



ANTIMICROBIAL ACTIVITIES FOR HADHRAMI HONEY ON GROWTH OF SOME PATHOGENIC BACTERIA

Wedad M. Al-Haik 🔟, Ahmed M. Al-Haddad 🕮, Ali Gamal Al-kaf 🀌, Wadhah Hassan Edrees ७

¹Department of Biology, Faculty of Science, Hadhramout University, Al-Mukalla, Yemen.

²Department of Medical Laboratories, College of Medicine and Health Sciences, Hadhramout University, Al-Mukalla, Yemen. ³Department of Medicinal and Analytical Chemistry, Faculty of Pharmacy, Sana'a University- Sana'a – Yemen. ⁴Department of Biology, Faculty of Science, Sana'a University, Yemen.

Article Info:

Cite this article:

Research 2017; 2(6): 6-11.

http://doi.org/10.22270/ujpr.v2i6.R2

E-mail: ahmed_al_haddad@yahoo.com

*Address for Correspondence:

Article History:

Al-Haik WM, Al-Haddad AM, Al-kaf AG, Edrees WH. Antimicrobial activities for

hadhrami honey on growth of some pathogenic

bacteria. Universal Journal of Pharmaceutical

Dr. Ahmed M. Al-Haddad, Department of

Medical Laboratories, College of Medicine and

Health Sciences, Hadhramout University, PO-Box 52047, Al-Mukalla, Republic of Yemen.

Received: 9 October 2017 Reviewed: 11 November 2017

Accepted: 30 December 2017

Published: 15 January 2018

Abstract

Objectives: The majority of the Yemeni honey varieties are characterized by low moisture content, in addition to the various flora of Yemeni plant, which may not be found in many countries, which makes them of high medicinal importance and high monetary value.

Methods: This study was carried out the effect of three types of Hadhrami honey: Somur, Sidr (Baghya) and Meria against the growth of some pathogenic bacteria (*Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Proteus vulgaris*, *Escherichia coli*, *Enterobacter* sp., *Staphylococcus aureus*, and *Klebsiella* sp.).

Results: The results revealed that that Sidr honey gave the highest antibacterial activity against all bacteria tested, whereas the Somur and Meria honey were not recorded activity for growth *Klebsiella* sp. and Meria honey was not recorded activity for growth *E. coli*, respectively. When the antibiotics compared to types of honey antimicrobial activity, it was observed that the antimicrobial effect of Sidr honey was better than Imipenem antibiotic effect against *P. aeruginosa*.

Conclusions: Study concludes that inhibition of the studied strains was dependent on the type of honey source. It is concluded that Yemeni honey could potentially be used as therapeutic agents against bacterial infection particularly to the tested microorganisms.

Keywords: Antimicrobial activity of honey, sidr and meria, somur, Yemeni honey varieties.

INTRODUCTION

Mobile: +967-733251099.

Honey is the product of beekeeping that has great market potential. Honey contains more than 200 compounds comprising approximately 38% fructose, 31% glucose,10% other sugar types, 18% water and 3% of other compounds. However, precisely the great mixture of compounds in this 3% is the product's greatest feature, with special reference to phenolic and carotenoids compounds¹. Honey is one of the most complete foods for humans, due to its therapeutic², antioxidant³, antimicrobial^{4,5}, antitumoral⁶, antiinflammatory⁷, antiviral⁸, and antiulcer activities⁵. Most studies on the effects of honey are concentrated on the activities of bioactive compounds, especially phenolic compounds, in the human organism. The most relevant are those widely distributed in nature, including the phenolic acids and flavonoids⁹. Carotenoids were found in small concentrations in the dark honey (10 mg b-carotene Kg⁻¹) but they were not found in light colored honey. This fact reveals the effect that carotenoids^{1,10} and phenolic compounds have in the honey color¹¹. The natural ingredients of honey show different activities against various microorganisms. Its activity is likely to be dependent on the grazing grounds and the weather conditions where the bees were raised, and on the natural structure of the blossom nectar¹². Honey has an increasing effect on the levels of anti-oxidants, iron and rare elements in blood¹³. The antibacterial activity of honey has never been reported nor any toxicity or side effects, low cost of maintenance, and local availability confer valuable advantages to using honey as an alternative antimicrobial therapy¹⁴. There are numerous reports of the antimicrobial activity of honey against a wide range bacterial and fungal species^{8,12,14,15}. of The antimicrobial activity could be attributed to osmotic effect of honey, the low pH of honey being between 3.2 and 4.5,¹⁶ hydrogen peroxide, defensin-1, as well as the presence of phytochemical factors¹⁷.

Thereby, the inhibitory activity caused by the osmotic effect of honey dilutions obviously depends on the

species of bacteria. The major contributor to the antimicrobial activity of honey is hydrogen peroxide, and the different concentrations of this compound in different honey result in their varying antimicrobial effects¹⁸. Several types of bacteria, commonly involved in wound infections like E. coli, S. aureus, P. mirabilis, Klebsiella spp., Streptococcus faecalis, and P. *aeruginosa*, are susceptible to the antibacterial activity of honey regardless to their resistance to antibiotics¹⁹. In vitro studies support the antimicrobial effect of honey against an extensive range of pathogens including β -haemolytic streptococci, methicillinresistant S. aureus and Pseudomonas sp²⁰. In vivo studies are less conclusive but honey has been used to burns²¹ treat and meningococcal lesions²². Subrahmanyam²³ compared between honey and silver sulphadiazine on the treatment of patients with burns and found less inflammation. This study aimed to investigate the antibacterial activities of three types of Yemeni Hadhrami honey against some pathogenic microorganisms (gram positive and gram negative bacteria) isolated from patients and compared between them with the effect of antibiotics.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Bacterial strains

The bacteria strains that used in this study are most commonly involved in causing gastroenteritis, wound and burn exudates, urinary tract infection and ear secretions. Six bacteria strains (*P. aeruginosa*, *P. vulgaris*, *E. coli*, *S. aureus*, *Enterobacter* sp., and *Klebsiella* sp.) were isolated from different patients attending Al-Mukalla's Hospitals in Hadhramout–Yemen, and used throughout this study. The isolated bacteria were subcultured on Nutrient agar (Difco) and incubated aerobically at 37°C for 24 hours. Organisms were maintained in the laboratory on nutrient agar slopes at 4°C²⁴.

Honey samples

In this study, three Hadhrami honey samples were taken from Yemeni mountain nature were used: {Somur, Sidr (Baghya) and Meria}, and stored in the dark at room temperature. The physical character-izations of honey samples such as pH which was measured using a pH meter (JeNWAY-3505), while the appearance was assessed in each sample by visual examination to determine the color.

Determination the minimal inhibitory concentration of the honey

The minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) of honey was determined by using a different dilution for each type of honey that diluted with sterile distilled water. It was weighed 7gm/7mL from honey and the following concentration was prepared $(1:4, 1:8, 1:10, \text{ and } 1:20)^{25}$.

Antibacterial activity

The well diffusion technique under aerobic condition was employed as previously described by Harris et al.,²⁶ About 20 ml of the sterilized medium was poured into each sterile Petri-dish (9 cm diameter) and allowed to solidify. Bacterial suspension for each strain tested was adjusted at 3x108 CFU/ml by McFarland scale which prepared by mixing 0.1 ml of 1.0% dehydrate barium chloride with 9.9 ml of 1.0% Sulfuric acid $\mathrm{H}_2\mathrm{SO}_4$ as described by McFarland.^{27} 0.1 ml of the prepared bacterial suspension was spread evenly onto the agar surface using a cotton swab and kept in a refrigerator for 2 h. Wells (7 mm) were cut into the plates using sterile cork. Thereafter, all prepared plates were incubated at 37°C for 24 h²⁸. After that, the diameter of inhibition zone around the well was measured in mm.

Antibiotic susceptibility test

Antibiotic susceptibility tests were carried out by the Kirby- Bauer disk diffusion technique according to Clinical Laboratory Standard Institute guidelines²⁹. Mueller Hinton agar was used for growing the lawn of culture of the strains by spreading the culture onto the agar plate^{30,31}.

In this study, eight of different antibiotics disks (OXOID and HIMEDIA) were used against investigated bacteria. These antibiotics disks were: Aztreonam (AT 30 μ g)-Imipenem (IPM 10 μ g)-Gentamicin (GEN 10 μ g)-Ceftazidime (CAZ 30 μ g)-Piperacillin (PI 100 μ g)-Amikacin (AK 30 μ g)-Amoxicillin+Clavulanic acid) (AMC 30 μ g)-Cefuroxime (CXM 30 μ g).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the physical characterizations and the prices of the three types of Hadhrami honey (Somur, Sidr and Meria) were recorded in Table 1. The results of antibacterial activity of different honey types against P. aeruginosa, P. vulgaris, E. coli, S. aureus, Enterobacter sp., and Klebsiella sp. were presented in Table 2. The Sidr honey was highly antimicrobial effective against all tested bacteria, which ranged between 10 ± 0.11 mm to 30 ± 0.1 mm, while the Somur and Meria honey showed no activity for the growth of Klebsiella sp. and Meria honey against E. coli (not inhibition zone). It was found that the Sidr honey has more influence antimicrobial activity, followed by Somur honey and then the Meria honey as the last one. These results are in agreement with reported by Othman²⁴ who recorded that the Yemeni Sidr honey has more effective than Egyptian honey against Salmonella typhi, Neisseria meningitides, E. coli, Klebsiella pneumoniae, S. aureus, P. aeruginosa, H. influenza, Shigella flexneri, and P. vulgaris.

Table 1: Characteristics of types of honey tested.							
Haman	The price of (pН	Dark	Light			
Honey	In Yemeni Riyals	In USA Dollars					
Somur	5000	14	4.5	++	-		
Sidr	20,000	55	3.8	-	++		
Meria	2000	5	5.9	-	+++		

Table 2: Inhibitory growth activity of Hadhrami honey against p	<u>athogenic</u> bacteria.
---	----------------------------

Microorganisms Mean diameter of inhibition zone (mm)±SD

		Type of Hone	ey
	Somur	Sidr	Meria
P. aeruginosa	24±0.2	30±0.1	22±0.0
E. coli	15 ± 0.10	23±0.3	-
Enterobacter sp.	11 ± 0.1	21±0.2	10 ± 0.11
P. vulgaris	19±0.0	20±0.0	20±0.0
S. aureus	13±0.18	16±0.28	11 ± 0.2
<i>Klebsiella</i> sp.	-	17 ± 0.01	-

 Table 3: The minimal inhibitory concentration (MIC) of Somur, Sidr, and Meria honey against growth of microorganisms.

Honey	Microorganism	Mean diameter of inhibition zone (mm) results			
Concentration	_	Somur honey	Sidr honey	Meria honey	
	P. aeruginosa	20	22	18	
	E. coli	16	18	12	
1:4	Enterobacter sp.	10	13	10	
1.4	P. vulgaris	15	18	-	
	S. aureus	10	12	13	
	<i>Klebsiella</i> sp.	-	11	-	
	P. aeruginosa	15	19	12	
	E. coli	10	12	-	
1. 0	Enterobacter sp.	-	10	-	
1:8	P. vulgaris	11	11	-	
	S. aureus	-	10	10	
	<i>Klebsiella</i> sp.	-	-	-	
	P. aeruginosa	10	15	10	
	E. coli	-	10	-	
1:10	Enterobacter sp.	-	-	-	
1.10	P. vulgaris	10	10	-	
	S. aureus	-	10	-	
	<i>Klebsiella</i> sp.	-	-	-	
	P. aeruginosa	-	10	-	
	E. coli	-	-	-	
1:20	Enterobacter sp.	-	-	-	
1.20	P. vulgaris	-	11	-	
	S. aureus	-	-	-	
	<i>Klebsiella</i> sp.	-	-	-	

The experiment on El-Ariqi and El-Hamodi³² observed that the Sidr honey was the second one on the antimicrobial activities against S. aureus, E. coli, Salmonella sp., Proteus sp., and P. aeruginosa. On the other hand, Almasaudi *et al.*,³³ compared the effects of five types of honey (both imported and local Saudi honey) against S. aureus. It was found that the Manuka Honey showed the best results and had a bactericidal effect on both methicillin resistant and sensitive S. aureus. However, Sidr and Nigella sativa honey exerted a bacteriostatic effect. The present study showed varying degree of growth inhibition activity of three types of Yemeni honey against the tested microorganisms; these might be due to an advantage for honey like osmotic effect, the effect of low pH, and these organisms are sensitive to hydrogen peroxide which are unsuitable for bacterial growth, represented as an inhibition factor in honey^{21,32,34}. This result was supported by a number of previous studies which have demonstrated that various honey, both commercially and locally produced, have antibacterial activity. A study by Nzeako and Hamdi³⁵ used six types of commercial honey and found that inhibition of S. aureus, E. coli and P. aeruginosa. Another study by Ceyhan and Ugar³⁶ investigated 84 types of honey

against eight bacteria and two fungi. It was shown that the honey has a broad-spectrum activity against the used microorganisms. In addition, these authors found that the antibacterial activity of honey was greater than that which could be attributed to the sugar content of the honey. The antibacterial activity of honey has also been investigated for its potential use in reducing foodborne pathogens³⁷, preventing catheter exit/entry site infection³⁸, for the treatment of colitis³⁹, or even to protect the gastric mucousin H. pylori induced inflammation^{40,41}. The application of honey to wounds to animals in veterinary environments has also been noted⁴². Furthermore, the results of the current study revealed that most bacteria tested were sensitive at 1:4 concentration of all types of honey studied, except Klebsiella sp. was resistance to Somur and Meria honey. P. aeruginosa was more sensitive than others (Table 3). All bacteria were resistant to 1:20 concentration of all types of honey except P. aeruginosa and P. vulgaris were sensitive to Sidr honey with inhibition zone (10 mm and 11 mm), respectively. A similar result was previously reported by Shreef et al.,25 who reported that most bacteria tested sensitive to 1:4 concentration more than other concentration (1:8, 1:10, 1:16, 1:20, 1:24) of both natural and industrial honey. Also, Al-Nahari et al.,43 studied antimicrobial activities of Saudi honey against P. aeruginosa. The results indicated that all types of honey tested exerted a full inhibition of bacterial growth at the highest concentration tested of 50% at 24 h of contact. Othman²⁴ showed that all the different concentrations of both honey samples (10 to 80%) showed growth inhibitory activity against E. coli more than other bacteria tested. It was recorded that all the tested bacteria were sensitive to Isis and Yemeni Sidr honey at 40 to 80% concentrations. The antibacterial activity of Yemeni Sidr honey was higher than those obtained by Isis honey. Variations seen in overall antibacterial activity were due to changes in the level

of hydrogen peroxide achieved and in some cases to the level of non- peroxide factors²⁴. The content of nonperoxide factors was obviously related to the Yemeni floral source and sometimes accounted for the major part of the antibacterial activity in honey⁴⁴. Molan and Cooper⁴⁵ reported that the difference in antimicrobial potency among the different honey can be more than 100-fold, depending on its geographical, seasonal and botanical source. This result was in agreement with those previously reported by Mohammed *et al.*,⁴⁶. The different concentrations of the two honey samples had good growth inhibitory effect on the tested microorganisms.

Table 4: The antibiotic susceptibility test for tested bacteria.						
Antibiotics	tics Mean diameter of inhibition zone (mm)					
	Bacteria tested					
	Klebsiella sp.	P. vulgaris	Enterobacter sp.	S. aureus	E. coli	P. aeruginosa
Piperacillin	11	15	13	18	10	19
Amikacin	15	16	13	15	11	16
Imipenem	17	18	20	17	19	22
Cefuroxime	11	10	0	15	0	0
Aztreonam	14	12	20	20	19	18
Amoxicillin						
+ Clavulanic	13	10	20	18	11	0
acid						
Gentamicin	10	17	20	17	19	16
Ceftazidime	0	0	12	14	0	0

.....

A similar result was previously reported by Mohapatra et al.⁴⁷ for E. coli and P. aeruginosa⁴⁸, for E. coli, K. pneumoniae and for Haemophilus influenza⁴⁹. The less inhibition effect of the two tested honey against K. pneumoniae and S. aureus was in agreement with Patricia et al.,⁵⁰ who reported that the overall poor activity of the honey against S. aureus was unexpected as previous reports which recorded that Maunka honey has an excellent activity against this organism. For example, Cooper and Molan²⁰ who also used an agar dilution method and demonstrated that the minimum inhibitory concentration for Maunka honey against 58 strains of Staphylococcus sp. was 2-3% (v/v) and for pasture honey 3-4% (v/v). In this study, the antibiotic susceptibility was tested and the highest percentage of the sensitivity to Imipenem for most bacteria were recorded. The highest inhibition zone of Imipenem was (22 mm) for *P. aeruginosa* (Table 4), while the highest inhibition zone of Sidr honey was (30 mm) that indicated the antimicrobial effect of honey was higher than antibiotic effect. A similar result was previously reported by Al-Nahari et al.,⁴³ for Manuka honey UMF +10 was the most effect on antimicrobial resistance and had an effect on modulation of Imipenem resistant P. aeruginosa. The resistance of pathogenic microorganisms to antibiotics is a serious global health concern⁵¹. On another hand, Al-Naama⁵² showed that honey, like antibiotics, has certain organisms sensitive to it, and provides alternative therapy against certain bacteria and is also shown to have an antimicrobial action against a broad spectrum of bacteria (both grampositive and -negative bacteria). Honey contains compounds with antioxidant and antibacterial capacities, such as phenolic compounds and

carotenoids⁵³. Honey bees add an enzyme, called glucose oxidase, to the collected nectar during the honey-making process, which converts the glucose in the honey into hydrogen peroxide (H₂O₂) and gluconic acid. H_2O_2 is toxic to many microbes⁵¹.

Mohapatra et al.,47 showed that the honey has an antibacterial effect against both gram-positive bacteria (S. aureus, B. subtilis, B. cereus, Enterococcus faecalis, and Micrococcus luteus) as well as anti-gram negative bacteria (E. coli, P. aeruginosa, and S. typhi). This effect was either bacteriostatic or bactericidal depending on the type of honey tested. There are countless varieties of honey being produced worldwide, and some may have superior antimicrobial activities that are yet to be discovered.

CONCLUSIONS

The results indicated that three types of honey affected the test organisms differently. Also it was evident that the antibacterial effect of different types of honey is type and concentration dependent. Sidr honey was more potent than Somur and Meria honey in inhibiting the bacterial growths in vitro. Consequently, using honey for the treatment of infections may be worth perusing.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors extend their thanks and appreciation to the Hadhramout University, Al-Mukalla, Republic of Yemen to provide necessary facilities for this work.

AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTION

Al-Haik WM: designed the study. **Al-Haddad AM:** acquired the data. **Al-kaf AG:** analyzed the data and interpreted the results. **Edrees WH:** drafted the article. All authors revised the article and approved the final version.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The datasets generated during this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None to declare.

REFERENCES

- Alvarez-Suarez JM, Tulipani S, Díaz D, Estevez Y, Romandini S, Giampieri F, *et al.* Antioxidant and antimicrobial capacity of several monofloral Cuban honeys and their correlation with color, polyphenol content and other chemical compounds. Food Chem Toxicol 2010; 48: 2490-2499. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fct.2010.06.021
- Blasa M, Candiracci M, Accorsi A, Piacentini MP, Piatti E. Honey flavonoids as protection agents against oxidative damage to human red blood cells. Food Chem 2007; 104: 1635-1640.
 - https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2007.03.014
- Lachman J, Orsak M, Hejtmankova A, Kovarova E. Evaluation of antioxidant activity and total phenolics of selected Czech honeys. Food Science Tech 2010; 43: 52-58 .https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2009.06.008
- Escuredo O, Silva LR, Valentao P, Seijo MC, Andrade PB. Assessing Rubus honey value: Pollen and phenolic compounds content and antibacterial capacity. Food Chem 2012; 130: 671-678. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2011.07.107
- Vandamme L, Heyneman A, Hoeksema H, Verbelen J, Monstrey S. Honey in modern wound care: A systematic review. Burns 2013; 39: 1514-1525. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.burns.2013.06.014
- Jaganathan SK, Mazumdar A, Mondhe D, Mandal M. Apoptotic effect of eugenol in human colon cancer cell lines. Cell Biol Int 2011; 6: 607-615. https://doi.org/10.1042/CBI20100118
- Van Den Berg AJ, Vand Den Worm E, Van Ufford HC, Halkes SB, Hoekstra MJ, Beukelman CJ. An *in vitro* examination of the antioxidant and anti-inflammatory properties of buckwheat honey. J Wound Care 2008; 17: 172-178.https://doi.org/10.12968/jowc.2008.17.4.28839
- Watanabe K, Rahmasari R, Matsunaga A, Kobayashi N. Anti-influenza viral effects of honey *in vitro*: potent high activity of manuka honey. Arch Med Res 2014; 45: 359-365 .https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arcmed.2014.05.006
- 9. Vermerris W, Nicholson R. Phenolic compound Biochemistry. Springer, USA; 2006.
- Ferreira IR., Aires E, Barreira JM, Estevinho M. Antioxidant activity of Portuguese honey samples: Different contributions of the entire honey and phenolic extract. Food Chem 2009; 114: 1438-1443. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2008.11.028
- Estevinho L, Prereira AP, Moreira L, Dias LG, Pereira E. Antioxidant and antimicrobial effects of phenolic compounds extracts of Northeast Portugal honey. Food Chem Toxicol 2008; 46: 3774-3779. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fct.2008.09.062

- Abd-El Aal A, El-Hadidy M, El-Mashad N, El-Sebaie, A. Antimicrobial effect of bee honey in comparison to antibiotics on organisms isolated from infected burns. Ann. Burns Fire Dis 2007; 20: 83 .PMID: 21991075
- Theunissen F, Grobler S, Gedalia I. The antifungal action of three South African honeys on *Candida albicans*. Apidologie 2001; 32: 371–379. https://doi.org/10.1051/apido:2001137
- 14. Zainol MI, Yusoff KM, Yusof MYM. Antibacterial activity of selected Malaysian honey. BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine 2013; 13: 129. https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6882-13-129
- Chute RK, Deogade NG, Kawale M. Antimicrobial activity of Indian honey against clinical Isolates. Asiatic J Biotech Res 2010; 1: 35-38.
- Cooper RA, Molan PC, Harding KG. The sensitivity to honey of gram- positive cocci of clinical significance isolated from wounds. J Appl Micro 2002; 93: 857-863.
- Frankel S, Robinson GE, Berenbaum MR. Antioxidant capacity and correlated characteristics of 14 unifloral honeys. J Apic Res 1998; 37: 27-31. https://doi.org/10.1080/00218839.1998.11100951
- Ahmed M, Djebli N, Meslem A, Aissat S. Antibacterial activity of various honey types of algeria against pathogenic gram-negative Bacilli: *Escherichia coli* and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. Asian Pacif J Trop Dis. 2012; 211-214.https://doi.org/10.1016/S2222-1808(12)60048-6
- George, N.M., and Cutting, K.F. Antibacterial honey (Medihoney): *In vitro* activity against clinical isolates of MRSA, VRE, and other multiresistant oram-negative Organisms Including *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. Wounds 2007; 19(9):231-236.
- 20. Cooper RA, Molan PC. Antibacterial activity of honey against strains of *Staphylococcus aureus* from infected wounds. J R Soc Med 1999; 92(6):283-285. https://doi.org/10.1177/014107689909200604
- 21. Minisha DM, Shyamapada M. Honey: Its medicinal property and antibacterial activity. Asian Pacif J Trop Biomed 2011; 154-160. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2221-1691(11)60016-6
- 22. Dunford C, Cooper R, Molan P. Using honey as a dressing for infected skin lesions. Nurs Times 2000; 96 (14): 7-9.
- 23. Subrahmanyam M. A prospective randomised clinical and histological study of superficial burn wound healing with honey and silver sulfadiazine. Burns 1998; 24(2):157-161.

https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-4179(97)00113-7

- 24. Othman AS. Antibacterial activity of bee and Yemeni Sidr honey against some pathogenic bacteria species. Int J Curr Microbiol App Sci 2014; 3(10): 1015-1025. https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6882-9-34
- 25. Shreef AY, Mohammed K, Mohammed RI. A comparative study of the effect of natural and commercial honey on the growth of some bacterial species. Tikrit J Sci Exch 2012; 17 (1):1-9. https://doi.org/10.5829/idosi.abr.2017.365.372
- 26. Harris LJ, Daeschel MA, Stiles MA. Antimicrobial activity of Lactic acid bacteria against *Listeria* monocytogenes. J Food Prot 1989; 52: 384-387. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2012.05.023
- 27. McFarland J. Nephelometer: An instrument for estimating the number of bacteria in suspensions used for calculating the opsonic index and for vaccines. J American Med Assoc: 1907;49: 1176. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.1907.25320140022001f
- Joshi VK, Sharma S, Rana NS. Bacteriocin from lactic acid fermented vegetables. Food Technol Biotechnol. 2006; 44: 435-439 .PMID: 22973159
- 29. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) (2009). Performance standards for antimicrobial disk susceptibility tests; approved standard. 10th ed. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. CLSI document M02-A10, Wayne, Pennsylvania, USA, 2009.

- 30. Carvalho C, Geslin, P, Vazpato MV. Pulsed-field gel electrophoresis in Streptococcus pneumoniae isolated in France and Portugal. Pathology Biol 1996; 44:430-434. PMID: 9705417
- 31. Rajput A, Prajapati B, Chauhan B, Shah A, Trivedi T, Kadam M. Prevalence of Metallo-betalactamases (MBL) producing Pseudomonas aeruginosa in a Tertiary care Hospital. J Bas App Med Res 2012; 1(4): 304-308. https://doi.org/10.4103/0972-5229.76089
- 32. El-Ariqi SNS, El-Hamodi MH. Antibacterial activity for Yemeni honeys against some pathogenic bacteria. J Agricultural Chem Biotech 2010; 1 (1): 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2042-7158.1991.tb03186.x
- 33. Almasaudi SB, Al-Nahari AM, El Sayed M, El-Ghany A, Barbour E, Al Muhayawi SM, Al-Jaouni S, Azhar E, Qari M, Qari YA, Harakeh S. Antimicrobial effect of different types of honey on Staphylococcus aureus. Saudi J Biol Sci 2017; 24: 1255-1261. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sjbs.2016.08.007
- 34. Postmes T, Van den Bogaard AE, Hazen M. Honey for wounds, ulcers, and skin graft preservation. Lancet 1993; 341(8847): 756-775.

https://doi.org/10.1016/0140-6736(93)90527-n

- 35. Nzeako BC, Hamdi J. Antimicrobial potential of honey on some microbial isolates. SQU J Sci Res Med Sci 2000; 2:75-79.
- 36. Ceyhan N, Ugar A. Investigation of in vitro antimicrobial activity of honey. Riv Biol 2001; 94(2):363-371.PMID: 11702659
- 37. Taormina PJ, Niemira BA, Beuchat LR. Inhibitory activity of honey against foodborne pathogens as influenced by the presence of hydrogen peroxide and level of antioxidant power. Int J Food Micro 2001; 69:217-225.

https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1605(01)00505-0

- 38. Quadri KH, Huraib SO. Manuka honey for central vein catheter exit site care. Semin Dial 1999; 12:397-398 . https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1525-139x.1999.99052-3.x
- 39. Bilsel Y, Bugra D, Yamaner S, Bulut T, Cevikbas U, and Turkoglu U. Could honey have a place in colitis therapy? Effects of honey, prednisolone, and disulfiram on inflammation, nitric oxide, and free radical formation. Digestive Surgery. 2002; 19 (4): 306-311. https://doi.org/10.1155/2013/829070
- 40. Osata MS, Reddy SG, Graham DY. Osmotic effect of honey on growth and viability of Helicobacter pylori. Dig Dis Sci 1999; 44:462-464. https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1026676517213
- 41. Ali MTM. Prevention of ammonia-induced gastric lesions in rats by natural honey. Environ Med 2003; 13:239-246.

https://doi.org/10.1080/13590840310001649899

- 42. Mathews KA, Binnington AG. Management of wounds using honey. Compend Contin Educ Vet Pract 2002; 24:53-61.
- 43. Al-Nahari AM, Almasaudi SB, El Sayed M, El-Ghany A, Barbour E, Al Jaouni S, Harakeh KS. Antimicrobial activities of Saudi honey against Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Saudi J Biol Sci 2015; 22: 521-525.
- 44. Algurashi AM. Masoud EA, Alamin MA Antibacterial activity of Saudi honey against Gram negative bacteria. J Micro Antimic 2013: 5(1): 1-5.
- 45. Molan PC, Cooper RA. Honey and sugar as a dressing for wounds and ulcers. Trop Doct 2000; 30:249-250. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2221-1691(11)60016-6
- 46. Mohammed RD, Kamran F, Jalal S, Jalil DS, Mohammed RV, Nasermaheri-sis. Evaluation antibacterial activity of the Iranian honey through MIC method on some dermal and intestinal pathogenic bacteria. J Anim Vet Adv 2008; 7(4):409-412.
- 47. Mohapatra DP, Thakur V, Brar SK. Antibacterial efficacy of raw and processed honey. Biotech Res Int 2011; 1-6 .https://doi.org/10.4061/2011/917505
- 48. Agbaje EO, Ogunsanya T, Aiwerioba OIR. Conventional use of honey as antibacterial agent. Ann Afr Med 2006; 5(2):78-81. https://doi.org/10.4172/2472-0992.1000124
- 49. Hern TT, Rosliza AR, Siew HG, Ahmad SH, Siti AH, Siti AS, Kirnpal-Kaur BS. The antibacterial properties of Malaysian tualang honey against wound and enteric microorganisms in comparison to manuka honey. BMC Complementary Altern Med 2009; 9:34. https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6882-9-34
- 50. Patricia E, Lusby, Alexandra L, Coombes, Jenny M. Wilkinson bactericidal activity of different honeys against pathogenic bacteria. Archives Med Res 2005; 36: 464-467. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arcmed.2005.03.038
- 51. McLoone P, Warnock M, Fyfe L. Honey: A realistic antimicrobial for disorders of the skin. J Microbiol Immunol Infect 2016; 49: 161-167. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmii.2015.01.009
- 52. Al- Naama RT. Evaluation of in-vitro inhibitory effect of honey on some microbial isolate. J Bact Res 2009; 1(6): 064-067.
- Bueno-Costa FM, Zambiazi RC, Bohmer BW, 53. Chaves C, da Silva W, Zanusso T, Dutra A. Antibacterial and antioxidant activity of honeys from the state of Rio Grande do Sul. Brazil Food Sci Tech 2016; 65: 333-340.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2015.08.018