and synthetic and Antimicrobial agent. In Hugo, W.B  
 421 and Russel, A.D. *Pharmaceutical Microbiology* 6<sup>th</sup> edition. Blackwell Scientific  
 422 publications, pp 91-95.
- 423 Springbob, Karen & Kutchan, Toni M. (2009). "Introduction to the different classes of natural  
 424 products". In Lanzotti, Virginia. *Plant-Derived Natural from Products: Synthesis,*  
 425 *Function, and Application*, 69–75.
- 426 Samuelsson, G. M.; Faraha, H.; Claeson, P.; Hages, M.; Thulin, M.; Hedberg, Orwa *et al.*, (1992)  
 427 Inventory of plants used in traditional medicine in Somalia III. Plants of the Families  
 428 Lauraceae-papilionaceae. *J. Ethnopharmacol* 93-112.
- 429 Sandabe, U. K. (2002). *Phytochemical and toxicological studies of Aqueous extract of Ficus*  
 430 *sycomorus in laboratory Animals*. PhD thesis, University of Maiduguri, Maiduguri.
- 431 Sandabe, U. K.; Onyeyili, P. A. & Chibuzo, G. A. (2006). Phytochemical screening and effect of  
 432 aqueous extract of *Ficus sycomorus* L (moraceae) stem bark on muscular Activity in  
 433 laboratory animals. *J. Ethnopharmacol*,
- 434
- 435 Sofowara A., (1993). Medicinal plants and traditional medicines in Africa, *John Wiley and*  
 436 *Sons*, New York, pp 256-259.  
 437

- 438 Solomon-Wisdom G. O., Shittu G. A., Agboola Y. A. (2011): Antimicrobial And Phytochemical Screening  
439 Activities Of *Ficus Sur* (Forssk). New York Science Journal 4(1):15-18.
- 440 Swain, Tony, ed. (1968). Plants in the Development of Modern Medicine. Harvard University  
441 Press.
- 442 Stary F. (1998): Medicinal Herbs and Plants. PP.6-20. Tiger Books International Plc. U.K.
- 443
- 444 Sparg S.G, Light ME, Staden J. (2004).Biological activities and distribution of plant and  
445 saponins.*Journal of Ethnopharmacology*.
- 446 Trease G. E., Evans W. C. (1989).Textbook of Pharmacognosy. 13<sup>th</sup> Edition. W.B. Sanders  
447 Company Ltd, London . 542-545
- 448 Trease Evans , Williams Charles Evans. (2002).Pharmacognosy,*Journal of ethnopharmacology*  
449
- 450 Tapsell LC, Hemphill I, Cobiac L, et al. (August 2006). "Health benefits of herbs And spices: the  
451 past, the resent, the future". *Med. J. Aust.* **18** (4 Suppl): 4–24.
- 452 Udobi C. E., Onaolapo J.A., Agunu A. (2008): Antibacterial activities and bioactive components of the aqueous  
453 fraction of the stem bark of *Parkia biglobosa* (JACQ) (Mimosaceae). Nigerian J. Pharm. Sci. 7(1): 49-55.
- 454
- 455 Watcho P, Ngadjui E, Alango NP, Benoit NT, Kamanyi A. ( 2009).Repr Effects of Ficus  
456 asperifolia (Moraceae) in female rats. *African Health education of Science*.  
457 oductive  
458  
459