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ABSTRACT

The ethanol extracts of root, bark and leaf of Bridelia ferruginea was investigated for antibacterial activity against clinical isolate of Staphylococcus aureus and Escherichia coli. The extracts had significant antibacterial activity in vitro at concentration of 25 mg/ml, 50 mg/ml, 100 mg/ml and 200 mg/ml and in vivo at dose of 50 mg/kg and 100 mg/kg. The root extract in vitro had the highest zone of inhibition, followed by the bark extract for both Staphylococcus aureus and Escherichia coli. The concentration of 200 mg/ml had the highest zone of inhibition in vitro. The minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) showed a decreasing inhibitory effect of the plant extracts for both Staphylococcus aureus and Escherichia coli as the concentration decreases with root having 3.125 mg/ml, bark having 6.25 mg/ml and leaf having 25 mg/ml for Staphylococcus aureus and Escherichia coli. Likewise, the minimum bactericidal concentration (MBC) showed decreasing bactericidal effects with decrease concentration with root having 12.5 mg/ml, bark having 12.5 mg/ml and leaf having 25 mg/ml for Escherichia coli while root had 6.25 mg/ml, bark had 12.5 mg/ml and leaf had 25 mg/ml for Staphylococcus aureus. The in vivo investigation showed that the root and bark extract exhibited antibacterial activity on both Staphylococcus aureus and Escherichia coli at doses of 100mg/kg and 50mg/kg: the root extract had higher activity than the bark and root/bark combined. The dose of 100 mg/kg had the highest colonies reduction for Staphylococcus aureus and Escherichia coli in vivo. Preliminary phytochemical screening of root, bark and leaves of Bridelia ferruginea revealed the presence of tannins, flavonoids, carbohydrates, cardiac glycoside (root, bark and leaves), saponins (root and bark). The presence of tannins, saponins, flavonoid, cardiac glycoside and carbohydrate in the bark and root extracts of the plant indicates that the bark and root extracts were pharmacological important.
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INTRODUCTION

Bridelia ferruginea is a native medicinal plant in Nigeria, commonly found in the savannah region of the country. It is a shrub of 6-15 meter high which may sometime attain the size of a tree in favourable condition, it belongs to the family Euphorbiaceae and genus Bridelia. Bridelia ferruginea in Nigeria commonly called Kimi, Kizni in Hausa language; Mirehi in Fulani language; Iralodan in Yoruba language and Ola in Igbo language. Bridelia ferruginea root, bark and leaf are commonly sold in Nigeria markets and shop as traditional medicine for various purpose including treatment of infectious diseases. Bridelia ferruginea has been used traditionally for diverse purpose in Nigeria and other African countries. The roots bark and leaves are constituents of Yoruba (in Nigeria) in fusions, primarily given to children; the same use is made of the root decoction in Ivory Coast [1]. The plant bark and infusion (bright red) from it are frequently sold in Nigeria markets and shops for use as mouthwash and to redress thirst in children [2]. The bark decoction has been used for toothache in Congo and for dysentery, diarrhea or as a laxative in Ivory Coast [3]. The plant bark has also been used as antidote against poison and arrow poison [1]. According to Irobi, et al., 1994 the root decoction is used by local medicine men for the treatment of gonorrhea infection [4]. Cimanga, et al., 1999, reported that the leaves decoction has been used to treat diabetes, and as a purgative and a vermifuge [5]. Iwu,1984 also reported that a leaf extract in saline solution is reported is produce marked reduction of blood sugar in laboratory rats and clinical trials have given a drop from 250mg% to the normal less than 120mg% after eight weeks of daily treatment [6]. The roots have been reportedly used as chewing stick and root bark used for treatment of intestinal and bladder disorders and as remedy for skin disease [7]. The bark preparation has been shown to be useful for immunity against arrow poison and syphilis [2], likewise the bark extract was reported to be beneficiary for milk coagulation as well as lime juice for the formulation of traditional gargle “Ogunefu” [8].

Some reported activity of the plant extract included antimicrobial[9]; trypanocidal potential of methanolic extract[10]; Molluscidal activity[11]; Anti-inflammatory activity[12]; Antimicrobial properties of stem bark
against facultative gram negative organisms[13]. Positive effect on gram positive bacteria (Sarcina lutea and staphylococcus aureus)[14], Bark extract of Bridelia ferruginea mix with the stem of costus afer for the treatment of minor epilepsy[15]. Water treatment potential [16], Analgesic and antipyretic properties of stem bark[17].

The antimicrobial activities of the leaves and stem bark of Bridelia ferruginea against some potential pathogenic organism have been extensively investigated in vitro [2, 4]. However in vitro investigation on the activities of the root extracts of Bridelia ferruginea and in vivo evaluation of the leaves bark and root extracts have not been extensive. This current study was designed to investigate if Bridelia ferruginea plant extract (leaves, bark and roots) have antibacterial activity in vitro and in vivo and with a view of validating the plant’s ethnomedical treatment of infectious diseases.

Also known as antibacterial are a group of agents called antimicrobial drugs effective in treatment and prevention of bacterial caused infections[19]. These agents may either kill of inhibit bacterial growth. The American Society of Health System Pharmacists in 2015 reported that a few numbers of antibiotics also have antiprotozoal activity [19], Alexander Fleming identified penicillin in 1928, a chemical substance with antibiotic properties [20]. Since after then antibiotics have completely changed modern medicine and have saved lives of million patients [18, 21]

The drug antibiotic did not only save millions of patients’ lives, but have played a key role in accomplishing major development in medicine and surgery [20]. It has positively stop and managed infections that emerge in patients who are on chemotherapy treatment, patient with chronic disease like rheumatoid arthritis, renal diseases, diabetes or patient who had complex surgery like organ transplant, joint replacement or cardiac surgery [18,20,21,22 &23]. In under developed country such as Nigeria where hygienic measures or recycling waste is still poor, antibiotics have been reported to reduce the morbidity and mortality that occur as a result of food borne infections and other poverty related infections [23]. In developed country like the United States, antibiotics have contributed to increase life span expectancy by altering the state of bacterial infections [15,20]. Congressional Research Service reported that people in the United State were expected to live an average life of 56.4 years old in 1920, but currently the average life span expectancy of people in the United State is approximately 80 years.

In 1928, the contemporary era of antibiotics began with the discovery of penicillin by Sir Alexander Fleming [24, 25]. Following the discovery of penicillin, antibiotics have transformed contemporary medicine and rescued millions of patients’ lives [18, 21]. Antibiotics were initially prescribed to treat weighty infections in the 1940s [20], Penicillin was effective in restraining bacterial infections among World War II Soldiers, nevertheless briefly after that; penicillin resistance befitted a substantial clinical problem. In response to penicillin resistance a new beta-lactam antibiotic were uncovered, developed and added to re-establishing trust [25, 26]. However, the first case of methicillin resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) was established in the same decennium in the United Kingdom (1962) and the United State (1968)[18, 26]

According to Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Office of infectious Disease. Antibiotics resistance has unfortunately been seen to closely all antibiotics developed [19]. In the year 1972, Vancomycin was announced into clinical practice for treatment of methicillin staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) and coagulase-negative staphylococci[18, 25]. It had been very hard to produce vancomycin resistance, notwithstanding cases of vancomycin resistance had been reported in coagulase-negative Staphylococci in the year 1979 and 1985[18]. Spellberg and Gilbert, 2014 reported that Pharmaceutical industry had introduced many newer antibiotics from the late 1960s to the early 1980s to tackle the resistance difficulty associated with antibiotics, yet thereafter, the antibiotics pipeline started to dry up and fewer new drugs were added. As a matter of fact, in 2015, resistance to antibiotics is still observed after many years of patients treated with antibiotics; bacterial infections have again become a threat [20, 26].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Plant Materials Collection

Bark, Roots and leaves of Bridelia ferruginea (Voucher Number: FHJ236) were collected from the Herbarium unit of Department of forestry technology, Federal College of Forestry Jos Nigeria. The plant and its parts were authenticated by Mr. Joseph Jeffrey Azila of the department of Forestry Technology, Federal College of Forestry Jos Nigeria.

Preparation of Extracts:

The roots bark and leaves of the plant were chopped into smaller parts and dried at 25°C in the laboratory for four weeks. The dried samples were pulverized and ground into powder using blender machine and the powders were labeled and stored in an air tight container for further use. 100g of each powdered sample of root, bark and leaves was weighted into 500ml conical flasks each and soaked in 70% ethanol and then allowed to stand overnight (24 hours) and shook for three hours on a mechanical shaker. The content was filtered using a non-absorbent cotton wool on a Buchner funnel-flask using a vacuum pump. The root, bark and leaves residue were subjected to several parts of rinsing and filtration with fresh solvents to attain some level of elusive maceration (extraction). The root, bark and leaves filtrates were evaporated to dryness using a rotary evaporator and a drying cabinet. The percentage yield was determined (Root=19%, Bark=14.2% and Leaves=18.9%) and the extract transferred into stirrer sample container properly labeled and preserved in the refrigerator for further use [27, 28].

Phytochemical Analysis:

The phytochemical evaluation was performed to ascertain the presence of active metabolite which is of pharmacological importance in the extracts. The phytochemical analysis for flavonoids, cardiac glycosides, alkaloids, tannins, anthraquinones, steroids and carbohydrates, saponins were carried out based on standard procedures [27, 28].

Test Organisms

The clinical isolates used in this study were Escherichia coli and Staphylococcus aureus. They were obtained from the faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Department of Pharmaceutical Microbiology University of Jos, Plateau State of Nigeria. Biochemical and identification test were carried out for detection and identification of the test organisms.

Indole test was carried out for detection of Escherichia coli. Test organism was inoculated into a sterile bottle containing 3ml of sterile
tryptone water then incubate at 35-37 °C for 48hours then 0.5ml of Kovac’s reagents was added and shake gently a red colour in the surface layer within 10minutes indicated Escherichia coli; identification test for Escherichia coli was carried out by culturing test organism on MacConkey agar then observed for rose pink after incubating for 18-24hours. Catalyst test was carried out to detect staphylococcus aureus. Hydrogen peroxide was placed on a slide and test organism inoculated, bubble sign indicated Staphylococcus aureus; Identification test for Staphylococcus aureus was carried out by culturing test organism on a mannitol salt agar then observed for a change from red to yellowish colour after incubating for 18-24hours.

In Vitro Assay

Antibacterial Sensitivity Test

The antibacterial sensitivity test was determined using the agar well diffusion method [29]. The bacteria isolates were cultured in nutrient broth for 18hours before use and standardized to 10^6cfu/ml Staphylococcus aureus and 10^9cfu/ml Escherichia coli respectively.

The medium employed was nutrient agar solution, which was prepared according to manufacturer’s standard of 38g of Mueller Hinton Agar was dissolved in 1000ml of distilled water. The agar was heated gently to dissolve completely, 20mls was then dispensed into sterile bottles and autoclaved at 121 °C for 15minutes. The agar was allowed to cool at room temperature. Broth cultures of test isolates (0.1ml) containing 10^8 cfu/ml organisms was introduced into the bottles containing 20ml of molten Mueller Hinton Agar, the content was thoroughly mixed and poured into labeled sterile petri-dish and allowed to set firm. The plates were surface dried at 35 °C for 15minutes, then 6mm diameter well were made with a sterile cork borer on the surface of the inoculated agar, then equal volumes of plant extracts (1000µL) and gentamycin (control) were transferred into well with the aid of micropipette from extracts concentration of (200, 100, 50, 25, 12.5, 6.25 and 3.125) mg/ml were prepared by serial dilution. The plates were surfaced dried at 35 °C for 5minutes and plates were inoculated with test isolates at 37 °C for 18-24hours. At the end of incubation, plates were observed for growth or death of test organisms. The lowest concentration inhibiting growths were taken to be the minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC). Experiments were carried out in triplicates.

Minimum Bactericidal Concentration (MBC)

This test determines the lowest concentrations at which an antibacterial agent will kill a particular microorganism [31]. A portion from each plate that exhibited no growth were taken from the MIC test and then sub-cultured on a Mueller Hinton agar (nutrient agar) and was incubated at 37 °C for 24hours. The lowest concentration that revealed no visible bacterial growth was taken as the minimum bactericidal concentration.

In Vivo Assay

Animal

Male and female mice aged between 6 and 8weeks (15-25g) obtained from random bred at National Veterinary Research Institute (NVIR), Vom Plateau State Nigeria, were used for this investigation. Animals were housed in the animal house of university of Jos in temperature-controlled room under 12hours light and 12-hour dark cycle. Animals had free access to food and water and were acclimatized for more than a week prior to experiments.

Evaluation of Antibacterial Activity

The determination of the antibacterial activity was carried out in vivo according to Hosseinzadeh et al., 2007 [32] with little modifications. 48 mice were used, male and female mice aged between 6 and 8weeks (15-25g) and grouped into eight groups of six animals each. In each group, three mice were infected with 0.1ml (10^6cfu/ml) of Staphylococcus aureusand three mice with 0.1ml (10^6cfu/ml) Escherichia coli suspension intraperitoneally then placed in different cages. Twenty-four hours later specimen (blood) was taken from the animal’s tail and culture on a specific medium for Staphylococcus aureus (Mannitol salt agar) and Escherichia coli (MacConkey agar) respectively. Colonies growth was observed for both Staphylococcus aureus and Escherichia coli indicating that animals are already infected with the test organisms. Twenty-four hours later each group received different treatments. Groups were designed as follow:

Negative Control. Group 1 received 0.4ml of normal saline against Staphylococcus aureus and Escherichia coli.

Positive Control. Group 2 received 4mg/kg gentamycin against Staphylococcus aureus and Escherichia coli

Root Extract. Group 3 received 100mg/kg Root Extracts against Staphylococcus aureus and against Escherichia coli.

Root Extract. Group 4 received 50mg/kg Root Extract against Staphylococcus aureus and against Escherichia coli.

Bark Extract. Group 5 received 100mg/kg Bark extract against Staphylococcus aureus and against Escherichia coli.

Bark Extract. Group 6 received 50mg/kg Bark extract against Staphylococcus aureus and against Escherichia coli.
**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Preliminary phytochemical investigation of root, bark and leaves of *Bridelia ferruginea* revealed the presence of tannins, flavonoids, carbohydrates, cardiac glycoside (root, bark and leaves), saponins (root and bark) as indicate in Table 1. The availability of flavonoid, tannins, cardiac glycoside, saponins and carbohydrate in the extracts (root and bark) of the plant reveals that the extracts were of pharmacological importance [13]. The presence of saponins and tannins enhanced antimicrobial activity as reported by Ndukwe et al., 2005 [14]. The root extract exhibited higher activity against *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Escherichia coli* at concentration of 25, 50, 100 and 200mg/ml in vitro. But the leaf extract exhibited lesser activity compared to root and bark. The in vitro and in vivo Antimicrobial investigation shows that root and bark extracts had significant antibacterial activities than that of the leaf extract. This could be attributed to the presence of active substance which could be higher in root and bark and are probably different from that of the leaf. According to Adetunji, 1999 *Bridelia ferruginea* has been used traditionally in the treatment of typhoid fever and various stomach related problems [33]. There were no significant different when the root extract was compared with the control at P < 0.05, also in this study the extract root and bark inhibit growth of *Escherichia coli* and *staphylococcus aureus* to a high degree. The relative high zone of inhibition shown by the root extracts on *staphylococcus aureus* and *Escherichia coli* suggest, the plant can be used for the treatment of infectious diseases primarily associated to microorganisms as reported by Owoseni et al., 2010 [34]. The concentration of 200mg/ml had the highest zone of inhibition for *staphylococcus aureus* and *Escherichia coli* this suggest that as the concentration of the extract was increased the antibacterial activity increased, this could be attributed to the fact that antimicrobial activities of substance is concentration dependent [34], and that antimicrobial activity is a function of active ingredient reaching an organism. Minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) as shown in Table 3a & 3b indicates a decreasing inhibitory effect of the plant extracts as concentration decreases for all the extracts (root, bark and leaf) this implies that the antibacterial activities are concentration dependent [34]. The root and bark extracts had minimum inhibitory concentration of 6.25 and 12.5 mg/ml for both *staphylococcus aureus* and *Escherichia coli* respectively, while the leaf had minimum inhibitory concentration of 25mg/ml for *staphylococcus aureus* and *Escherichia coli*.

**Table 1:** Phytochemical constituents of bark root and leave of *Bridelia ferruginea*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituents</th>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Bark</th>
<th>Leaves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alkaloids</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tannins</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavonoids</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saponins</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steroids</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthraquinones</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbohydrates</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac glycosides</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: -: Negative, +: Positive

**Table 2a:** *In vitro* antibacterial activities of ethanol extracts of *Bridelia ferruginea* against *Staphylococcus aureus*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extracts</th>
<th>Control (Gentamycin)</th>
<th>25mg/ml</th>
<th>50mg/ml</th>
<th>100mg/ml</th>
<th>200mg/ml</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root</td>
<td>25.3±0.3</td>
<td>16.5±0.29&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>18.7±0.3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>21±0.3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>22.5±0.3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bark</td>
<td>25.5±0.3</td>
<td>11.7±0.9&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>13.3±0.7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>15.5±0.7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>17.8±0.2&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaves</td>
<td>25.3±0.3</td>
<td>9.5±0.3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10.5±0.3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>12.5±0.3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>14.8±0.2&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>P<0.05 when compared to control (gentamycin)

<sup>b</sup>P<0.05 when compared to control root extract.

<sup>c</sup>P<0.05 when compared to 200mg/ml concentration
### Table 2b: In vitro antibacterial activities of ethanol extracts of *Bridelia ferruginea* against *Escherichia coli*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extracts</th>
<th>Control (Gentamycin)</th>
<th>25mg/ml</th>
<th>50mg/ml</th>
<th>100mg/ml</th>
<th>200mg/ml</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root</td>
<td>25.7±0.3</td>
<td>19.3±0.3*</td>
<td>21.6±0.3*</td>
<td>23.5±0.3*</td>
<td>25.7±0.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bark</td>
<td>26.5±0.4</td>
<td>15.3±0.4*T</td>
<td>17.8±0.8*T</td>
<td>19.7±0.4*T</td>
<td>21.5±0.4*T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaves</td>
<td>26.2±0.2</td>
<td>11.2±0.6*T</td>
<td>12.8±0.4*T</td>
<td>11.2±0.6*T</td>
<td>26.2±0.16*T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P<0.05 when compared to control (gentamycin)

T<0.05 when compared to root extract.

≠P<0.05 when compared to 200mg/ml concentration

---

### Table 3a: Minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) of ethanol extracts of *Bridelia ferruginea* against *Staphylococcus aureus*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concentrations of extracts (mg/ml)</th>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Bark</th>
<th>Leaves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** _— No growth, +: Growth_

### Table 3b: Minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) of ethanol extracts of *Bridelia ferruginea* against *Escherichia coli*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concentrations of extracts (mg/ml)</th>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Bark</th>
<th>Leaves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** _— No growth, +: Growth_

### Table 4a: Minimum bactericidal concentration (MBC) of ethanol extracts of *Bridelia ferruginea* against *Staphylococcus aureus*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concentrations of extracts (mg/ml)</th>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Bark</th>
<th>Leaves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>NT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** _— No growth, +: Growth, NT: Not tested_
Table 4b: Minimum bactericidal concentration (MBC) of ethanol extracts of Bridelia ferruginea against Escherichia coli.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concentrations of extracts (mg/ml)</th>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Bark</th>
<th>Leaves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>NT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** _—_ No growth, +: Growth, NT: Not tested

The minimum bactericidal concentration (MBC) illustrates a decreasing inhibitory effect as shown in Table 4a & 4b with concentration dependent. The root, bark and leaf extracts exhibited a bactericidal activity at 12.5, 25 and 50 mg/ml respectively. The root extract showed a better minimum bactericidal concentration when compared with the bark and leaves extract this suggest that the root extract could be bactericidal agent (kill organisms).

The in vitro assay showed that the root extract had higher activity than the bark and root/bark combined. The dose of 100mg/kg had the highest colonies reduction for Staphylococcus aureus and Escherichia coli this suggest that as the dose of the extracts was increased the numbers of colonies were reducing until there was a clear plate, but there was no significant difference when concentrations used was compared, this could be attributed to the fact that antimicrobial activities of substance is a function of active ingredient reaching an organism [34]. When compared with positive control there were no significant difference between the treatment groups and positive control, this may suggest that the plant extract exhibits antibacterial activity and could be employed in the treatment of infectious diseases. In the same vein when treatment groups were compared with negative control, there was significant difference between the treatment groups this suggests, that plant extracts may have antibacterial activity. The antibacterial screening of crude ethanol extract carried out in vitro revealed antibacterial activity against Staphylococcus aureus and Escherichia coli at concentration of 50mg/kg and 100mg/kg. The root extract exhibited higher bactericidal activity than the bark extract. The combination of root and bark extracts showed synergetic activity against Staphylococcus aureus and Escherichia coli. The extracts inhibited bacterial colony completely after treatment for 114 hours.

**CONCLUSION**

The antibacterial activities exhibited by Bridelia ferruginea in this study validate its use in ethnomedical treatment of infectious diseases. This study and previous reports show that Bridelia ferruginea has effective antibacterial activities in vitro. The in vitro study reveals that the extracts of Bridelia ferruginea also exhibited effective antibacterial activity against Gram positive (Staphylococcus aureus) and Gram negative (Escherichia coli) organisms. It shows that the plant extracts possess activity against Gram positive and Gram-negative organisms.

This study shows that the plant extract (root) contained phytochemical constituents that are of pharmacological importance and exhibit effective antibacterial activity when compared to the bark and leaves in vitro and in vivo.
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