

# Ispitivanje antimikrobne aktivnosti *Pelargonium radula* (Cav.) L'Hérit

---

Pepeljnjak, Stjepan; Kalodera, Zdenka; Zovko, Marijana

Source / Izvornik: **Acta Pharmaceutica, 2005, 55, 409 - 415**

Journal article, Published version

Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:163:578697>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#)/[Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2023-12-10**



Repository / Repozitorij:

[Repository of Faculty of Pharmacy and Biochemistry University of Zagreb](#)



## Investigation of antimicrobial activity of *Pelargonium radula* (Cav.) L'Hérit

STJEPAN PEPELJNJK<sup>1\*</sup>  
ZDENKA KALOĐERA<sup>2</sup>  
MARIJANA ZOVKO<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Microbiology  
Faculty of Pharmacy and Biochemistry  
University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia

<sup>2</sup> Department of Pharmacognosy  
Faculty of Pharmacy and Biochemistry  
University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia

Antimicrobial activities of two ethanolic extracts, made from fresh and dried leaves of *Pelargonium radula* (Cav.) L'Hérit, were tested against fourteen species of bacteria and fifteen species of fungi. The well-diffusion method indicated the strongest activity against *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. The broth dilution method revealed that the most sensitive microorganisms were *Bacillus pumilus*, *Bacillus subtilis*, *Escherichia coli* and *Serratia marcescens*. Extract prepared from fresh leaves showed significantly higher antimicrobial activity than the extract prepared from dried leaves.

Received May 20, 2005  
Accepted July 20, 2005

**Keywords:** *Pelargonium radula*, ethanolic extract, well-diffusion method, dilution method, antimicrobial activity

*Pelargonium radula* (Cav.) L'Hérit (*Geraniaceae*) is a decorative plant that originates from the Southeast of Africa. In literature, it is frequently found under different synonyms (*P. radens* H. E. Moore, *P. raduloides* Hoffmgg., *P. multifidum* Salisb., *P. revolutum* Jacq., *P. roseum* Wild., non Ait., Eckl. & Zeyh.). It is commercially cultivated for its essential oil. The main component of the essential oil is geraniol (up to 50%), while other important monoterpenes include citronellol, *i*-menthone, citronellyl formate, and geranyl formate, their oxides and esters (1).

Water and ethanolic extracts of the plant were found to have hypoglycaemic properties (2, 3). There are also indications that the plant extracts possess antimicrobial activity (4, 5). However, this activity has been investigated only on a small number of microorganisms. In the present study, we have further analyzed the antimicrobial activity of ethanolic extracts prepared from fresh as well as dried plants on 29 microorganisms.

---

\* Correspondence, e-mail: spep33@yahoo.com

## EXPERIMENTAL

### *Extracts preparation*

*Pelargonium radula* was cultivated in the Botanical Garden of the Faculty of Pharmacy and Biochemistry in Zagreb. The voucher sample of the plant is deposited in the Herbarium of the Department of Botany, University of Zagreb, Croatia. Plant extracts were obtained by two procedures. Extract I (E1) was obtained from fresh leaves by percolation with 45% ethanol, and Extract II (E2) by percolation of dried leaves with 90% ethanol. Plant material was macerated for 12 h prior to percolation. For preparation of both extracts, 35 g of plant material was taken and 35 g of extract was collected.

### *Thin-layer chromatographic analysis*

TLC analysis was carried out on Kieselgel 60 F<sub>254</sub> (precoated 0.2 mm thick plastic plates, Merck, Germany) using the mobile phase: ethyl acetate/formic acid/acetic acid/water (100:11:11:27, V/V). Visualisation of flavonoids and phenolic acids was achieved by spraying the sheet with 1% methanolic solution of diphenylboric acid aminoethyl ester, followed by 5% ethanolic solution of polyethylene glycol 4000. The chromatogram was evaluated under UV light at 365 nm (6). Apigenin, luteolin, quercitrin, isoquercitrin, rutin and hyperoside and chlorogenic acid (Roth, Germany) were used for reference purposes.

### *Determination of total phenolics in the extracts*

The amount of total phenolic compounds was determined spectrophotometrically according to Swain and Hills (7), and the amount of tannins was calculated according to the method of Schneider (8). Briefly, 2 mL of plant extract, previously diluted with methanol, was pipetted into a flask containing 10 mL of sodium acetate buffer and 8 mL of distilled water (Solution 1). To 10 mL of solution 1, 50 mg of casein was added, and the mixture was then vortexed for 45 minutes and filtrated (Solution 2). To 1 mL of each solution, 0.5 mL of Folin and Ciocalteu's phenol reagent was added, and the solutions were diluted to 10 mL with saturated sodium carbonate solution. Absorbance measurements were recorded at 725 nm and tannic acid was used in the construction of the standard curve. The amount of tannins was calculated as the difference in the amount of phenolic compounds before and after adsorption to casein. Estimation was carried out in triplicate.

### *Analysis of the flavonoid content in extracts*

Flavonoid content was determined spectrophotometrically, according to the method of Christ and Müller (9). In short, 10 mL of acetone, 2 mL of 25% hydrochloric acid and 1 mL of 0.5% solution of hexamethylenetetramine was added to 10 mL of the extracts. After heating at 56 °C for 30 minutes, samples were cooled and diluted to 100 mL. 20 mL of each extract was diluted with water, and extracted three times with ethyl acetate. Organic layers were combined, washed twice with water, dried over anhydrous sodium

sulfate, and diluted to 50 mL. To 10 mL of each extract, 2 mL of 2% aluminum chloride solution in 5% methanolic solution of acetic acid was added. The samples were diluted to 25 mL with 5% methanolic solution of acetic acid. Absorbances ( $A$ ) were read after 30 minutes at 425 nm. An extract solution prepared in the same manner but without addition of aluminum chloride solution served as a blank. Experiments were performed in triplicate.

Flavonoid content ( $x$ ) expressed as quercetin percent was calculated from the equation

$$x = \frac{A \cdot 0.772}{b}$$

where  $b$  is the mass of the extract, in grams.

### Microbial strains

Six Gram-positive (*Bacillus cereus* ATCC 11778, *Bacillus pumilus* NCTC 8241, *B. subtilis* NCTC 8236, *Sarcina lutea* ATCC 9341, *Staphylococcus aureus* ATCC 6538P, *Enterococcus faecalis* ATCC 29212) and eight Gram-negative (*Escherichia coli* 923 MFBF, *Klebsiella oxytoca* MFBF, *Salmonella* sp. 1993 MFBF, *Shigella sonnei* MFBF, *Serratia marcescens* MFBF, *Citrobacter freundii* 051 MFBF, *Proteus rettgeri* MFBF, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* ATCC 27895) bacterial strains were used in the study. Furthermore, activity against eight yeast strains (*Candida albicans* MFBF, *C. apicola* MFBF, *C. guilliermondii* MFBF, *C. krusei* MFBF, *C. parapsilosis* MFBF, *C. kefyr* MFBF, *C. tropicalis* MFBF, *Hansenula anomala* MFBF), five moulds (*Aspergillus flavus* 3769 MFBF, *A. niger* 259 MFBF, *A. ochraceus* MFBF, *Penicillium* sp. MFBF) as well as three dermatophytes (*Microsporum gypseum* 539 MFBF, *Trichophyton mentagrophytes* 981 MFBF, *Epidermophyton floccosum* 951 MFBF) was tested. All tested species denoted with MFBF were from the collection of the Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Pharmacy and Biochemistry, University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia.

### Diffusion method

Fresh cultures of bacterial strains were used for inoculum preparation. Before preparation, bacterial strains were cultured on Müller-Hinton agar (Merck, Germany) for 18 h at 37 °C with physiological saline. Density of inoculums used was  $10^6$  cells mL<sup>-1</sup> as compared to MacFarland's standard solution of BaSO<sub>4</sub> (0.1 mL of 1% BaCl<sub>2</sub> + 9.9 mL of 1% H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>). Yeasts were cultivated on Sabouraud 2%-dextrose agar (Biolife, Italy) with the addition of chloramphenicol (50 mg L<sup>-1</sup>) for 5 days at 25 °C for suppression of bacterial growth. One mL of inoculum was mixed with approximately 16 mL of melted agar, previously cooled down to 45 °C. Müller-Hinton or Sabouraud 2%-dextrose agar were used for bacterial or yeast strains, respectively. Inoculated agars were then cooled to room temperature. The wells (6 mm in diameter) were cut from the agar with stainless steel cylinders and 0.2 mL of extract solution (E1 or E2) or 70% ethanol was delivered into them. To ensure enough time for diffusion of samples into agar, plates were incubated at 4 °C for 1 h. They were then incubated at either 37 °C for bacteria or 25 °C for yeasts for appropriate time periods under aerobic conditions. The diameter of the inhibition zone around each hole was measured and recorded.

### Dilution method

For determination of minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) and minimum microbicidal concentration (MMC), the broth twofold macrodilution method in Müller-Hinton or Sabouraud broth (Merck, Germany) was applied. In short, test strains were grown in a nutrition medium containing progressively lower dilutions of the test extract and incubated at 37 °C for bacteria or 25 °C for yeasts. The last two tubes were free of test extract and served as growth control in broth and 70% ethanol. After incubation, approximately the 10 µL of content of each test-tube was transferred with a loop onto Müller Hinton or Sabouraud agar. Agar plates were incubated for an appropriate time under aerobic conditions at 37 °C or 25 °C for bacteria or yeasts, respectively. MIC was defined as the lowest concentration of extract that allows no more than 20% bacterial growth, and MMC as the lowest extract concentration from which the microorganisms did not recover and grow when transferred to fresh medium.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The presence of flavonoids quercitrin, isoquercitrin, rutin and hyperoside as well as chlorogenic acid in both extracts was confirmed by the TLC method. The results of spectrometric determination showed that ethanolic extract differed in the amount of phenolic compounds. Extract prepared from fresh leaves with 45% ethanol (E1) contained  $0.453 \pm 0.001\%$  (mean  $\pm$  SD,  $n = 3$ ) and the extract prepared from dried leaves (E2)  $0.228 \pm 0.011\%$  (mean  $\pm$  SD,  $n = 3$ ) of phenols. The amount of tannins in E1 was found to be  $0.206 \pm 0.005\%$  (mean  $\pm$  SD,  $n = 3$ ), while E2 contained  $0.080 \pm 0.015\%$  (mean  $\pm$  SD,  $n = 3$ ) of these compounds. The content of flavonoids was also different. E1 contained  $0.018 \pm 0.001\%$  (mean  $\pm$  SD,  $n = 3$ ), while E2 contained  $0.028 \pm 0.001\%$  (mean  $\pm$  SD,  $n = 3$ ) of flavonoids.

Ethanolic extracts of *Pelargonium radula* were screened for antimicrobial activity against 14 bacterial, 8 yeast, 5 mould and 3 dermatophyte strains by the agar diffusion method (Table I). 70% ethanol, which was used as the control, showed no zones of inhibition. Extract E1 was active against all the bacterial strains tested. Among the microorganisms tested, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* was the most susceptible to the extract, inhibition zone being 22 mm. E1 was active against all the bacterial strains included in testing. Inhibition zones ranged from 11–15 mm for a vast majority of bacteria. The activity against yeasts and moulds was of somewhat reduced spectrum. Only *Candida guilliermondii*, *C. parapsilosis* and *C. kefyr* were moderately sensitive to E1. On the other hand, E1 exerted activity against two of the three dermatophytes included in investigation. In contrast to E1, which exhibited activity of a relatively broad spectrum, extract E2 was inactive against the majority of the microorganisms tested. The bacterium most susceptible to extract E1 was *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. The inhibition zone around the well was 15 mm.

The results of the broth twofold macrodilution method for E1 are presented in Table II. The procedure was performed only on microorganisms that were found to be sensitive to the extracts in the diffusion method. All the tested bacteria were inhibited by extract concentrations ranging from 3.13 to 60%. Among the Gram-positive bacteria, the strongest effect of the extract (MIC 3.13%) was observed against *Bacillus pumilus* and *Bacillus subtilis*. As regards Gram-negative strains, E1 demonstrated the lowest MIC against *Escherichia coli*

Table I. Results of the well-diffusion method for E1 and E2

| Microorganism                               | Inhibition zone (mm) |    |
|---|----------------------|----|
|   | E1                   | E2 |
| <i>Bacillus cereus</i> ATCC 11778           | 14                   | 12 |
| <i>Bacillus pumilus</i> NCTC 8241           | 11                   | –  |
| <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> NCTC 8236          | 14                   | 11 |
| <i>Sarcina lutea</i> ATCC 9341              | 8                    | 8  |
| <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> ATCC 6538P     | 12                   | 12 |
| <i>Enterococcus faecalis</i> ATCC 29212     | 12                   | –  |
| <i>Escherichia coli</i> 923 MFBF            | 7                    | –  |
| <i>Klebsiella oxytoca</i> MFBF              | 12                   | –  |
| <i>Salmonella</i> sp. 1993 MFBF             | 14                   | –  |
| <i>Shigella sonnei</i> MFBF                 | 15                   | –  |
| <i>Serratia marcescens</i> MFBF             | 12                   | –  |
| <i>Citrobacter freundii</i> 051 MFBF        | 15                   | –  |
| <i>Proteus rettgeri</i> MFBF                | 14                   | –  |
| <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> ATCC 27895    | 22                   | 15 |
| <i>Candida albicans</i> MFBF                | –                    | –  |
| <i>Candida apicola</i> MFBF                 | –                    | –  |
| <i>Candida guilliermondii</i> MFBF          | 10                   | –  |
| <i>Candida krusei</i> MFBF                  | –                    | –  |
| <i>Candida parapsilosis</i> MFBF            | 8                    | –  |
| <i>Candida kefyr</i> MFBF                   | –                    | –  |
| <i>Candida tropicalis</i> MFBF              | 7                    | –  |
| <i>Hansenula anomala</i> MFBF               | –                    | –  |
| <i>Aspergillus flavus</i> 3769 MFBF         | –                    | –  |
| <i>Aspergillus niger</i> 259 MFBF           | –                    | –  |
| <i>Aspergillus ochraceus</i> MFBF           | –                    | –  |
| <i>Penicillium</i> sp. MFBF                 | –                    | 11 |
| <i>Microsporium gypseum</i> 539 MFBF        | 7                    | –  |
| <i>Trichophyton mentagrophytes</i> 981 MFBF | 6                    | –  |
| <i>Epidermophyton floccosum</i> 951 MFBF    | –                    | –  |

ATCC – American Type Culture Collection, Rockville, USA; NCTC – National Collection of Type Cultures, London, Great Britain; MFBF – collection of microorganisms of the Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Pharmacy and Biochemistry, University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia.

and *Serratia marcescens*, while the growth of *Klebsiella oxytoca*, *Salmonella* sp., *Shigella sonnei* and *Citrobacter freundii*, was inhibited by the 6.25% concentration. The only yeast tested by the dilution method, *Candida guilliermondii* was inhibited by E1 concentration of 6.25%, while *Microsporium gypseum* and *Trichophyton mentagrophytes* were inhibited by the concentration of 12.5%. The lowest MMC (6.25%) among all the microorganisms included in the dilution method was observed for *Bacillus pumilus*, *Bacillus subtilis*, *Escherichia coli* and *Serratia marcescens*. Table II shows the results of the dilution method for E2. In addition to its limited spectrum of activity, extract E2 demonstrated relatively high MICs for all the microorganisms included in the dilution method. The most sensitive one was *Staphylococcus aureus* (MIC 20%). For the other microorganisms tested MICs ranged from 25 to 50%.

Table II. Results of the dilution method for E1

| Microorganism                               | Concentration (%) |                  |
|---|-------------------|------------------|
|   | MIC <sup>a</sup>  | MMC <sup>b</sup> |
| <i>Bacillus cereus</i> ATCC 11778           | 25                | 50               |
| <i>Bacillus pumilus</i> NCTC 8241           | 3.13              | 6.25             |
| <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> NCTC 8236          | 3.13              | 6.25             |
| <i>Sarcina lutea</i> ATCC 9341              | 50                | 60               |
| <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> ATCC 6538P     | 20                | 25               |
| <i>Enterococcus faecalis</i> ATCC 29212     | 12.5              | 25               |
| <i>Escherichia coli</i> 923 MFBF            | 3.13              | 6.25             |
| <i>Klebsiella oxytoca</i> MFBF              | 6.25              | 12.5             |
| <i>Salmonella</i> sp. 1993 MFBF             | 6.25              | 12.5             |
| <i>Shigella sonnei</i> MFBF                 | 6.25              | 12.5             |
| <i>Serratia marcescens</i> MFBF             | 3.13              | 6.25             |
| <i>Citrobacter freundii</i> 051 MFBF        | 6.25              | 12.5             |
| <i>Proteus rettgeri</i> MFBF                | 10                | 12.5             |
| <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> ATCC 27895    | 25                | 50               |
| <i>Candida guilliermondii</i> MFBF          | 6.25              | 12.5             |
| <i>Microsporium gypseum</i> 539 MFBF        | 12.5              | 25               |
| <i>Trichophyton mentagrophytes</i> 981 MFBF | 12.5              | 25               |

<sup>a</sup> Minimum inhibitory concentration.

<sup>b</sup> Minimum microbicidal (bactericidal or fungicidal) concentration.

Table III. Results of the dilution method for E2

| Microorganism                            | Concentration (%) |                  |
|--|-------------------|------------------|
|  | MIC <sup>a</sup>  | MMC <sup>b</sup> |
| <i>Bacillus cereus</i> ATCC 11778        | 25                | 50               |
| <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> NCTC 8236       | 30                | 50               |
| <i>Sarcina lutea</i> ATCC 9341           | 50                | 60               |
| <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> ATCC 6538P  | 20                | 25               |
| <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> ATCC 27895 | 25                | 50               |
| <i>Penicillium</i> sp. MFBF              | 50                | 60               |

<sup>a</sup> Minimum inhibitory concentration

<sup>b</sup> Minimum microbicidal (bactericidal or fungicidal) concentration

## CONCLUSIONS

While the efficacy of the dried-leaves extract was found to be moderate, the fresh-leaves extract demonstrated significant antimicrobial activity. Comparison of the flavonoid content of the extracts shows that E2 is richer in these compounds than E1. Therefore, it

might be concluded that flavonoids are not the main active compounds of the extracts, but rather other phenolic compounds and/or essential oil. Results reported here contribute to the knowledge of the antimicrobial efficacy of *Pelargonium radula*.

#### REFERENCES

1. Z. Kalodera, N. Blažević and M. Volenec, Composition of the essential oil of *Pelargonium radula* (Cav.) L'Hérit: A study of its vegetative cycle, *Acta Pharm.* **51** (2001) 153–157.
2. M. Slijepčević, Z. Kalodera and M. Hadžija, Hypoglycaemic effect of *Pelargonium radula* (Cav.) L'Hérit, *Acta Pharm.* **47** (1997) 101–108.
3. Z. Kalodera, M. Hadžija, M. Slijepčević and P. Theiss, Stimulation of DNA synthesis in isolated Langerhans islets treated by *Pelargonium radula* (Cav.) L'Hérit. Extracts with hypoglycaemic efficacy, *Acta Pharm.* **49** (1999) 181–188.
4. H. Wollmann, G. Habicht, I. Lau and I. Schultz, Various properties of the volatile oils of *Pelargonium roseum* Willd. from indigenous cultivation, *Pharmazie* **28** (1973) 56–58.
5. M. Lis-Balchin, G. Buchbauer, K. Ribisch and M.-T. Wenger, Comparative antibacterial effects of novel *Pelargonium* essential oils and solvent extracts, *Lett. Appl. Microbiol.* **27** (1998) 135–141.
6. H. Wagner, S. Bladt and E. M. Zgainski, *Drogenanalyse*, Springer Verlag, Berlin 1983, pp. 163–165.
7. T. Swain and W. E. Hills, The phenolic constituents of *Prunus domestica* I. – The quantitative analysis of phenolic constituents, *J. Sci. Food Agric.* **10** (1959) 63–68.
8. G. Schneider, Zur Bestimmung der Gerbstoffe mit Casein, *Arch. Pharm.* **309** (1976) 38–44.
9. B. Christ and K. H. Müller, Zur serienmäßigen Bestimmung des Gehaltes an Flavonol-Derivaten in Drogen, *Arch. Pharm.* **293** (1960) 1033–1042.

#### S A Ž E T A K

### Ispitivanje antimikrobne aktivnosti *Pelargonium radula* (Cav.) L'Hérit

STJEPAN PEPELJNJAK, ZDENKA KALODERA i MARIJANA ZOVKO

Od svježih, odnosno suhих listova *Pelargonium radula* (Cav.) L'Hérit, pripravljena su dva etanolna ekstrakta. Antimikrobna aktivnost ekstrakata je ispitana na četrnaest bakterijskih vrsta i petnaest vrsta gljivica. Metodom difuzije najjače djelovanje pokazivao je ekstrakt na vrstu *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. Najosjetljiviji mikroorganizmi u metodi dilucije bili su *Bacillus pumilus*, *Bacillus subtilis*, *Escherichia coli* i *Serratia marcescens*. Ekstrakt pripremljen od svježih listova pokazao je znatno veću antimikrobnu aktivnost od ekstrakta priređenog od suhих listova.

*Ključne riječi:* *Pelargonium radula*, etanolni ekstrakt, metoda difuzije, metoda dilucije, antimikrobna aktivnost

*Farmaceutsko-biokemijski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Zagreb*