

# MOSQUTIO LARVICIDAL ACTIVITY OF SAPONIN ISOLATED FORM *EUPHORBIA HIRTA* LINN OF EUFORBIACEAE

# NEETU ARYA, ANITA SHAKYA, FIRDOUS MALA, SONALI NIGAM, S. M. JAIN, MATADEEN BHARTI, NEERA SAHAI and R. C. SAXENA

Pest Control and Ayurvedic Drug Research Laboratory, S. S. L. Jain P.G. College, VIDISHA (M.P.) INDIA

## ABSTRACT

Many plant based products are widely used for their insecticidal and repellent properties for the control of mosquitoes. The present paper reports isolation of mosquito larvicidal bioactive saponin form an indigenous plant found in India *–Euphorbia hirta* of family –Euforbiaceae.

The mosquito larvicidal activity of bioactive saponin isolated from *Euphorbia hirta* have been tested against *Culex quinquefasciatus* by exposing IInd and IV instar larvae to four different concentration of the compound. Three trials were performed for each concentration along with control and untreated. 24 hours  $LC_{50}$  and  $LC_{90}$  values were determined using probit analysis method. It was noticed that IVth instar larvae are more susceptible than IInd instar larvae. The results obtained suggest that bioactive compound of *Euphorbia hirta* could be used in the search for new larvicidal compound of plant origin.

Key words: Bioactive saponin, Euphorbia hirta, Larvicidal, Culex quinquefasciatus.

### **INTRODUCTION**

Mosquitoes are the vector for various disease including malaria, filarial Japanies encephalitis, yellow fever and chikungunya. Mosquito have developed resistance to the chemical pesticides. Further, the mosquito pesticidal compound caused several ill effect to the human beings. This is the reason that new control methods have been tried during the last one decade all over the world. In this contest, the present problem was proposed to be undertaken to provide suitable alternatives to control vector mosquito using biological control methods.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>\*</sup>Author for correspondence; E-mail: rcsvds@yahoo.com

Among these mosquito borne disease, lymphatic filariasis caused by *Wucheria bancrofti* is transmitted by Culex spp. Especially *Culex quinquefasciatus* and is of prime importance throughout India. The filariasis is a widely distributed of infection affectiong people residing both in the urban and rural areas. Sharma<sup>1</sup> reported that in 1985, it was estimated that 342 million population is exposed to the risk of filarial and 252 million in rural areas.

Many plant based products are widely used for their insecticidal and repellent properties for the control of mosquitoes. By reviewing the literature, it is quite apparent that plants have been a good sources of secondary metabolites to be used against malaria and filarial vectors. Therefore, present paper reports isolation of mosquito larvicidal bioactive saponin form an indigenous plant found in India, *Euphorbia hirta* of family euphorbiaceae.

#### **EXPERIMENTAL**

#### Material and methods

Plant material: *Euphorbia hirta* a berb belonging to the family Euphorbiaceae is found distributed through out the country. The plant after proper identification was procured in the harberium data sheet of the laboratory as a bouchar specimen. The shade dried powered material was soxhlated in 90% alchohol and water, respectively. Saponins are much more polar compounds and hence, they are extracted in polar solvents. The saponin were isolated form the crude extract using TLC plates coated with silica gel (E. Marck, Germany) with n-hexane,



Euphorbin - A

benzene and ethyl acetate as solvent. Water soluble fraction of n-hexane extract was chromographed from glass coloumn and purified till white needles are obtained. Upon methylation, the white crystalline substance afforded a compound with molecular formula  $C_{34}H_{54}O_3$  and melting point 260°C.

#### **Experimental bioassay methods**

For experiment on mortality, WHO 1971 guidelines were followed. For detail bioassay 25 IInd and IVth instar larvae of *Culex quinquefaciatus* from laboratory stock were used. Each experiment was conducted in 500 mL beaker in 3 replicates having one control and one untreated group of insects. 24 hour  $LC_{50}$  value was determined using biostatical method of Finney<sup>2</sup>. Mortality including moribund larvae were removed time to time and development and behavioural changes were also noticed.

The results are reported in Table 1-3.

#### Table 1: Percentage loss in weight

Wet weight of the plant (g)	Dry weight of the plant (g)	Total weight loss in after drying (g)	Percentage of weight loss (%)
1550	1240	310	20.00

Solvent used	Weight of plant material powder (g)	Weight of extract (g)	Percentage of yield (%)
n-Haxane	200	5.62	2.62
Chloroform	200	6.42	3.21
Ethyl acetate	200	2.85	1.42
90% Alchohol	200	5.30	2.65
Water	200	15.3	7.66

Table 2: Percentage yield of *euphorbia hirta* by Soxhlet apparatus in different solvents

Table 3: Different fractions isolated form 90% alcohol of *Euphorbia hirta* Amount of Crude 90% alcohol extract = 500 mg; Amount of silica gel packed in glass column = 11.875 g

Solvent	Fraction code	Weight of fraction (mg)	Characteristics and biological active fraction
MeOH-H <sub>2</sub> O (13:7)	А	55.3	On TLC, four spots were rechromatographed. Fraction E1-light yellow green (2 mg) R <sub>f</sub> = 0.60; found effective against the mosquito
H <sub>2</sub> O-n-BuOH (1:1)	В	25.4	Negligible amount was obtained on rechromatography. Hence, not tested
EtOAc- Acetone (4 : 1)	С	60.2	On TLC, three spots were obtained, out of which fraction E3 –yellow (6.2 mg) $R_f = 0.60$ , found much effective on the mosquito.
Haxane- Me <sub>2</sub> O (4 : 1)	D	12.5	Negligible amount was obtained on rechromatography. Hence, not tested.
n-BuOH-H <sub>2</sub> O	E	20.5	On TLC, three spots were obtained, rechromatographed. Fraction E5-light green, $R_f = 0.55$ showed some biological activity as compared to fraction E1 and E3

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The treatment of IInd and IVth instar larvae to five different concentrations of crude extract of *Euphorbia hirta* have been mentioned in Table 4 and 5. The maximum  $LC_{50}$  value was found to be 596.76 and 446.4 ppm for the plant extract. From the results, it appeared that IVth instar are more susceptible than the IInd instar larvae.

Lakshmana Kumar<sup>3</sup> also reported that IVth instar are more susceptible than IInd instar larvae in all the six extracts. The present findings are quite comparable with earlier reports of Saxena and Yadav<sup>4</sup> and Prasad et al.<sup>5</sup>, who have reported the high larvicidal activity in aqueous and alcoholic extract. Similar views have been observed by Singara et al.<sup>6</sup> who have noticed the larvicidal activity in water extract against three species of mosquito larvae. The activity was found to be dose dependent. As the dose was increased, the mortality was also found to be increased. On the basis of the present results, it may be concluded that water and alcoholic extracts contain potent larvicidal compound, which may be further purified to have its synthetic analogues.

	Table '	4: Larvicidal a	ctivity of n-h	exane extract (	of Euphoi	rbia hirta	against <i>Cu</i>	ılex quin	quefascia	ıtus
Larval state	Conc. (ppm)	24 hrs larval mortality (%)	Regression equation (v = a + bx)	Heterogeniety Chi-square [x <sup>2</sup> (n-2)]	LC <sub>50</sub> (ppm)	LC <sub>90</sub> (ppm)	Variance (v)	S.E.	S.D.	Fiducial limits (ppm)
	100	20								
	200	26								
IInd	300	34								
Instar	400	42			376 703		0.010.0	0700	0 10101	M1 = 313
	500	48	$1.19 \pm 02X$	(7-0) 100.7	00/.060	007.071	6010.0	0.000	0.10401	M2 = 80.317
	Control	04								
	100	30								
	200	36								
IVth	300	42		(12/300	116 161	LJC 00J	0.01570	<i>CL310</i> 0	007200	M1 = 22.039
Instar	400	48 2	.241 + 0.928X	(7-0) (7-0	440.401	107.000	7/010.0	7/CIN.0	onocn.u	M2 = 70.157
	500	65								
	Control	04								
25 Each (p < 0.01	second an	d fourth instar la	urvae were tak	en in average of	three repl	icates. Val	ues are sign	nificantly	different	than the control

$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Larval state	Conc. (ppm)	24 hrs larval mortality (%)	Regression equation (v = a + bx)	Heterogeniety Chi-square [x <sup>2</sup> (n-2)]	LC <sub>50</sub> (ppm)	LC <sub>90</sub> (ppm)	Variance (v)	S.E.	S.D.	Fiducial limits (ppm)
$ \begin{array}{l lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$		100	32								
Ind30048Instar40054 $2.513 + 1.0x$ $0.16(5-2)$ $306.902$ $725.75$ $0.01448$ $0.5382$ $0.12034$ S0060 $0$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $0$ Inota $100$ $36$ $2.513 + 1.0x$ $0.16(5-2)$ $306.902$ $725.75$ $0.01448$ $0.5382$ $0.12034$ Inota $100$ $36$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $0$ Inota $300$ $54$ $1.892 + 1.327x$ $0.651(5-2)$ $219.849$ $670.35$ $0.007346$ $0.03833$ $0.0857$ Instar $400$ $62$ $1.892 + 1.327x$ $0.651(5-2)$ $219.849$ $670.35$ $0.007346$ $0.03833$ $0.0857$ Instar $400$ $62$ $1.892 + 1.327x$ $0.651(5-2)$ $219.849$ $670.35$ $0.007346$ $0.03833$ $0.0857$ S00 $72$ $200$ $72$ $219.849$ $670.35$ $0.007346$ $0.03833$ $0.0857$ S00 $72$ $200$ $72$ $219.849$ $670.35$ $0.007346$ $0.03833$ $0.0857$ S00 $72$ $200$ $72$ $219.849$ $670.35$ $0.007346$ $0.03833$ $0.0857$ Instar $1000$ $62$ $1.3892 + 1.327x$ $0.651(5-2)$ $219.849$ $670.35$ $0.007346$ $0.03833$ $0.0857$ $1000$ $72$ $1.3257x$ $0.651(5-2)$ $219.849$ $670.35$ $0.007346$		200	42								
Instar         400         54 $2.513 + 1.0x$ $0.16(5-2)$ $306.902$ $725.75$ $0.01448$ $0.5382$ $0.12034$ $Control$ 04 $2.513 + 1.0x$ $0.16(5-2)$ $306.902$ $725.75$ $0.01448$ $0.5382$ $0.12034$ $Control$ 04 $0.016(5-2)$ $306.902$ $725.75$ $0.01448$ $0.5382$ $0.12034$ $100$ $36$ $44$ $560$ $44$ $560$ $54$ $1.892 + 1.327x$ $0.651(5-2)$ $219.849$ $670.35$ $0.007346$ $0.03833$ $0.0857$ Instar $400$ $62$ $1.892 + 1.327x$ $0.651(5-2)$ $219.849$ $670.35$ $0.007346$ $0.03833$ $0.0857$ Instar $400$ $62$ $1.892 + 1.327x$ $0.651(5-2)$ $219.849$ $670.35$ $0.007346$ $0.03833$ $0.0857$ Instar $400$ $62$ $1.892 + 1.327x$ $0.651(5-2)$ $219.849$ $670.35$ $0.007346$ $0.03833$ $0.0857$ $200$	IInd	300	48								
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Instar	400	54					0.01.440	0 5707		MI = 145.926
Control       04         100       36 $200$ 44 $200$ 44 $10$ 54 $1.892 + 1.327x$ 0.651 (5-2) $100$ 53 $100$ 54 $1.892 + 1.327x$ 0.651 (5-2) $219.849$ 670.35       0.007346 $100$ 72 $500$ 72 $Control$ 04 $25 Each second and fourth instar larvae were taken in average of three replicates. Values are significantly different (p < 0.01)$		500	60	$x_{0.1} + \varepsilon_{1c.2}$	(7-0) 01.0	206.000	C1.C71	0.01448	7000.0	0.12034	M2 = 432.380
$ \begin{array}{c cccc} 100 & 36 \\ 200 & 44 \\ \hline 200 & 54 \\ 1 & 300 & 54 \\ 1 & 300 & 62 \\ 50 & 72 \\ \hline 200 & 72 \\ \hline Control & 04 \\ 500 & 72 \\ \hline 219.849 & 670.35 & 0.007346 & 0.03833 & 0.0857 \\ \hline 300 & 72 \\ \hline 300 &$		Control	04								
$ \begin{array}{c cccc} 200 & 44 \\ \hline {\bf IVth} & 300 & 54 \\ \hline {\bf Instar} & 400 & 62 \\ 500 & 72 \\ \hline {\bf Control} & 0.651 (5-2) & 219.849 & 670.35 & 0.007346 & 0.03833 & 0.0857 \\ \hline {\bf S00} & 72 \\ \hline {\bf Control} & 04 \\ \hline \\ \hline 25 \ Each \ second \ and \ fourth \ instar \ larvae \ were \ taken \ in \ average \ of \ three \ replicates. \ Values \ are \ significantly \ differently \ di$		100	36								
IVth $300$ $54$ $1.892 + 1.327x$ $0.651 (5-2)$ $219.849$ $670.35$ $0.007346$ $0.03833$ $0.0857$ Instar $400$ $62$ $1.892 + 1.327x$ $0.651 (5-2)$ $219.849$ $670.35$ $0.007346$ $0.03833$ $0.0857$ $500$ $72$ $72$ $200$ $72$ $200$ $72$ $200$ $72$ $200$ $72$ $200$ $72$ $200$ $72$ $200$ $72$ $200$ $72$ $200$ $72$ $200$ $72$ $200$ $72$ $200$ $72$ $200$		200	44								
Instar $400$ $62$ $1.392 + 1.32/x$ $0.001 (3-2)$ $2.19.849$ $0.00.35$ $0.007340$ $0.03635$ $0.0035$ $500$ 72Control0425 Each second and fourth instar larvae were taken in average of three replicates. Values are significantly differen $(p < 0.01)$	IVth	300	54		0 (51 (5 0)	010 010		71 0000			M1 = 191.956
$\begin{array}{ccc} 500 & 72 \\ Control & 04 \\ 25  Each  second  and  fourth  instar  larvae  were taken  in  average  of  three  replicates. Values  are  significantly  differen (p < 0.01) \\ \end{array}$	Instar	400	62 1	.892 + 1.52/X	(7-0) 100.0	219.849	cc.0/0	0.00/340	ددەدט.ט	1000.0	M2 = 313.413
Control0425 Each second and fourth instar larvae were taken in average of three replicates. Values are significantly differen $(p < 0.01)$		500	72								
25 Each second and fourth instar larvae were taken in average of three replicates. Values are significantly differen $(p < 0.01)$		Control	04								
	25 Each (p < 0.0]	second an 1)	d fourth instar le	arvae were tak	en in average of	three repl	licates. Va	lues are sig	nificantly	/ different	than the control

N. Arya et al.: Mosqutio Larvicidal Activity of....

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

One of the author Neetu Arya acknowledges with thanks the Financial assistance received from U. G. C., New Delhi as JRF to the SAIF and CDRI, Lucknow for spectral analysis.

#### REFERENCES

- 1. G. K. Sharma, Status, Distribution and Methods of Control of Vector Borne Diseases in India, Proceedings of the ICMR/WHO Workshop to Review Research Results, 3-15 (1986).
- 2. D. J. Finney, Probit Analysis, Third Edition, Cambridge Univ. Press, London (1971).
- 3. Lakshmana Kumar, Studies on the Effect of Certain Plant Products on the *Corpus Allatum* and Gonads of *Culex Quinquefasciatus* (SAY), Ph. D. Thesis, Barkatullah University, Bhopal (2001).
- 4. S. C. Saxena and R. S. Yadav, A New Plant Extract to Suppress the Population of Yellow Fever and Dangue Vector *Aedes Aegypti* (Diptera : Culicidae), Curr. Sci., **52**, 713-715 (1983).
- S. M. Prasad, D. Singh and M. Zeeshan, Toxicity of Aqueous Extract of *Azadirachta Indica* Against Larvae of Mosquito *Anopheles Stephensi*, J. Exp. Zoology, India, 4, 75-79 (2001).
- S. G. Velu, M. G. Ragunathan, S. Mahalingam and M. Dhanaseker, Toxic Effect of Some Plant Extract on Three Species of Mosquito Larvae, Indian J. Exp. Biol., 2(1), 133-136 (2001).

Revised : 15.01.2011

Accepted : 17.01.2011