The genus, *Viburnum*, formerly belonging to Caprifoliaceae and in recent years positioned under Adoxaceae family, contains about 200 species throughout the world, and about 17 species of them have been reported in India. The *Viburnum* have been reported in literature to possess uterine sedative, anti-asthmatic, astrigent, anti-inflammatory and antimicrobial activities. A verbal enquiry to the tribal of Ooty and Coimbatore, Tamilnadu, also supported that aforesaid pharmacological activities were traditional and were promising with roots and leaves of these species.

And a qualitative chemical screening to reveal that the leaf part of these two species contains an appreciable amount and a wide range of phenolic compounds. A few of these species have been reported to contain bio-active molecules such as: triterpenes phytosterols, (pentacyclic) and phenolic compounds tannins, flavonoids, anthocyanidins, iridoid glycosides, biflavones, phenolic compound of C6-C3 skeletons and their glycosides. Even though the genus is popular for its big population, the number of species scientifically investigated and the volume of research establishments on records are notably scant, especially on their pharmacological behaviours. Therefore, it has been decided to select some two species of the genus-*Viburnum* Linn., To begin with the current study, different solvent extracts of the two species were subjected to a preliminary phyto-chemical investigation to select appropriate solvent extracts.
Based on the type of phyto-constituents detected in the selected extracts deduced from preliminary phyto-chemical analysis and informations reported in literatures. In order to obtain reliable results, suitable methods were selected for evaluation. The selected plant species and chemotherapeutic study carried out on these also were very scant. Therefore, the result of the present study will definitely be the good start and lead for the further investigations.

**Materials and Methods**

**Collection of specimens**

The leaf and roots of *Viburnum* Linn. Species were collected from Nilgiri hills at an altitude of 1500–1800 ft, were authenticated by Dr Chelladurai, (Ex Professor) medicinal plants supply for siddha, Govt. of India, Tamilnadu, to undertake some pharmacological investigations. The voucher specimens of *Viburnum coriaceum* Blume and *Viburnum erubescens* Wall.ex DC were labelled (VC131) and (VE131), and deposited in the department of pharmacognosy at Cherraan’s College of Pharmacy, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu. The photograph of the plant species taken at the location- Nilgiri Hills were also submitted (Fig. 1 & Fig. 2).

**Bacterial strain based cytotoxicity screening by Agar diffusion method**

Bacterial Strain Based Cytotoxicity was carried out using Agar diffusion method and the sample was prepared using DMSO (dimethyl sulfoxide). The stock solution was 10 mg/mL sample in DMSO. Extracts to be screened were prepared in various concentrations such as 25, 50, 100, 250, 500 and 1000 µg/mL. Then the media for the cytotoxicity study was prepared to contain Tryptone-10 g, NaCl-10 g and Yeast extract 5 g, Agar 20 g in 1000 mL of distilled water. The *E. coli* AB 1157, a wild-type strain, proficient to repair damage in the DNA is considered for this study. Initially, the stock culture of bacteria was revived by inoculating in broth medium and grown at 37°C for 18 h. The LB Agar plates were prepared and wells were made in the solidified LB agar plate. Each plate was inoculated with 18 h old cultures (100 µL, 10-4 cfu) and spread evenly on the plate. After 20 min the wells were filled with compound at different concentrations. All the plates were incubated at 37°C for 24 h and the diameter of inhibition zone were noted8.

**Evaluation of cytotoxicity by MTT assay method**

This is a colorimetric assay that measures the reduction of yellow 3-(4,5-dimethylthiazol-2-yl)-2,5-diphenyl tetrazolium bromide (MTT) by mitochondrial succinate dehydrogenase. The MTT enters the cells and passes into the mitochondria where it is reduced to an insoluble, coloured (dark purple) formazan product. The cells are then solubilized with an organic solvent (e.g., DMSO, Isopropanol) and the released, solubilized formazan reagent is measured colorimetrically. Since the reductions of MTT can only occur in metabolically active cells the level of activity is a measure of the viability of the cells9,10,11.

**Fig. 1** — *Viburnum coriaceum* plant at the location-Nilgiri Hills

**Fig. 2** — *Viburnum erubescens* plant at the location-Nilgiri Hills
Effect of extracts on HeLa cervical cancer cell lines and MCF-7 breast cancer cell lines

For the MTT assay method Human HeLa cervical cancer cell lines were procured from Biogenics Lab Bangalore. The cell line were cultured in DMEM (Dulbecco’s Modified Eagle Medium) (Cat No-11965-092) medium which was supplemented with 10% heat inactivated FBS (Fetal Bovine Serum) (Gibco, Invitrogen) Cat No-10270106, and 1% Antibiotic–Antimycotic 100X solution (containing 10000 U/mL of penicillin, 10000 µg/mL streptomycin and 25 µg/mL of Gibco amphotericin-B) (Thermofisher Scientific)-Cat No-15240062.

The cells were seeded at a density of approximately 5×10³ cells/well in a 96-well flat-bottom micro plate and maintained at 37°C in 95% humidity and 5% CO₂ for overnight. Different concentration (200, 100, 50, 25, 12.5, 6.25 µg/mL) of samples was treated. The cells were incubated for another 48 h. The cells in well were washed twice with phosphate buffer solution, and 20 µL of the MTT staining solution (5 mg/mL in phosphate buffer solution) was added to each well and plate was incubated at 37°C. After 4 h, 100 µL of dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) was added to each well to dissolve the formazan crystals, and absorbance was recorded with a 570 nm using micro plate reader.

Results

For the Bacterial Strain Based Cytotoxicity study extracts such as VCMLE, VEMLE, VCCRE and VECRE were selected and various concentrations (25 µg/mL, 50 µg/mL, 100 µg/mL, 250 µg/mL, 500 µg/mL, 1000 µg/mL) were also made. After the incubation period of 24 h at 37°C, the diameter of inhibition was analyzed. No extract had prevented the growth of bacterial strain up to the concentration 250 µg/mL. At 500 µg/mL concentration VCMLE and VCCRE showed 5 mm and 3 mm zone of inhibition respectively against the E. coli AB1157 strain whereas no inhibition exhibited by the VEMLE and VECRE (Table 1 & Fig. 3).

The cytotoxicity studies were started with IC₅₀ value determination and it was to be 562.17±25.14 µg/mL of VCMLE against the MCF-7 cell lines whereas against the HeLa cell lines it was 358.02±12.45 µg/mL.
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breast cancer cell lines whereas the same extracts exhibited 433.20±15.33 µg/mL as IC50 against the HEla cervical cancer cell lines (Table 2).

Then the cell viability assay was carried out using various concentrations of the extract such as 200 µg/mL, 100 µg/mL, 50 µg/mL, 25 µg/mL, 12.5 µg/mL and 6.25 µg/mL. The maximum viability (99.67±4.66%) retained in case of VCCRE at 6.25 µg/mL, whereas, the highest inhibition of growth of cell lines (29%) was achieved at 200 µg/mL. The VCMLE had produced maximum inhibition (36%) at 200 µg/mL whereas the least inhibition (5%) at 6.25 µg/mL. The result revealed that the VCMLE had been slightly more potent than VCCRE against MCF-7 cell lines (Table 3, Fig. 4 & Fig. 5). The HEla cervical cancer cell lines were involved in cell viability analysis using concentrations as in the case of MCF-7 cell lines. The VCCRE showed slightly improved inhibition (35%) at 200 µg/mL concentration whereas the extract could only produce inhibition of cell growth around 3% at 6.25 µg/mL concentration. As like VCCRE, VCMLE also had shown somewhat improved protection against HEla cancer cells i.e., around 40% inhibition and 60% retention of viability whereas, at 6.25 µg/mL concentration it showed around 4% protection (Table 4, Fig. 6 & Fig. 7).

**Discussion**

The methanolic Leaf and chloroform root extracts were tested for their bacterial strain based cytotoxicity employing Agar diffusion method. For the analysis *E. coli* AB1157, a wild-type strain was selected because of their capacity to repair the damage caused to their DNA.

Also, the literature reviews of *E. coli* AB1157 (a wild-type, K-12 strain having no known defects in DNA repair capability) had shown unusual resistance when irradiated daily with very large X-ray doses and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extracts</th>
<th>IC50 (µg/mL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCF-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCMLE</td>
<td>562.17±25.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCCRE</td>
<td>759.90±31.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are expressed as mean±SEM, n=3, VCCRE- *V. coriaceum* chloroform root extract, VCMLE- *V. coriaceum* methanolic leaf extract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concentration</th>
<th>MCF-7 Cell lines Viability (%)</th>
<th>HEla Cell lines Viability (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200 µg/mL</td>
<td>65.68±4.51</td>
<td>71.77±2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 µg/mL</td>
<td>71.36±3.70</td>
<td>76.54±4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 µg/mL</td>
<td>79.84±2.93</td>
<td>85.76±4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 µg/mL</td>
<td>85.38±2.26</td>
<td>86.98±2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5 µg/mL</td>
<td>89.43±4.04</td>
<td>93.87±5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.25 µg/mL</td>
<td>94.97±4.47</td>
<td>99.67±4.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are expressed as mean±SD, n=3, VCCRE- *V. coriaceum* chloroform root extract, VCMLE- *V. coriaceum* methanolic leaf extract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concentration</th>
<th>VCMLE Viability (%)</th>
<th>VCCRE Viability (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200 µg/mL</td>
<td>60.36±2.12</td>
<td>64.41±3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 µg/mL</td>
<td>69.13±4.22</td>
<td>71.67±4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 µg/mL</td>
<td>75.63±3.74</td>
<td>79.36±2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 µg/mL</td>
<td>83.03±4.01</td>
<td>86.74±4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5 µg/mL</td>
<td>89.76±5.14</td>
<td>92.87±5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.25 µg/mL</td>
<td>96.35±3.22</td>
<td>97.04±3.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are expressed as mean±SD, n=3, VCCRE- *V. coriaceum* chloroform root extract, VCMLE- *V. coriaceum* methanolic leaf extract
UV photons. The resistance exerted by the species compelled us to select *E. coli* AB1157 for the susceptibility study. Due to its high resistance, the selected extracts—VCMLE, VEMLE, VCCRE and VECRE were expected to show either very little or no effect. In the susceptibility study only when concentration was increased up to 1000 µg/mL VCMLE, VEMLE and VCCRE had shown diameter of inhibition zone 10 mm, 9 mm and 10 mm respectively. The only extract VECRE did not show MIC in any of the concentrations tested and suggests that these compounds did not exhibit any deleterious effect or toxicity to the bacteria. The susceptibility study further confirms that the extracts selected for the current study are free from either of mutagenicity, carcinogenicity and cytotoxicity effects.

The extracts VCMLE and VCCRE were selected for the anticancer studies as the cytotoxicity studies result suggested these would be effective. The anticancer activity was performed using MTT (3-(4,5-dimethylthiazol-2-yl)-2,5-diphenyl tetrazolium bromide) assay method and the formation of formazan measured colorimetrically.

Before MTT assay IC$_{50}$ value determination of the selected test extracts against the MCF-7 breast cancer cell lines and HeLa cervical cell lines was done. MCF-7 breast cancer cell line (Michigan Cancer Foundation-7) and HeLa cervical cancer cell line (named after the first victim Henrietta Lacks) were possessing estrogen and progesterone receptors, and estrogen receptor respectively. The cytotoxicity potentials exhibited by the extracts may be due to the presence of diverse number of phytoconstituents which were already reported and unreported in the literatures. Also, the effect believed to be the affinity of *Viburnum* extracts towards the estrogen and progesterone receptors needs further investigation.

Finally, result suggested that both the extracts performed very closely against cancer cell lines but VCMLE dominated VCCRE extract in higher concentrations.

**Conclusion**

From the result of the study it was concluded that VECRE did not produce observable ZOI on *E. coli* AB1157 bacterial strain and presumed to be not having any cytotoxic effect. But the other three extracts had produced comparable cytotoxic effects at the level of 1000 µg/mL concentration level gave a clue to proceed with anticancer activity by MTT assay method. The MTT assay further concluded that anticancer potentials of extracts through cytotoxicity mechanism had produced pronounced effect about 30-40% protection at 200 µg/mL concentration was good enough to try with more concentrations. From the result of these studies, the cytotoxic effect it is assumed that it may be due to the presence of diverse number of active constituents present in *Viburnum* Linn species, also, may be the phytoconstituents and their affinity towards the estrogen and progesterone receptors present on the cancer cell lines. Apart from these two species among 17 species reported in India, needed to be thoroughly analysed for their anticancer potentials and the result drawn from the current study will definitely be useful lead.
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