

1 **PRELIMINARY PHYTOCHEMICAL ANALYSIS AND *IN VITRO* ANTIMICROBIAL**
2 **STUDY OF THE ROOT AND STEM BARK EXTRACTS OF *FICUS SYCOMORUS***
3 ***LINN.***

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, antimicrobial** activity.

27
28
29 **INTRODUCTION**

30
31 Nature has been a source of medicinal agents for thousands of years and an impressive
32 number of modern drugs have been isolated from natural sources [1]. At least 12000 of such

33 compounds have been isolated so far, a number estimated to be less than 10% of the total[2,3].
34 Chemical compounds in plants mediates their effects on human body through processes identical
35 to those we already understood for their chemical compound in conventional drugs in terms of
36 how they work. This enables herbal medicines to have beneficial pharmacology, but also gives
37 them the same potential as pharmaceutical drugs to cause side effects [2, 3].

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

42 In Nigeria like many African countries, several plants are still being used for the treatment
43 of various ailments. Nigeria is naturally blessed with both savannah and tropical rainforests
44 vegetation and these offer a wide distribution of plants believed to possesses secondary
45 metabolites which are responsible for treating or curing various diseases [4]. Quite a number of
46 plants are used as medicines virtually in all cultures of the world. A good number of these
47 medicinal plants are in common use in African traditional medicine. Most of the plants grow
48 near houses and are easily overlooked, especially by urban dwellers [5].

49 This research work was carried out to study the phytochemical screening and *in vitro* anti-
50 microbial activities of root and stem bark extract of *Ficus sycomorus* on some selected micro
51 organisms. *Ficus sycomorus* is a common savannah tree that grows or can be found almost
52 everywhere. It is called in English Language as “Wild fig” “sycamore fig”, or common cluster
53 fig. Spanish call it “sicomoro”. The Sukur people call it “Dashakwai”, Tiv people called it
54 “Tur”, in Hausa it is known as “Baure”, Kilba and Marghi people called it “Kamda” , in Fali
55 Language is called “Boduven” and Gude call it “Bodeva” (personal contact, 15th, January 2016).
56 It grows in high water table areas, it can be found along water courses such as streams, rocky
57 places, swamps and water holes [6]. The sycamore fig is sensitive to frost but can withstand
58 some cold. The relevance of this plant in traditional medicine is as a result of the secondary
59 metabolites such as glycosides, reducing sugar, phenols, saponins, steroids, tannins, alkaloids,
60 terpenoids and flavonoids which they have been screened to contain. Also referred to as
61 phytochemicals, they are reported to possess inhibitory activities against the growth and disease
62 inducing activities of some pathogenic microorganisms [7,8,9,10,11].

63 The root and stem-bark of *Ficus sycomorus* are said to be used as herb in Northern
64 Nigeria for treatment of diseases like diarrhea, dysentery, cough, sore throat, chest diseases, and
65 infertility and as antidote for snake. Therefore, this study was conducted to carry out the
66 phytochemical screening and to evaluate antimicrobial activity of root and stem-bark of *Ficus*
67 *sycomorus* in order to validate the claims of the traditional users of this plant.

68 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

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

70 Plant roots and stem-barks of the plant *Ficus Sycomorus* were collected from Sukur
71 Kingdom in Madagali Local Government Area, Adamawa State, Nigeria. It was identified and
72 authenticated by a Botanist from the Department of Biological Sciences, Adamawa State
73 University, Mubi. A voucher number AD170023 was assigned. Sampling was carried out in the
74 month of May from the tree.

75 **Sample preparation**

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

80 **Extraction**

81 **Aqueous Extract**

82 For the water extraction was done by cold maceration method according to the procedure
83 described by Fatope *et al* [12] and Nguta *et al* [13] with little modification. Two hundred grams
84 (200 g) of each of the stem and root barks powder was weighed and soaked in 1000 mL of
85 distilled water in a beaker for 48 h to obtain aqueous extracts. The aqueous extracts were filtered
86 using sterile filter paper (Whatman No.1) into a clean conical flask. The filtrate was concentrated
87 with a rotary evaporator. The extracts were then stored in a refrigerator.

88 Percentage yield was calculated as: weight of extract/ weight of dried powdered sample \times 100

89 **Preparation of ethanol extracts**

90 Maceration method of extraction as described by Fatope *et al* [12] and Nguta *et al* [13] was
91 adopted in this study. Two hundred grams (200g) each of the root and stem bark powdered
92 material was weighed and soaked in 1000 mL of 70% ethanol and left for 24 h .Thereafter, it was

93 decanted. The procedure was repeated with another 1000 mL to ensure complete extraction of
94 the active ingredient .The extract was filtered and evaporated to dryness wit rotary evaporator.
95 The dried extract was then weighed and stored in tightly closed bottle in a refrigerator until
96 required.

97 Percentage yield was calculated as: weight of extract/ weight of dried powdered sample \times 100

98 **Qualitative Phytochemical analysis.**

99 The qualitative phytochemical screening of the samples was carried out as described by Trease
100 and Evans [14], Nweze *et al* [15], Senthilkumar and Reetha [16] with slight modification. The
101 root or stem bark extracts was screened for carbohydrates, alkaloids, flavonoids, steroids,
102 phenols and tannins, saponin, glycosides, and proteins.

103 **Preparation of stock solution**

104 Two grams (2g) each of root or stem bark extracts were dissolved in 10 mL of water or ethanol
105 to make a concentration of 200 mg/mL

106 **Test for Tannins**

107 One milliliter (1 mL) of the extracts was taken in a test tube and 2 mL of 5 % ferric chloride was
108 added. Formation of blue –black, green or blue – green precipitate was taken as evidence for the
109 presence of tannins.

110 **Test for Saponins**

111 One milliliter (1 mL) of the extracts was shaken with 5 mL of distilled water in a test tube for 5
112 min. Frothing which persists on warming was taken as evidence for the presence of Saponins.

113 **Test for Terpenoids**

114 Five milliliters (5mL) of aqueous extract of each plant sample was mixed with 2mL of CHCl_3 in
115 a test tube and then 3mL of concentrated H_2SO_4 was carefully added to the mixture to form a
116 layer. An interface with a reddish brown coloration was considered as indication for the presence
117 of terpenoids.

118 **Test for Flavonoids**

119 A little amount of magnesium powder and a few drops of concentrated hydrochloric acid were
120 added to 3 mL of the extracts. A red or intense coloration indicated the presence of flavonoids.

121 **Test for Alkaloids**

122 To 2 mL of plant extracts, 2 mL of concentrated hydrochloric acid was added. The mixture was
123 filtered and then 3 drops of Mayer's reagent was added. Presence of green colour or white
124 precipitate indicated the presence of alkaloids.

125 **Test for glycosides**

126 Two milliliter (2 mL) of the extracts was hydrolyzed with HCl solution and neutralized with
127 NaOH solution. A few drops of Fehling's solution A and B were added. Presence of red
128 precipitate indicates the presence of glycosides.

129 **Test for Steroids (Salkowski's test)**

130 To 1 mL of plant extract, equal volume of chloroform and 3 drops of concentrated sulphuric acid
131 was carefully added to form a lower layer. Formation of brown ring indicates the presence of
132 steroids.

133 **Test for phenols**

134 Five drops of 10% ferric chloride was added to 1 mL of the extracts in a test tube. Formation of
135 green or dirty green precipitate indicated the presence of phenols.

136 **Test for reducing Sugar**

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

139 **Antimicrobial Analysis**

140 *Escherichia coli*, *Shigella dysenteriae*, *Salmonella typhi* and *Staphylococcus aureus* were used in
141 this study. The microorganisms were obtained at the Microbiology Laboratory of Modibbo
142 Adama University of Technology, (MAUTECH) Yola, Nigeria.

143 **Standardization of Isolates:**

144
145 Test organisms were sub-cultured onto fresh plates of MacConkey agar and incubated
146 aerobically at 37°C for 24 h. Colonies from these plates were suspended in Mueller- Hinton
147 broth to a turbidity matching 0.5 McFarland standard (108cfu/ml). Mueller-Hinton agar was then
148 used for antimicrobial assay. All the broth cultures were incubated at 37°C.

149 **Preparation of the Extract for Antimicrobial Study**

150
151 Two grams (2g) each of aqueous and ethanol root or stem bark extracts were separately
152 dissolved in 10 mL of dimethylsulfoxide (DMSO) to obtain a concentration of 200mg/mL.

153 This was the initial concentration of each of the extracts used.

154 155 **Antimicrobial Test:**

156
157 The method described by the National committee for Clinical Laboratory Standard [17] was
158 used.

159 Suspensions of the bacteria obtained contained approximately 1×10^8 cfu/mL. Each labeled
160 plate was uniformly seeded with a test organism by means of sterile swab stick rolled in the
161 culture medium. Five wells, 4mm each in diameter were created using cork borer. Aliquots were
162 dropped in each well to fullness at various concentrations of 100, 50, 25 and 12.5 mg/mL for
163 both the root and stem bark extracts on different plates. Each plate was kept in the refrigerator
164 for 1 hour to allow the extracts to diffuse into the culture medium while the immediate growth of
165 the organism was stopped from taking place. These plates were then incubated at 37°C for 24 h.
166 The zones of inhibition around the wells were measured in millimeter (mm). Control antibiotic
167 (tetracycline capsule 100 µg/mL) was placed in a well on each plate along with the test extracts
168 as control.

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

170 The minimum inhibitory concentration of the extract was evaluated by the method described by
171 Ibekwe *et al* [18].

172 The extract concentration were serially diluted with distilled water to various concentrations of
173 100, 50, 25and 12.5mg/mL. The extract and the nutrient agar broth were mixed in the sterile test
174 tube; the cultured medium was added to each test tube and incubated for 24hrs at 37°C .The
175 lowest zones of inhibition for all the tested organisms showing no visible growth of **bacteria** was
176 taken as the MIC.

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

178 The minimum bactericidal concentration (MBC) was determined after the minimum inhibitory
179 concentration (MIC) was obtained. This was **carried out** by selecting the test tube that shows no
180 growth during the MIC determination. A loopful from the test tube containing the media and the
181 extract were inoculated into a sterile nutrient broth media. This was further incubated for another
182 24-48 hrs at 37°C for bacteria, after which was examined for bacteria for any microbial growth.
183 The lowest concentration at which no growth was observed on the plate was taken as the MBC
184 [18].

185 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

186 This study was undertaken to investigate the antimicrobial activity and phytochemical
187 screening the aqueous and ethanolic root and stem bark extracts of *Ficus sycomorus* Linn. Due
188 to the side effects of the current drugs and the resistance that pathogenic microorganisms build
189 against antibiotics, much attention has led to the study of biologically active compounds isolated
190 from plant species used in herbal medicine [19]. Different scientific studies provided evidence
191 that medicinal plants might indeed be potential sources of new antibacterial agents even against
192 some antibiotic-resistant strains [20].

193 The yield of the plant extracts is presented in Table 2. It was observed that Ethanol stem bark
194 extract (ESBE) gave the highest yield 16.00g (8.0%) followed by Ethanol root bark extract (ERBE)
195 14.14 g (7.07 %) then Aqueous root bark extract (ARBE) 12.23 g (6.12%) and the lowest is Aqueous
196 stem bark extract (ASBE) 11.16 g (5.58 %). In general the solvent, ethanol gave higher yield
197 irrespective of the plant part than the aqueous solvent.

198 The result of this study shows the presence of phytochemicals considered as active
199 medicinal chemical constituents as shown in table 2. Phytochemicals such as tannins, saponin,
200 terpenoids, flavonoids, alkaloids, glycosides, steroids, phenols and reducing sugars were all
201 found to be present in both the ethanol extracts of roots and stem bark of *Ficus sycomorus*.
202 However, glycosides was the only constituent not detected in Aqueous extracts of the root and
203 stem bark. The result is contrary to the findings of [21] who reported the presence glycoside in
204 the methanolic stem bark extract of *Ficus sycomorus* obtained from Zaria city of Kaduna State,
205 Nigeria. This difference could be attributed to geographical location of the samples.

206 The various phytochemical compounds detected are known to have beneficial
207 importance in industrial and medicinal sciences. These secondary metabolites exert antimicrobial
208 activity through different mechanisms. Plant phenolic compounds especially flavonoids are
209 currently of growing interest owing to their supposed properties in promoting health (anti-
210 oxidants) [22]. Flavonoids have been demonstrated to have antiinflammatory, antiallergenic,
211 anti-viral, anti-aging, and anti-carcinogenic activity. The broad therapeutic effects of flavonoids
212 can be largely attributed to their antioxidant properties. In addition to an antioxidant effect,
213 flavonoid compounds may exert protection against heart disease through the inhibition of
214 cyclooxygenase and lipoxygenase activities in platelets and macrophages[23].Tannins are
215 reported to possess physiological astringent and haemostatic properties, which hasten wound
216 healing and ameliorate inflamed mucus membrane and also inhibit the growth of microorganisms
217 by precipitating microbial proteins and making nutritional proteins unavailable for them; they

218 form irreversible complexes with proline rich proteins, resulting in the inhibition of the cell
219 protein synthesis. They have important roles such as stable and potent antioxidants [23, 24].
220 They act as binders and for treatment of diarrhea and dysentery [25] Tannins also reported to
221 exhibit antiviral, antibacterial, anti-tumor activities. It was also reported that certain tannins are
222 able to inhibit HIV replication selectivity and is also used as diuretic [23]

223 The results of the zones of inhibition of the different extracts (ARBE, ASBE, ESBE
224 and ERBE) against the tested pathogens are exhibited in Tables 3 – 6. It showed that the extracts
225 have dose dependent antimicrobial activities against the pathogens at various concentrations used
226 in this study. It was noticed that the extract was more effective at concentration of 100 mg/mL,
227 but the effectiveness increases as the concentration increases. The highest activity was shown by
228 the ESBE and ERBE at 100 mg/mL (15mm) against *E. coli*. Although most of the extracts at the
229 various concentrations used showed activity against the pathogens, it was observed on the
230 general that the extracts are more effective at 100 mg/mL on *E. coli*, which showed similar
231 activity with the standard drug (Tetracycline at 100µg/mL) used. At lower concentrations, the
232 extracts seem to show more activity against *Shigella dysenteriae* as seen in tables 3 - 6.

233 From table 3, it is revealed that the zones of inhibitions of the extract (ARBE)
234 against the tested pathogens showed that the extract has antimicrobial activities against the
235 pathogens at various concentrations respectively. It was noticed that the extract was very
236 effective at a concentration of 100 mg/mL, the effectiveness increases as the concentration
237 increases. The control was more effective on *E. coli* with zone of inhibition up to 20 mm. Table
238 4 shows the zones of inhibitions of the aqueous stem bark extract (ASBE) on the
239 microorganisms. The result shows that the extract was effective at different concentrations with
240 various zones of inhibitions as the concentration increases. However, *E. coli* was resistant
241 against the extract at higher concentration of 100 mg/mL and 50 mg/mL but effective at lower
242 concentration 25 mg/mL and also the control which has the highest zone of inhibition (11mm) on
243 *E. coli*. From table 5, the ethanol stem bark extract (ESBE) also showed considerable
244 antimicrobial activities on the tested clinical isolates at various concentrations used. The result
245 shows that at a higher concentration the extract was active against the clinical isolates or
246 pathogens but more effective on *Shigella* at lower concentration (25 mg/mL) with zone of
247 inhibition 10 mm, also the control was more effective with the highest zone of inhibition 16 mm.
248 This extract show more activity against *E. coli* than the control drug at 100 mg/mL with 15 mm
249 zone of inhibition. From table 6 the results of ethanol root extract (ERBE) against the pathogens

250 also shows that the antimicrobial potential of the extract increases considerably as the
251 concentration increases.

252 The result of the antimicrobial activity of root and stem bark extracts in this study is
253 similar to that of [26,27,28] who asserted that many plants have been reported for therapeutic
254 purposes because of the chemical compounds synthesized in these plants. The antibacterial
255 activities of the ethanolic extracts of the leaves and stem bark of *F. sycomorus* have been previously
256 reported [27]. The present study suggests that *F. sycomorus* may serve as a potential source of
257 antibacterial and/or antimicrobial agents of plants origin. Hence, the observed antimicrobial
258 activity of the root and stem bark extracts against the test organisms in this study may be due to
259 the presence of phytochemical components. The findings demonstrated that the stem and root
260 bark extract were sensitive to all the tested organisms and thus showed that the extract contained
261 potential antimicrobial agents such as tannin, saponin, alkaloid, glycosides as secondary
262 metabolite responsible for curing various sicknesses. The presence of tannin in all the extract
263 could be probably responsible for the observed antimicrobial activity. The claim of literature
264 that *F. sycomorus* has antimicrobial activity is hereby verified. The anti-microbial activity of the
265 extracts, both the ethanol and aqueous of root and stem have shown a reasonable zone of
266 inhibition to the concentration from 12.5 – 100 mg/mL and the control drug (Tetracycline) at 100
267 µg/mL concentration. However, the ASBE extracts of *F. sycomorus* was observed to be less
268 potent against the tested clinical isolate respectively.

269
270 **The Minimum Inhibitory Concentration (MIC) and Minimum Bactericidal Concentration**
271 **(MBC) of the extracts are shown in Tables 7 and 8.** The result has shown that the MIC for all
272 extracts of root and stem bark was 50 mg/mL. At this concentration, the extract was able to
273 inhibit the growth of microorganisms. The result also revealed that the MBC was at 100 mg/mL
274 these means that at this concentration the extract was able to kill the bacteria completely. This
275 result is similar to the work of [26] who reported that the Minimum Inhibitory Concentration
276 (MIC) and Minimum Bactericidal Concentration (MBC) of the aqueous and ethanolic root and
277 stem bark extracts of *Ficus sycomorus* extracts ranged from 3.125 mg/mL to 100 mg/mL. [21].
278 also reported that the minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) of methanol root bark extract of *F.*
279 *sycomorus* was observed within the range of 2.5– 5.0mg/ml against *E. faecalis*, *E. coli*, *S. typhi*,
280 *S. dysenteriae* and *C. albicans*. This result therefore suggests that the extracts are more of
281 bacteriostatic.

282

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

Extract	Initial weight	YIELD(g)	%
ERBE	200.00g	14.14g	7.07
ESBE	200.00g	16.00g	8.00
ARBE	200.00g	12.23g	6.12
ASBE	200.00g	11.16g	5.58

284 Key:

285 ERBE-----Ethanol Root Extract

286 ESBE-----Ethanol Stem Bark Extract

287 ARBE-----Aqueous Root Extract

288 ASBE-----Aqueous Stem Bark Extract

289

290 **Table 2: Qualitative Phytochemical analysis of the root and stem bark extract of**
291 *Ficus sycomorus*

292

TEST	Aqueous extract		Ethanol extract	
	Root	Stem bark	Root	Stem bark
295 Tannins	+	+	+	+
296 Saponin	+	+	+	+
297 Terpenoid	+	+	+	+
298 Flavonoids	+	+	+	+
299 Alkaloids	+	+	+	+
300 Glycosides	-	-	+	+
301 Steroids	+	+	+	+
302 Phenols	+	+	+	+
303 Reducing sugar	+	+	+	+

304

305 + = Present - = Absent

306

307 **Table 3: Zone of Inhibition in (mm) Aqueous Root bark Extract (ARBE) Against**
 308 **Opportunistic Pathogens.**
 309

S/No.	Name of Organism	Concentration mg/mL				
		100	50	25	12.5	Tetracycline(Control)
	<i>S. aureus</i>	7	6	5	2	13
	<i>Escherichia coli</i>	10	8	7	4	20
	<i>Salmonella spp</i>	12	7	5	R	13
	<i>Shigella spp</i>	10	9	7	4	13

310 Key:

311 **Resistant---- R**
 312 **Aqueous Root bark Extract----- ARBE**
 313

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

Name of Organism	Concentration mg/mL				
	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

316

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

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

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

320 **Key: Ethanol stems bark extract----- ESBE**
 321

322
323
324

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

S/No.	Name of Organism	Concentration mg/MI				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

325

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

326

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

327
328
329
330

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>	-	-	+	+

331

+ = Growth ; - = No growth

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368

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

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>	-	+	+	+

+ = Growth ; - = No growth

CONCLUSION

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

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

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

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors are grateful to Laboratory Technologists, in person of Mr. Umar, Mallam Sani, Esther Dauda, all from Microbiology Department, Modibbo Adama University of Technology Yola, for their contributions for the success of the research.

369 **REFERENCES**

- 370 1. Cragg, G.M, and Newman D.J., (2001). Natural product drug discovery in the next
371 millennium. *Pharmaceutical Biology*; Vol. 39, Supplement, pp. 8–17
372
- 373 2. Tapsell LC, Hemphill I, Cobiac L.,(2006). "Health benefits of herbs And spices: the past, th
374 resent, the future". *Med. J. Aust.* **18** (4 *Suppl*): 4–24.
375
- 376 3. Lai P.K. and Roy J., (2004). Antimicrobial and chemopreventive properties of herbs and
377 spices. *Current Medicinal Chemistry*, 11(11): 1451-1460
- 378 4. Rabiou, M.K., Safiyya, A., Sani, A. K., and Gambo, C., (2018). Phytochemical Compositions
379 In Some Nigerian Medicinal Plants and Their Pharmacological Properties: A Review;
380 *Journal of Anesthesiology*; 6(1): 15-25.
381
- 382 5. Sofowora, A. (2008). *Medicinal Plants and Traditional Medicine in Africa*, 3rd Edition,
383 Spectrum Books Ltd., Ibadan, Nigeria, page: 23-25
384
- 385 6. Orwa C, Mutua A, Kindt R, Jamnadass R, Simons A (2009). *Agroforestry Database:a tree*
386 *reference and selection guide version 4.0* [Online] Availableat: [http:// www World](http://www.worldagroforestry.org/treedb2/speciesprofile.php?Spid=620#)
387 [agroforestry.org/treedb2/speciesprofile.php? Spid=620#](http://www.worldagroforestry.org/treedb2/speciesprofile.php?Spid=620#) [Accessed 19 August, 2017].
388
- 389 7. Hassan, S.W., Lawal M., Muhammad, B.Y., Umar, R.A., (2007). Antifungal activity and
390 phytochemical analysis of Column Chromatographic fractions of stem bark extracts of
391 *Ficus sycomorus* L (Muraceae). *Journal of Plant Sciences*. 2(2): 209-215.
392
- 393 8. Oyeleke, S. B., Dauda, B. E. N., Boye, O. A. (2008): Antibacterial activity of *Ficus capensis*.
394 *Afr. J. Biotechnol.* 7: 1414 - 1417.
395
- 396 9. Sandabe, U. K.; Onyeyili, P. A. & Chibuzo, G. A.(2006). Phytochemical screening and effect
397 of aqueous extractof *Ficus sycomorus* L (moraceae) stem bark on muscularActivity in
398 laboratory animals. *Journal of Ethnopharmacology*, **104**: 203 - 285
399
- 400 10. Solomon-Wisdom G. O., Shittu G. A., Agboola Y. A. (2011): Antimicrobial And
401 Phytochemical Screening Activities Of *Ficus Sur* (Forssk). *New York Science Journal*
402 4(1):15-18.
403
- 404 11. Udobi C. E., Onaolapo J.A., Agunu A. (2008): Antibacterial activities and bioactive
405 Components of the aqueous fraction of the stem bark of *Parkia biglobosa* (JACQ)
406 (Mimosaceae). *Nigerian Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences*; **7**(1): 49-55.
407
- 408 12. Fatope, M.O., Ibrahim H. and Takada Y. (1993).Screening for higher plants reported as
409 Pesticides using the brine shrimp lethally Assay. *International Journal of Pharmacology*
410 11(6): 250-254.
- 411 13. Nguta, J.M., Mbaria, J.M., Gakuya, D.W., Gathumbi, P.K., Kabasa, J.D., Kiama, S.G.
412 (2011).Biological Screening of Kenya Medicial Plants using *Artemia salina* L. (Artemiidae),
413 *Pharmacology online*, 2, 458-478
414
- 415 14. Trease, G.E. and Evans, W.C. (2002). *Pharmacognosy*. 15th Ed. Saunders Publishers,

- 416 London. pp. 42-44, 221-229, 246-249, 304-306, 331-332, 391-393.
417
- 418 15. Nweze E.T., Okafor J.I. and Njoku O., (2004). Antimicrobial activities of methanolic extract
419 of *Trumeguineesis* (Schumm and Thorn) and *Morinda lucinda* Benth used in Nigerian
420 herb medicinal practice. *Journal of Biological Research and Biotechnology*, 2(1): 34-46.
421
- 422 16. Senthilkumar P.K. and Reetha D., (2009). Screening of antimicrobial properties of certain
423 Indian medicinal plants. *J. Phytol.*, 1(3): 193-198.
424
- 425 17. National Committee for Clinical Standards. Reference method for both dilution antifungal
426 susceptibility testing of yeast Approved Standard M27-APA: National Committee for
427 Clinical Laboratory Standards Wayne, 2000.
428
- 429 18. Ibekwe, V. I., Nnanyere, N. F. and Akujobi, C. O. (2001). Studies of Antibacterial Activity
430 and Phytochemical Qualities of Extracts of Orange Peels. *International Journal of*
431 *Environment and Human Health*, 2(1):41-46.
432
- 433 19. Essawi, T., Srour, M. (2000). Screening of some Palestinian medicinal plants for antibacterial
434 activity, *Journal of Ethnopharmacology*, 70, 343-349
435
- 436 20. Kone, W. M., K. K. Atindehou, C. Terreaux, K. Hostettmann, D. Traore, and M. Dosso.
437 (2004). Traditional medicine in North Cote-d'Ivoire: screening of 50 medicinal plants for
438 antibacterial activity. *Journal of Ethnopharmacology*, 93, 43-49.
- 439 21. Abubakar, U. S., Danmalam, U. H., Musa, K. Y., Banni, Z., Yahaya, I., Abba, A. and Sani,
440 A., (2015). Phytochemical and antimicrobial screening of methanol root bark extract of *Ficus*
441 *sycomorus* linn. (moraceae). *Nigerian Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences*;
442 Vol. 14, No.2, pp1 -6
443
- 444 22. Rauha JP, Remes S, Herinonen W, Hopia M, Kgjala T, Pitinlaja K ,(2000). Antimicrobial
445 effects of finished plant extract containing flavanoids and other phenolic compounds. *Int. J*
446 *Food Microbiol* ; 56: 3-12
447
- 448 23. Fateh, A.L., Rahman F. Magbool, Elamin I. E., Shayoub, M. E., Salah, E. O. H., (2017).
449 Phytochemical and Antimicrobial Screening of Stem Bark and Leaves Extracts from *Ficus*
450 *sycomorus*. *World Journal of Pharmaceutical and Medical Research*; 3(11), 234-239
451
- 452 24. Ogunleye, D.S., Ibitoye, S.F., (2003). Studies of antimicrobial activity and chemical
453 constituents of *Ximenia Americana*. *Trop. J Pharm Res.*; 2: 239-241. 35.
454
- 455 25. Dharmananda S.(2003). Gallnuts and the uses of tannins in Chinese medicine. A paper
456 Delivered at the Institute for Traditional Medicine, Portland, Oregon, 2003.
457
- 458 26. Abdullahi M. (2014). Susceptibility Profiles of Some Bacteria Isolated From Stool of
459 Diarrhoeal Patients to the Stem and Root Barks Extracts of *Ficus Sycomorus* Linn
460 (Moraceae). M.Sc. Thesis Submitted to the School of Postgraduate Studies
461 (unpublished), Ahmadu Bello, University, Zaria.
462
- 463 27. Adeshina, G.O., Okeke C. L. E., Osuagwu N.O. and Ehinmidu, J.O. (2010). Preliminary *in*

464 *vitro* antibacterial activities of ethanolic extracts of *Ficus sycomorus* Linn and *Ficus*
465 *platyphylla* (Moraceae). *African Journal of Microbiology Research*; 4(8) pp 598-601.
466
467 28. Bello, O.M., Ojediran, O.J., Dada, O.A., Olatunya, A.M. and Awakan, O.J., (2015): *In Vivo*
468 Toxicity Studies and Phytochemical Screening of Stem Bark of *Ficus sycomorus* Linn
469 (Moraceae). *Journal of Environmental Science, Toxicology and Food Technology* 9(3):72-
470 74.