

IN VITRO ALPHA-GLUCOSIDASE INHIBITORY ACTIVITY OF EGYPTIAN PLANT EXTRACTS AS AN INDICATION FOR THEIR ANTIDIABETIC ACTIVITY

MAY A EL-MANAWATY*, LAMIAA GOHAR

Department of Pharmacognosy, Pharmaceutical and Drug Industries Research Division, National Research Centre, Cairo, Egypt.
Email: mayalyem@gmail.com

Received: 12 March 2018, Revised and Accepted: 16 April 2018

ABSTRACT

Objective: Diabetes mellitus is a highly prevalent chronic disease in Egypt leading to high socioeconomic problems, especially in the cities due to the unhealthy life style. Although many drugs are available, they have many side effects. Furthermore, the body arouses resistance after a while for the drug so it should be changed every once in a while. Plants could be a good source for drugs. In Egypt, we have a rich flora which has not been subjected to systematic screening for antidiabetic activity.

Methods: The aim of this work was to screen 264 plant extracts for their *in vitro* α -glucosidase inhibitory activity. Those extracts which gave more than 70% inhibition were screened on different concentrations and their inhibitory concentrations giving 50% activity (IC_{50}) were calculated.

Results: Out of all the tested extracts, 63 gave more than or equal 70% inhibition on α -glucosidase at the tested concentration (25 ppm). After the calculation of the IC_{50} values, 10 extracts were chosen for further study having 5 ppm and less IC_{50} .

Conclusion: The most active plant extract is *Pinus roxburghii* Sarg. branches (IC_{50} is 2.47 ppm).

Keywords: Antidiabetic, Alpha-glucosidase, *In vitro*, Plant extracts, Bioassay, Egyptian.

© 2018 The Authors. Published by Innovare Academic Sciences Pvt Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>) DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22159/ajpcr.2018.v11i7.25856>

INTRODUCTION

Diabetes is a complex metabolic condition where the patient suffers a chronic increase in blood glucose concentration (hyperglycemia) since the body cannot properly utilize it [1-4].

Diabetes mellitus is a highly prevalent chronic disease in Egypt leading to high socioeconomic problems, especially in the cities due to the unhealthy life style. Although many drugs are available, they have many side effects. Furthermore, the body arouses resistance after a while for the drug so it should be changed every once in a while.

It is noteworthy that therapeutic pathways for type 2 diabetes mellitus are based on the following: Stimulation of insulin secretion, reducing the production of glucose from the liver, interfering with the metabolism and digestion of carbohydrates (our target), and optimizing insulin action [5].

Plants and natural products could represent an excellent source for drugs since they can provide new compounds which cannot be predicted by computational chemistry [6].

The α -glucosidase enzyme is responsible for changing oligo and disaccharides into monosaccharides. In case it is inhibited, the blood concentration of glucose decreases since only monosaccharides can be absorbed through intestinal mucosa [7] thus reducing the demand for insulin.

The aim of this work was to begin a series of diabetes-related *in vitro* screening program, studying the Egyptian flora. Since no systematic Egyptian large scale bio-study was done in that area before, we find it of great interest to undergo such a study.

The paper at hand, aimed to screen 264 plant extracts for their *in vitro* α -glucosidase inhibitory activity.

METHODS

Preparation of the plant extracts

Seventy five grams of dried plant powder were percolated in 450 ml 95% analytical grade methanol (ADWIC-Egypt) for 24 h in a stainless steel percolator. The percolate was vacuum dried using Büchi R-114 rotatory evaporator at 45°C. The distillate was used for re-percolation of the marc and the same procedure was adopted. The dried extract was kept in the dark at -20°C till its use [8].

Preparation of the stock solutions of plant extracts for bioassays

Ten mg of the dried methanol plant extract are dissolved in 500 μ l dimethyl sulfoxide (stock solution A). Master plates for the extracts to achieve different concentrations are prepared as follows: 5 μ l from the stock solution A + 195 μ l buffer (stock B); 100 μ l from the stock solution B + 100 μ l buffer (stock C); 100 μ l from the stock solution C + 100 μ l buffer (stock D); and 100 μ l from the stock solution C + 100 μ l buffer (stock D).

α -glucosidase inhibitory activity

Briefly α -glucosidase (Sigma G5003-100UN-USA) of concentration 0.2 U/ml is prepared in phosphate buffer saline (0.2 M) (pH 6.8) (35.084 g Na_2HPO_4 [Loba Chemie-0597100500] + 13.872 g KH_2PO_4 [s.d.fine-Chem Ltd. BOISAR 39608]L). 10 μ l of sample at varying concentrations are mixed with 60 μ l of 0.2 U/ml α -glucosidase and incubated for 20 min at 37°C in a 96 well plate. The 150 μ l of 1.25 mM p-nitrophenyl α -D-glucopyranoside (p-NPG) (Sigma N1377-5g-USA) are added and incubated at 37°C for 20 min giving final concentrations of 0.2 to 25 ppm in the final volume. The reaction is terminated by the addition of 50 μ l of 2 g/L sodium hydroxide (NaOH). α -glucosidase activity is determined spectrophotometrically at 405 nm by measuring the quantity of bright yellow p-nitrophenol released from the colorless p-NPG. The negative control has 10 μ l of buffer solution in place of the test entity while acarbose is used as a positive control. For blank p-NPG with buffer solution is added instead of the enzyme [9,10].

Calculation of the result:

The percentage inhibition = $(1 - [\text{average of sample absorbance} / \text{average of negative control absorbance}]) \times 100$

RESULTS

Two hundred and sixty four plant extracts (25 ppm) were screened for their α -glucosidase inhibitory activity (Table 1).

Out of all the tested extracts, 63 gave more than or equal 70% inhibition on glucosidase at the tested concentration, where their IC_{50} values were calculated (Tables 2 and 3). IC_{50} of acarbose as a positive control is 45 ± 2.7 ppm. By reviewing the results, the most active plant extract proved to be *Pinus roxburghii* Sarg. branches methanol extract (IC_{50} is 2.47 ppm).

DISCUSSION

The present study was designed for the purpose of screening a part of the Egyptian flora for their antidiabetic properties. Where a huge number of animals would be needed for the purpose, the resort to a simple *in vitro* method pointing out the plants which can be chosen as candidates for deeper *in vivo* studies is adopted. This paper is the beginning step in a much longer path so as to reach an effective antidiabetic drug from natural origin.

By reviewing our findings, several plant extracts showed significant results in blocking the α -glucosidase enzyme ability to break down starch, which, in turn, would decrease the blood glucose level.

Pinus roxburghii Sarg. being the most active plant was subjected to a literature survey. The survey showed that the bark alcohol extract has

Table 1: Screening of extracts on α -glucosidase inhibitory *in vitro* bioassay at 25 ppm

Genus species	Part	Activity on α -glucosidase (%)
<i>Acacia ehrenbergiana</i> Hayne	Fr	13
<i>Acacia saligna</i> (Labill.) H.L.Wendl.	L, Fl and Fr	1
	Br	100
<i>Acalypha wilkesiana</i> Mull. Arg. Cv. Hoffmanianum	L	99
<i>Acer negundo</i> L.	Bark	-24
<i>Acer oblongum</i> Wall. ex DC.	H	12
<i>Achillea fragrantissima</i> (Forssk) Sch	H	15
<i>Achras sapota</i> L.	L	100
<i>Adenantha pavonina</i> L.	Bark	10
<i>Aegilops ventricosa</i> (Zhuk.) Chennav.	H	15
<i>Aegle marmelos</i> (L.) Corrêa	Inflorescence	16
<i>Ageratum houstonianum</i> Mill	Br	21
<i>Albizia stipulata</i> Boiv.	L, Br and Fl	16
<i>Albizia lebeck</i> (L.) Benth.	L	12
<i>Alhagi graecorum</i> Boiss.	H	3
<i>Alkanna orientalis</i> (L.) Boiss.	Br	43
<i>Aloe arborescens</i> Mill	Shoot system	16
<i>Amaranthus graecizans</i> L.	H	0
<i>Anagallis arvensis</i> L.	H	0
<i>Anredera baselloides</i> (HBK) Bail	L and Br	26
<i>Aptenia cordifolia</i> (L.f.) Schwant.	L	27
<i>Arisarum vulgare</i> v.vesligii	H	0
<i>Artemisia judaica</i> L.	H	0
<i>Astragalus fruticosus</i> Forssk.	H	0
<i>Atriplex halimus</i> L.	H	9
<i>Atriplex portulacoides</i> L.	H	11
<i>Atriplex semibaccata</i> R.Br.	H	21
<i>Avena sterilis</i> L.	H	0
<i>Ballota kaiseri</i> Tackh.	Br	0
<i>Baugainvillea glabra</i> Choisy	Bark	0
<i>Bauhinia hookeri</i> F.J.Muell.	L and Br	100
	L	100
<i>Bauhinia variegata</i> (L.) Benth.	Fr with seeds	-15
	Bark	100
<i>Beta vulgaris</i> L.	Weed	30
<i>Bombax malabaricum</i> DC.	L	100
<i>Bougainvillea spectabilis</i> Willd.	L and Br	17
<i>Brassia actinophylla</i> Endl.	L and Br	78
<i>Brassica nigra</i> L.	Weed	19
<i>Brassica oleracea</i> L.	Weed	23
<i>Caesalpinia ferrea</i> C.Mart.	L and Fl	3
<i>Calligonum comosum</i> L'Her.	Br	32
<i>Calligonum polygonoides</i> L.	H	99
<i>Campsis radicans</i> (L.) seem.ex Bur.	Br	33
<i>Capsella bursa-pastoris</i> (L.) Medik.	Weed	20
<i>Caryota urens</i> L.	Fr	100
<i>Cassia Fistula</i> L.	Br	100
<i>Cassia renegra</i> Wallich ex Benth.	Br	100
	L	26
<i>Celosia argentea</i> L.	Br, Fr and Bark	19
<i>Chenopodium ficifolium</i> Sm.	Weed	15
<i>Chorisia insignis</i> (A.St.-Hil.) Ravenna	Bark	99

(Contd...)

Table 1: (Continued)

Genus species	Part	Activity on α -glucosidase (%)
<i>Chrysophyllum oliviforme</i> L.	Br	100
<i>Cichorium endivia</i> L.	Weed	16
<i>Cissus rotundifolia</i> (Forssk.) Vahl	L and Br	0
<i>Citharexylon quadrangularis</i> Jacq.	Br	0
	Bark and Wood	14
<i>Citrullus colocynthis</i> (L.) Schrad.	Fr	0
<i>Citrus aurantiifolia</i> (Christm.) Swingle	Shoot system	24
<i>Cleome amblyocarpa</i> Barr. and Murb.	L and Br	14
<i>Cleome chrysantha</i> Decne.	H	-30
<i>Cleome droserifolia</i> (Forssk.) Del.	Bark	-17
	H	10
<i>Clerodendrum inermis</i> L.	H with Fl	0
<i>Clerodendrum splendenc</i> G. Don.	Br	5
	L	27
<i>Clivia miniata</i> Regrl.	L	0
<i>Coccoloba peltata</i> Schott	L	39
<i>Convolvulus arvensis</i> L.	Weed	15
<i>Cordia gharaf</i> (Forssk.) Ehrenb.ex Asch.	L	2
	Br	2
	Bark	11
<i>Cordia myxa</i> L.	H	7
<i>Cornopus niloticus</i> (Delile) Spreng.	Weed	15
<i>Cornulaca monacantha</i> Delile	Bark	19
<i>Cressa cretica</i> L.	H	0
<i>Cynanchum acutum</i> L.	L and Fl	43
<i>Dactyloctenium aegyptium</i> (L.) Willd.	H	0
<i>Datura stramonium</i> L.	H with Fr	3
<i>Dellina indica</i> L.	Br	13
	H	68.70
<i>Delonix regia</i> (Boj. ex Hook.) Raf.	Fl	74
<i>Dendrocalamus strictus</i> (Roxb.) Nees	H with Fl	14
<i>Derris robusta</i> (Roxb. ex DC.) Benth.	L and Fl	89
	Br	87
<i>Diplotaxis harra</i> (Forssk.) Boiss.	H	11
<i>Dombeya tiliaceae</i> (Endl.) planch	Br	50
<i>Encephalartos villosus</i> Lem.	Male Cone	100
<i>Ephedra alata</i> Decne.	L	5
<i>Ephedra aphylla</i> Forsskål	H	100
<i>Eriobotrya japonica</i> (Thumb) Lindl.	Br	64
	L	59
<i>Erodium cicutarium</i> (L.) L'Hér. ex Aiton	H	52
<i>Eruca sativa</i> Mill.	Weed	32
<i>Erythrina indica</i> Lam.	Bark	37
	L and Br	0
<i>Eucalyptus citriodora</i> (Hook.) K.D. Hill and L.A.S.Johnson	H	100
<i>Eucalyptus rostrata</i> Schldt.	Bark	95
<i>Eugenia uniflora</i> L.	L	97
<i>Euphorbia cotinifolia</i> L.	H	26
<i>Euphorbia ingens</i> E.Mey. ex Boiss.	Bark	37
<i>Euphorbia peplis</i> L.	Weed	45
<i>Euphorbia pulcherrima</i> Willd. Ex. Kolotzch.	L	23
<i>Euphorbia retusa</i> Forssk.	H	27
<i>Feronia elephantum</i> Corrêa	Bark	-23
<i>Ficus afzelii</i> G.Don	Bark	100
	L	75
	Br	56
<i>Ficus bengalensis</i> L.	Aerial Roots	67
	Fr	56
<i>Ficus cyathistipula</i> Warb.	L	11
<i>Ficus decora</i> Hort. Cv. Variegata	H	28
<i>Ficus elastica</i> Roxb. ex Hornem.	Bark	100
<i>Ficus eriotroydes</i> (Ficus afzeliiG. Don.)	Br	22
	H	95
<i>Ficus palmata</i> Forssk. Sub. Sp. Virgata (Roxb.)	Br	24
<i>Ficus platyphylla</i> Delile	Br	25
	H	32
<i>Ficus pyriformis</i> L.	Shoot system	21
<i>Ficus sperguana</i> L.	Bark	100
	H	96
<i>Flacourtia cataphracta</i> Roxb. ex Willd.	L	-11
<i>Halocnemum strobilaceum</i> (Pall.) Bieb.	H	17

(Contd...)

Table 1: (Continued)

Genus species	Part	Activity on α -glucosidase (%)
<i>Harphephyllum caffrum</i> Bernh. ex C.Krauss	Br	6
<i>Harpullia cupanioides</i> Roxb.	Bark	6
	Br	83
	L	0
	H	15
<i>Heliotropium digynum</i> (Forssk.) Aschers. ex C. Christ.	H	-6
<i>Hippeastrum vittatum</i> (L. Her.)	Br	20
<i>Hyphaene thebaica</i> (L.) Mart.	Fl	2
	H	0
<i>Iphiona scabra</i> DC. ex Decne.	H	0
<i>Jasminum primulinum</i> Hemsl.	Br	18
	L	33
<i>Juncus rigidus</i> Desf.	H	0
<i>Khaya dewi</i> A.Juss.	L and Br	30
	L	0
<i>Khaya senegalensis</i> (Desr.) A.Juss.	L	66
	Br	83
	Bark	97
<i>Koelreuteria elegans</i> (seem.) A.C. Sm.(<i>Koelreuteria henryi</i> Dummer)	L	96
<i>Koelreuteria paniculata</i> Laxm.	Br	100
<i>Lagerstroemia indica</i> (L.) Pers.	Br	87
<i>Lamium amplexicaule</i> L.	Weed	23
<i>Lantana camara</i> L.	Br	0
<i>Lasiurus hirsutus</i> (Forssk.) Boiss.	L	20
<i>Launaea spinosa</i> (Forssk.) Sch.Bip.	H	-5
<i>Leucaena glauca</i> L. Benth	H with Fl and Fr	27
	L	32
<i>Liomoniastrum monopetalum</i> (L.) Boiss.	L, Br and Fl	8
	H	100
<i>Lonicera japonica</i> Thunb.	L and Br	23
<i>Lotus tenuis</i> Waldst. and Kit. ex Willd.	Weed	16
Synonyms <i>Lotus glaber</i> Mill.		
<i>L. corniculatus</i> subsp. <i>tenuifolius</i> L.		
<i>Lycium europaeum</i> L.	L and Br	31
<i>Lycium shawii</i> Roem and Schult.	H	10
<i>Macadamia integrifolia</i> Maiden and Betche	Br and L	26
<i>Maclura pomifera</i> (Raf.) Schneid.	Bark	0
<i>Magnolia grandiflora</i> L.	Bark	-15
	Fl	0
<i>Malpighia glabra</i> L.	L	0
<i>Malvaviscus arboreas</i> Cav.	H	21
<i>Mangifera indica</i> L.	Br	96
<i>Markhamia platycalyx</i> (Baker) Sprague	Fl	16
<i>Medicago polymorpha</i> L.	Weed	17
<i>Melaleuca ericifolia</i> Sm.	L and Fl	50
	Br	55
<i>Melia azedarach</i> L.	Weed	0
<i>Melilotus indicus</i> (L.) All.	Weed	25
<i>Mesembryanthemum nodiflorum</i> L.	Weed	19
<i>Montanoa bipinnatifida</i> (Kunth) K.Koch	L	-26
	Br	2
<i>Morettia philaena</i> (Del.) DC	Br	2
<i>Morus alba</i> L.	L and Br	32
<i>Morus nigra</i> L.	Bark	99
<i>Myoporum laetum</i> G. Forst.	H	5
<i>Nitraria retusa</i> (Forssk.) Asch.	H	0
<i>Ononis vaginalis</i> Vahl	H	16
<i>Oreopanax reticulatum</i> Willd.	Fr	0
<i>Panicum turgidum</i> Forssk.	H	20
<i>Parietaria judaica</i> L.	L and Br	30
<i>Parkinsonia aculeata</i> L.	L	30
<i>Paspalidium geminatum</i> (Forssk.) Stapf.	H	0
<i>Phlomis aurea</i> Decne.	Shoot system	25
<i>Phoenix dactylifera</i> L.	Pulp	0
<i>Pinus canariensis</i> C.Sm.	Fr	100
	L	100
<i>Pinus halepensis</i> Mill.	Fr	75
	Br	37
	L	79
<i>Pinus pinea</i> L.	Br	100

(Contd...)

Table 1: (Continued)

Genus species	Part	Activity on α -glucosidase (%)
<i>Pinus roxburghii</i> Sarg.	L	99
	Fr	30
	Br	99.50
<i>Pistacia chinensis</i> Bunge	L	68
	L and Fr	11
<i>Pithecellobium dulce</i> (Roxb.) Benth.	L and Unripe Fruit	0
	Fr	100
<i>Plantago lagopus</i> L.	H	0
<i>Plumeria rubra</i> L.	L, Br and Fr	15
<i>Polyscias paniculata</i> (DC.) Baker	Br	100
<i>Psidium guajava</i> L.	Br	99
	L	99
<i>Pterospermum acerifolium</i> (L.) Willd.	Br	17
<i>Pulicaria incisa</i> (Lam.) DC.	H with Fl	0
<i>Putranjiva roxburghii</i> Wallich	Br	47
	L	100
<i>Pyracantha fortuneana</i> (Maxim) H.L.Li (<i>Pyracantha creneto-serrata</i> Hance Rehd)	L	88
<i>Pyrethrum santolinoides</i> (<i>Tanacetum santolinoides</i>)	H	0
<i>Pyrus communis</i> L.	Shoot system	42
<i>Ranunculus sceleratus</i> L.	H	0
<i>Reseda pruinosa</i> Delile	H	9
<i>Rumex dentatus</i> L.	Weed	92
<i>Sabal peregriana</i> L.H. Bailey	L	9
<i>Salsola kali</i> L.	H	10
<i>Sambucus nigra</i> L.	Bark	0
<i>Saraca cauliflora</i> Bak.	L	91
<i>Schefflera arboricola</i> (Hayata) Kanehira	Shoot system	30
<i>Senecio glaucus</i> L. Synonyms <i>Senecio coronopifolius</i> Desf	Weed	23
<i>Senna surattensis</i> (Burm. f.) H. Irwin and Barneby	Br	98
<i>Sesbania sesban</i> (L.) Merr.	L and Br	-17
<i>Shinopsis balansea</i> Engl	Br	98
<i>Silene rubella</i> L.	Weed	19
<i>Silybum marianum</i> (L.) Gaertn.	Weed	23
<i>Sonichus oleraceus</i> L.	W	20
<i>Spathodea nilotica</i> Seem.	L and Br	19
	Fl	6
<i>Spondias lutea</i> L.	L	89
	Fr	100
	Br	100
<i>Stachys aegyptiaca</i> Pers.	H	0
<i>Stellaria pallida</i> (Dumort.) Piré	Weed	34
<i>Sterculia foetida</i> L.	L	51
	Br	100
<i>Suaeda aegyptiaca</i> (Hasselt.) Zohary	H	17
<i>Suaeda pruinosa</i> Lange	H	32
<i>Suaeda vera</i> Forssk. ex J.F.Gmel.	H	0
<i>Swietenia macrophylla</i> King	L	62
<i>Swietenia mahagoni</i> (L.) Jacq.	L	100
	Br	100
<i>Tecoma radicans</i> (L.) Juss.	Bark	42
	L and Br	14
<i>Tecoma stans</i> (L.) Juss. ex Kunth	H	21
	L	26
<i>Terminalia angustifolia</i> Blanco	Br	0
<i>Terminalia arjuna</i> (Roxb.) Wight and Arn.	Br	100
<i>Terminalia bellirica</i> (Gaertn.) Roxb.	Br	12
<i>Teucrium polium</i> L.	H	0
<i>Tipuana tipu</i> (Benth.) Kuntze	Bark	36
	L	0
<i>Trifolium resupinatum</i> L.	Fl	15
	Weed	23
<i>Trigonella stellata</i> Forssk.	H	0
<i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> Jacq.	L	50
<i>Verbascum sinaiticum</i> Benth.	Br	4
<i>Verbena x hybrida</i> Ross.	L	15
<i>Vicia sativa</i> L.	Weed	12
<i>Woodfordia fruticosa</i> (L.) Kurz	Bark	4
<i>Xanthium spinosum</i> L.	H	0
<i>Zilla spinosa</i> (L.) Subsp. Parmata	Br	12
<i>Zygophyllum album</i> L.	L	20
<i>Zygophyllum decumbens</i> Delile.	Aerial part	12

H: Herb, Fr: Fruits, Fl: Flowers, L: Leaves, Br: Branches

Table 2: The percentage inhibition of extracts which gave $\geq 70\%$ at 25 ppm on α -glucosidase on different concentrations to be used in the calculation of the IC values

Genus species	Part	Activity on α -glucosidase (%)					
		25 ppm	12.5 ppm	6.3 ppm	3.1 ppm	1.6 ppm	0.8 ppm
<i>Acacia saligna</i> (Labill.) H.L. Wendl.	Br	99	86	66	37		
<i>Acalypha wilkesiana</i> Mull. Arg. Cv. <i>Hoffmanianum</i>	L	99	95	71	30		
<i>Achras sapota</i> L.	L	96	73	38	15		
<i>Bauhinia hookeri</i> F.J. Muell.	L and Br	90	88	73	34		
	Br	100	88	54	25		
<i>Bauhinia variegata</i> (L.) Benth.	Bark	71	71	59	54		
<i>Bombax malabaricum</i> DC.	Bark	97	78	48	24		
<i>Brassia actinophylla</i> Endl.	L, Br	83	64	33	15		
<i>Calligonum polygonoides</i> L.	H	100	100	97	50		
<i>Caryota urens</i> L.	L	99	90	60	27		
<i>Cassia Fistula</i> L.	Bark	95	82	59	40		
<i>Cassia renegra</i> Wallich ex Benth.	L	85	72	56	36		
<i>Chorisia insignis</i> (A.St.-Hil.) Ravenna	Bark	99	97	90	50		
<i>Chrysophyllum oliviforme</i> L.	Br	100	95	73	3		
<i>Derris robusta</i> (Roxb. ex DC.) Benth.	L and Fl	89	45	17	8		
	Br	88	82	79	46		
<i>Encephalartos villosus</i> Lem.	Male Cone	100	100	70	32		
<i>Ephedra aphylla</i> Forsskål	Herb	89	64	38	17		
<i>Eucalyptus citriodora</i> (Hook.) K.D. Hill and L.A.S. Johnson	Bark	84	52	28	20		
<i>Eucalyptus rostrata</i> Schldl.	Bark	95	87	81	73		
<i>Eugenia uniflora</i> L.	L	97	95	85	43		
<i>Ficus afzelii</i> G. Don	Bark	98	99	99	67	36	16
	L	84	62	28	0		
<i>Ficus elastica</i> Roxb. ex Hornem.	Bark	100	96	87	40		
<i>Ficus eriobotryoides</i> (<i>Ficus afzelii</i> G. Don.)	Br and Fr	88	51	41	2		
<i>Ficus sperguana</i> L.	L	83	62	42	20		
	Bark	100	98	73	12		
<i>Harpullia cupanioides</i> Roxb.	Br	83	13	0			
	Fl	72	39	21	10		
<i>Khaya senegalensis</i> (Desr.) A. Juss.	Br	86	81	51	13		
	Bark	99	98	98	76	45	34
	L	89	86	80	60		
<i>Koelreuteria elegans</i> (seem.) A.C. Sm. (<i>Koelreuteria henryi</i> Dummer)							
<i>Koelreuteria paniculata</i> Laxm.	Br	93	67	29	0		
<i>Lagerstroemia indica</i> (L.) Pers.	L and Fl	96	90	77	44		
<i>Liomonastrium monopetalum</i> (L.) Boiss.	Herb	100	76	41	11		
<i>Mangifera indica</i> L.	L	96	100	85	35		
<i>Morus nigra</i> L.	Bark	99	99	85	55		
<i>Pinus canariensis</i> C.Sm.	Fr	99	99	93	50		
	L	91	61	30	12		
<i>Pinus halepensis</i> Mill.	Fr	75	41	8	2		
	L	79	52	26	7		
<i>Pinus pinea</i> L.	Br	92	57	0	0		
	L	91	62	26	4		
<i>Pinus roxburghii</i> Sarg.	Br	92.00	97	91	67		
<i>Pithecellobium dulce</i> (Roxb.) Benth.	Bark	95	94	78	38		
<i>Polyscias paniculata</i> (DC.) Baker	Br	95	82	57	24		
<i>Psidium guajava</i> L.	Br	99	97	64	19		
	L	99	98	71	30		
<i>Putranjiva roxburghii</i> Wallich	L	87	54	37	11		
<i>Pyracantha fortuneana</i> (Maxim) H.L.L.i (<i>Pyracantha creneto-serrata</i> (Hance) Rehd)	B	98	94	70	47		
<i>Rumex dentatus</i> L.	Weed	75	38	10	4		
<i>Saraca cauliflora</i> Bak.	L	99	97	70	32		
<i>Senna surattensis</i> (Burm. f.) H. Irwin and Barneby	Br	99	89	64	27		
<i>Shinopsis balansea</i> Engl	Bark	98	97	77	41		
<i>Spondias lutea</i> L.	L	89	82	64	62		
	Br	100	99	88	51		
	Fr	66	37	0			
<i>Sterculia foetida</i> L.	L	100	100	72	17		
	Br	100		89	50		
<i>Swietenia mahagoni</i> (L.) Jacq.	L	99	98	88	52		
	Br	100	100	100	65		
<i>Terminalia arjuna</i> (Roxb.) Wight and Arn.	Br	100	100	60	30		

H: Herb, Fr: Fruits, Fl: Flowers, L: Leaves, Br: Branches

Table 3: The calculated IC50 of the extracts which gave ≥70% at 25 ppm

Plant name	Part	IC50
<i>Acacia saligna</i> (Labill.) H.L. Wendl.	Br	05.64±1.0
<i>Acalypha wilkesiana</i> Mull. Arg. Cv. <i>Hoffmanianum</i>	L	05.43±0.9
<i>Achras sapota</i> L.	L	09.17±1.7
<i>Bauhinia hookeri</i> F.J.Muell.	L and Br	06.20±1.6
	Br	06.26±0.9
<i>Bauhinia variegata</i> (L.) Benth.	Bark	07.95±1.3
<i>Bombax malabaricum</i> DC.	Bark	07.80±1.7
<i>Brassia actinophylla</i> Endl.	L, Br	11.07±1.9
<i>Calligonum polygonoides</i> L.	H	03.54±0.5
<i>Caryota urens</i> L.	L	11.63±2.1
<i>Cassia Fistula</i> L.	Bark	07.80±1.9
<i>Cassia renegra</i> Wallich ex Benth.	L	08.44±2.0
<i>Chorisia insignis</i> (A.St.-Hil.) Ravenna	Bark	02.97±0.8
<i>Chrysophyllum oliviforme</i> L.	Br	05.77±1.1
<i>Derris robusta</i> (Roxb. ex DC.) Benth.	L, fl	18.83±2.7
	Br	05.53±1.6
<i>Encephalartos villosus</i> Lem.	Male Cone	04.48±0.6
<i>Ephedra aphylla</i> Forsskål	H	10.66±1.2
<i>Eucalyptus citriodora</i> (Hook.) K.D. Hill and L.A.S.Johnson	Bark	12.41±2.1
<i>Eucalyptus rostrata</i> Schldl.	Bark	03.20±0.1
<i>Eugenia uniflora</i> L.	L	04.36±0.8
<i>Ficus afzelii</i> G.Don	Bark	03.37±0.2
	L	13.23±1.1
<i>Ficus elastica</i> Roxb. ex Hornem.	Bark	03.99±0.1
<i>Ficus eriotroydes</i> (Ficus afzelii G. Don.)	Br and Fr	13.18±1.4
<i>Ficus sperguana</i> L.	L	11.66±2.1
	Bark	05.17±1.1
<i>Harpullia cupanioides</i> Roxb.	Br	21.01±4.1
	Fl	15.50±2.1
<i>Khaya senegalensis</i> (Desr.) A.Juss.	Br	08.21±1.7
	Bark	03.03±0.4
<i>Koelreuteria elegans</i> (seem.) A.C. Sm. (<i>Koelreuteria henryi</i> Dummer)	L	03.96±0.3
<i>Koelreuteria paniculata</i> Laxm.	Br	11.18±2.0
<i>Lagerstroemia indica</i> (L.) Pers.	L and Fl	04.93±1.6
<i>Liomoniastrum monopetalum</i> (L.) Boiss.	H	08.09±2.1
<i>Mangifera indica</i> L.	L	04.66±0.5
<i>Morus nigra</i> L.	Bark	03.53±0.3
<i>Pinus canariensis</i> C.Sm.	Fr	04.37±0.7
	L	11.27±1.9
<i>Pinus halepensis</i> Mill.	Fr	17.00±3.1
	L	13.30±2.1
<i>Pinus pinea</i> L.	Br	13.63±1.9
	L	12.07±2.0
<i>Pinus roxburghii</i> Sarg.	Br	02.47±0.2
<i>Pithecellobium dulce</i> (Roxb.) Benth.	Bark	05.22±1.0
<i>Polyscias paniculata</i> (DC.) Baker	Br	07.42±1.2
<i>Psidium guajava</i> L.	Br	05.71±0.8
	L	04.99±0.2
<i>Putranjiva roxburghii</i> Wallich	L	11.97±2.1
<i>Pyracantha fortuneana</i> (Maxim) H.L.L.i (<i>Pyracantha crenato-serrata</i> (Hance Rehd)	Br	04.92±0.4
<i>Rumex dentatus</i> L.	Weed	17.60±2.4
<i>Saraca cauliflora</i> Bak.	L	05.29±0.8
<i>Senna surattensis</i> (Burm. f.) H. Irwin and Barneby	Br	06.43±0.1
<i>Shinopsis balansea</i> Engl	Bark	04.74±0.7
<i>Spondias lutea</i> L.	L	05.30±0.5
	Br	03.72±0.3
	Fr	18.03±3.0
<i>Sterculia foetida</i> L.	L	04.01±0.8
	Br	03.37±0.2
<i>Swietenia mahagoni</i> (L.) Jacq.	L	03.58±0.3
	Br	02.64±0.1
<i>Terminalia arjuna</i> (Roxb.) Wight and Arn.	Br	04.92±1.2

H: Herb, Fr: Fruits, Fl: Flowers, L: Leaves, Br: Branches

anti-inflammatory and analgesic effect [11], the wood oil of the plant possesses hepatoprotective activity, and the essential oil of the needles is antibacterial and antifungal [12]. The antidiabetic *in vivo* activity of the bark extract and its hypolipidemic property were studied, where it

proved to have a hypoglycemic effect [13]. The fore-mentioned result conforms to our work on the branches of the same plant. It was also studied as a protective for gastric ulcers [14] and for its antibacterial activity [15].

CONCLUSION

After the calculation of the IC values, 10 extracts were chosen having 5 ppm and less IC₅₀ which will be subjected to further extensive *in vivo* studies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was financed by the National Research Centre, Egypt, under the project "Search of a novel anti-diabetic drug from natural origin;" contract agreement number 11010309 (2016-2019), Principal Investigator May A El-Manawaty.

AUTHORS CONTRIBUTIONS

Both authors contributed in the preparation of the extracts, the performance of the bioassay and the calculation of the IC₅₀ values.

CONFLICTS OF INTERESTS

The authors have no conflicts of financial or personal interests with any other organizations or people.

REFERENCES

1. Alberti KG, Zimmet PF. Definition, diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus and its complications. Part 1: Diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus. Provisional report of a WHO consultation. *Diabetic Med* 1998;15:539-53.
2. Bhutkar M, Bhise S. *In vitro* hypoglycemic effects of *Albizia lebeck* and *Mucuna pruriens*. *Asian Pac J Trop Biomed* 2013;3:866-70.
3. Herman WH. Diabetes epidemiology: Guiding clinical and public health practice the kelly west award lecture. *Diabetes Care* 2007;30:1912-9.
4. Mellitus D. Diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus. *Diabetes Care* 2004;28:S37.
5. Sena CM, Bento CF, Pereira P, Marques F, Seiça R. Diabetes mellitus: New challenges and innovative therapies. In: *New Strategies to Advance Pre/Diabetes Care: Integrative Approach by PPPM*. Netherlands: Springer; 2013. p. 29-87.
6. Uddin N, Hasan MR, Hossain MM, Sarker A, Hasan AN, Islam AM, Chowdhury MMH and Rana MS. *In vitro* α -amylase inhibitory activity and *in vivo* hypoglycemic effect of methanol extract of *Citrus macroptera* Montr. fruit. *Asian Pac J Trop Biomed* 2014;4:473-9.
7. Funke I, Melzig MF. Traditionally used plants in diabetes therapy-phytotherapeutics as inhibitors of α -amylase activity. *Rev Bras Farm* 2006;16:1-5.
8. Fayad W, Salwa M, El-Manawaty MA, Mounier MM, Soliman AA, Yousry AA, *et al.* A systematic multicellular spheroids screening approach lead to the identification of antineoplastic activity in three different plant extracts from the Egyptian flora. *J Appl Pharm Sci* 2017;7:13-22.
9. Elya B, Basah K, Yulastuti AW, Bangun A, Septiana EK. Screening of α -glucosidase inhibitory activity from some plants of *Apocynaceae*, *Clusiaceae*, *Euphorbiaceae*, and *Rubiaceae*. *J Biomed Biotechnol* 2012;2012:1-6.
10. Qaisar MN, Chaudhary BA, Sajid MU, Hussain N. Evaluation of α -glucosidase inhibitory activity of dichloromethane and methanol extracts of *Croton bonplandianum* Baill. *Trop J Pharm Res* 2014;13:1833-6.
11. Kaushik D, Kumar A, Kaushik P, Rana AC. Analgesic and anti-inflammatory activity of *Pinus roxburghii* Sarg. *Adv Pharmacol Sci* 2012;2012:1-6.
12. Kaushik P, Kaushik D, Khokra SL. Ethnobotany and phytopharmacology of *Pinus roxburghii* Sargent: A plant review. *J Integr Med* 2013;11:371-6.
13. Kaushik P, Khokra SL, Kaushik D. Evaluation of antidiabetic potential of *Pinus roxburghii* bark extract in alloxan induced diabetic rats. *J Pharm Nat Prod* 2015;1:1-5.
14. Chaudhary AK, Ahmad S, Mazumder A. Protective effect of *Cedrus deodara* and *Pinus roxburghii* on experimentally induced gastric ulcers in rat. *Int J Pharm Pharm Sci* 2014;6:587-91.
15. Rana IS, Singh A, Gwal R. *In vitro* study of antibacterial activity of aromatic and medicinal plants essential oils with special reference to cinnamon oil. *Int J Pharm Pharm Sci* 2011;3:376-80.