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#### Abstract

Crude, methanol and ethanol extracts of seeds, leaves and callus of Butterfly pea (Clitoria ternatea L.) were studied for antifungal activity against three fungal strains i.e. Aspergillus niger, Alternaria solani and Rhizopus oryzae using agar well diffusion method. It was observed that extracts of seeds, callus, leaves of tissue-cultured and pot-grown plants showed antifungal effect against A. niger and A. solani and none of these extracts exhibited pronounced effect against $R$. oryzae. The zone of inhibition acquired by the leaves extracts from pot-grown plants was more than that of tissue-cultured plants against fungal strains. The MIC values for different extracts ranged from 0.1-1.4 cm in diameter. Hence, it was observed that the extracts obtained from C. ternatea had good antifungal properties.
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## Introduction

Clitoria ternatea L. is a perennial herb that belongs to the family Fabaceae and subfamily Papilionaceae. The various parts of C. ternatea have been reported for anti-inflammatory, antipyretic, and antimicrobial activities (Mukherjee et al., 2008). The member of this plant family exhibited strong anti-fungal activity against number of important fungi including Aspergillus niger and Candida albican (Bishnupada et al., 2011). The C. ternatea leaves extract illustrated the strong antifungal activity against $A$. niger with a minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) 0.8 mg $\mathrm{mL}^{-1}$ (Kamilla et al., 2009). In an other study, the crude extract from C. ternatea seeds showed strong good antifungal activity against $A$. niger and A. ochraceous (Mhaskar et al., 2010).

Few reports are available regarding in vitro antifungal activity of C. ternatea (Malabadi and Nataraja, 2001), however antimicrobial activity of seeds and callus extracts of C. ternatea has been reported against fish pathogen (Ponnusamy et al., 2010). It has further been investigated that the antifungal properties of $C$. ternatea L . is attributed due to the presence of cystein rich protein and finotin (Shahid et al., 2009).

Keeping in view the importance of the plant the present study was conducted to compare the antifungal activity of methanolic and ethanolic extracts obtained from seed, callus, leaves of tissue-cultured and pot grown plants of $C$. ternatea.

## Materials and Methods

## Extraction of plant material

Seeds, callus cultures, tissue-cultured and pot-grown plants of C. ternatea were ground and 30 g of plant material was placed in extraction chamber, hanging above the flask having the solvent ( 250 mL ) and below a condenser. As the flask was heated, methanol evaporated and moved into the condenser where it converted into a liquid that trickled into the extraction chamber containing the plant material. When the solvent surrounding the sample rose at a certain level, it ran over and dropped back into the boiling flask. This cycle was allowed to repeat at least 3-4 times. The flask containing the methanol extract was removed and methanol or ethanol was evaporated with the help of rotary evaporator.

To acquired extract by steady state extraction, the material was poured in the flask containing 250 mL of solvent. The flask was left for 15 days on shaker after which the material was filtered. To obtain the extracts by circulatory extraction, the plant material was added into a flask containing 250 mL of the solvent and placed on orbital shaker. The material was filtered and dried with the help of rotary evaporator.

## Assay for Antimicrobial Activity

Methanolic and ethanolic extracts of seeds, callus, in vitro-grown and pot-grown leaves were tested for their antifungal activity against three different fungal strains i.e. Aspergillus niger (IIB 21), Alternaria solani (GCU 32) and Rhizopus oryzae (IIB57)The test microorganisms used were procured from Government College University,

Lahore, Pakistan and maintained by sub-culturing periodically on nutrient agar and preserved at $4{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The MIC was determined by agar dilution technique.

Different concentrations of C. ternatea were prepared in two organic solvents methanol and ethanol. The antifungal activity was experimented by agar well diffusion method (Mukherjee et al., 1995). Wells of 7 mm diameter were made with
sterile borer after the solidification of Petri plates prefilled with potato dextrose agar and fresh inoculam of each fungus. The wells were then filled with 0.1 mL of different concentrations (from 0.9 to $0.1 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{mL}^{-1}$ ) of the extracts. For antifungal assay plates were incubated at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 48 h . After incubation, the zones of inhibition diameter around each of the well were measured.

Table 1: Antifungal action of leaves of pot-grown plants (LPP) and seeds extracts of Clitoria ternatea.

| Concentration of extracts |  | Extraction procedure | Zone of Inhibition (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Aspergillus niger | Alternaria solani |  | Rhizopus oryzae |  |
|  |  | Methanol | Ethanol | Methanol | Ethanol | Methanol | Ethanol |
| $0.3 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{~mL}^{-1}$ | Seeds |  | Soxhlet | $0.3 \pm 0.02$ | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  | Circulatory | $0.5 \pm 0.01$ | $0.5 \pm 0.02$ | $0.2 \pm 0.01$ | $0.1 \pm 0.01$ | - | - |
|  | LPP | Steady state | $0.1 \pm 0.02$ | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  | Soxhlet | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  | Circulatory | $0.3 \pm 0.01$ | $0.2 \pm 0.01$ | $0.2 \pm 0.01$ | $0.1 \pm 0.01$ | - | - |
|  | Seeds | Steady state | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  | Soxhlet | $0.3 \pm 0.01$ | $0.3 \pm 0.01$ | $0.1 \pm 0.01$ | - | - | - |
| $0.4 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{mL}^{-1}$ |  | Circulatory | $0.8 \pm 0.02$ | $0.7 \pm 0.02$ | $0.3 \pm 0.04$ | $0.2 \pm 0.02$ | - | - |
|  | LPP | Steady state | $0.1 \pm 0.03$ | $0.1 \pm 0.02$ | - | - | - | - |
|  |  | Soxhlet | $0.2 \pm 0.01$ | - | - | - | - | - |
| $0.5 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{mL}^{-1}$ |  | Circulatory | $0.3 \pm 0.02$ | $0.3 \pm 0.01$ | $0.2 \pm 0.01$ | $0.2 \pm 0.01$ | - | - |
|  | Seeds | Steady state | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  | Soxhlet | $0.5 \pm 0.03$ | $0.4 \pm 0.02$ | $0.2 \pm 0.02$ | $0.1 \pm 0.02$ | - | - |
|  |  | Circulatory | $0.9 \pm 0.01$ | $0.7 \pm 0.02$ | $0.5 \pm 0.02$ | $0.5 \pm 0.04$ | - | - |
|  | LPP | Steady state | $0.2 \pm 0.03$ | $0.1 \pm 0.01$ | $0.1 \pm 0.03$ | $0.1 \pm 0.03$ | - | - |
| $0.9 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{~mL}^{-1}$ |  | Soxhlet | $0.3 \pm 0.01$ | $0.3 \pm 0.01$ | $0.1 \pm 0.01$ | $0.1 \pm 0.01$ | - | - |
|  |  | Circulatory | $0.5 \pm 0.02$ | 0.4 | $0.4 \pm 0.02$ | $0.3 \pm 0.01$ | - | - |
|  |  | Steady state | $0.2 \pm 0.01$ | $0.1 \pm 0.01$ | - | - | - | - |
|  | Seeds | Soxhlet | $1.3 \pm 0.02$ | $1.1 \pm 0.02$ | $0.8 \pm 0.02$ | $0.7 \pm 0.01$ | - | - |
|  |  | Circulatory | $1.4 \pm 0.01$ | $1.3 \pm 0.01$ | $1.0 \pm 0.02$ | $0.9 \pm 0.05$ | - | - |
|  | LPP | Steady state | $0.5 \pm 0.01$ | $0.4 \pm 0.03$ | $0.3 \pm 0.01$ | $0.2 \pm 0.01$ | - | - |
|  |  | Soxhlet | $0.9 \pm 0.01$ | $0.9 \pm 0.09$ | $0.8 \pm 0.03$ | $0.7 \pm 0.02$ | - | - |
|  |  | Circulatory | $1.2 \pm 0.01$ | $1.1 \pm 0.01$ | $0.9 \pm 0.01$ | $0.9 \pm 0.01$ | - | - |
|  |  | Steady state | $0.8 \pm 0.01$ | $0.7 \pm 0.04$ | $0.7 \pm 0.02$ | $0.6 \pm 0.01$ | - | - |

Table 2: Antifungal action of leaf callus extracts of Clitoria ternatea.

| Concentration of extracts | Zone of Inhibition (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Aspergillus niger |  |  |  |  |  |  | Alternaria solani | Rhizopus oryzae |
|  | Methanol | Ethanol | Methanol | Ethanol | Methanol | Ethanol |  |  |  |  |
| $0.5 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{mL}^{-1}$ | TCL | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |
|  | Callus | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |
| $0.6 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{mL}^{-1}$ | TCL | 0.7 | 0.6 | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |
|  | Callus | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |
| $0.7 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{mL}^{-1}$ | TCL | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | - | - |  |  |  |
|  | Callus | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | - | - |  |  |  |
| $0.9 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{mL}^{-1}$ | TCL | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | - | - |  |  |  |
|  | Callus | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | - | - |  |  |  |

TCL: Tissue cultured leaves

Table 3: Comparison between zone of inhibition of different fungal strains of in vivo leaves and in vitro leaves extracts of Clitoria ternatea.

| Fungal species | Concentrations of extracts ( $\mathrm{mg} \mathrm{mL}^{-1}$ ) | Zone of inhibition (cm) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | In vivo leaves |  | In vitro leaves |  |
|  |  | Methanol | Ethanol | Methanol | Ethanol |
| Aspergillus niger | 0.4 | - | - | - | - |
|  | 0.5 | $0.2 \pm 0.05$ | $0.1 \pm 0.04$ | $0.1 \pm 0.025$ | - |
|  | 0.6 | $0.4 \pm 1.0$ | $0.3 \pm 0.05$ | $0.2 \pm 0.02$ | $0.1 \pm 0.025$ |
|  | 0.7 | $0.6 \pm 0.03$ | $0.4 \pm 0.02$ | $0.3 \pm 0.02$ | $0.2 \pm 0.01$ |
|  | 0.8 | $0.7 \pm 0.01$ | $0.6 \pm 0.25$ | $0.4 \pm 0.15$ | $0.4 \pm 0.01$ |
|  | 0.9 | $0.8 \pm 0.03$ | $0.7 \pm 0.05$ | $0.6 \pm 0.051$ | $0.5 \pm 0.01$ |
| Alternaria solani | 0.5 | - | - | - | - |
|  | 0.6 | $0.1 \pm 0.01$ | $0.1 \pm 0.01$ | - | - |
|  | 0.7 | $0.4 \pm 0.002$ | $0.3 \pm 0.01$ | $0.2 \pm 0.00$ | $0.1 \pm 0.02$ |
|  | 0.8 | $0.5 \pm 0.01$ | $0.4 \pm 0.02$ | $0.4 \pm 0.01$ | $0.3 \pm 0.00$ |
|  | 0.9 | $0.7 \pm 0.02$ | $0.6 \pm 0.01$ | $0.5 \pm 0.01$ | $0.5 \pm 0.01$ |
|  | 0.9 | - | - | - | - |

Minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) was determined as the lowest concentration of ex-plant extracts inhibiting the growth of the organism. All the experiments were performed in triplicate.

## Statistical analysis

For the experiment, a completely randomized design with 3 replicates was used. The SAS program was used for analysis of variance of antifungal activity of $C$. ternatea extracts at $P$ $\leq 0.05$.

## Results and Discussion

Methanolic and ethanolic seeds, callus, potgrown and tissue-cultured leaf extracts

Table 1-3 indicated the zone of inhibitions by extracts of seeds, leaves and callus against fungal strains. The methanolic and ethanolic seeds extract through circulatory extraction showed inhibition zone of 1.4 cm to 1.3 cm against $A$. niger, respectively. Whereas, leaves methanolic extracts from pot-grown plant showed 1.2 cm inhibition zone against $A$. niger. The callus extracts of C. ternatea showed MIC against $A$. niger and A.solani at high concentration of 0.7 mg $\mathrm{mL}^{-1}$ and the inhibition zone was 0.1 cm . The methanolic and ethanolic extract of C. ternatea seeds by circulatory extraction process showed inhibition zone at $0.2 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{mL}^{-1}$ against fungal strains than callus, pot-grown and in vitro leaves extract. At the highest concentration of 0.9 mg $\mathrm{mL}^{-1}$ callus extracts showed 0.4 cm zone of inhibition against $A$. niger. The concentrations range of 0.1 mg mL -1 to 0.5 mg mL -1 of methanolic and ethanolic callus extracts didn't show inhibition zone against fungi. Present results
were in uniformity with findings of Kamilla et al. (2009) and Mhaskar et al. (2010).

Comparison between antifungal activity of leaf extracts of pot-grown and tissue-cultured plants

It is evident from Table 3 that both the potgrown and tissue-cultured leaf extracts didn't show any response against Rhizopus sp. The extracts from leaves of plants grown in pots showed high inhibition zone than tissue-cultured leaves extracts against $A$. niger and $A$. solani with the values of 0.8 cm and 0.6 cm , respectively. The minimum inhibition concentration of methanolic and ethanolic in vivo leaves extracts was $0.5 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{mL}^{-1}$ against $A$. niger but ethanolic in vitro leaves extracts against $A$. niger showed $0.6 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{mL}^{-1}$.

The results of the present study conclude that the extracts of C. ternatea were effective against $A$. niger and A. solani, but not against $R$. arrhizus. The methanolic extracts obtained through circulatory extraction from seeds and pot-grown leaves of $C$. ternatea showed maximum inhibition zone against $A$. niger. The $C$ ternatea seeds extract was more resistant against fungal strains than the leaves extracts.
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