Global Journal of Science Frontier Research: D
Agriculture and Veterinary
Volume 15 Issue 2 Version 1.0 Year 2015
Type : Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Publisher: Global Journals Inc. (USA)
Online ISSN: 2249-4626 & Print ISSN: 0975-5896

Minimum Inhibitory and Bactericidal Concentrations (MIC & MBC) of Honey and Bee Propolis against Multidrug Resistant (MDR) *Staphylococcus Sp.* Isolated from Bovine Clinical Mastitis

By Aamer, A. A., Abdul-Hafeez, M. M. & Sayed, S. M.
Assiut University, Egypt

Abstract- With the emergence of antibiotic-resistant Staph. sp., search for antimicrobial agents other than antibiotic is of great concern. The study aimed to determine both MIC and MBC of different honey samples against these strains. The study was conducted with 64 different Staph sp. isolated from bovine mastitis and tested in vitro against 11 antimicrobial agents. The most MDR strains (19) were tested in vitro against six honey batches; marjoram, cotton, two fennel samples and two different trefoil samples as well as against 10% propolis-fennel honey mixture. Both MIC & MBC of the tested honey samples against every tested strain were determined. Propolis-fennel honey mixture showed the lowest both MIC & MBC values against all Staph sp. all over the study with highly significant differences, while against different Staph sp., also it had the lowest MIC and MBC values against S. intermedius followed by S. aureus.

Keywords: *MIC, MBC, apitherapy, antimicrobial, staphylococcus, mastitis.*

GJSFR-D Classification : *FOR Code: 300599p*

Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of :

© 2015. Aamer, A. A., Abdul-Hafeez, M. M. & Sayed, S. M. This is a research/review paper, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 3.0 Unported License http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/), permitting all non commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Minimum Inhibitory and Bactericidal Concentrations (MIC & MBC) of Honey and Bee Propolis against Multidrug Resistant (MDR) *Staphylococcus Sp.* Isolated from Bovine Clinical Mastitis

Aamer, A. A. [α], Abdul-Hafeez, M.M. [σ] & Sayed, S.M. [ρ]

Abstract- With the emergence of antibiotic-resistant Staph. sp., search for antimicrobial agents other than antibiotic is of great concern. The study aimed to determine both MIC and MBC of different honey samples against these strains. The study was conducted with 64 different Staph sp. isolated from bovine mastitis and tested in vitro against 11 antimicrobial agents. The most MDR strains (19) were tested in vitro against six honey batches; marjoram, cotton, two fennel samples and two different trefoil samples as well as against 10% propolis-fennel honey mixture. Both MIC & MBC of the tested honey samples against every tested strain were determined. Propolis-fennel honey mixture showed the lowest both MIC & MBC values against all Staph sp. all over the study with highly significant differences, while against different Staph sp., also it had the lowest MIC and MBC values against S. intermedius followed by S. aureus. The study revealed that among the different Staph. sp., S. aureus was the most sensitive species to the honey antimicrobial action with highly significant differences. The study concluded that all tested Staph. sp. –despite of being MDR- were sensitive to the antimicrobial activity of all tested honeys where S. aureus was the most sensitive one, while adding 10% propolis powder would maximize its antimicrobial activity significantly.

Keywords: MIC, MBC, apitherapy, antimicrobial, staphylococcus, mastitis.

I. Introduction

As the traditional knowledge about the use of natural products or substances should be scientifically investigated[25] and the antimicrobial application requires safe preparations, knowledge of the composition of antibacterial factors and standardized antibacterial activity[15], the in vitro study of honey therapeutic action is of great necessity for its applicability. Honey possesses therapeutic potential and its antimicrobial activity is widely documented as a large number of in vitro studies of MIC and MBC confirmed its broad- pectrum antimicrobial properties either in solo use [27,29,30,38]or in combination with other agents as royal jelly[9], bee propolis[17], ginger starch[24], garlic extract[25] or rifampicin[33]even on MDR such as S. aureus methicillin resistant (MRSA)[22] or vancomycin-resistant enterococci (VRE)[10]. Propolis extract also proved to possess antimicrobial activity[31,23,34,36,37]. Moreover, subinhibitory concentration of honey in combination with oxacillin restored oxacillin susceptibility to MRSA[22]. The present work aimed to investigate the in vitro MICs & MBCs of different honey batches and propolis powder against different MDR Staph. spp. isolated from bovine clinical mastitis.

Author α: Department of Animal Medicine, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Assiut University., Assiut, Egypt.
e-mail: aamer_ahmad@ymail.com
Author σ ρ: Animal Health Research Institute, Assiut Lab., Assiut, Egypt. e-mail: moh_hafeez55@yahoo.com

II. Material & Methods

a) Bacterial isolation

Out of 101 milk samples from clinical mastitic cows through a previous work for the same author[40], 64 Staph. sp. strains were recovered and be the baseline of the present study where the most MDR strains (no 19) as Staph aureus (6), Staph intermedius (3), Staph saprophyticus and Staph epidermedis (5 for each)were tested against all honey patches.

b) Antimicrobial sensitivity testing

All these 64 isolated Staph. sp. strains were tested against 11 antimicrobial agents [Oxacillin (OX) 1 μg, Ampicilin (AM) 10 μg, Cefotaxime (CTX) 30 μg, Doxycycline (DO) 30 μg, Enrofloxacin (ENR) 5 μg, Gentamicin (CN) 10 μg, Lincomycin (L) 2 μg, Oxytetracycline (T) 30 μg, Penicillin (P) 10 μ, Trimethoprim – Sulflamethaxzole (SXT) 25 μg and Cloxacillin (CX) 10 μg.]* to determine the MDR strains using disc diffusion sensitivity method according to Kirby-Bauer as described in the guidelines of the National Committee for Laboratory Standards (NCCLS)[2]. For Oxacillin inhibition zones around the disc were measured after 24 and 48 h using the following breakpoints: susceptible (S) ≥ 18 mm; resistance (R) ≤ 17 mm [3].

© 2015 Global Journals Inc. (US)

c) Honey batches

Six row full strength different unprocessed honey batches were used in the study; A (marjoram), B (cotton), C (fennel-1)**, D (fennel-2)**, E (trefoil-1)** and F (trefoil-2)** as well as G (10% propolis- Fennel honey mixture) as 10% w/v bee propolis powder*** in fennel honey. To study the synergistic action and to detect the sole antimicrobial action of propolis, 50 mg propolis powder (the added amount in propolis honey mixture) was tested plain for its MIC &MBC against all tested strains.

d) Determination of MIC

Three to six strains of the most MDR strains from each species were chosen for the in vitro MIC & MBC study. Honey batches were investigated for their MIC & MBC against the chosen isolated Staph. sp. strains where 1 ml of the tested honey was used in bifold dilution method[5] with series of 6 tubes containing 1 ml of Mueller Hinton broth (Accumix – Verna, India) to achieve final dilutions of 50, 25, 12.5, 6.25, 3.12 and 1.62 % v/v. Standard bacterial inoculums (5x105) of the chosen isolated Staph. spp. were inoculated into all 6 dilutions post thorough honey mix. The inoculated tubes were over night incubated at 37°C. The highest dilution of the tested honey to inhibit growth (no turbidity in the tube) was considered as the MIC value of this honey batch against the tested bacterial species.

e) Determination of MBC

From all tubes showed no visible signs of growth / turbidity (MIC and higher dilutions), loopfuls were inoculated onto sterile Mueller Hinton agar (Accumix – Verna, India) plates by streak plate method. The plates were then overnight incubated at 37°C . The least concentration that did not show any growth of tested organisms was considered as the MBC value of the tested honey against the tested bacterial species.

f) Statistical analysis

Mean values, standard deviation (SD) and ANOVA analysis were adopted by means of PASWV.18 (2010, spss Inc, Chicago, Illinois, USA). Results were considered statistically significant when $P > 0.05$ and highly significant when $P > 0.01$.

*Antibiotic sensitivity discs were purchased from Bioanalyse - Turkey.

**Fennel or Trefoil 1 & 2: honey batches were collected from two different pasture locations.

***Chinese bee propolis provided kindly from Plant Protection Research Institute (PPRI)- Assiut unit.

III. Results

The present study was conducted with 64 Staph. sp. strains isolated from bovine mastitis, where the most MDR strains which showed MDR pattern > 6 antimicrobials were chosen and be prepared for MIC & MBC study as shown in Table (1). Against Staph. sp., all tested strains - which showed at least 6 MDR pattern - were sensitive to all tested honey batches with MICs ranged from 20.83% (trefoil-2) up to 33.33% (fennel-2) (Fig 1) and MBCs from 37.92% (cotton) up to 45.83 % v/v (for both fennel-1 & trefoil-1) (Fig 2). However, 10% propolis fennel honey mixture showed the most favorable results as the lowest both MIC and MBC (13.96% & 28.26 % v/v respectively) with highly significant differences $p>0.01$ (Fig 1&2). Propolis powder alone gave no any bacterial inhibition. S. aureus showed the lowest MIC (13.3%) & MBC (27.1%) v/v with highly significant differences $P > 0.01$ (Fig. 3&4) among all tested Staph. sp. By the statistical analysis for the antibacterial activity of different honey batches against different Staph. sp., it was found that propolis honey mixture had the lowest MIC value against both coagulase positive Staph. sp. (S. intermedius and S. aureus) allover the present study as 6.2% & 7.25% v/v respectively with highly significant differences $P >0.01$ (Fig. 5), while MBC values were 12.5 & 14.58% respectively (Fig. 6).

Table 1: *Staph. sp.* isolated from bovine clinical mastitis and MDR pattern of the honey tested strains

Isolates	Antimicrobial testing		Honey tested strains	
	No.	MDR ≥ 5 antimicrobials	No.	MDR pattern
S. aureus	35	30	6	9 antimicrobials
S. intermedius	9	5	3	(6 - 7) antimicrobials
S. saprophyticus	11	8	5	(7 - 9) antimicrobials
S. epidermidis	9	8	5	8 antimicrobials
Total	64	51	19	

© 2015 Global Journals Inc. (US)



Figure 1 : MIC values of different honey batches against *Staph. Sp*



Figure 2 : MBC values of different honey batches against Staph. Sp

© 2015 Global Journals Inc. (US)



Figure 3 : MIC values of honey against different *Staph. Sp*



Figure 4 : MBC values of honey against different Staph. Sp



Figure 5 : MIC values of different honey batches against different Staph. Sp

© 2015 Global Journals Inc. (US)



A: marjoram B: cotton C: fennel-1

D:fennel-2 E: trefoil-1 F: trefoil-2

G:propolis/honey mixture

Figure 6 : MBC values of different honey batches against different *Staph. Sp*

IV. Discussion

Veterinary apitherapy nowadays is documented either in dairy [6,16] or broiler[39] farms rather than in immunomodulation performance[12]. Concerning to apitherapeutic antimicrobial activity, it is widely documented as mentioned in the above premise. MRSA contribute the most predominant isolated species from bovine mastitic milk [40] and is widespread pathogen. It is of great concern for human public health hazard threatens transmission among dairy farm workers or their environments [32]. The emergence of antibiotic-resistant bacteria leads to the re-examination of earlier remedies such as honey [9] or propolis [26]. The antibacterial potency differences among different studied honey samples could be attributed to the natural variations in floral sources of nectar and the different geographical locations since honey micro components possess physicochemical and phytochemical characteristics resulting in its potency that differs associated with botanical and geographical origins [18]. Different honey samples of different botanical or geographical origins; Egyptian honey had MIC & MBC values as 12.5 & 50% v/v [7], Malysian honey as 5% & 6.25% w/v [38], UK Manuka honey had MIC as 6% w/v [22] and Ethiopian honey as 6.25% w/v[27]. Honey antimicrobial action involves several mechanisms but mainly the presence of bacteriostatic and bactericidal action is due to production of hydrogen Peroxide [28]. H2O2 alone may not be sufficient to the full activity [21], since it is in conjunction with other unknown honey components produce bacterial cytotoxic effects and DNA degradation. The concentration of polyphenols and H2O2 in different honeys may be of critical importance for bacterial cell survival [20]. Another mechanism of honey antimicrobial activity may be due to its lysosomal contents [35] or micro components as polyphenols, phenolic acids and flavonoids [14] or due to increase in cytokine release [19]. On the other hand, the mechanism of propolis antimicrobial activity is more complex and might be attributed to the synergistic activity between its various potent biological ingredients[17] that more than 300 compounds mainly phenolics and flavonoids [8]. It was found that propolis affects bacterial cytoplasmic membrane, and it inhibits motility, enzyme activity, cell division, and protein synthesis through inhibition of RNA-polymerase which can explain partially the synergism of propolis with drugs[1]. Moreover, galagin and caffeic acid derived from propolis are enzymatic inhibitor agents for bacteria[4]. Since the synergistic action might be detected when the MIC of the combination of both

© 2015 Global Journals Inc. (US)

studied antimicrobial agents is lower than the MIC of each alone[17], the present study was designed to test the added propolis powder (50 mg) alone where did not inhibit the tested Staph. sp. The present study chose Egyptian fennel honey for propolis mixture as our previous studies [7,12] recommendations. Although fennel showed low results for both MIC & MBC through the present study, its antimicrobial action was maximized giving highly significant difference ($P > 0.01$) when propolis be added 10% w/v. The synergy of honey antimicrobial activity when be added to another antimicrobial was fully studied [25,9,17,24,33] and for propolis, the added flavonoids and phenolic acids - have antibacterial, antifungal and antiviral properties[11] - might maximize the action of these micro components present in honey resulting in synergy of its antimicrobial action. Fortunately, S. aureus (either MRSA or methicillin sensitive) which is the most predominant and virulent pathogen was the most sensitive Staph. sp. to honey antimicrobial action with highly significant. It is documented and proved that S. aureus was the most sensitive species to the antimicrobial activity of honey among all tested bacterial species studied [25,15,13].

V. Conclusion

It was concluded that all tested MDR Staph. sp. were sensitive to the antimicrobial activity all tested honey samples, where S. aureus was the most sensitive one among the four tested Staph. sp. It was concluded that adding 10% w/v propolis powder to the chosen honey patch would maximize its antimicrobial activity with highly significant difference. The promising results encourage the utilization of propolis extract in combination with the chosen honey patch for
treatment of subclinical bovine mastitis to achieve the synergistic antimicrobial action.

References Références Referencias

1. Mirzoeva O, Grishani R, Calder P C (1997) Antimicrobial action of propolis and some of its components: the effects on growth, membrane potential and motility of bacteria. Microbiol Res 152(3):239-46.
2. NCCLS (2000) Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Disk Susceptibility Test.
3. Approved Standard M2 – A7, M100 – S10. PA: National Committee for Laboratory Standards.
4. Bogado I, Sutich E, Krapp A, Marchiaro P, Marzi M (2001) Methicillin resistance study in clinical isolates of coagulase-negative staphylococci and determination of their susceptibility to alternative antimicrobial agents. J of applied Microbiology 91: 344-350.
5. Koo H, Rosalen P, Cury J, Park Y, Bowen W (2002) Effects of compounds found in propolis on Streptococcus mutans growth and on glucosyl transferase activity. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother., 46(5):1302-1309.
6. Quinn P J, Carter M E, Markey B, Carter G R (2004) Bacteriology: Clinical veterinary microbiology. 6nd Ed. Mosby Edinburgh London New York Oxord Philadelphia St Louis Sydney Toronto
7. Abdul Hafeez M M, Ali M M, Abdel-Rahman M F, Nahed – Wahba M (2005) Antibacterial activity of honey for treatment of subclinical mastitis : 2- Intramammary infusion as a tool to manage non responding antibiotic cases. 8th Scientific Congress of Cattle disease, 11 – 13 Dec. Assiut, Egypt.146-149.
8. Ali M Wahba, N; Abdel-Rahman, M. and Abdel-Hafeez M M. (2005) Antibacterial activity of honey for treatment of subclinical bovine Mastitis: 1- In vitro study of bacterial inhibits and chemical bioassay of some different honeys. 8th Sci. cong., Egyptian society for cattle diseases Assiut Egypt, pp., 139-146.
9. Khalil M L (2006) Biological activity of bee propolis in health and disease. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev 7(1):22-31.
10. Boukraa L, Benbarek H, Moussa A (2008) Synergistic action of starch and honey against Candida albicans in relation with diastase number. Brazilian Journal of Microbiology 39:40-43.
11. Mavric E, Wittmann S, Bart G, Henle T (2008) Identification and quantification of methylglyoxal as the dominant antibacterial constituent of Manuka (Leptospermum scoparium) honeys from New Zealand. Mol. Nutr. Food Res., 52, 483–489.
12. Šarić M, Rastija, V, Bojić M, Males Z (2009) From functional food to medicinal product: systematic approach in analysis of polyphenolics from propolis and wine. Nutr. J. 22;8:33. doi: 10.1186/1475-2891-8-33.
13. Sayed S, Abou El-Ella G, Wahba N M, El Nisr N, Raddad K et. al. (2009) Immune defense of rats immunized with fennel honey, propolis, and bee venom against induced staphylococcal infection. J Med Food 12(3):569-75.
14. Sherlock O, Dolan A, Athman R, Power A ,Gethin G et. al. (2010) Comparison of the antimicrobial activity of Ulmo honey from Chile and Manuka honey against
15. methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus, Escherichia coli and Pseudomonas aeruginosa. BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine 10:47.
16. Al-Hindi R, Bin-Masalam M, El-Shahawi M (2011) Antioxidant and antibacterial characteristics of phenolic extracts of locally produced honey in Saudi Arabia. Int J Food Sci Nutr 62(5):513-517.
17. Kwakman P, Velde A, Boer L, Grauls C, Zaat, S (2011) Two major medicinal honeys have different

© 2015 Global Journals Inc. (US)

mechanisms of bactericidal activity. PLoS One 4,6(3):e17709.
18. Nahed M Wahba, Niveen A El Nisr, Sayed M S, Abdallah M Ret al (2011) Intramammary honey infusion: A new trend in the management of bovine subclinical mastitis. J of Anim and Vet Advances 10 (20):2740 – 2744.
19. Al-Waili N, Al-Ghamdi A, Ansari M, Salom Y K (2012) Synergistic Effects of Honey and Propolis toward Drug Multi-Resistant Staphylococcus aureus, Escherichia coli and Candida albicans isolates in single and polymicrobial cultures. Int J Med Sci 9(9):793-800.
20. Alzahrani H, Alsabehi R, Boukraâ L, Abdellah, F, Bellik Y et. al. (2012) Antibacterial and Antioxidant Potency of Floral Honeys from Different Botanical and Geographical Origins. Molecules17:10540-10549.
21. Aparna S, Srirangarajan S, Malgi V, Setlur K, Shashidhar R et. al. (2012) A
22. comparative evaluation of the antibacterial efficacy of honey in vitro and antiplaque efficacy in a 4-day plaque regrowth model in vivo: preliminary results. J Periodontol 83(9):1116-21.
23. Brudzynski K, Lannigan R (2012) Mechanism of honey bacteriostatic action against MRSA and VRE involves hydroxyl radicals generated from honey's hydrogen peroxide. Frontiers in Microbiology 3 (36): 1-8.
24. Chen C, Campbell L T, Blair S E, Carter D A (2012) The effect of standard heat and filtration processing procedures on antimicrobial activity and hydrogen peroxide levels in honey. Front Microbiol. 3: 1–7.
25. Jenkis R, Cooper R (2012) Improving antibiotic activity against wound pathogens with manuka honey in vitro. PLoS One 7(9).
26. Monzote L, Rubio O, Fernandez M, Hernandez I, Fraga J et. al. (2012) In vitro antimicrobial assessment of Cuban propolis extracts. Mem Inst Oswaldo Cruz 107(8):978-84.
27. Moussa A, Noureddine D, Sm H, Saad A, Bourabeh A. et. al. (2012) Additive potential of ginger starch on antifungal potency of honey against Candida albicans. Asian Pac J Trop Biomed. 2(4):253-255.
28. Andualem B (2013) Combined antibacterial activity of stingless bee (Apis mellipodae) honey and garlic (Allium sativum) extracts against standard and clinical pathogenic bacteria. Asian Pac J Trop Biomed 3(9): 725-731.
29. Cunha M, Franchin M, Galvão L, Ruiz A, Carvalho J et. al. (2013) Antimicrobial and antiproliferative activities of stingless bee Melipona scutellaris geopropolis. BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine 13:23.
30. Ewnetu Y, Lemma W, Birhane N (2013) Antibacterial effects of Apis mellifera and stingless bees honeys on susceptible and resistant strains of Escherichia coli, Staphylococcus aureus and Klebsiella pneumoniae in Gondar, Northwest Ethiopia. BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine 13:269.
31. Feás X, Iglesias A, Rodrigues S, and Estevinho L (2013) Effect of Erica sp. honey against microorganisms of clinical importance: study of the factors underlying this biological activity. Molecules 18(4):4233-4246.
32. Hammond E, Donkor E (2013) Antibacterial effect of Manuka honey on Clostridium difficile. BMC Research Notes 6:188.
33. Kronda J, Cooper R, Maddocks S (2013) Manuka honey inhibits siderophore production in Pseudomonas aeruginosa. J Appl Microbiol., 115(1):86-90.
34. Liberio S, Pereira A, Dutra R, Reis A, Araújo M et. al. (2013) Antimicrobial activity against oral pathogens and immunomodulatory effects and toxicity of geopropolis produced by the stingless bee Melipona fasciculata Smith. BMC Complement Altern Med 4,11:108.
35. Lim S K, Nam H M, Jang G C, Lee H S, Jung S C et. al.. (2013) Transmission and Persistence of Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus aureus in Milk, Environment, and Workers in Dairy Cattle Farms. Foodborne Pathogens and Diseases Vol. 10, No., 8:731-736.
36. Müller P, Alber D G, Turnbull L, Schlothauer R C, Carter D A et al (2013) Synergism between Medihoney and rifampicin against methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA). PLOS One.,8(2):e57679.doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0057679
37. Possamai M, Honorio-França A, Reinaque A P, França E Souto P (2013) Brazilian propolis: a natural product that improved the fungicidal activity by blood phagocytes. Biomed Res Int 10.1155/2013/541018.
38. Ruiz L, Porto A V, Al-Habsi N, Vera S, San Andrés M P et. al. (2013) Antioxidant, antibacterial and ACE-inhibitory activity of four monofloral honeys in relation to their chemical composition. Food Funct 4(11):1617-1624.
39. Skaba D, Morawiec T, Tanasiewicz M, Mertas A, Bobela E et. al. (2013) Influence of the toothpaste with brazilian ethanol extract propolis on the oral cavity health. Evid Based Complement Alternat Med 10.1155/2013/215391.
40. 37- Wojtyczka R, Dziedzic A, Idzik D, Kępa M, Kubina R et. al. (2013) Susceptibility of Staphylococcus aureus clinical isolates to propolis extract alone or in combination with antimicrobial drugs. Molecules 12;18 (8):9623-40.
41. Zainol M, Yusoff K, Yusof, M (2013) Antibacterial activity of selected Malaysian
42. honey. BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine 13:129.

© 2015 Global Journals Inc. (US)

43. Attia Y A, Abd Al-Hamid AE, Ibrahim M S, Al-Harthi M A, Bovera F, Sh Inaggar A (2014) Productive performance, biochemical and hematological traits of broiler chickens supplemented with propolis, bee pollen, and mannan oligosaccharides continuously or intermittently. Livestock science journal. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2014.03.005
44. Sayed S M (2014) Bacteriological study on staphylococcal bovine clinical mastitis with reference to methicillin-resistant Staph. aureus (MRSA). Assiut Vet Med J 60 (140): 38-46.

© 2015 Global Journals Inc. (US)