International Journal of Healthcare Sciences ISSN 2348-5728 (Online)
Vol. 2, Issue 2, pp: (94-101), Month: October 2014 - March 2015, Available at: www.researchpublish.com

Effectiveness of Antibiotics Blended With Honey on Some Pathogenic Bacteria Species

Salwa H. Alkhyat[1], Maher Ali Al.Maqtari[2]

[1]Sana'a University, Faculty of Science, Department of Biology
[2]Sana'a University, Faculty of Science, Department of Chemistry

Abstract: **The antibacterial activity of three local Yemeni honey brands (Sidr, Maraiy and Somor honey) and antibiotics (Gentamicin and Doxycyclinehyclate) were investigated by agar well diffusion method against four standard bacteria isolates; *Escherichia coli* ATCC 10536 *(E. coli)*, *Staphylococcus aureus* ATCC 29737 *(S. aureus*), *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* ATCC 25619 *(P. aeruginosa)* and *Salmonella abony* ATCC6017 *(S. abony)* and comparative these with the effectiveness of antibiotics blended with honey on the growth of all used standard bacteria. All diluted honey brands (25%, 50% and 75%) inhibit growth of 3 standard bacteria (*S. abony*, *S. aureus* then *E. coli*), while *P. aeruginosa* gave moderate growth with effect on its pigment production. The inhibitory effect of Gentamicin on test organisms was inhibit growth of *S. aureus* (17.5 mm), *S. abony* (15 mm) and *P. aeruginosa* (6.5 mm). Mixture of Gentamicin and honey brands showed maximum inhibitory zones (sensitivity) with *S. abony* and *S. aureus* then *P. aeruginosa* were 32, 30 and 16 mm; respectively. Whereas Doxycycline hyclate was not effective on the tested organisms except *S. aureus* which showed high sensitivity (30-32 mm) when blended Doxycycline hyclate with samples of honey. The obtained results in this study approved mixture of honey and antibiotics having antibacterial potency able to establish valuable inhibition zones in vitro and they were higher in inhibition values than the reference drugs. In conclusion, honey (a natural product) could effectively complement standard antibiotics, especially in cases of pathogenic infections in wounds in general and in burn wounds in particular, with beneficial healing effects.**

Keywords: **Yemeni honey, Antibiotics blended with honey, Pathogenic organisms.**

1. INTRODUCTION

Antimicrobial agents are the substances known to have therapeutic effect on microorganisms either as a control, prevention or cure of microbial and non-microbial disease origin. These antimicrobial agents are synthesized chemotherapeutic substances obtained majorly from microorganisms, plants and some animal products. The failure of these antibiotics has resulted for man to search for more effective sources of natural products. In some cases, they have been found safe and good source of pharmacological effect for man (Omoya and Akharaiyi, 2012).

Honey is a sweet food made from the synthesis of nectar from flowers, plant saps and man waste products. Honey is a mixture of sugars, mainly fructose and glucose, having the highest percentage among other carbohydrates present (Omoya and Akharaiyi, 2012).

Antimicrobial agents with selective toxicity are especially useful as a chemotherapeutic agent in treating infectious diseases and may be a function of specific receptor requirement for drug attachment or it may depend on the inhibition of biochemical events essential to the pathogen but not to the host (Omoya and Akharaiyi, 2012). Other antimicrobial factors subsequently suggested were low protein content, high C/N ratio, acidity, low redox potential, viscosity,and high osmotic pressure (Adeleke and Olaitan, 2006 a; Chute *et al.*, 2010; Ahmadi *et al*., 2013).

Honey's curative and antimicrobial effects against various diseases and infections have been documented (Adeleke and Olaitan, 2006 b). Recently, studies have focused on honey application for various therapeutic purpose such as prevention of infection in wounds or burns (Mullai and Menon, 2007) and it has been ranked higher in antibacterial effect on burn wounds than silver sulphadiazine (Adeleke and Olaitan, 2006 b), oral infections, erosion of mucosa (Ahmadi *et al*., 2013),

as an anticarcinogenic agent, anti-leishmanial effects, chest pain, fatigue vertigo, respiratory ailments, measles, period pains, postnatal disorders, male impotence and pharyngitis due to its antibacterial and anti-inflammatory effects (Eteraf-Oskouei and Najafi, 2013).

Honey are now available on formularies in many developed countries. Registered products include medical grade honey in tubes, ointments, gels, impregnated onto non-adherent dressings or alginate, and non-sticky flexible honey sheets. All are sterilized by gamma irradiation (Jenkins and Cooper, 2012).

More recently, honey has been reported to have an inhibitory effect to around 60 species of bacteria including aerobes, anaerobes, Gram positive or Gram-negative (Chute *et al.*, 2010; Aurongzeb and Azim, 2011; Ahmadi *et al*., 2013; AL-Waili *et al*., 2013), moulds and yeasts with unique properties because of its bacteriostatic and bactericidal effect (Chute *et al.*, 2010; Aurongzeb and Azim, 2011; Ahmadi *et al*., 2013). In 1892, the antibacterial action of honey was reported for the first time are two sorts of antibacterial agents or so called inhibines (AL-Waili *et al.*, 2013).

Gentamicin is an antibiotic noted for its activity against Gram-negative bacteria at a concentration of 4.0 µg/ml. While, doxycycline is bacteriostatic against a wide variety of organisms, both Gram-positive and Gram-negative. It is used mainly for the treatment of urinary tract, respiratory tract, and gastrointestinal (GI) tract infections (Jantratid *et al*., 2010).

Available reports do not indicate deliberate comparative studies on honey's antibacterial activity and standard antibiotics, that a combination of honey and antibiotics may be an effective new antimicrobial therapy for chronic infections. Therefore this study highlights the potential of honey or antibiotics and a combinational use of them on selected pathogenic bacteria to develop novel therapies for chronic infections, to both improve efficacy and reduce the risk of antibiotic resistance.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. Bacterial Strains

Four standard bacterial strains (*S. aureus* ATCC 29737, *E. coli* ATCC 10536, *P. aeruginosa* ATCC 25619 and *S. abony* ATCC 6017) were used throughout this study.

All bacteria isolates were obtained from the stock culture of the Department of Biology, Faculty of Science, Sana'a University, Republic of Yemen.

2.2. Honey Samples

Three brands of fresh Yemeni honeys were used in antibacterial susceptibility testing including Sidr Dawaney No. 1 (Sidr) , Maraiy Mahwetey (Maraiy) and Somor Hadramey No. 1 (Somor) were taken from different areas of Yemen (Table 1).

Table 1. Local honeys used in the study.

Honeys	Origin of honey	Floral source
Sidr	Dawan-Hadramout	*Ziziphusspinachristi*
Maraiy	Almahweet	Wild types of plants
Somor	Hadramout	*Acacia niloticas*ubspIndica

2.3. Antibiotics

Two types of antibiotics:

- Gentamicin sulphate: as a product of Loramycin, Iran, was obtained in ampoule vials (2 ml) from a local pharmacy store. The antibiotic was used in concentrations of 4 µg/ml (aq.).

- Doxycycline hyclate as standard antibiotic was used in concentration of 0.08 ppm (µg/ml).

2.4. Methods

2.4.1. Biological methods

2.4.1.1. Preparation of Honey Samples

This study was carried out with natural, un-treated and unpasteurized honey samples. The samples were originated from blossoms of wild flowers and did not contain artificial preservatives or diluents.

The samples were prepared by diluting each honey with sterile distilled deionized water (v/v) to obtain 25%, 50% and 75%. Moreover, pure natural or undiluted honey was also used as test sample.

2.4.1.2. Preparation of Inoculums

Mueller–Hinton broth was inoculated aseptically with appropriate microorganisms 24 hs before testing. This was to ensure that the bacteria fully adapted to the broth and reached the stationary phase of growth. The inoculums bacteria strains were incubated at 37°C during 18-24 hs in Mueller – Hinton agar.

After 24 hs of incubation, bacterial suspension (inoculums) was diluted with sterile physiological solution to approximately 10^6 CFU/ml by matching with McFarland barium sulfate standard 0.5. The turbidity was visually compared with McFarland 0.5 standard (Becton, Dickinson and Co., MD, USA).

2.4.1.3. Antibacterial Susceptible Testing

The agar diffusion method (Halawani and Shohayeb, 2011; Anthimidou and Mossialos, 2013) was used to assess the antibacterial potential of Yemeni honeys, antibiotic and there mixture.

One hundred µl of the prepared bacterial suspension was spread over plates containing Mueller Hinton Agar (HIMEDIA, India) by sterile cotton swab. With previously sterilized cork borer (6 mm in diameter), wells of equal distance were bored.

100 µl of pure or diluted honey (25, 50 and 75%) in the 1st group, (45, 70 and 100 µl) of antibiotic (Gentamicin or Doxycycline hyclate) in the 2nd group and antibiotic blended with honey in the 3rd group. All samples were aseptically poured into the wells. The plates were allowed to dry at 4°C for 1 h. The dishes were then incubated at 37ºC for 24 hours. Culture growth was monitored over 24 hours, and if no growth occurred over 24 hours, it is referred to as "no growth" or complete inhibition (Lu *et al.*, 2013). Considerations for the sensitivity and resistance of bacteria were based on the extent of the presence or absence of inhibition zones. The zone of inhibition was taken to be the diameter of the zone visibly showing the absence of growth without the 6 mm hole. If there was no inhibition the value of 0 mm was assigned to the test sample. All assays were repeated three times for each honey concentration.

Statistical Analysis

All assays were carried out in triplicate. The results were expressed as means ± SD.

3. RESULTS

The results of antibacterial activity of 3 Yemeni honey samples with four concentrations (25, 50, 75 and 100% v/v) against standard pathogenic bacteria were recorded in tables 2, 3, 4 and 5. The zone of inhibition was taken to be the diameter of clear zone without the 6 mm hole (diameter of cork borer). The antibacterial activity was classified as: resistant, for diameter lower than 8 mm; sensitive, for diameters from 8 to 14 mm; very sensitive, for diameters from 15 to 19 mm; extremely sensitive, for diameters higher than 20 mm (Moussa *et al.*, 2012). All honey samples showed antibacterial activity on bacterial isolates. Sidr, Maraiy and Somor honey showed maximum sensitivity against *S. abony* ATCC 6017 was 28-29 mm followed by *S. aureus* ATCC 29737was 26 mm then *E. coli* ATCC 10536 was 13.5-24 mm. Whereas, standard isolate of *P. aeruginosa* (ATCC 25619) was gave sensitivity between 12-18.5 mm and effect on its pigment production with all honey brands. The largest inhibition zone of standard *P. aeruginosa* in concentration 75% was 18.5 mm with sidr honey, while the minimum inhibition zone showed by Maraiy honey was 12 mm. The samples of raw honey were not observed any sensitivity with all bacterial tested, but the bacterial growth was moderate on the medium surface (Table 2).

Table 2. Antibacterial activity of three types of honey against standard bacterial isolates. (mean ± SD)

Bacterial strain	Honey sample	honey dilution				
		25%	50%	75%	Net	
		Diameter of Inhibition zone (mm)*				75% SD ±
E. coli	Sidr	0	11	13.5	0	0.11
	Maraiy	14	22	24	0	0.21
	Somor	14.5	21.5	24	0	0.21

S. aureus	Sidr	0	21.5	26	0	0.34
	Maraiy	14	20.5	26	0	0.34
	Somor	15.5	24	26	0	0.34
P. aeruginosa	Sidr	0	0	18.5	0	0.13
	Maraiy	0	9	12	0	0.12
	Somor	7	10	12.5	0	0.13
S. abony	Sidr	14.5	23.5	28.5	0	0.22
	Maraiy	14	25	28	0	0.21
	Somor	16.5	24	29	0	0.11

0= No inhibition zone. mean volume.*

Standard Doxycycline hyclate were not effective on the test bacterial isolates except on *S. aureus* with inhibitory zones between 9-11 mm at 70 and 100 µl; respectively.

All the test organisms were susceptible to gentamycin except *E. coli*. *S. aureus* was the most inhibited with zones of inhibition 11, 15.5 and 17.5 mm at 45, 70 and 100µl; respectively and *S. abony* was also inhibited with zones of inhibition 8.5, 13.25 and 15 mm at 45, 70 and 100 µl; respectively. whereas *P. aeruginosa* was resistant organisms (Table 3).

Table 3. Antibacterial activity of antibiotics against standard bacterial isolates. (mean ± SD)

Bacterial strain	**Antibiotics**	**µl**			
		45	**70**	**100**	
		Diameter of Inhibition zone (mm)*****			**100 µl SD ±**
E. coli	Gentamicin	0	0	0	0.0
	Doxycycline hyclate	0	0	0	0.0
S. aureus	Gentamicin	11	15.5	17.5	0.01
	Doxycyclinehyclate	0	9	11	0.02
P. aeruginosa	Gentamicin	0	0	6.5	0.03
	Doxycycline hyclate	0	0	0	0.0
S. abony	Gentamicin	8.5	13.25	15	0.10
	Doxycycline hyclate	0	0	0	0.0

*0= No inhibition zone. * mean volume.*

The inhibitory potency the mixture of 100 µl honey and antibiotics (Gentamicin or Doxycycline hyclate) were measured. *S. abony* ATCC 6017 and *S. aureus* ATCC 29737 were showed extremely sensitivity with all blended samples and maximum zone of inhibition showed (by 100 µl of sidr honey at concentration 75% blended with 45 µl gentamicin) were 32 mm and 30 mm respectively. While, the largest inhibition zone of *P. aeruginosa* was 16 mm by 100 µl of Somor honey blended with 100 µl Gentamicin (Table 4).

Table 4. Antibacterial activity of three types of honey blended with gentamicin against standard bacterial isolates. (mean ± SD)

Bacterial strain	**Honey sample**	**honey dilution****				
		25%	**50%**	**75%**	**Net**	
		Diameter of Inhibition zone (mm)*****				**75% SD ±**
S. aureus	Sidr	20	28	30	28	0.13
	Maraiy	6	20	22	28.5	0.25
	Somor	15.5	25	27.5	29	0.33
P. aeruginosa	Sidr	7	8	8	11	0.01
	Maraiy	7.5	8	11	13	0.12
	Somor	7	9.5	12	16	0.12

S. abony	Sidr	21	26	32	29.5	0.15
	Maraiy	12.5	21.5	24	26	0.21
	Somor	19	22.5	24	25.5	0.21

0= No inhibition zone. **mean volume.*

**100 µl of honey dilution blended with 45 µl Gentamicin (for *S. aureus* and *S. abony*), or with 100µl Gentamicin for *P. aeruginosa*

The results in Table (5) showed that the extremely sensitivity for *S. aureus* with all honey brands blended with Doxycycline hyclate and the highest inhibition zones were between 30-32 mm.

Table 5. Antibacterial activity of three types of honey blended with doxycycline hyclate against standard bacterial isolates. (mean ± SD)

Bacterial strain	**Honey sample**	**honey dilution****				
		25%	**50%**	**75%**	Net	
		Diameter of Inhibition zone (mm)*				**75% SD ±**
S. aureus	Sidr	13	24	30	32	0.13
	Maraiy	10	23	27	31	0.32
	Somor	22	25	29	30	0.11

0= No inhibition zone. **mean volume.*

**100 µl of honey dilution blended with 70 µl of Doxycycline hyclate.

Generally, Gentamicin or Doxycycline hyclate activity against organisms lower than when mixed of it with raw and diluted honey. In the event of therapeutic failure with antibiotics, honey offers a suitable and better alternative in managing infected burns, wounds and other infections.

4. DISCUSSION

Under limitations of this study, results demonstrated that natural honey had an antibacterial activity on some standard pathogenic bacterial isolates. This effect dependent on to the concentration of honey used.

Three of imported Yemini honeys (Sidr, Maraiy and Somor) were evaluated for their antibacterial potential using agar diffusion technique. The antimicrobial activity of honey has been reported to be due to osmotic effect, acidity, hydrogen peroxide and phytochemical factors (Aurongzeb and Azim, 2011; Moussa *et al.*, 2012). Mechanisms of antimicrobial activity of honey are different from antibiotics, which destroy the bacteria's cell wall or inhibit intracellular metabolic pathways. The antibacterial activity is related to four properties of honey. First, honey draws moisture out of the environment and thus dehydrates bacteria. The sugar content of honey is also high enough to hinder the growth of microbes, but the sugar content alone is not the sole reason for honey's antibacterial properties. Second, the pH of honey is between 3.2 and 4.5, and this acidity is low enough to inhibit the growth of most microorganisms (Salwa and Maher, 2014). Hydrogen peroxide produced by the glucose oxidase is the third and probably the most important antibacterial component, although some authors believe the nonperoxide activity to be more important. Lastly, several phytochemical factors for antibacterial activity have been identified in honey (Eteraf-Oskouei and Najafi, 2013), and the different honeys result in their varying antimicrobial effects (Moussa *et al*., 2012). Moreover, possibility might be related to the differences in susceptibility of each species of microorganism to the antibacterial activity of honey used, and also possibly be due to the different floral sources utilized by the bees and the geographical factors like temperature, humidity where the honey was produced (Tumin *et al*., 2005).

Raw honey was not showed obvious inhibited with bacterial species due toviscosity, that limits oxygen dissolving in honey, and it has a negligible level of hydrogen peroxide (Molan's, 2012; Anthimidou and Mossialos, 2013). This is because hydrogen peroxide that has been formed in honey disappears as a result of reaction with other components of the honey.

Glucose oxidase is practically inactive in raw honey. It becomes active to form hydrogen peroxide only when the honey is diluted (White *et al*., 1963; Aurongzeb and Azim, 2011), because that enzymes need a sufficiently high level of free water to be active (Alston and Freedman, 2002) by a factor of 2500-50,000,thus giving "slow-release" antiseptics at a level, which is antibacterial (Aurongzeb and Azim, 2011), and in undiluted honey the water that is presents is almost all bound up on the sugar molecules. During diluted honey by sterilized double distillation water, the honey produces H_2O_2 which is antimicrobial agent. The first indication that there was something more involved than osmosis was the discovery by Sackett in 1919 that the antibacterial potency of honey was increased rather than decreased by dilution of honey with water, an observation that was hard to explain *(*Molan's, 2012).

Therefore, our results were in agreement with the previous studies those reported that the antibacterial activity of honey increased when the honey was diluted (Sherlock *et al.*, 2010; Halawani and Shohayeb, 2011; Mandal and Mandal, 2011;Kuncic*et al*., 2012*)* and it is not agree with few studies (Sharma *et al*., 2012; Ahmadi *et al*., 2013). An explanation for the difference of results may be due to methodological difference between the studies and variation in the composition of the honey being used (Lusby *et al.*, 2005; Ahmadi *et al.*, 2013).

Application of natural honey for the inhibition of microorganisms might be a substitute way in some suitable cases for topical application for certain partially systematic infections (Aurongzeb and Azim, 2011). Molan, 2000 who find contrasting results in favour of honey on a higher antibacterial activity for honey than silver sulphadiazine in the treatment of bacterial infections of burn wounds.

A combination of the antimicrobial properties of clinically approved antibiotics and the antibacterial activity of honey could lead to a new spectrum of antimicrobials than when used in single form and that have the potential to prevent the emergence of resistant bacterial strains, providing broad-spectrum coverage and consequently improving therapeutic efficiency (Mu¨ller *et al*., 2013).This emphasized that combination of two or more substances with medicinal values could be better if their components will not cause a reaction that could cause health disaster than healing and it will be remedying of multiple actions, hence some illnesses by certain pathogens in man. In our work, the recommend dose is 75% of honey , that can use in clinical practice.

5. CONCLUSION

The obtained results in this study approved honey and antibiotics having antibacterial potency able to establish valuable inhibition zones in vitro. In our work, the recommend dose was 75% that can use in clinical practice. Therefore, current study will help in preparation of novel antibacterial drugs using natural products blended with antibiotic.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We would like to express our thanks to the Faculty of Sciences, Sana'a University for chemicals and instrumental facilities.

REFERENCES

[1] Omoya FO and Akharaiyi FC(2012). Mixture of Honey and Ginger Extract for Antibacterial Assessment on Some Clinical Isolates. Int. Res. J. of Pharmaceuti., 2(5): 127-132.

[2] Adeleke OE, Olaitan JO and Okpekpe EI (2006 a). Comparative Antibacterial Activity of Honey and Gentamicin Against *Escherichia coli and Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. Annals of Burns and Fire Disasters., XIX(3): 201-204.

[3] Chute RK, Deogade NG and Kawale M (2010). Antimicrobial activity of Indian honey against clinical isolates. Asiatic. J. Biotech. Reso., 1: 35-38.

[4] Ahmadi FM, Hendi SS, Alikhani MY, Khamverdi Z (2013). Antibacterial Activity of Honey on Cariogenic Bacteria. J Denti. Tehran Univ. Medi. Sci., 10(1):10-15.

[5] Adeleke OE and Olaitan PB (2006 b). The Antipseudomonal Property of Honey and Gentamicin. Annals of Burns and Fire Disasters., XIX(3): 140-143.

[6] Mullai V and Menon T(2007). Bactericidal activity of different types of honey against clinical and environmental isolates of Pseudomonas aeruginosa. J. Altern. Compleme. Medic., 13(4):439-41.

[7] Eteraf-Oskouei T and Najafi M (2013). Traditional and Modern Uses of Natural Honey in Human Diseases: A Review. Iran J. Basic Med. Sci., 16 (6): 731-742.

[8] Jenkins RE and Cooper R (2012). Synergy between oxacillin and manuka honey sensitizes methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* to oxacillin. J. Antimicrob. Chemother., 67: 1405–1407.

[9] Aurongzeb M and Azim MK (2011). Antimicrobial properties of natural honey: a review of literature, Pak. J. Biochem. Mol. Biol., 44(3): 118-124.

[10] AL-Waili N, Al Ghamdi A, Ansari MJ, Al-Attal Y, Al-Mubarak A, Salom K(2013). Differences in composition of honey samples and their impact on the antimicrobial activities against drug multiresistant bacteria and pathogenic fungi. Archi. Medi. Res., 44(4):307-316.

[11] Jantratid E, Strauch S, Becker C, Dressman JB, Amidon GL, Junginger HE, Kopp S, Midha KK, Shah VP, Stavchansky S and Barends DM (2010). Biowaiver Monographs for Immediate Release Solid Oral Dosage Forms: Doxycycline Hyclate. J. Pharmaceu. Sci., 99(4):1639–1653.

[12] Halawani E and Shohayeb M (2011). Survey of the antibacterial activity of Saudi and some international honeys. J. Micr. .Antimicro., 3(4): 94-101.

[13] Anthimidou E and Mossialos D (2013). Antibacterial activity of Greek and Cypriot honeys against Staphylococcus aureus and Pseudomonas aeruginosa in comparison to manuka honey. J. Med. Food., 16(1):42-47.

[14] Lu J, Carter DA, Turnbull L, Rosendale D, Hedderley D, Stephens J, Gannabathula S, Steinhorn G, Schlothauer RC, Whitchurch CB, Harry EJ (2013). The Effect of New Zealand Kanuka, Manuka and Clover Honeys on Bacterial Growth Dynamics and Cellular Morphology Varies According to the Species. PLOS ONE., 8(2): e55898 .

[15] Moussa A, Noureddine D, Abdelmelek M and Saad A (2012). Antibacterial activity of various honey types of Algeria against Pathogenic Gram-Negative Bacilli: Escherichia coli and Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Asian Pacif. J. Tropi. Dise., 211-214.

[16] Salwa H. Alkhyat and Maher Ali Al.Maqtari (2014). Antibacterial Potential and Physicochemical Properties of Selected Yemeni Honeys Against Clinical Wounds Bacteria and Comparative with Standard Bacteria Isolates. Glo. Adv. Res. J. Microbiol., 3(3) 049-058.

[17] Tumin N, Halim NAA, Shahjahan M, Izani NNJ, Sattar MA, Khan AH and Mohisin SSJ(2005). Antibacterial Activity of Local Malaysian Honey. Malaysian J. Pharmaceu. Sci., 3(2): 1–10.

[18] Molan's P (2012). articles on http://waikato.academia.edu/PeterMolan

[19] White JW, Subers MH and Schepartz AI (1963). The identification of inhibine, the antibacterial factor in honey, as hydrogen peroxide and its origin in a honey glucose-oxidase system. Biochimica et Biophysica Acta., 73: 57-70.

[20] Alston MJ and Freedman RB (2002). The water-dependence of the catalytic activity of bilirubin oxidase suspensions in low-water systems. Biotech. and Bioengin., 77(6): 651-657.

[21] Sherlock O, Dolan A, Athman R, Power A, Gethin G, Cowman S, Humphreys H (2010). Comparison of the antimicrobial activity of Ulmo honey from Chile and Manuka honey against methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus, Escherichia coli and Pseudomonas aeruginosa. BMC Compleme. Altern. Medic., 10(47): 1-5.

[22] Halawani E and Shohayeb M (2011). Survey of the antibacterial activity of Saudi and some international honeys. J. Micr. .Antimicro., 3(4): 94-101.

[23] Mandal MD and Mandal S (2011). Honey: its medicinal property and antibacterial activity. Asia Pac. J. Trop. Biomed., 154-160.

[24] Kuncic MK, Jaklic D, Lapanje A and Gunde-Cimerman N (2012). Antibacterial and antimycotic activities of Slovenian honeys. Brit. J. Biomedi. Sci., 69(4): 154-8.

[25] Sharma N, Negi S, Kumar A, Patil S and Kumar A (2012). Comparative Antimicrobial Potential of Raw & Commercial Honey Against Various Bacteria Isolated From Wound & Throat Samples. Asian J. Bioche. Pharmace. Res., 2(2): 31-39 .

[26] Lusby PE, Coombes AL, Wilkinson JM (2005). Bactricidal activity of different honeys against pathogenic bacteria. Arch. Med. Res., 36(5):464-467.

[27] Molan P (2000). "The Curative Property of Honey: The Nature of Antibacterial Activity and the Bee World", 10-15, Waikato University Press, New Zealand.

[28] Mu¨ller P, Alber DG, Turnbull L, Schlothauer RC, Carter DA, 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.