Synergistic or additive antimicrobial activities of Indian spice and herbal extracts against pathogenic, probiotic and food-spoiler micro-organisms

^{1*}Das, S., ²Anjeza, C. and ¹Mandal, S.

¹Department of Botany, Charuchandra College, 22 Lake Road, Kolkata-29, India. ² Environment and Health Department, Institute of Public Health(IPH), Tirana, Albania

Abstract: Traditionally the people of India have a long-standing practice of using wide variety of herbal products in treatment of diseases or as preservatives in foods. Spices are indispensable components of Indian cuisines since ancient times. Spices are considered as rich source of bio-active antimicrobial compounds. The disc diffusion and MIC bioassays were performed with some selected Indian spices and herbs against some entero-pathogenic, probiotic or food-spoiler microbes. Widest inhibition zones (12-14 mm DIZ) were seen in cases of aqueous extracts of fenugreek, mustard and henna. Gram positive bacteria were more prone to these spices or herbal extracts than Gram negative bacteria and fungus. *Klebsiella pneumonie* and *Aspergillus niger* were the most resistant microbes while *Staphylococcus aureus* and *E. coli* were most susceptible strains. Combinations of the spices in several cases demonstrated synergistic or additive effect. No antagonistic effect was seen. Cumin and fenugreek or Black cumin and mustard combinations demonstrated higher synergistic antimicrobial effects.

Keywords: Antimicrobial, spice, synergy, additive, MIC, FIC

Introduction

In the last two decades, antibiotic resistance is an emerging problem worldwide (Walsh, 2000; Cohen, 2002). This has lead to the search for new, safe and effective antimicrobial agents from alternative natural resources like plant products. At the same time, there is a growing demand among consumers for natural preservative or additives in processed foods (Gutierrez *et al.*, 2008). In comparison to chemical or synthetic additives herbal additives are preferred as these are safer, flavour enhancer and without any side effects (Brull and Coote, 1999). Herbal extracts are fast becoming popular as natural antimicrobial preservatives or additives (Akarpat *et al.*, 2008; Pazos *et al.*, 2008; Cox *et al.*, 2010).

Traditionally the people of India have a longstanding practice of using extensive diversity of plant products in treatment of diseases. Spices are essential components of Indian cuisines since ancient times. These are used in minute amounts to impart flavour, taste and aroma in food preparation to improve their palatability (Rahman and Gul, 2002; Nair and Chanda, 2006). Spices are also used for stabilizing several food items from deterioration (Kizil and Sogut, 2003). Spices are considered as rich source of bio-active antimicrobial compounds (Lia and Roy, 2004). The typical Indian spices and herbs like cumin, black cumin, mustard, fenugreek, ajowain, curry-leaf, nutmeg and henna are usually used in curries, pickles, sauces etc. These spices are also known to have some ethno-medicinal or antimicrobial properties (Singh et al., 2002). Plants traditionally used for medicinal purpose in different parts of the world have been screened for possible antimicrobial action by several workers (Bonjar, 2004). Antibacterial activities of extracts of different plants against various microorganisms have been reported by many scientists (Sagdic and Ozcan, 2003; Nair and Chanda, 2006; Shan et al., 2007; Chaudhury and Tariq, 2008; Gutierrez et al., 2008). Some medicinal herbs have also been assessed (Ahmad and Beg, 2001). Some spices were specifically tested for anti-microbial activities (Shelef, 1983; Sagdic et al., 2003). But there are little reports on some of the Indian spices and herbs (Singh et al., 2002; Arora and Kaur, 1999; Romson et al., 2011). There is no report on their synergistic effects especially on food-spoiler and probiotic microbes. The objective of the present study is to evaluate some traditional Indian spices and their combining effects on selected pathogenic, food-spoiler and probiotic microorganisms.

Materials and Methods

Plant materials

Eight types of typical Indian spices and herbs (cumin, black cumin, mustard, fenugreek, ajowain, curry-leaf, nutmeg and henna) (in whole fruit, seed or leaves form) were purchased from reliable retail shop in Kolkata in April-June, 2009. The spices were dry fruits of Cuminum cyminum L. (Apiaceae) (Cumin) and Trachyspermum ammi L. (Apiaceae) (Ajowain); seeds of Nigella sativa L. (Ranunculaceae)(Black cumin), Brassica nigra L. (Fabaceae)(Mustard) and Trigonella foenumgraceum L. (Fabaceae) (Fenugreek); dry leaves of Lawsonia inermis L., (Lythraceae)(Henna) and Murraya koenigii L. (Rutaceae) (Curry-leaf) and nuts of Myristica fragrance Houtt. (Myristicaceae) (Nutmeg). The dry spices were sieved and checked visually for any contamination.

Preparation of aqueous decoction

The dried spices were washed thoroughly with sterile double distilled water to make these spices completely free from any possible contamination. Aqueous decoction of each spice was prepared by boiling 20 g of dry spice in 100ml sterile distilled water over moderate flame for 20 min. The aqueous extract was cooled, filtered through Whatman No.1 filter paper and then kept in sterile screw capped glass vials at 4°C. The aqueous extracts were re-confirmed as free of any contamination by plating method (APHA, 1992). These crude aqueous decoctions were diluted with sterile double distilled water (which is to be used as negative control) to obtain required concentrations before experiments.

Preparation of solvent extraction

Twenty gram of each dry sample was crushed in ethanol for 48 hours at 24°C with stirring (Liu and Nakano, 1996). The extracts were centrifuged and filtered through Whatman No.1 filter paper and evaporated using vacuum rotary evaporator to near dryness and stored in glass vials in dark at 4°C. These crude solvent extracts were diluted with 10% dimethyl sulphoxide (DMSO- which is to be used as negative control) to obtain required concentration before experiments.

Test organisms

Four enteropathogenic, three food-spoiler and one probiotic bacterial strains were selected for the study. The enteropathogenic and food-spoiler strains were taken to assess antimicrobial activities of spices against those strains. To understand the interference of spices against the growth of beneficial gut-bacteria, the probiotic strain was included in this study. The strains were Salmonella enterica serovar typhimurium MTCC 3224, Serratia marcescens MTCC 4822, Staphylococcus aureus MTCC 7405, Escherichia coli MTCC 3221, Klebsiella pneumoniae subsp pneumoniae MTCC 6644, Proteus vulgaris MTCC 7299, Bacillus cereus MTCC 6909, Lactobacillus brevis MTCC 4460 were obtained from MTCC, IMTECH, Chandigarh, India. All bacterial cultures were maintained on tryptic soy agar (HiMedia) and subcultured regularly. The fungal strain Aspergillus niger was taken from laboratory collection (isolated from bread) and grown on Sabouraud dextrose agar (HiMedia). Standard inoculum was prepared by subculturing 4-5 freshly grown isolated colonies of each strain in Tryptic soy broth (TSB) and incubated at 35-37 °C for 24 hours. Inocula were standardized with sterile TSB to give final cell load of 10⁶-10⁷ CFU/ml.

Disc diffusion bioassay

The disc diffusion test was performed as described by Jorgensen *et al.* (1999). A 0.5 ml standardized inoculum suspension of each bacterial strain was spread on TSA plates with a sterile bent glass rod spreader. Sterile 6-mm Whatman no.1 filter paper discs were aseptically placed on plates. Spice decoctions or extracts of standard concentrations (10 mg dry weight) were aseptically poured on the discs along with sterile double distilled water or 10% DMSO as negative and ampicillin as positive controls. Plates were allowed to stand for 30 minutes at room temperature prior to incubation at 35-37 °C for 24 hours. The inhibition zone diameters were measured three times and means were represented to nearest mm.

Determination of MICs

Minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) were determined by broth dilution method in culture tubes (Jorgensen *et al.*, 1999). Various concentrations (50, 40, 30, 25, 20, 15, 10, 7.5, 5, 2.5, 1.25 mg dry weight/ml) of the extracts were added to broth immediately after inoculating with fresh 0.2 ml culture of the strain, keeping final volume at 5 ml. The cultures were incubated on a rotary shaking incubator at 37°C for 48 hours. The lowest concentration of the spice or herbal extracts showing no visible growth was considered as the MIC.

Combined effect study

The more effective spices were chosen for combined assessment against selected microorganisms. The spices were combined on one to one basis as popularly used in conventional Indian cooking or fresh fast food preparations. The assessment was done using checkerboard assay method (Satish et al., 2005). The combined effect of spices was calculated by the following formula and results were interpreted as synergy (S, FIC \leq 0.5), addition (A, 0.5 \leq FIC \leq 1), indifference (I, 1<FIC<4) and antagonism (AN, FIC≥4) (Berenbaum, 1981; Gutierrez et al., 2009):

 $\sum_{A(comb)} FIC = FIC_{A(comb)} + FIC_{B(comb)}$ =MIC of A in combination/ MIC_A+ MIC of B in combination/MIC_p

Statistical analyses

The experiments were done at least twice and their mean values were represented. All statistical analyses including ANOVA were done in SPSS Version 17.0. Differences were considered significant when p< 0.05.

Results and Discussion

In India, spices are ethnically used as active ingredients in ayurvedic medicines and reported to possess a number of pharmacological effects to treat different human ailments (Bonjar et al., 2004). Several investigations have been directed towards their anti-microbial properties (Voravuthikunchai et al., 2005). The disc diffusion assay showed that the spices have different degrees of bacterial and fungal growth inhibition, depending on the strains (Table 1). The aqueous extracts of spices like cumin, mustard and ajowain showed broadest antimicrobial activity by inhibiting more or less most of the microbial strains involved. Ethanolic extracts of cumin, fenugreek and curry-leaf indicated higher anti-microbial activity showing greater diameter of inhibition zones. In case of black cumin or henna, aqueous extract was more effective than their ethanolic extracts. But in cases of curry leaf, ethanolic extract was stronger. Widest inhibition zones (12-14 mm DIZ) were seen in cases of aqueous extracts of fenugreek, mustard and henna. Gram positive bacteria were more prone to these spices or herbal extracts than Gram negative bacteria and fungus. Staphylococcus aureus was found to be the most sensitive strain. Klebsiella pneumonie was the most resistant strain tested against these spices. It is clear that different extracts or decoctions of spices or herbs differ in their anti-microbial activities, which may depend on solubility of the active constituents.

			of selected spices or	ces or herbs aga	inst the micro-or	herbs against the micro-organisms [- means <6mm DIZ]	s <6mm DIZ]		,	
	Extract	Escheri-chia	Staphylo-coccus	Salmonella	Serratia	Klebsiella	Proteus	Bacillus cereus	Lacto-bacillus	Aspergillus niger
Spices		coli	aureus	enterica	marcescens	pneumo-niae.	vulgaris.		brevis	0
	Aqueous	10±2	11 ±2	1	7±1	9±1	11±3	10 ± 2	8±1	8±2
Cumin	Ethanol	9±1	11±2	8±2	10 ± 3	7±1	9±1	9±3		•
	Aqueous	8±2	10±1	ı		8±1	9±1		6 ± 1	
Blackcumin	Ethanol		9±3	8±3				6±2	8±1	
	Aqueous	12±3	9±2	9±2	11±3		12±2	12±3	11±2	12±3
Mustard	Ethanol	6±2	7±2	9±2	7±2			8±2	6±2	11±2
	Aqueous	12±2	14±3	ı	-		9±2	10±3	7±2	10±2
Fenugreek	Ethanol	9±2	11±2	7±2	8±3		7±2	9±2		6±2
	Aqueous	10±2	12±2	9±2	10 ± 2	7±2	7±2	11±3	9±2	8±3
Ajowain	Ethanol		8±2	9±2	-			6±2	-	
	Aqueous	11 ± 2	13±3	6±1	1		6±2	13±2	$10{\pm}2$	6±2
Henna	Ethanol	ı		ı	1	1	1	6±1	6±2	
	Aqueous	8±2	11±3	ı	6 ± 1	6±2	7±2	9±3	7 ± 1	7±3
Nutmeg	Ethanol	10 ± 2	6±2	ı	1	6±1	8±3	1	6±1	1

Table 1. Antibacterial activities, indicated by diameter of inhibition zone (DIZ, mm, for 10 mg dry wt/ disc, Mean±SD)

$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Aqueous	6±1		8±2	8±2	1	,	ı	,	
	Curry leaf	Ethanol	8±3	7±2	10±2	7±2		8±2	7±2		7±3
$ \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Ampicillin		15±2	16±3	11±2	15±2	9±2	12±2	11±3	10±2	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		_	Table 2. An	tibacterial activ	ities, indicated by selected spices or	/ minimum inhibi · herbs against the	tory concentrat	ions (MIC, mg dr ms	y wt. ml ⁻¹)	7-0*	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Spices	Extract	Escheri-chia coli		Salmonella enterica	Serratia marcescens	Klebsiella pneumo- niae.	Proteus vulgaris	Bacillus cereus	Lacto-bacillus brevis	Aspergillus niger
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Aqueous	10	15	>50	15	10	10	10	20	30
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Cumin	Ethanol	15	20	25	20	25	20	40	40	50
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Aqueous	25	15	40	40	20	15	50	50	>50
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Blackcumin	Ethanol	>50	25	40	50	>50	50	40	30	40
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Aqueous	10	20	15	15	40	10	15	30	15
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Mustard	Ethanol	40	40	30	30	>50	50	30	15	15
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Aqueous	15	5	40	40	50	20	20	40	15
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Fenugreek	Ethanol	25	20	40	15	50	30	40	50	40
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Aqueous	10	7.5	20	25	15	25	15	30	25
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Ajowain	Ethanol	40	30	20	40	50	50	40	50	40
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Aqueous	10	5	30	50	50	40	10	15	50
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Henna	Ethanol	30	40	50	50	>50	50	30	40	50
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Aqueous	25	15	50	40	25	20	20	40	30
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Nutmeg	Ethanol	20	25	50	>50	40	20	40	40	>50
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Aqueous	50	40	30	25	50	50	40	40	50
T:5557.510157.5tribacterial activities, indicated by Fractional inhibitory concentrations (FIC $_{A}$ +FIC _B = Σ FIC, mg dry wt. ml ⁻¹) of combined spices or herbs against selector arrange interval7.5107.5organisms (S, FIC ≤ 0.5), addition (A, 0.5 +FIC(<1), indifference (I, 1 7 -FIC(<4) and antagonism (AN, FIC ≥ 4)corganisms (S, FIC ≤ 0.5), addition (A, 0.5 -FIC(<1), indifference (I, 1 7 -FIC(<4) and antagonism (AN, FIC ≥ 4)arrangebaronical SamonellaNetworkspreunonica: Networksfamore $0.75+0.5=1.42$ $0.831(A)$ -2 $0.5+0.35=0.75$ -2 Agreens $0.75+0.5=1.6$ $0.5+0.3=0.833$ -2 $0.25+0.25=0.75$ -2 -2 Agreens $0.75+0.5=$ -2 $0.5+0.3=$ -2 $0.5+0.3=0.75$ -2 -2 -2 Agreens $0.81(A)$ $0.75+0.5=$ -2 $0.5+0.3=0.833$ -2 -2 $0.5+0.3=0.75$ -2 -2 Agreens $0.81(A)$ -2 $0.5+0.3=$ -2 $0.5+0.3=0.75$ -2 -2 $0.5+0.3=0.75$ -2 <	Curry leaf	Ethanol	30	30	25	50	50	40	40	50	40
titleacted by Fractional inhibitory concentrations (FIC ${}_{A}$ +FIC $_{a}^{a}$ = Σ FIC, mg dry vt. ml ⁻¹) of combined spices or herbs against selecting organisms (S, FIC≤ 0.5), addition (A, 0.5 <fic<1), (1,="" (an,="" 1<fic<4)="" and="" antagonism="" fic≥4)<="" indifference="" th="">ExtentExterticial coliSappilococcusSamonlaNotation (A, 0.5<fic<1), (1,="" (an,="" 1<fic<4)="" and="" antagonism="" fic≥4)<="" indifference="" th="">ExtentExtention coliSamonlaNotationNotation (A, 0.5<fic<1), (1,="" 1<fic<4)<="" indifference="" th="">Detension (A), FIC≥4)ExtentExtentExtent form coliSamonlaNotationNotation (A), FIC≥4)Detension (A), FIC>4Agronom0.75+0.6=1420.83+0.5=$\cdot$$\cdot$0.25+0.55=0.5 (S)$0.5+0.25=0.75$<math>to contrationsAgronom0.75+0.6=1.420.83+0.5=$\cdot$$\cdot$$0.25+0.5=0.5$ (S)$0.5+0.25=0.75$<math>to contrationsAgronom0.8+1.0=$0.77+0.5=$$\cdot$$0.5+0.5=$$\cdot$$0.25+0.5=0.75$<math>to contrationsAgronom0.8+1.0=$0.75+0.5=$$\cdot$$0.5+0.5=$$\cdot$$0.25+0.5=0.75$<math>to contrationsAgronom0.8+1.0=$0.77+0.5=$$\cdot$$0.5+0.5=$$\cdot$$0.25+0.5=$<math>to contrationsAgronom0.8+1.0=$0.7+0.6=$$1.0(1)$$0.7+0.6=$<math>to contrations<math>to contrationsAgronom0.8+1.06<math>to contration$0.83(A)$<math>to contration<math>to contrationsAgronom$0.8+1.06=$<math>to contration$0.5+0.5=$<math>to contration<math>to contrationAgronom<math>to contration$to contration$</math></math></math></math></math></math></math></math></math></math></math></math></math></math></fic<1),></fic<1),></fic<1),>	Ampicillin		7.5	5	5	5	7.5	10	10	7.5	50
Excharcing coli Stephylococcus Sammelia Servatia Ktebsiella Proteux vulgaris Bacilha servas Lactobacilhas Aqueous $0.75+0.6=1.42$ $0.83+0.5=$ \cdot <	Table 3. Anti	ibacterial activi	ities, indicated by organisms (5	/ Fractional inhi S. FIC< 0.5), ad		ions (FIC _A +FIC _B C<1), indifferenc	$=\Sigma FIC$, mg dry e (I. 1< $FIC<4$)	wt. ml ⁻¹) of comb and antagonism (AN. FIC>4)	herbs against sel	ected micro-
Fitted aurens enterica marcescens preumoniae. brevis. brevis. $Aqueous$ $0.75+0.6=1.42$ $0.83+0.5=$ \cdot	Combined		Escherichia coli	Staphylococcus	Salmonella	Serratia	Klebsiella	Proteus vulgaris	Bacillus cereus	Lactobacillus	Aspergillus niger
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Spices (A+B)	Extract		aureus	enterica	marcescens	pneumoniae.			brevis	
Ehland $10+1.0=$ $0.75+0.5=$ \cdots $0.5+0.33=0.83$ \cdots $0.5+0.33=0.83$ \cdots \cdots $0.5+0.33=0.83$ \cdots $0.5+0.5=$ \cdots $0.125(0)$ \cdots $0.125(0)$ \cdots $0.125(0)$ \cdots $0.12+0.25=$ \cdots $0.33+0.5=$ \cdots $0.33+0.5=$ \cdots $0.5+0.5=$ \cdots $0.33+0.5=$ \cdots $0.57+0.5=$ $0.57+0.5=$ $0.57+0.5=$ $0.57+0.5=$ $0.57+0.5=$ $0.57+0.5=$ $0.57+0.5=$ $0.57+0.5=$ $0.57+0.5=$ $0.57+0.5=$ $0.57+0.5=$ $0.57+0.5=$ $0.57+0.5=$ $0.57+0.5=$ $0.57+0.5=$ $0.57+0.5=$ $0.57+0.5=$ $0.5+0.7=$ $0.57+0.5=$ $0.57+0.5=$ $0.57+0.5=$ $0.57+0.5=$ $0.57+0.5=$ $0.57+0.5=$ $0.57+0.5=$ $0.55+0.5=$	Cumin	A que ous	0.75+0.6=1.42 (I)	0.83+0.5= 0.83 (A)	ı	I	I	0.25+0.25= 0.5 (S)	0.5+0.25=0.75 (A)	I	0.5+0.33=0.8
Aqueous $0.8+1.0=1.8$ (1) $0.17+0.25=$ \cdot $ 0.33+0.5=$ \cdot $ -$	+ Fenugreek	Ethanol	1.0+1.0= 2.0 (I)	0.75+ 0.5= 1.25 (I)	1	$\begin{array}{c} 0.5 + 0.33 = 0.83 \\ (I) \end{array}$	I	1	ı	I	I
$Ethanol$ $Ethanol$ \cdot $0.5+0.5=$ $0.5+0.5=$ $0.67+0.33=1.0$ $0.67+0.33=1.0$ $0.67+0.33=1.0$ $0.67+0.33=1.0$ $0.67+0.33=1.0$ $0.67+0.33=1.0$ $0.67+0.33=1.0$ $0.67+0.33=1.0$ $0.67+0.33=1.0$ $0.67+0.33=1.0$ $0.67+0.33=1.0$ $0.67+0.4=$ $0.67+0.6=$ $1.47(1)$ $0.67+0.8=$ $0.67+0.6=$ $1.47(1)$ $0.67+0.8=$ $0.67+0.7=$ $0.67+0.7=$ $0.67+0.7=$ $0.67+0.7=$ $0.67+0.7=$ $0.67+0.7=$ $0.67+0.7=$ $0.67+0.7=$ $0.75+0.6=$	Black cumin	Aqueous	0.8+1.0= 1.8 (I)	0.17+0.25= 0.42 (S)		,	,	0.33+0.5= 0.83 (A)	,		,
Aqueous - 0.67+0.6= 1.34 (1) 0.67+0.8= 1.47 (1) 0.67+0.8= 1.47 (1) 0.67+0.8= 1.47 (1) -<	+ Mustard	Ethanol	,	,	0.5+0.5= 1.0 (A)	ı	ı	1	,	0.67+0.33=1.0 (A)	$\begin{array}{c} 0.75+0.67=1.42 \\ (I) \end{array}$
Ethanol - $0.5+0.4=$ $0.5+0.4=$ $0.5+0.4=$ $0.5+0.5=$ $0.5/1.0=$	Mustard +	Aqueous	,	,	0.67+0.6= 1.34 (I)	0.67+0.8= 1.47 (I)	ı	, ,	,	,	,
Aqueous $0.5+0.5=$ $0.67+1.0=$ $.$ $1.0+1.33=$ $0.75+0.6=$ $.$ $1.0(A)$ $1.67(I)$ $.$ $2.33(I)$ $.$ $0.75+0.6=$ $.$ $Ethanol$ $.$ $0.75+0.75=$ $.$ $2.33(I)$ $.$ $1.42(I)$ $.$ $Ethanol$ $.$ $.$ $1.5(I)$ $.$ $.$ $.$ $.$ $.$	Curry leaf	Ethanol	,	,	0.5+0.4= 0.9 (A)	,	ı	,	,	,	1.0+0.67= 1.67 (I)
Ethanol - 0.75+0.75= -	Cumin +	Aqueous	0.5+0.5= 1.0 (A)	0.67+1.0= 1.67 (I)	I	1	1.0+1.33= 2.33 (I)	ı	0.75+0.6= 1.42 (I)	I	ı
-	Ajowain	Ethanol	1	,	0.75+0.75= 1.5 (I)	ı	ı	1	,	,	ı

The MIC assay of aqueous and ethanolic extracts showed that cumin had the highest anti-microbial action against the strains tested, followed by mustard, henna and ajowain (Table 2). Whether the aqueous or ethanolic extract would work well on microbes, it all depends on active constituents (de Boer et al., 2005). Among the microbial strains tested, Klebsiella pneumonie and Aspergillus niger were the most resistant microbes while Staphylococcus aureus and E. coli were the most susceptible strains. Spices like cumin, fenugreek or henna worked very well against E. coli though E. coli was earlier shown as resistant to different anti-microbial agents (Saeed et al., 2007). Probiotic strain *Lactobacillus brevis* was to some extent resistant to spices so it may be expected that these spices would not interfare with growth of Lactobacillus brevis in human gut. Micro-organisms differ in their resistance to a given spice.

Oneway Analysis of Variance was used to determine whether the antimicrobial activity differs among different type of spices. The analysis shows significant difference among the groups F (8,72)=4.254, p<0.01). Post Hoc Tamhane test shows that Curry leaf differ significantly from other groups and is statistically significant for Cumin, Ajowin and ampicillin. ANOVA, in case of ethanolic extracts shows significant difference among the groups F (8,72)=6.263, p<0.01). Post Hoc Scheffe test shows that Ampicilin differ significantly from other groups and is statistically significant for blackumin, ajowain, henna, nutmeg curry leaf.

Combined antimicrobials are preferred as microbial tolerance is less likely to develop against substances having more than one type of modes of action (Gutierrez et al., 2008). It was thus necessary to check the antimicrobial activities of these spices in combinations as used in conventional cooking or salad dressing. Combinations of the spices in several cases demonstrated synergistic or additive effects on microorganisms and showed lower FICs (Table 3). Combinations like aqueous extract of cumin and fenugreek showed synergistic activity against Proteus vulgaris and additive effects against Staphylococcus aureus, Bacillus cereus and Aspergillus niger. Black cumin and mustard demonstrated synergistic activity against Staphylococcus aureus and additive antimicrobial effects against Salmonella enterica, Proteus vulgaris and Lactobacillus brevis. Synergistic or additive effects support the use of these spices in combination in stead of use in isolation. According to Cain et al. (2003) synergistic activity suggests different mode of actions of the combining compounds. Combinations like mustard and curry leaf or cumin and ajowain generally showed indifferent

effects. No combinations showed antagonistic effect. Toroglu (2011) showed how some spice essencial oils showed synergistic activities with antibiotics. The effective spice-combinations may be engaged in food preservation and may lead to new choices for antimicrobial agents. It could be concluded that cumin, mustard and henna have potentially higher antimicrobial efficacy. All tested herbal extracts (aqueous or ethanolic) have more or less antimicrobial efficacy against all microbes examined. When used in combinations these spices generally show synergistic antimicrobial effect specially on fungus.

Differential antimicrobial activity of herbs against different bacteria might be due to present of different active phyto-compounds. Among those antimicrobial compounds, phenolic compounds, terpenoids, and alkaloids are very important compounds in antimicrobial or antioxidant effects (Hoult and Paya, 1996; Rios and Recio, 2005). Some of the known active constituents are cuminaldehyde and monoterpene hydrocarbons like β -pinene of cumin, thymol of black cumin, sinigrin glucoside of mustard, trigonelline alkaloid of fenugreek, volatile terpenes and thymol of ajowain, monoterpene hydrocarbons like a-pinene of nutmeg and polyphenols of curry-leaf and henna (Karapinar and Aktug, 1987; de Guzman and Siemonsma, 1999). Further study is required to determine the different antibacterial compounds from these herbs and their full spectrum of efficacy. These ethno-medical spices and herbal resources or their combinations open the prospect of finding new clinically efficient antimicrobial compounds. The knowledge about the botanical preparation of traditional medicinal plants can be extended for future investigation into the field of pharmacology, phyto-chemistry or food chemistry for better drug discovery.

Acknowledgement

This work has been supported by University Grants Commission, India. Authors are thankful to MTCC, IMTECH, Chandigarh from where necessary strains were obtained.

References

- Ahmad, I. and Beg, A. Z. 2001. Antimicrobial and phytochemical studies on 45 Indian medicinal plants against multi-drug resistant human pathogens. Journal of Ethnopharmacology 74: 113-123.
- Akarpat, A., Tuthan, S. and Ustun, N. S. 2008. Effects of hot water extracts from myrtle, rosemary, nettle and lemon balm leaves on lipid oxidation and color

of beef patties during frozen storage. Journal of Food Processing and Preservation 32(1): 117-132.

- American Public Health Association (APHA). 1992.
 Standard Methods of Water and Wastewater Analysis, 18th Ed. American Public Health Association, Washington D. C.
- Arora, D. S. and Kaur, J. 1999. Antimicrobial activity of spices. International Journal of Antimicrobiological Agents 12: 257-262.
- Berenbaum, M. C. 1981. Criteria for analyzing interactions between biologically active agents. Adv. Cancer Research 35: 269-335.
- Brull, S. and Coote, P. 1999. Preservative agents in foods: mode of action and microbial resistance mechanisms. International Journal of Food Microbiology 50: 1-17.
- Bonjar S. 2004. Evaluation of antibacterial properties of some medicinal plants used in Iran. Journal of Ethnopharmacology 94: 301-305.
- Cain, C. C., Lee, D., Waldo III, R. H., Henry, A. T., Casida Jr, E. J., Wani, M. C., Wall, M. E., Oberlies, N. H. and Falkinham III, J. O. 2003. Synergistic antimicrobial activity of metabolites produced by a nonobligate bacterial predator. Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy 47(7): 2113-2117.
- Chaudhury, N. M. A. and Tariq, P. 2008. *In vitro* antibacterial activities of kalonji, cumin and poppy seed. Pakistan Journal of Botany 40(1): 461-467.
- Cohen, M.L. 2002. Changing patterns of infectious disease. Nature 406: 762-767.
- Cox, S., Abu-Ghannam, N. and Gupta, S. 2010. An assessment of the antioxidant and antimicrobial activity of six species of edible Irish seaweeds. International Food Research Journal 17: 205-220.
- de Boer, H.J., Kool, A., Broberg, A., Mziray, W.R., Hedberg, I. and Levenfors, J.J. 2005. Antifungal and antibacterial activity of some herbal remedies from Tanzania. Journal of Ethnopharmacology 96: 461-469.
- de Guzman, C. C. and Siemonsma, J. S. 1999. Plant resources of South-East Asia. No. 13: Spices. Prosea Foundation, Bogor, Indonesia.
- Gutierrez, J., Barry-Ryan, C. and Bourke, P. 2008. The antimicrobial efficacy of plant essential oil combinations and interactions with food ingredients. International Journal of Food Microbiology 124: 91-97.
- Gutierrez, J., Barry-Ryan, C. and Bourke, P. 2009. Antimicrobial activity of plant essential oils using food model media: Efficacy, synergistic potential and interactions with food components. Food Microbiology 26: 142-150.
- Hoult, J. R. S. and Paya, M. 1996. Pharmacological and biochemical actions of simple coumarins: natural products with therapeutic potential. General Pharmacology 27: 713-722.
- Jorgensen, J. H., Turnidge, J. D. and Washington, J. A. 1999. Antibacterial susceptibility tests: dilution and disc diffusion methods. In: Murray, P.R., Barron, E. J., Praller, M.A., Tenover, F.C. and Yolken, R.H., (Eds.) Manual of clinical microbiology. pp. 1526-1562,

Washington D.C., ASM Press.

- Karapinar, M. and Aktug, S. E. 1987. Inhibition of food borne pathogens by thymol, eugenol, menthol and anethole. International Journal of Food Microbiology 4(2): 161-166.
- Kizil, S. and Sogut, T. 2003. Investigation of antibacterial effects of spices. Crop Research 3: 86-90.
- Lia, P. K. and Roy, J. 2004. Antimicrobial and chemopreventive properties of herbs and spices. Current Medical Chemistry 47(2): 234-238.
- Liu, Z. and Nakano H. 1996. Antibacterial activity of spice extracts against food-related bacteria. Journal of the Faculty of the Applied Biological Science 35: 181-190.
- Nair, R. and Chanda, S. 2006. Activity of some medicinal plants against certain pathogenic bacterial strains. Indian Journal of Pharmacology 38: 142-144.
- Pazos, M., Alonso, A. Sanchez, I. and Medina, I. 2008. Hydroxytyrosol prevents oxidative deterioration in foodstuffs rich in fish lipids. Journal of Agricultural Food Chemistry 56(9): 3334-3340.
- Rahman, M. and Gul. S. 2002. Antibacterial activity of hydrodistilled essential oil of *Psmmogeton canescens* N. O. Umbelliferae. Biotechnology 1: 55-60.
- Rios, J. L. and Recio, M. C. 2005. Medicinal plants and antimicrobial activity. Journal of Ethnopharmacology 100: 80-84.
- Romson, S., Sunisa, S. and Worapong, U. 2011. Stability of antioxidant and antibacterial properties in heated turmeric-chili paste and its ingredients. International Food Research Journal 18: 397-404.
- Saeed, S., Naim, A. and Tariq, P. 2007. A study on prevalence of multi-drug-resistant G-ve bacteria. International Journal of Biology and Biotechnology 4(1): 71-74.
- Sagdic, O., Karahan, A. G., Ozcan, M. and Ozkan, G. 2003. Effect of some spice extracts on bacterial inhibition. Food Science and Technology International 9(5): 353-358.
- Sagdic, O. and Ozcan, M. 2003. Antibacterial activity of Turkish spice hydrosols. Food Control 14(3): 141-143.
- Shan, B., Cai, Y., Brooks, J. D. and Corke, H. 2007. The in vitro antibacterial activity of dietary spice and medicinal herb extracts. International Journal of Food Microbiology 117(1): 112-119.
- Satish, K.P., Moellering, R.C. and Eliopoulos, G.M., 2005. Antimicrobial combinations. In:Lorian V. (Ed). Antibiotics in laboratory medicine. Lippincott Williams and Wilkins, Philadelphia.
- Shelef, L. A. 1983. Antimicrobial effect of spices. Journal of Food Safety 6: 29-44.
- Singh, G., Kapoor, I. P., Pandey, S. K., Singh, U. K. and Singh, R. K. 2002. Studies on essential oils: Part 10, Antibacterial activity of volatile oils of some spices. Phytotherapy Research 16(7): 680-682.
- Toroglu, S. 2011. In vitro antimicrobial activity and synergistic/antagonistic effect of interactions between antibiotics and some spice essential oils. Journal of Environmental Biology 32(1): 23-29.

- Voravuthikunchai, S. P., Phongpaichit, S. and Subhadhirasakul, S. 2005. Evaluation of antibacterial activities of medicinal plants widely used among AIDS patients in Thailand. Pharmaceutical Biology 43(8): 701-706.
- Walsh, C. 2000. Molecular mechanisms that confer antibacterial drug resistance. Nature 406:775-781.