

Screening of phytochemicals and *in vitro* evaluation of antibacterial and antioxidant activities of leaves, pods and bark extracts of *Acacia nilotica*(L.) Del.

Muhammad Bilal Sadiq¹, Warunee Hanpithakpong², Joel Tarning^{2,3} and Anil Kumar

Anal^{1*}

¹Food Engineering and Bioprocess Technology, Asian Institute of Technology, Bangkok, Thailand.

²Mahidol-Oxford Tropical Medicine Research Unit, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand.

³Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Clinical Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom.

***Corresponding author**

Dr. Anil Kumar Anal

Food Engineering and Bioprocess Technology, Asian Institute of Technology, PO Box 4, Klongluang, Pathumthani 12120, Thailand.

Tel; +66 25246110

Fax: +66-2-5246200

E-mail: anilkumar@ait.ac.th; anil.anal@gmail.com

Abstract

The objective of this study was to determine the phytochemical content, antibacterial activity and antioxidant activity of leaves, bark and pods of *Acacia nilotica*. The different extracts of acacia were evaluated for total phenolic, flavonoid and protein contents, antibacterial (agar well diffusion and broth dilution methods) and antioxidant (DPPH; 1, 1 diphenyl-2-picrylhydrazyl assay) activities. The characterization and identification of phenolic compounds was carried out by Liquid Chromatography-tandem Mass Spectrometry analysis. The MS² fragmentation pattern showed the presence of galloylated catechins and galocatechin derivatives in tested extracts. The results indicated that all parts of the plant, but especially leaves, were effective in inhibiting the growth of antibiotic resistant strains of *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella species* obtained from clinical and food isolates. The leaves were found to be rich in total phenolic content, proteins and high antioxidant activity as compared to pods and bark. The presence of functional groups of active compounds was confirmed by Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy (FTIR) analysis of plant extracts. It was concluded that all tested parts of *A. nilotica* had antibacterial and antioxidant activities. These properties might be due to the presence of high total phenolic content, proteins and/or flavonoids. Hence the extracts of leaves, bark and pods of *A. nilotica* represent a potential source of antibacterial and antioxidant compounds that may be used in food, agriculture and/or pharmaceutical products.

Keywords

Acacia nilotica, Antioxidant, Antibacterial, Radical Scavenging activity, Total phenolic contents, Flavonoids, FTIR, LC-ESI-MS.

41 **Abbreviations**

42 DPPH (1, 1diphenyl-2-picryl hydrazyl), FTIR (Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy), LC-
43 ESI-IT-MS (Liquid chromatography-Electrospray ionization-Ion trap-Mass spectrometer),
44 TIC (Total ion chromatogram), MIC (Minimum inhibitory concentration), MBC (Minimum
45 bactericidal concentration).

1. Introduction

Acacia nilotica (L.) Del. is a medicinal plant belonging to the family Mimosaceae. It is a medium size tree locally named as “Babul” or “Kikar” and is widely distributed in tropical and subtropical regions. In traditional medicine, it is believed that *A. nilotica* is rich in nutrients and contains therapeutic compounds that are capable of prevention, mitigation and treatment of various infectious diseases and pathological conditions. Ayurvedic medicine practices suggest the use of leaves, bark and pods of *A. nilotica* against cancer, cough, diarrhea, fever, small pox, piles and menstrual problems (Ambasta, 1992). The plant is rich in polyphenolic compounds, in which catechins are hypothesized to possess antioxidant and anti-inflammatory activities (Maldini *et al.*, 2011). The bark and pods were reported to have inhibitory effect against hepatitis C virus (Hussein, G. *et al.*, 2000). In aerial parts of the plant a variety of phenolic compounds were identified, with a wide range of biological activities (R. Singh *et al.*, 2008). The plant *A. nilotica* is reported to have antibacterial effects against pathogenic microorganisms such as *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Escherichia coli* and *Staphylococcus aureus* (Oladosu *et al.*, 2013). In recent years researchers have tried to isolate strong, nontoxic antioxidants from edible plants to prevent autoxidation and lipid peroxidation with the aim to replace synthetic antioxidants (Tamuly *et al.*, 2015). Plant extracts containing high amounts of bioactive compounds especially antioxidants, have the potential of being used in food, agriculture, nutraceuticals, cosmetics and pharmaceutical products (Tuncel and Yilmaz, 2015). The plant phytochemicals and their products are generally nontoxic and contain many medicinal benefits. Antioxidant activities of plants are commonly correlated with their polyphenolic compounds content (Singh and Kumari, 2015).

Plants also contain secondary metabolites in addition to minerals and primary metabolites that are responsible for antioxidant and antibacterial potentials(Akinmoladun *et al.*, 2007). The use of such secondary metabolites alone or in combination with antibiotics against drug resistant pathogens can be an alternative approach to overcome the escalating issues of drug resistant infections (Sibanda and Okoh, 2007).

The medicinal values of plants and natural extracts have now been considered as alternative therapy, especially against various infectious diseases in both developed and developing countries. The use of medicinal plants as an alternative therapy against infectious diseases might be best exemplified in the field of antimalarial therapy, where the recommended first-line active drug compound (i.e. artemisinins) was originally derived from *Artemisia annua*.

Food-borne pathogens are a major cause of infectious diseases outbreaks in both developing and developed countries(Pires *et al.*, 2012). *Salmonella* and *Escherichia coli* are few of the main food-borne pathogens responsible for food poisoning and subsequent enteric infections (Costa *et al.*, 2012). In South East Asia, there is an absence of official *Salmonella* surveillance, but it is estimated that upto 22.8 million cases of Salmonellosis occur annually with 37,600 deaths(Majowicz *et al.*, 2010). Antibacterial drug resistance is an evolutionary phenomenon, resulting from repeated exposure of antibiotics in human or agriculture (Walsh, 2000).*Salmonella* and *Staphylococcus aureus* isolated from retail poultry meat were found resistant to various commercially available antibiotics (Akbar and Anal, 2013). Thus food contaminated with drug resistant bacteria is a major threat to public health (Akbar and Anal, 2014).Therefore, it is essential to explore new potent antibacterial compounds from natural sources to overcome the problem of antibacterial resistance.The objective of this study was to

determinethe phytochemical profile, total phenolic, flavonoid and protein contents as well as antioxidant and antibacterial activities of leaves, pods and bark extracts of *A.nilotica* against multidrug resistant enteric pathogens.

2. Materials and methods:

2.1 Preparation of crude Plant extracts and microbial sample collection

The leaves, pods and bark of the *A.nilotica* plant (wild) were collected from Lahore, Pakistan.

The plant was identified and voucher specimen was deposited to Botany Society Government

College of Science, Lahore, Pakistan. The selected plant parts were washed thoroughly under

running tap water to remove the surface dirt, followed by rinsing with sterilized distilled

water. The plant samples were dried under shade in an open air for 48 hours. The dried

samples were grounded by means of a mechanical grinder (Philips Co. Ltd., China) and finally

into finely divided powder by pestle and mortar. The extraction from these dried parts of *A.*

nilotica was conducted following the method as described by Adwan *et al.*, (2010) with slight

modifications. Powdered plant samples (30 g) were placed in 250 ml of ethanol (80%, v/v) in

conical flasks and placed on shaking incubator (Gallenkamp, UK) for 48 hours at 200 rpm.

The extracts were filtered and concentrated by means of a rotary evaporator (Büchi rotavapor

R-144, Switzerland) followed by lyophilization for 24 h in a freeze dryer (Scanvac Cool Safe

55-4, Denmark). The freeze dried extracts were stored at 4°C until further use and

reconstituted in analytical grade methanol to prepare stock solutions (1mg/ml) for total

phenolic, flavonoid and DPPH assay. For antibacterial activity stock solutions (100 mg/ml) of

each extract were prepared in analytical grade dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO).

111 *E. coli* and *S. enterica* subsp. *enterica* were isolated from fish and poultry meat, respectively, in
112 the Bioprocess Technology laboratory at the Asian Institute of Technology Bangkok,
113 Thailand. Other human clinical isolates, namely *E. coli* and *S. typhimurium* were acquired from
114 the clinical laboratory of Thammasat Hospital, Pathumthani, Thailand.

115 **2.2 Phytoconstituents analyzed**

116 The preliminary screening for presence of major phytoconstituents was done by treating
117 leaves, pods and bark extracts with chemical tests to identify the presence of saponins
118 (Frothing test), tannins and phenols (Ferric chloride test), alkaloids (Hager's test), glycosides,
119 anthraquinones (Borntrager's test), flavonoids (Shinoda test), proteins (Ninhydrin test) and
120 anthocyanins (Doughari and Ioryue, 2009; Fatma Alhakmaniet al., 2013).

121 **2.3 FTIR Analysis of extracts**

122 A FT-IR spectrometer (Perkin Elmer, USA) with a middle range infrared light source (4000-
123 400 cm⁻¹ wavenumbers) was used to analyze the chemical finger-printing of the extracts from
124 various parts of the plant. The plant extracts were ground with potassium bromide (KBr) to a
125 fine powder, placed under high pressure with compression dye until formation of a pellet and
126 then examined.

127 **2.4 LC-ESI-MS of *Acacia nilotica* extracts**

128 The qualitative analysis of leaves, pods and bark extracts of plant was carried out by liquid
129 chromatography-Electrospray ionization-Ion trap-Mass spectrometer (LC-ESI-IT-MS) by
130 using a LC system (Hitachi, Japan) consisting of LC pump and vacuum degasser. The data
131 acquisition and qualitative analysis were performed using Hystar 3.1 and Quantanalysis

(Bruker Daltonics, USA). The crude extracts were separated on Hypersil BDS (150 mm x 4.6 mm I.D. 5 μ m) column protected by a Hypersil Gold C18 guard column (10 mm x 2.1 mm I.D. 5 μ m) using a gradient elution at constant flow rate of 400 μ l/min by using a mobile phase A represented by water acidified with formic acid (0.1%) and mobile phase B represented by acetonitrile acidified with formic acid (0.1%). The gradient elution was: 0-15 min, from 0% to 25% B; 15-25 min from 25% to 70% of B; 25-35 min, from 70% to 80% of B; 35-45 min, from 80% to 30% of B; 45-50 min, from 30% to 25% of B and 50-60 min, from 25% to 10% of B. An Esquire 4000 ion trap mass spectrometer (Bruker Daltonics, USA) with an Electro Spray Ionization Source (ESI) interface operated in the negative mode was used for LC-MS/MS analysis. The ESI drying gas temperature was maintained at 365°C, flow rate of 9 L/min, ESI capillary +3000 nA and nebulizer at 40 psi. The qualitative analysis was performed using total ion chromatograms (TIC) for mass range 50-1000 m/z. Data were processed using DataAnalysis (Bruker Daltonics, USA). The LC-MS/MS method was optimized for skimmer 1 (-23.7 V), skimmer 2 (-6.0 V), capillary exit (-69.2 V), octopole (-2.31 V), lens 1 (5.0 V) and lens 2 (60 V).

2.5 Quantification of phenolic compounds by HPLC/DAD

The quantification of phenolic compounds of acacia leaves, pods and bark extracts was carried out by high performance liquid chromatography/diode array detection (HPLC/DAD) using gallic acid, catechin, tannic acid, isoquercetin, quercetin, hydroquinine, eriodictyol, apigenin, kaempferol and rutin as standards, acquired from Sigma-Aldrich (USA). The samples and standards were dissolved in ethanol (HPLC grade) and filtered by 0.22 μ m sterile

Millex filters(Millipore, Bedford, U.K.) before injection. Aliquots of 20 µl were injected into the HPLC/DAD system.

The analysis was carried out by using an Agilent HPLC 1100 system (Agilent, Germany) composed of auto sampler and diode array detector. The separation was performed on LiChroCART RP-18 column (150 x 4.6 mm, 5 µm, Purospher STAR Merk, USA). A binary solvent system was used as mobile phase consisting of (A) acetonitrile and (B) 10 mM ammonium formate buffer pH 4 adjusted with formic acid. Separation was carried out by gradient elution: 0-5 min, B 100%; 5-10 min, A 0-20%; 10-20 min, A 20% constant; 20-60 min, A 20-40%. The column temperature was set at 40°C with a solvent flow rate of 1 ml/min. The diode array detector was monitored at 270, 330, 350 and 370 nm. The phenolic compounds in each sample were identified by comparing with pure standards of each identified compound using retention time and absorbance spectra. The quantification of phenolic compounds was performed based on peak area comparison (external standard method).

2.6Determination of total phenolic and total flavonoid content

The total phenolic content of plant extracts was determined by Folin-Ciocalteu reagent (Sigma-Aldrich, Switzerland) following the method of Ainsworth and Gillespie (2007) with slight modifications. Stock solutions (1 mg/ml) of dried crude plant extracts were diluted with deionized water to prepare 100 µg/ml. For each plant extract, 0.5ml (100 µg/ml) was mixed with 2ml of freshly prepared Folin-Ciocalteu reagent (1:10 diluted with de-ionized water) and further neutralized with 4 ml of sodium carbonate solution (7.5% w/v). The reaction mixture

was incubated at room temperature for 30 min and subjected to shaking intermittently. The absorbance was then measured at 765 nm using UV-visible spectrophotometer (UNICAM UV/Vis Spectrophotometer, UK). The results were expressed as gallic acid equivalents (GAE) per gram of sample.

The total flavonoid content was determined by colorimetric method as described by Chang *et al.*, 2002, with slight modifications. The plant extract, 0.5 ml (1 mg/ml) was mixed with ethanol (95% v/v, 1.5 ml), aluminum chloride hexahydrate (10% w/v, 0.1 ml), potassium acetate (1 M, 0.1 ml) and deionized water (2.8 ml). The reaction mixture was incubated for 40 min at 25°C and absorbance was measured at 415 nm against blank. The total flavonoid content was determined by using quercetin (Sigma-Aldrich, USA) as standard. The results were expressed as quercetin equivalents (QE) per gram of sample. Each experiment was conducted in triplicates.

2.7 Determination of DPPH radical scavenging activity

The antioxidant activity of plant extracts was determined in terms of DPPH (1,1-diphenyl-2-picrylhydrazyl) radical-scavenging activity following the method as described by Cuendet *et al.*, 1997, with slight modifications. Different concentrations (1000 µg/ml, 500 µg/ml, 250 µg/ml and 125 µg/ml) of each extract were prepared from stock solution. Ascorbic acid was used as a positive control. Fifty microliters from each concentration of samples were added to 5 ml of freshly prepared 40 ppm methanol solution of DPPH (Sigma-Aldrich, USA) and the reaction mixture was kept at 25°C for 30 min at a dark place. After incubation the absorbance was read against blank at 517 nm. The methanol was used as blank and DPPH solution

without plant extract was used as control. The assay was carried out in triplicates for each extract and percentage inhibition was determined by the following equation:

$$\text{DPPH \% inhibition} = \frac{(\text{AC} - \text{AS})}{\text{AC}} \times 100$$

where AC is the Absorbance Control and AS is the Absorbance test sample.

The IC₅₀ values representing the concentration of sample required to scavenge 50% of the DPPH free radical, were calculated by implementing 1/Y²-weighted non-linear regression; log (inhibitor concentration) vs. normalized response model with a variable slope (Z. Chen *et al.*, 2013). Data analysis was performed using GraphPad Prism[®] version 6.01 (San Diego, US).

2.8 Quantification of protein content

The Bradford (1976) assay was used to quantify the amount of protein in each crude plant materials. Briefly, ground plant materials (0.5 g) were soaked in 10 ml of 0.5, 1 and 1.5 N (Normality) sodium hydroxide separately for an hour, followed by ultra-sonication at 45°C for 30 min. The samples were then subjected to centrifugation at 5000 rpm for 20 min and supernatant was collected. The supernatant (100 µl) was added to Coomassie Brilliant Blue dye (Bio-Rad, USA) solution (5 ml diluted 1:4 with de-ionized water) and the optical density was measured at 595 nm after 15 min of incubation at room temperature. The concentration of protein in each plant extract was determined by using Bovine Serum Albumin (BSA) (Sigma-Aldrich, USA) as standard.

2.9 Antimicrobial activity

The agar well diffusion method was used to determine the antibacterial effects of plant extracts by method as described by Taye *et al.*, 2011 with slight modifications. Each inoculum was adjusted to 0.5 McFarland standard and spread with the help of sterilized cotton swab on the surface of Muller Hilton Agar (MHA) (Himedia, India) plates. Wells of 6mm in diameter were made on each plate with the help of sterilized cork-borer and 100 µl of different concentrations (25, 50 and 100 mg/ml) of each extract were introduced into the agar wells by using micropipette. Amikacin (30 µg/ml) was used as a positive control whereas dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) was used as negative control. The plates were incubated for 24 hours at 37°C. The results were interpreted by measuring the diameter of clear zone around the wells. All experiments were conducted in triplicates.

2.10 Determination of minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) and minimum bactericide concentration (MBC)

MIC and MBC were determined according to method described by Kubo *et al.*, 2004, with minor modification. Stock solution of each extract was prepared in DMSO. Two-fold serial dilutions of extracts were filtered through 0.45 µm Millipore filters and prepared in sterile nutrient broth to obtain the concentrations 25, 12.5, 6.25, 3.12, 1.56, 0.78 and 0.39 mg/ml. Each inoculum was adjusted to 0.5 McFarland standard and then diluted to 1:100 for broth dilution method. The standardized inoculum was introduced in each concentration of extract. The test tubes containing solvent blank in nutrient broth along with standardized inoculum were used as a growth control and test tubes containing broth without inoculum and extract were used as negative control. The test tubes were incubated for 24 h at 37°C in the incubator and the lowest concentration which had no visible growth after 24 h incubation was

considered as the MIC. MBC was determined by sub-culturing all concentrations that had no detectable growth. 100µl from each dilution was inoculated on the surface of freshly prepared nutrient agar plates and incubated for 24 h. The minimum concentration that had no visible growth on agar plates after 24 h incubation was considered as the MBC. Each experiment was conducted in triplicates.

2.11 Statistical analysis

All experiments were carried out in triplicates and results are expressed as mean values with standard deviation (\pm SD) of three replicates. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Duncan's multiple range tests were carried out to determine significant group differences ($p < 0.05$) between means by using SPSS statistical software package (SPSS, version 16.0).

3. Results and discussion

3.1 Phytoconstituents analyzed

The leaves and pods of *A. nilotica* contained saponins, tannins, phenols, alkaloids, glycosides, flavonoids and proteins. Whereas alkaloids and glycosides were not found in the barks as shown in table 1.

3.2 FTIR characterization of extracts

The FTIR spectrum was used to identify the functional groups corresponding to the each of the active components present in plant extracts based on the peak values in the region of infrared radiation. The FTIR spectrums of freeze dried extracts and assignment of bands to functional groups are shown in figure 1 and table 2, respectively. The functional groups were assigned to its corresponding peaks in accordance with D'Angelo and Zodrow (2011). The C=O in carboxylic acid and ketones ($1724-1700\text{ cm}^{-1}$), NH_3^+ in NH_4OH due to NH_3 deformation ($1600-1520\text{ cm}^{-1}$), N–O nitro compounds due to N–O symmetric stretch ($1360-1290\text{ cm}^{-1}$) and C–O–C in aliphatic ethers, Si–O in silicates ($1040-1030\text{ cm}^{-1}$) group frequencies were present in leaves and pods extracts but absent in the bark. Whereas NH_2 in NH_4OH ; C–OH in secondary alcohols ($1095-1074\text{ cm}^{-1}$) group frequencies due to NH_2 groups in-plane rocking vibrations; C–O stretch were present in the leaves and bark extracts only. The FTIR results confirmed the presence of alcohols, phenols, alkanes, carboxylic acids, ketones, aromatic compounds, amines, secondary alcohols, alkynes and alkyl halides in the plant extracts. The leaves were found rich in functional groups which support the higher efficacy of leaves extracts over the bark and pods.

3.3 LC-ESI-MS of *Acacia nilotica* extracts

The LC-ESI-IT-MS/MS analysis was performed for qualitative analysis of leaves, pods and bark extracts of plant. The total ion chromatogram (TIC) and ESI-MS (negative ion mode) finger prints of leaves, pods and bark extracts are shown in figures 2 and 3. The obtained m/z values suggested the presence of phenolic compounds in all the tested extracts belonging to the classes of gallic acid, catechin and gallocatechin derivatives. The precursor ions obtained in all extracts were tentatively identified based on MS² spectrum data, literature and Riken tandem mass spectral database (ReSpect) (Sawada *et al.*, 2012; Koolen *et al.*, 2013; Sánchez-Rabana *et al.*, 2003; Mihailović *et al.*, 2015). The leaves were found to be abundant in epicatechin (m/z, 289), epicatechin-5-gallate (m/z, 441), ethyl gallate (m/z, 197), gallic acid (m/z, 169), vitexin (m/z, 431), L-arabinoside (m/z, 417) and caffeic acid hexose (m/z, 341). The pods exhibited similar components; epicatechin-5-gallate (m/z, 441), m-digallic acid (m/z, 321), epicatechin (m/z, 289), digallocatechin-5-gallate (m/z, 457), gallic acid (m/z, 169), dialloyl glucose (m/z, 483), caffeic acid hexose (m/z, 341) and kaempferol (m/z, 285). The bark extract showed maximum relative abundance of ions at m/z, 421 that was suspected to be magniferin (Ramírez *et al.*, 2013). The other suspected compounds from bark extracts were taxifolin (m/z, 303), myricetin (m/z, 317) and kaempferol (m/z, 285).

3.4 Quantification of phenolic compounds by HPLC/DAD

The standards of phenolic compounds were evaluated by HPLC using a visible diode array detector, monitoring at 270, 330, 350 and 370 nm. The described method showed good separation of standard compounds. Absolute quantification of phenolic compounds by using

289 the available standards was carried out as shown in table 4. The leaves were found rich in
290 gallicacid ($87,502 \pm 151.1$ mg/kg), catechin ($82,588 \pm 171.3$ mg/kg), isoquercetin ($9,725 \pm 41.6$
291 mg/kg), rutin ($6,856 \pm 15.4$ mg/kg) and quercetin ($1,637 \pm 11.6$ mg/kg), whereas, apigenin and
292 kaempferol were present in minute quantities. The pods were rich in gallic acid ($139,458$
293 ± 191.9 mg/kg), tannic acid ($6,874 \pm 31.9$ mg/kg), catechin ($6,369 \pm 29.2$ mg/kg) and rutin
294 ($4,026 \pm 17.8$ mg/kg), whereas quercetin and isoquercetin were found in minute quantities.
295 The bark extract contained all the tested standards but only catechin ($18,501 \pm 71.1$ mg/kg),
296 isoquercetin ($7,479 \pm 119.5$ mg/kg), tannic acid ($1,459 \pm 11.4$ mg/kg) and quercetin ($1,069 \pm$
297 17.3 mg/kg) were present in considerable quantities.

3.5 Total phenolic and flavonoid contents

The total phenolic contents were expressed as mg of GAE/g of dried extract. The total phenolic contents in leaves, pods and bark were 136.49 ± 2.49 , 103.68 ± 1.46 and 62.03 ± 1.69 mg GAE/g of extract, respectively, as shown in figure 4. The higher total phenolic content in leaves support its higher antioxidant potential as compared to pods and bark. The ethanol was used as a solvent for extraction of phenolic compounds preferably because it served as a preservative and less toxic as compared to other organic solvents (Tunget *al.*, 2007). Moreover, 80% ethanol was considered favorable for extraction of total phenolic content (W.H. Wong *et al.*, 2015).

The total flavonoid contents for each extract were determined by using a quercetin standard calibration curve. The total flavonoid contents in leaves, pods and bark were 37.53 ± 0.82 , 29.03 ± 0.92 and 45.5 ± 2.99 mg QE/g, respectively, as shown in figure 5. The result indicated that bark was rich in flavonoids as compared to leaves and pods.

Previous reports indicated the presence of various phenolic compounds in *Acacia* species such as ellagic acid, gallic acid, leucocyanadin, isoquercitin, rutin, catechin, m-catechol and their derivatives (Singh *et al.*, 2007). These polyphenolic compounds are strong antioxidants and are responsible for various biological activities like antidiabetic, antiaging, anticancer and prevention of cardiac diseases (Dixon *et al.*, 2005). A strong relationship between total phenolic content and antioxidant activity has been reported by Dorman *et al.*, 2003. The antioxidant activities of polyphenolic

compounds are because of their redox properties which are mainly responsible for neutralizing and absorbing free radicals (Itagakiet *al.*, 2009). The total phenolic content in ethanol extracts of leaves in the current study was found higher than that previously reported by Gowriet *al.*, 2011. Kalaivani and Mathew (2010) reported total phenolic and flavonoid contents in *A. nilotica* leaves, determined by using different extraction solvents (petroleum ether, benzene, dichloromethane, chloroform, ethanol and water). In the current study, total phenolic content of leaves was lower than that reported for ethanol and chloroform extracts but higher than all other solvent extracts reported, whereas the total flavonoid content in the current study was higher than all solvent extracts of leaves determined by them.

The total phenolic and flavonoid contents of leaves and pods extracts in the presented study were higher than that previously reported by I.B. Abdel *et al.*, 2014. In the present study, the extracted amount of total phenolic and flavonoid contents in barks were found to be less than that in *Acacia confusa* bark (Tung *et al.*, 2007). The reported variation in the phenolic and flavonoid contents in plants could be explained by the fact that presence of phenolic compounds is affected by plant species, maturity, growing conditions, soil conditions and post-harvest treatment (Jaffery *et al.*, 2003).

3.6 DPPH radical scavenging activity

There is considerable variation in antioxidant potential among the various parts of *Acacia* (table 5 and figure 6). The highest DPPH inhibition ($91.98 \pm 0.73\%$) was found

by leaves extract at 1000 $\mu\text{g/ml}$, whereas it was $88.49 \pm 1.22\%$ and $33.37 \pm 1.53\%$ for pods and bark, respectively. The positive control, L-ascorbic acid, showed similar DPPH inhibition ($96.50 \pm 0.36\%$ at 1000 $\mu\text{g/ml}$) as acacia leaves. DPPH inhibition of ethanol extracts of acacia leaves ($91.98 \pm 0.73\%$) in the current study was very close to methanol leaves extract (94.62%), reported by M. Al. Fatimiet *al.*, 2007.

The corresponding IC_{50} values are reported in table 5, where a lower IC_{50} value would represent a higher antioxidant potential. The smallest IC_{50} value of $360 \mu\text{g/ml}$ was found for leaves extract, whereas, the highest IC_{50} value of $1410 \mu\text{g/ml}$ was found for bark extract. The standard L-ascorbic acid had a IC_{50} value of $306 \mu\text{g/ml}$.

DPPH is a nitrogen centered stable violet colored free radical that is converted to yellow color due to reduction by hydrogen or electron donating ability of antioxidants present in tested extracts. All selected plant parts in this study were capable of scavenging DPPH free radicals. The DPPH radical scavenging activity decreased in order among the plant parts as leaves > pods > bark. This was supported further by the total phenolic content, indicating a positive trend between antioxidant activity and the amount of phenolic compound present in extracts.

3.7 Quantification of protein content

The results for estimation of protein content in the crude *A. nilotica* (leaves, pods and bark) by Bradford assay are shown in figure 7. Maximum protein content was $30.5 \pm 1.23 \text{ mg/g}$ for leaves after treatment with 1.5 N (Normality) sodium hydroxide. The protein content was found to be only $16.78 \pm 0.5 \text{ mg/g}$ after treatment with 1 and 1.5 N

sodium hydroxide from acacia bark. In pods there was no considerable change in protein content (20.09 ± 1.63 , 19.14 ± 2.22 and 18.43 ± 1.56 mg/g with 0.5, 1 and 1.5 N sodium hydroxide, respectively) with the change in concentration of sodium hydroxide. It was concluded that the leaves of acacia contained significantly ($p < 0.05$) higher protein content than the pods and bark, when treated with 1 and 1.5 N sodium hydroxide.

3.8 Antimicrobial activity

All selected parts of Acacia plant were found to be effective against the selected pathogens. The lowest tested concentration (25 mg/ml) of all parts of Acacia inhibited the growth of both clinical and food isolates of *E. coli* and *Salmonella*. The maximum diameter of zone of inhibition was 25.0 ± 1.0 mm and 24.33 ± 0.58 mm against E1 and S1 (*E. coli* and *Salmonella* obtained from clinical source), respectively, by leaves extract at a concentration of 100 mg/ml as shown in table 6. The antibacterial effects of Acacia pods were comparable to leaves and maximum zones of inhibition at a concentration of 100 mg/ml were 22.0 ± 1.0 mm and 21.0 ± 1.0 mm against E1 and S1, respectively. Whereas the maximum diameter of zone of inhibition by bark extract was 18.0 ± 1.0 mm and 16.33 ± 0.58 mm against E1 and S1, respectively. The results demonstrated that all selected pathogens were susceptible to all tested parts of plant. This indicated the strong antibacterial potential of *A. nilotica* against the antibiotic resistant pathogens tested here. The antibacterial results of current study are in accordance with literature, where extracts of *A. nilotica* were effective against

pathogenic bacteria including *E. coli* and *Salmonella* (Sharma *et al.*, 2014; Rosina *et al.*, 2009; Okoro *et al.*, 2014).

3.9 MIC and MBC of *Acacia nilotica* extracts

MIC and MBC of *Acacia* leaves were in the range of 1.56-3.12 mg/ml and 3.12-6.25mg/ml, respectively, against all tested bacterial strain as shown in table 7. The leaves showed the lowest MIC and MBC values as compared to pods and bark extracts. The MIC values of *Acacia* leaves and bark extracts against multidrug resistant *E. coli* were lower in the current study than previously reported by Sharma *et al.*, 2014 for *E. coli* causing otitis infection. The leaves extract showed lower MIC value against *S. typhimurium* than previously reported by Okoro, *et al.*, 2014 for *S. typhi*, the reported difference might be due to different strain of *Salmonella*.

All parts of plant were found to be effective even against the clinical isolates of *E. coli* and *Salmonella typhimurium* that were resistant to various commercially available antibiotics. Therefore, *Acacia* can be an alternative approach to treat resistant pathogens either in the form of its purified extract or in combination with commercially available antibiotics. However, more research is needed to validate these findings in animal models and in human clinical trials. We examined the antibacterial activity of ethanol extracts of leaves, pods and bark of *A. nilotica* against drug sensitive and multi drug resistant *E. coli* and *Salmonella Sp.* obtained from clinical and food sources. It was found that all extracts showed antibacterial activity against tested pathogens.

4. Conclusion

This study demonstrated that extracts of leaves, pods and bark of *Acacia nilotica* showed high DPPH radical scavenging activity (antioxidant activity), which could be due to high phenolic and flavonoid content. All extracts of the plant showed antibacterial activity against antibiotic resistant and sensitive pathogens (*E. coli* and *Salmonella*). However, leaves had the lowest MIC and MBC values against the tested pathogens as compared to pods and bark. Therefore, the extracts of leaves, bark and pods can be used as a natural source of antioxidant and antibacterial compounds. However, further research is needed to identify the individual active components responsible for antioxidant and antibacterial activities and their development for food and pharmaceutical applications.

Acknowledgements

The author acknowledged scholarship donor Higher Education Commission (HEC) of Pakistan (award letter: PD/OS-II/Batch-III/2011/8906) and Asian Institute of Technology, Thailand to conduct this work.

6. References

- Abdel-Farid, I. B., Sheded, M. G., & Mohamed, E. A. (2014). Metabolomic profiling and antioxidant activity of some *Acacia* species. *Saudi journal of biological sciences*, 21(5), 400-408.
- Adwan, G., Abu-Shanab, B., & Adwan, K. (2010). Antibacterial activities of some plant extracts alone and in combination with different antimicrobials against multidrug-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* strains. *Asian Pacific Journal of Tropical Medicine*, 3(4), 266-266.
- Ainsworth, E. A., & Gillespie, K. M. (2007). Estimation of total phenolic content and other oxidation substrates in plant tissues using Folin-Ciocalteu reagent. *Nature Protocols*, 2(4), 875-877.
- Akbar, A., & Anal, A. K. (2013). Prevalence and antibiogram study of *Salmonella* and *Staphylococcus aureus* in poultry meat. *Asian Pacific Journal of Tropical Biomedicine*, 3(2), 163-168.
- Akbar, A., & Anal, A. K. (2014). Isolation of *Salmonella* from ready-to-eat poultry meat and evaluation of its survival at low temperature, microwaving and simulated gastric fluids. *Journal of Food Science and Technology*, 1-7.
- Akinmoladun, A. C., Ibukun, E., Afor, E., Akinrinlola, B., Onibon, T., Akinboboye, A., Farombi, E. (2007). Chemical constituents and antioxidant activity of *Alstonia boonei*. *African Journal of Biotechnology*, 6(10).
- Alhakmani, F., Kumar, S., & Khan, S. A. (2013). Estimation of total phenolic content, in-vitro antioxidant and anti-inflammatory activity of flowers of *Moringa oleifera*. *Asian Pacific journal of tropical biomedicine*, 3(8), 623-627.
- Al-Fatimi, M., Wurster, M., Schröder, G., & Lindequist, U. (2007). Antioxidant, antimicrobial and cytotoxic activities of selected medicinal plants from Yemen. *Journal of Ethnopharmacology*, 111(3), 657-666.
- Ambasta, S. P., & Communication, N. I. o. S. (1992). The Useful Plants of India: National Institute of Science Communication, Council of Scientific & Industrial Research.
- Bradford, M. M. (1976). A rapid and sensitive method for the quantitation of microgram quantities of protein utilizing the principle of protein-dye binding. *Anal Biochem*, 72, 248-254.

- 451 Chang, C.-C., Yang, M. H., Wen, H. M., & Chen, J. C. (2002). Estimation of total
452 flavonoid content in propolis by two complementary colorimetric methods. *Journal of*
453 *Food and Drug Analysis*, 10(3), 178-182.
- 454 Chen, Z., Bertin, R., & Froldi, G. (2013). EC 50 estimation of antioxidant activity in
455 DPPH assay using several statistical programs. *Food chemistry*, 138(1), 414-420.
- 456 Costa, L. F., Paixao, T. A., Tsolis, R. M., Baeumler, A. J., & Santos, R. L. (2012).
457 Salmonellosis in cattle: Advantages of being an experimental model. *Research in*
458 *Veterinary Science*, 93(1), 1-6.
- 459 Cuendet, M., Hostettmann, K., Potterat, O., & Dyatmiko, W. (1997). Iridoid
460 Glucosides with Free Radical Scavenging Properties from *Fagraeablumei*. *Helvetica*
461 *ChimicaActa*, 80(4), 1144-1152.
- 462 D'Angelo, J. A., & Zodrow, E. L. (2011). Chemometric study of functional groups in
463 different layers of *Trigonocarpus grandis* ovules (Pennsylvanian seed fern, Canada).
464 *Org Geochemistry*, 42(9), 1039-1054.
- 465 Dixon, R. A., Xie, D. Y., & Sharma, S. B. (2005). Proanthocyanidins—a final frontier
466 in flavonoid research? *New phytologist*, 165(1), 9-28.
- 467 Dorman, H. D., Kosar, M., Kahlos, K., Holm, Y., & Hiltunen, R. (2003). Antioxidant
468 properties and composition of aqueous extracts from *Mentha* species, hybrids,
469 varieties, and cultivars. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 51(16), 4563-
470 4569.
- 471 Doughari, J. H., & Ioryue, A. S. (2009). Antimicrobial Activity of Stem Bark Extracts
472 of *Ceibapentandra*. *Pharmacology online*, 1, 1333-1340.
- 473 Gowri, S. S., Pavitha, S., & Vasantha, K. (2011). Free radical scavenging capacity and
474 antioxidant activity of young leaves and barks of *Acacia nilotica*(L.). *Del. Int. J.*
475 *Pharm. Pharm. Sci*, 3, 160-164.
- 476 Hussein, G., Miyashiro, H., Nakamura, N., Hattori, M., Kakiuchi, N., & Shimotohno,
477 K. (2000). Inhibitory effects of Sudanese medicinal plant extracts on hepatitis C virus
478 (HCV) protease. *Phytotherapy research*, 14(7), 510-516.
- 479 Itagaki, S., Kurokawa, T., Nakata, C., Saito, Y., Oikawa, S., Kobayashi, M., Iseki, K.
480 (2009). In vitro and in vivo antioxidant properties of ferulic acid: A comparative study
481 with other natural oxidation inhibitors. *Food Chemistry*, 114(2), 466-471.

482 Jeffery, E. H., Brown, A. F., Kurilich, A. C., Keck, A. S., Matusheski, N., Klein, B.
 483 P., & Juvik, J. A. (2003). Variation in content of bioactive components in broccoli.
 484 *Journal of food composition and analysis*, 16(3), 323-330.

485 Kalaivani, T., & Mathew, L. (2010). Free radical scavenging activity from leaves of
 486 *Acacia nilotica* (L.) Wild. ex Delile, an Indian medicinal tree. *Food and Chemical*
 487 *Toxicology*, 48(1), 298-305.

488 Khan, R., Islam, B., Akram, M., Shakil, S., Ahmad, A. A., Ali, S. M., & Khan, A. U.
 489 (2009). Antimicrobial activity of five herbal extracts against multi drug resistant
 490 (MDR) strains of bacteria and fungus of clinical origin. *Molecules*, 14(2), 586-597.

491 Kubo, I., Fujita, K. I., Kubo, A., Nihei, K. I., & Ogura, T. (2004). Antibacterial
 492 activity of coriander volatile compounds against *Salmonella choleraesuis*. *Journal of*
 493 *agricultural and food chemistry*, 52(11), 3329-3332.

494 Koolen, H. H., da Silva, F. M., Gozzo, F. C., de Souza, A. Q., & de Souza, A. D.
 495 (2013). Antioxidant, antimicrobial activities and characterization of phenolic
 496 compounds from buriti (*Mauritia flexuosa* L. f.) by UPLC–ESI-MS/MS. *Food*
 497 *Research International*, 51(2), 467-473.

498 Majowicz, S. E., Musto, J., Scallan, E., Angulo, F. J., Kirk, M., O'Brien, S. J., &
 499 Hoekstra, R. M. (2010). The global burden of nontyphoidal *Salmonella*
 500 gastroenteritis. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 50(6), 882-889.

501 Maldini, M., Montoro, P., Hamed, A. I., Mahalel, U. A., Oleszek, W., Stochmal, A.,
 502 & Piacente, S. (2011). Strong antioxidant phenolics from *Acacia nilotica*: Profiling by
 503 ESI-MS and qualitative–quantitative determination by LC–ESI-MS. *Journal of*
 504 *pharmaceutical and biomedical analysis*, 56(2), 228-239.

505 Mihailović, V., Mišić, D., Matić, S., Mihailović, M., Stanić, S., Vrvic, M.
 506 M., & Stanković, M. S. (2015). Comparative phytochemical analysis of
 507 *Gentianacruciata* L. roots and aerial parts, and their biological activities. *Industrial*
 508 *Crops and Products*, 73, 49-62.

509 Okoro, S. O., Kawo, A. H., & Arzai, A. H. (2014). Phytochemical Screening,
 510 Antibacterial and Toxicological Activities of *Acacia Nilotica* Extracts. *Bayero*
 511 *Journal of Pure and Applied Sciences*, 7(1), 105-115.

512 Oladosu, P., Isu, N. R., Ibrahim, K., Okolo, P., & Oladepo, D. K. (2013) Time kill-
 513 kinetics antibacterial study of *Acacia nilotica*. *African Journal of Microbiology*
 514 *Research*, 7(46), 5248-5252.

515 Pires, S. M., Vieira, A. R., Perez, E., Wong, D. L. F., &Hald, T. (2012). Attributing
 516 human foodborne illness to food sources and water in Latin America and the
 517 Caribbean using data from outbreak investigations. *International Journal of Food*
 518 *Microbiology*, 152(3), 129-138.

519 Ramirez, J. E., Zambrano, R., Sepúlveda, B., &Simirgiotis, M. J. (2013). Antioxidant
 520 properties and hyphenated HPLC-PDA-MS profiling of chilean Pica mango fruits
 521 (*Mangifera indica* L. Cv. piqueño). *Molecules*, 19(1), 438-458.

522 Sánchez-Rabaneda, F., Jáuregui, O., Casals, I., Andrés-Lacueva, C., Izquierdo-Pulido,
 523 M., &Lamuela-Raventós, R. M. (2003). Liquid chromatographic/electrospray
 524 ionization tandem mass spectrometric study of the phenolic composition of cocoa
 525 (*Theobroma cacao*). *Journal of Mass Spectrometry*, 38(1), 35-42.

526 Sawada, Y., Nakabayashi, R., Yamada, Y., Suzuki, M., Sato, M., et al. (2012) RIKEN
 527 tandem mass spectral database (ReSpect) for phytochemicals: a plant-specific
 528 MS/MS-based data resource and database. *Phytochemistry* 82: 38-45.

529 Sharma, C., Aneja, K. R., Surain, P., Dhiman, R., Jiloha, P., Meashi, V., & Kaur, M.
 530 (2014). In vitro evaluation of anti-microbial spectrum of *Acacia nilotica* leaves and
 531 bark extracts against pathogens causing otitis infection. *Journal of Innovative Biology*
 532 *March*, 1(1), 051-056.

533 Sibanda, T., &Okoh, A. I. (2007). The challenges of overcoming antibiotic resistance:
 534 Plant extracts as potential sources of antimicrobial and resistance modifying agents.
 535 *African Journal of Biotechnology*, 6(25), 2886-2896.

536 Singh, R., Singh, B., Singh, S., Kumar, N., Kumar, S., & Arora, S. (2008). Anti-free
 537 radical activities of kaempferol isolated from *Acacia nilotica* (L.) Willd. Ex. Del.
 538 *Toxicology in vitro*, 22(8), 1965-1970.

539 Singh, R., &Kumari, N. (2015). Comparative determination of phytochemicals and
 540 antioxidant activity from leaf and fruit of *Sapindus mukorossi* Gaertn.—A valuable
 541 medicinal tree. *Industrial Crops and Products*, 73, 1-8.

542 Singh, R., Singh, S., Kumar, S., & Arora, S. (2007). Evaluation of antioxidant
 543 potential of ethyl acetate extract/fractions of *Acacia auriculiformis* A. Cunn. *Food*
 544 *and Chemical Toxicology*, 45(7), 1216-1223.

545 Tamuly, C., Hazarika, M., Bora, J., Bordoloi, M., Boruah, M. P., &Gajurel, P. (2015).
 546 In vitro study on antioxidant activity and phenolic content of three Piper species from
 547 North East India. *Journal of Food Science and Technology*, 52(1), 117-128.

548 Taye, B., Giday, M., Animut, A., & Seid, J. (2011). Antibacterial activities of selected
 549 medicinal plants in traditional treatment of human wounds in Ethiopia. *Asian Pacific*
 550 *Journal of Tropical Biomedicine*, 1(5), 370-375.

551 Tuncel, N. B., & Yılmaz, N. (2015). Optimizing the extraction of phenolics and
 552 antioxidants from feijoa (*Feijoa sellowiana*, Myrtaceae). *Journal of Food Science and*
 553 *Technology*, 52(1), 141-150.

554 Tung, Y.-T., Wu, J.-H., Kuo, Y.-H., & Chang, S.-T. (2007). Antioxidant activities of
 555 natural phenolic compounds from *Acacia confusa* bark. *Bioresource technology*,
 556 98(5), 1120-1123.

557 Walsh, C. (2000). Molecular mechanisms that confer antibacterial drug resistance.
 558 *Nature*, 406(6797), 775-781.

559 Wong, W. H., Lee, W. X., Ramanan, R. N., Tee, L. H., Kong, K. W., Galanakis, C.
 560 M., & Prasad, K. N. (2015). Two level half factorial design for the extraction of
 561 phenolics, flavonoids and antioxidants recovery from palm kernel by-product.
 562 *Industrial Crops and Products*, 63, 238-248.

563

564 **Table 1** Phytoconstituents present in *Acacia nilotica*

Phytochemicals	<i>Acacia nilotica</i> parts		
	Leaves	Pods	Bark
Saponins	+	+	+
Tannins and Phenols	+	+	+
Alkaloids	+	+	-
Glycosides	+	+	-
Anthraquinones	-	-	-
Flavonoids	+	+	+
Proteins	+	+	+
Phenols	+	+	+
Anthocyanins	-	-	-

565 Where (+) means Available and (-) means Not Available

566 **Table 2** Assignment of FTIR bands to functional groups present in *Acacia nilotica*
 567 extracts

Range (cm ⁻¹)	Groups and class of compound	Assignment and remarks	Leaves (cm ⁻¹)	Pods (cm ⁻¹)	Bark (cm ⁻¹)
3450-3250	-OH in alcohols and phenols	O-H stretch	3376	3379	3351
3000-2850	C-H in alkanes	C-H stretch	2982, 2930	2931	2926
2936-2913	CH ₃ -, CH ₂ - in aliphatic compounds	CH ₃ -, CH ₂ - anti-symmetric stretch	2930	2931	2926
1724-1700	C=O in carboxylic acids, ketones	C=O stretch	1700	1707	None
1650-1580	N-H, 1° amines	N-H bend	1611	1614	1617
1600-1520	NH ₃ ⁺ in NH ₄ OH	NH ₃ deformation	1520	1534	None
1618-1498	Benzene ring in aromatic compounds	C=C aromatic ring stretch	1611, 1520,	1614, 1534	1617, 1512
1550-1475	N-O nitro compounds	N-O asymmetric stretch	1520	1534	1512
1360-1290	N-O nitro compounds	N-O symmetric stretch	1349	1351	None
1300-1150	alkyl halides	C-H wag (-CH ₂ X)	1209	1208	1288, 1244, 1161
1095-1074	NH ₂ in NH ₄ OH; C-OH in secondary alcohols	NH ₂ groups in-plane rocking vibrations; C-O stretch	1076	None	1076
1040-1030	C-O-C in aliphatic ethers, Si-O in silicates	C-O-C anti-symmetric stretch, Si-O stretch	1037	1038	None
900-700	=CH in aromatic hydrocarbons	=C-H out-of-plane bending	765, 819, 869	759, 868	773, 839
700-610	alkynes	-C≡C-H: C-H bend	621, 667	618, 667	631, 684

568

569 **Table 3** LC-ESI-MSMS analysis of leaves pods and bark extracts of *Acacia nilotica*.

570

Sample	MS (m/z)	MS/MS fragments (m/z)	Tentative identification
Leaves	441	289, 245	Epicatechin-5-gallate
	289	245, 205, 179	Epicatechin
	197	169, 125	Ethyl gallate
	169	125	Gallic acid
	431	341, 311	Vitexin
	417	348.9, 197	L- arabinose
	341	272.9, 178.9	Caffeic acid hexose
Pods	441	289, 245	Epicatechin-5-gallate
	289	245, 205, 179	Epicatechin
	457	305	Digallocatechin-5-gallate
	320.9	252.8, 169	m-Digallic acid
	168.9	125	Gallic acid
	483	414.8, 331.1, 276.9	Dialloyal glucose
	331.1	271, 211, 193, 169, 125	Monogalloyal glucose
	341.1	272.8, 179, 160.9	Caffeic acid hexose
	285.1	216.9, 131	Kaempferol
Bark	421.1	299.1	Magniferin
	317	248.9, 180.9, 113	Myricetin
	285.1	241, 216.9, 150.9	Kaempferol
	303	284.8, 259, 234.9, 125	Taxifolin

571 **Table 4** Retention times, UV visible spectra and contents of individual phenolic
572 compounds (mg/kg of dried extract) by HPLC/DAD

Phenolic compound	Leaves			Pods		Bark	
	HPLC-DAD	rt	Concentration	rt	Concentration	rt	Concentration
	λ_{max} (nm)	(min)	mg/kg	(min)	mg/kg	(min)	mg/kg
Gallic acid	270	6.9	87502 \pm 151.1	6.9	139458 \pm 191.9	6.9	544 \pm 11.6
Catechin	270	12.5	82588 \pm 171.3	12.5	6369 \pm 29.2	12.5	18501 \pm 71.1
Tannic acid	270		—	12.7	6874 \pm 31.9	12.7	1459 \pm 11.4
Rutin	270, 350	15.6	6856 \pm 15.4	15.4	4026 \pm 17.8	15.3	28 \pm 1.2
iso-quercetin	270, 350	16.5	9725 \pm 41.6	16.5	824 \pm 3.8	16.7	7479 \pm 119.5
Hydroquinine	270		—		—	23.1	812 \pm 2.7
Eriodictyol	270		—		—	31.5	108 \pm 0.95
Quercetin	270, 350	33.9	1637 \pm 11.6	34.0	592 \pm 5.7	34.1	1069 \pm 17.3
Apigenin	270, 350	42.2	103 \pm 1.7		—	42.2	180 \pm 2.2
Kaempferol	270, 350	43.4	114 \pm 2.1		—	43.8	637 \pm 4.9

573

574 The results were expressed as Mean \pm S.D for 3 replicates, rt is retention time, and
575 (—) indicates below limit of detection.

576

Table 5 Estimated IC_{50} values of *Acacia nilotica* (leaves, pods and bark) and L-ascorbic acid (standard)

Parts of <i>Acacia nilotica</i>	IC_{50} ($\mu\text{g/ml}$)	Hill Slope
Leaves	360 (285-455)	1.09 (0.78-1.41)
Pods	422 (348-511)	1.28 (1.01-1.54)
Bark	1410 (767-2592)	0.94 (0.62-1.27)
(L-ascorbic acid)	305.6 (259-360)	1.29 (0.99-1.58)

Parameters presented as mean estimates (95% confidence intervals).

Table 6 Antibacterial effect of *Acacia nilotica* against clinical and food isolates of *E. coli* and *Salmonella*.

Concentration (mg/ml)	Parts of <i>Acacia nilotica</i>	Diameter of zone of inhibition against pathogens			
		E1	E2	S1	S2
		(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)
25	Leaves	20.0 \pm 1.0 ^a	16.33 \pm 1.52 ^a	17.0 \pm 1.0 ^a	14 \pm 1.73 ^a
	Pods	17.7 \pm 3.05 ^a	11.33 \pm 0.58 ^b	13.7 \pm 0.58 ^b	12.7 \pm 1.15 ^a
	Barks	7.7 \pm 0.58 ^b	8.7 \pm 0.58 ^c	7.7 \pm 1.15 ^c	7.7 \pm 0.58 ^b
50	Leaves	21.7 \pm 1.52 ^a	18.33 \pm 0.58 ^a	19.33 \pm 1.52 ^a	18.7 \pm 1.52 ^a
	Pods	18.3 \pm 3.21 ^a	14.7 \pm 1.52 ^b	17.33 \pm 1.52 ^a	16.33 \pm 0.58 ^b
	Barks	13.7 \pm 1.52 ^b	12.0 \pm 1.0 ^c	11.0 \pm 2.64 ^b	11.0 \pm 1.0 ^c
100	Leaves	25.0 \pm 1.0 ^a	23.0 \pm 1.0 ^a	24.33 \pm 0.58 ^a	22.7 \pm 0.58 ^a
	Pods	22.0 \pm 1.0 ^b	21.7 \pm 1.52 ^a	21.0 \pm 1.0 ^b	18.0 \pm 1.0 ^b
	Barks	18.0 \pm 1.0 ^c	16.0 \pm 1.0 ^b	16.3 \pm 0.58 ^c	13.7 \pm 1.52 ^c
30 $\mu\text{g/ml}$	Amikacin (positive control)	20.4 \pm 1.51	23.8 \pm 1.73	23.4 \pm 2.14	23.5 \pm 1.53

The results were expressed as mean \pm S.D, based on 3 replicates. Different superscript letters (a-c) within a column indicate statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) differences between means at same concentration within a group of leaves, pods and bark. E1= *E.coli* and S1= *Salmonella typhimurium* isolated from clinical samples, E2= *E. coli* isolated from fish, S2= *Salmonella enterica* isolated from poultry meat.

Table 7 Minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) and minimum bactericidal concentration (MBC) values of *Acacia nilotica* extracts.

Microbial Strains	MIC			MBC		
	Leaves	Pods	Bark	Leaves	Pods	Bark
	(mg/ml)	(mg/ml)	(mg/ml)	(mg/ml)	(mg/ml)	(mg/ml)
E1	3.12	3.12	6.25	6.25	12.5	12.5
E2	3.12	6.25	6.25	3.12	12.5	12.5
S1	1.56	3.12	3.12	3.12	6.25	6.25
S2	1.56	3.12	3.12	3.12	6.25	6.25

The results were expressed as means of triplicates. E1= *E.coli* and S1= *Salmonella typhimurium* were isolated from clinical samples, E2= *E. coli* isolated from fish, S2= *Salmonella enterica* isolated from poultry meat.

597 **Figure1**FTIR spectrum of acacia leaves (AL), pods (AP) and bark (AB) extracts.

598 **Figure 2** LC-MS total ion chromatogram (TIC) of 80 % ethanol extract of bark (red),
 599 leaves (green) and pods (blue).

600 **Figure 3**ESI-MS (negative ion mode) finger prints of bark, leaves and pods extract.

601 **Figure4**Total phenolic content expressed as mg of GAE/g of dried extract in *Acacia*
 602 *nilotica* (leaves, pods and bark).Significant ($p < 0.05$) differences between groups are
 603 indicated by *. Numbers (above graphs) represent the calculated means and bars
 604 represent the estimated standard deviation of the mean.

605 **Figure5**Total flavonoid content expressed as mg of QE/g of dried extract in *Acacia*
 606 *nilotica* (leaves, pods and bark).Significant ($p < 0.05$) differences between groups are
 607 indicated by *. Numbers (above graphs) represent the calculated means and bars
 608 represent the estimated standard deviation of the mean.

609 **Figure6**Estimated DPPH inhibition of *Acacia nilotica* (leaves, pods and bark) and L-
 610 ascorbic acid (standard) at different concentrations, using non linear regression. Open
 611 circles represent observations, the solid lines represent the estimated means curves,
 612 and the broken lines represent the 95% confidence intervals of the mean estimates.

613 **Figure7**Protein content (mg/g)in various crude plant parts after treatment with 0.5, 1
 614 and 1.5 N sodium hydroxide.Significant ($p < 0.05$) differences between groups are
 615 indicated by *. Numbers (above graphs) represent the calculated means and bars
 616 represent the estimated standard deviation of the mean.




Fig. 1FTIR spectrum of acacia leaves (AL), pods (AP) and bark (AB) extracts.




Figure 2 LC-MS total ion chromatogram (TIC) of 80 % ethanol extract of bark (red), leaves (green) and pods (blue).

Figure




Figure 3 ESI-MS (negative ion mode) finger prints of bark, leaves and pods extract.




Fig. 4Total phenolic content expressed as mg of GAE/g of dried extract in *Acacia nilotica* (leaves, pods and bark). Significant ($p < 0.05$) differences between groups are indicated by *. Numbers (above graphs) represent the calculated means and bars represent the estimated standard deviation of the mean.




Fig. 5Total flavonoid content expressed as mg of QE/g of dried extract in *Acacia nilotica* (leaves, pods and bark). Significant ($p < 0.05$) differences between groups are indicated by *. Numbers (above graphs) represent the calculated means and bars represent the estimated standard deviation of the mean.




Fig. 6Estimated DPPH inhibition of *Acacia nilotica* (leaves, pods and bark) and L- ascorbic acid (standard) at different concentrations, using non linear regression. Open circles represent observations, the solid lines represent the estimated means curves, and the broken lines represent the 95% confidence intervals of the mean estimates.




Fig. 7Protein content (mg/g)in various crude plant parts after treatment with 0.5, 1 and 1.5 N sodium hydroxide.Significant ($p < 0.05$) differences between groups are indicated by *. Numbers (above graphs) represent the calculated means and bars represent the estimated standard deviation of the mean.