

1 **TITLE:** Antimicrobial efficacy of neem and liquorice with chlorhexidine on Streptococcus
2 sanguis, Streptococcus mutans, Lactobacillus and Actinomyces naeslundii – An In Vitro
3 Study

4 **Running title:** Efficacy of neem and liquorice

5 **Author:**

6 Saad M Alqahtani,

7 Chairman,

8 Department of Periodontics and Community Dental Sciences,

9 College of Dentistry, King Khalid University,

10 Abha-61471, Saudi Arabia.

11 E-mail: s.malqahtani123@gmail.com

12 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4724-4021>

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 **Abstract:**

25 The study was to formulate 2% neem and 2% liquorice mouthwashes and to compare the
26 antimicrobial efficacy of these mouthwashes with the standard 0.2% chlorhexidine
27 mouthwash. Alcoholic solution was prepared and added to neem mixture and liquorice
28 mixture separately and made up to a volume of 16000 ml with purified water. Nine dilutions
29 of each drug were done with Brain heart infusion broth (BHI) for MIC. Culture suspension
30 was added in each serially diluted tube of 200 µl. The tubes were incubated for 24 hours and
31 observed for turbidity. Minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) of 2% neem, 2% liquorice
32 and 0.2% chlorhexidine against *Lactobacillus*, *Actinomyces naeslundii*, *Streptococcus*
33 *sanguis*, *Streptococcus mutans* is determined by serial dilution analysis. *Streptococcus*
34 *mutans* shows sensitivity to all three mouthwashes at a concentration starting from 0.2 µg/ml.
35 *Lactobacillus* shows sensitivity to neem and chlorhexidine mouthwashes at a concentration
36 starting from 1.6 µg/ml, whereas liquorice is effective at a concentration starting from 3.125
37 µg/ml. *Streptococcus sanguis* shows sensitivity to chlorhexidine and liquorice mouthwashes
38 at a concentration starting from 25 µg/ml, whereas it shows sensitivity to neem at a
39 concentration starting from 50 µg/ml. *Actinomyces naeslundii* shows sensitivity to
40 chlorhexidine and neem mouthwashes at a concentration starting from 1.6 µg/ml, whereas it
41 shows sensitivity to liquorice at a concentration starting from 3.125µg/ml. Analysis showed
42 an inhibition of all the four strains by the mouthwashes. The MIC for the studied
43 mouthwashes was found to be similar to that of 0.2% chlorhexidine.

44

45 **Keywords:** Antimicrobial, chlorhexidine, liquorice, neem, streptococcus

46

47

48 INTRODUCTION

49 Plaque is an organized mass, consisting mainly of microorganisms, that adheres to teeth,
50 prostheses, and oral surfaces and is found in the gingival crevice and periodontal pockets. It
51 also comprises of an organic compound consisting of bacterial by-products such as enzymes,
52 materia alba, desquamated cells, and inorganic components such as calcium and phosphate
53 [1]. Gingivitis, which has a direct association with dental plaque [2], affects the oral health of
54 70%–100% of the population across the world [3-5]. Plaque-induced gingivitis is an
55 inflammatory response of the gingival tissues resulting from bacterial plaque accumulation
56 located at and below the gingival margin [6]. It does not result in clinical attachment loss or
57 directly cause tooth loss [7]. It is the most common form of gingival disease. Patients may
58 notice symptoms that include bleeding with tooth brushing, blood in saliva, gingival swelling
59 and redness, and halitosis in the case of established forms [8]. Experimental studies done on
60 plaque induced gingivitis have shown the first empiric evidence that accumulation of
61 microbial biofilm on clean tooth surfaces reproducibly induces an inflammatory response in
62 the associated gingival tissues and removal of plaque leads to disappearance of the clinical
63 signs of inflammation [9]. Plaque control is the regular removal of microbial plaque and the
64 prevention of its accumulation on the teeth and adjacent gingival surfaces. The utilization of
65 antimicrobial mouth rinses has been considered a useful adjunct to mechanical plaque control
66 [10]. Tooth brushing is the most popular self-performed oral hygiene method to
67 mechanically remove dental plaque. However, this mechanical approach by most individuals
68 is often not sufficiently effective [11]. Chlorhexidine (0.2%) is considered the gold standard
69 chemical plaque control agent because of its clinical efficacy. It is one of the most
70 investigated compounds in dentistry and has been proven to inhibit plaque regrowth and the
71 development of gingivitis by the first definitive experimental study [12].

72 Herbal medicines, derived from botanical sources, have been applied in dentistry for a long
73 history to inhibit microorganisms, reduce inflammation, soothe irritation, and relieve pain
74 [13]. Literature reports that a considerable number of herbal mouthwashes have achieved
75 encouraging results in plaque and gingivitis control. When compared with antimicrobial
76 activity of synthetic commercial mouthwashes, herbal mouthwashes can exhibit additional
77 anti-inflammatory and antioxidant properties, which could further improve periodontal health
78 [14]. Neem leaf and its constituents have been identified to exhibit immunomodulatory,
79 antiinflammatory, antihyperglycaemic, antiulcer, antimalarial, antifungal, antibacterial,
80 antiviral, antioxidant, antimutagenic and anticarcinogenic properties. The antibacterial effect
81 of neem mouthwash against salivary levels of Streptococcus mutans and Lactobacillus has
82 been demonstrated [15]. Liquorice extracts and its principal component, glycyrrhizin exhibits
83 useful properties such as anti- inflammatory, antiviral, antimicrobial, antioxidative, anticancer,
84 immunomodulatory, hepatoprotective and cardioprotective effects [16]. Licorice mouthwash
85 has shown its effectiveness in reducing plaque accumulation and gingival inflammation along
86 with no discoloration of teeth or unpleasant taste [17].

87 The present study was undertaken to formulate 2% neem and 2% liquorice mouthwashes and
88 seeks to compare the antimicrobial efficacy of these mouthwashes with the standard 0.2%
89 chlorhexidine mouthwash.

90 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

91 The neem leaf extract and liquorice extract were obtained from Amsar Private Limited,
92 Bardez, Goa, India, and the preparation of mouthwash was done at AVN Arogya Ayurvedic
93 Hospital, Madurai, India. (Fig.1)

94

95 All the materials were dispensed as per the list using suitable balances. Neem extract was
96 dissolved in water separately. Sodium benzoate and benzoic acid were dissolved in alcohol
97 (96%). Saccharin sodium, sorbitol and glycerin were dissolved in water and then transferred
98 to the alcoholic solution. The above alcoholic solution was added to the neem mixture and
99 made up to a volume of 16000 ml with purified water (Fig.2) to the filtered solution (Fig.3),
100 peppermint oil was added and stirred.

101 All the materials were dispensed as per the list using suitable balances. Liquorice extract was
102 dissolved in water separately. Sodium benzoate, citric acid, saccharin sodium, sorbitol and
103 glycerin were dissolved in water and then transferred to the alcoholic solution. The above
104 alcoholic solution was added to the liquorice mixture and made up to a volume of 16000 ml
105 with purified water. To the filtered solution, peppermint oil was added and stirred.
106 Commercially available 0.2% chlorhexidine (Hexifresh mouthwash) was used. Both the
107 prepared mouthwashes were stored in seaparate dark opaque bottles. (Fig.4)

108 Minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) of 2% neem, 2% liquorice and 0.2% chlorhexidine
109 against *Lactobacillus*, *Actinomyces naeslundii*, *Streptococcus sanguis*, *Streptococcus mutans*
110 is determined by serial dilution analysis.

111 MIC procedure:

112 Nine dilutions of each drug were done with Brain heart infusion broth (BHI) for MIC (Fig.5)
113 In the initial tube 20 μ l of drug was added into 380microliter of BHI broth. For further
114 dilutions 200 μ l amount of BHI broth was dispensed into the next 9 tubes separately. Then
115 from the initial tube 200 μ l was transferred to the first tube containing 200 μ l of BHI broth.
116 This was considered as 10^{-1} dilution. From 10^{-1} diluted tube 200 μ l was transferred to second
117 tube to make 10^{-2} dilution. The serial dilution (Fig.6) was repeated up to 10^{-9} dilution for
118 each drug. Out of the stock cultures that were maintained, 5 μ l was taken and added into 2 ml

119 of BHI (brain heart infusion) broth. Above culture suspension was added in each serially
120 diluted tube of 200 µl. The tubes were incubated for 24 hours and observed for turbidity.

121 **RESULTS**

122 In the present study, we formulated 2% neem, 2% liquorice and a commercially available
123 0.2% chlorhexidine mouthwash. An in vitro analysis of the antibacterial efficacy of the
124 mouthwashes was performed, followed by an in vivo analysis of the clinical efficacy in 90
125 subjects randomized into three groups. During the study, five participants did not complete
126 the study and were excluded from the analysis (2 from neem, 2 from liquorice and 1 from
127 chlorhexidine mouthwash groups). Table 1 shows the in vitro analysis of the antimicrobial
128 sensitivity test of *Streptococcus mutans*, *Streptococcus sanguis*, *Actinomyces naeslundii* and
129 *Lactobacillus* to neem, liquorice and chlorhexidine mouthwashes by serial dilution analysis.

130 *Streptococcus mutans* shows sensitivity to all three mouthwashes at a concentration starting
131 from 0.2 µg/ml. *Lactobacillus* shows sensitivity to neem and chlorhexidine mouthwashes at a
132 concentration starting from 1.6 µg/ml, whereas liquorice is effective at a concentration starting
133 from 3.125 µg/ml. *Streptococcus sanguis* shows sensitivity to chlorhexidine and liquorice
134 mouthwashes at a concentration starting from 25 µg/ml, whereas it shows sensitivity to neem
135 at a concentration starting from 50 µg/ml. *Actinomyces naeslundii* shows sensitivity to
136 chlorhexidine and neem mouthwashes at a concentration starting from 1.6 µg/ml, whereas it
137 shows sensitivity to liquorice at a concentration starting from 3.125µg/ml.

138 **DISCUSSION**

139 The formation of dental plaque, the primary etiological factor for periodontal diseases is
140 characterized by the initial adherence of limited number of pathogenic bacteria to the salivary
141 pellicle and progressive accumulation and growth of complex flora. There is a direct

142 relationship between the presence of dental plaque and the development of gingivitis, which
143 is characterized by the inflammation of gingiva without clinical attachment loss [10]. Plaque
144 control usually means preventive measures aimed at removing dental plaque and preventing
145 it from recurring. Complete removal of bacterial plaque from the dento-gingival region is the
146 most effective method of preventing gingivitis and periodontitis and the effective removal of
147 dental plaque is important for dental and periodontal health. This can be accomplished
148 through mechanical and chemical measures [18].

149 Tooth brushing is the most accepted oral hygiene practice. Chemical inhibitors of plaque and
150 calculus incorporated in mouthwashes or dentifrices also play an important role in plaque
151 control as adjuncts to mechanical cleansing [18]. The side effects associated with the
152 commercially available plaque control agents has ushered an era of herbal alternatives. Neem
153 and Liquorice are traditional herbs widely used in India and South Asia from time
154 immemorial for maintaining healthy teeth and gingiva.

155 Neem is rich in a vast array of biologically active compounds that are chemically distinct and
156 structurally multifaceted. Neem twigs are used for brushing and the leaves of neem have been
157 effectively used in the treatment of gingivitis and periodontitis [19]. Licorice or liquorice
158 (*Glycyrrhizaglabra*), is a perennial herb which possesses sweet taste and has extensive
159 pharmacological effects [20]. Being indigenous, cheap and readily available, neem and
160 liquorice can be definitely expected to have better patient compliance and acceptability. Due
161 to the aforementioned potential benefits, we aimed at formulating 2% neem and 2% liquorice
162 mouth rinses. Their efficacy *in vitro* was compared with a commercially available 0.2%
163 chlorhexidine mouthwash. We assessed the antimicrobial efficacy of neem, liquorice and
164 chlorhexidine *in vitro* using the serial dilution method with pre-cultured *Streptococcus*
165 *mutans*, *Streptococcus sanguis*, *Actinomycesnaeshlundii* and *Lactobacillus*, which are non-

166 specific opportunistic pathogens that can induce gingivitis. Neem exhibited potent
167 antimicrobial effect against *Streptococcus mutans*, *Streptococcus sanguis*,
168 *Actinomycesnaeslundii* and *Lactobacillus* at a concentration of 0.2, 50, 1.6 and 1.6 µg /ml
169 respectively.

170 Nayak A *et al* [21] observed inhibition of *E. faecalis*, *S. mutans*, *C.albicans* by alcoholic
171 neem extract at 1.88%, 7.5% and 3.75% respectively and the aqueous neem extract at 7.5%.

172 Maragathavalli S. *et al* [22] demonstrated inhibition of *Bacillus pumillus*, *Pseudomonas*
173 *aeruginosa* and *Staphylococcus aureus* by the methanol and ethanol extracts of neem.

174 Widowati *et al* [23] in their study concluded that the neem stick extract had a higher
175 antibacterial effect on *Streptococcus mutans* than the neem leaf extract. Chloroform extracts

176 of neem were identified to inhibit *Streptococcus mutans*, *Streptococcus salivarius* and
177 *Fusobacteriumnucleatum* by Packialakshmi *et al* [15] The minimum inhibitory concentration

178 of acetonic extract of neem for *Streptococcus sobrinus* was observed to be 0.05% (w/v) by M

179 Bhuiyan *et al* [24] In a study by Prashant *et al* [25] with neem extract, maximum zone of
180 inhibition on *Streptococcus mutans* was observed at 50% concentration with minimal effect

181 on *Streptococcus mitis*, *Streptococcus salivarius* and *Streptococcus sanguis*.

182 Our study revealed Liquorice to be a potent inhibitor of *Streptococcus mutans*, *Streptococcus*
183 *sanguis*, *Actinomycesnaeslundii* and *Lactobacillus* at a concentration of 0.2, 25, 3.125 and
184 3.125 µg /ml respectively.

185 Earlier studies on the antimicrobial effect of liquorice by Manoj. M. Nitalikar *et al* [26] with
186 gram positive (*Bacillus subtili* and *Staphylococcus aureus*) and gram negative (*E.coli* and

187 *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*) bacteria and M.H. Shirazi *et al* [27] with *Salmonella typhi*,

188 *Salmonella paratyphiB*, *Shigellasonni*, *Shigellaflexneri* and *Enterotoxigenic .E. coli* and Vivek

189 K. Gupta *et al* [28] with *Antimycobacterium* have proven the inhibitory effect of liquorice on

190 microorganisms. In our study *Streptococcus mutans*, *Streptococcus sanguis*,
191 *Actinomycesnaeslundii* and *Lactobacillus* were inhibited by chlorhexidine at concentration of
192 0.2, 25, 1.6 and 1.6 µg /ml respectively. This is in accordance with the antimicrobial efficacy
193 of chlorhexidine previously reported by W.W. Briner *et al* [29] on *Streptococci* and
194 *Actinomyces* and W.G Wade *et al* [30] on 355 subgingivalmicro organism isolates. Studies
195 reported by T.D. Hennesely *et al* [31] on gram positive cocci and Sigrun Eick *et al* [32] on
196 *Streptococci*, *Enterobacteria*, *Candida albicans*, *Porphyromonasgingivalis*,
197 *Aggregatibacteractinomycetemcomitans*, and *Fusobacteriumnucleatum* have reported
198 antimicrobial efficacy of chlorhexidine at a concentration of 0.19 to 2.0µg /ml and 0.01% to
199 0.50% respectively.

200 **CONCLUSION**

- 201 1. Ruminating on the substantial therapeutic benefits of neem and liquorice, we prepared 2%
202 neem and 2% liquorice mouthwashes and compared with 0.2% chlorhexidine mouthwash.
- 203 2. An in vitro analysis of the formulated mouthwashes, to test the effect on primary
204 colonizers like *Streptococcus mutans*, *Streptococcus sanguis*, *Lactobacillus* and
205 *Actinomyces naeslundii* showed an inhibition of all the four strains by themouthwashes.
- 206 3. The MIC for the studied mouthwashes was found to be similar to that of 0.2%
207 chlorhexidine.

208

209

210

211

212

213

214 **REFERENCES:**

- 215 1. American Academy of Periodontology. Glossary of periodontal terms. 4th ed. Chicago:
216 American Academy of Periodontology; 2001.
- 217 2. O. Shibly, S. Rifai, and J. J. Zambon, “Supragingival dental plaque in the etiology of oral
218 diseases,” *Periodontology 2000*, 1995; vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 42–59.
- 219 3. R. Rodan, F. Khlaifat, L. Smadi, R. Azab, and A. Abdalmohdi, “Prevalence and severity
220 of gingivitis in school students aged 6–11 years in Tafelah Governorate, South Jordan:
221 results of the survey executed by National Woman’s Health Care Center,” *BMC Research*
222 *Notes*, 2015; vol. 8, no. 1, p. 662.
- 223 4. P. Carvajal, M. Gomez, S. Gomes et al., “Prevalence, severity, and risk indicators of
224 gingival inflammation in a multi-center study on South American adults: a cross sectional
225 study,” *Journal of Applied Oral Science*, 2016; vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 524–534.
- 226 5. M. M. Idrees, S. N. Azzeghaiby, M. M. Hammad, and O. B. Kujan, “Prevalence and
227 severity of plaque-induced gingivitis in a Saudi adult population,” *Saudi Medical Journal*,
228 2014; vol. 35, no. 11, pp. 1373–1377.
- 229 6. Murakami S, Mealey BL, Mariotti A, Chapple ILC. Dental plaque–induced gingival
230 conditions. *J Periodontol*. 2018; 89(Suppl 1): S17–S27.
- 231 7. Tonetti MS, Chapple ILC, Jepsen S, Sanz M. Primary and secondary prevention of
232 periodontal and peri-implant diseases. *J Clin Periodontol*. 2015; 42(Suppl. 16):S1-S4.
- 233 8. Quirynen M, Dadamio J, Van den Velde S, et al. Characteristics of 2000 patients who
234 visited a halitosis clinic. *J Clin Periodontol*. 2009; 36:970–975.
- 235 9. Harald Loe,Else Theilade, S. Borglum Jensen. Experimental Gingivitis in Man. *J*
236 *Periodontol*. 1965; 36(3):177-187.
- 237 10. Treatment of plaque-induced gingivitis, chronic periodontitis and other clinical conditions

- 238 (Academy Report). *J Periodontol.* 2001; 72:1790-1800.
- 239 11. G. A. van der Weijden and K. P. Hioe, “A systematic review of the effectiveness of self-
240 performed mechanical plaque removal in adults with gingivitis using a manual
241 toothbrush,” *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*, 2005; vol. 32, no. Suppl 6, pp. 214–228.
- 242 12. Loe. H, Schiott C.R. The effect of mouthrinses and topical application of chlorhexidine on
243 the development of dental plaque and gingivitis in man. *J Periodontal Res.* 1970; 5(2): 79-
244 83.
- 245 13. J. B. Taheri, S. Azimi, N. Rafeian, and H. A. Zanjani, “Herbs in dentistry,” *International*
246 *Dental Journal*, 2011; vol. 61, no. 6, pp. 287–296.
- 247 14. Y. Chen, R. W. Wong, C. McGrath, U. Hagg, and C. J. Seneviratne, “Natural compounds
248 containing mouthrinses in the management of dental plaque and gingivitis: a systematic
249 review,” *Clinical Oral Investigations*, 2014; vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 1–16.
- 250 15. N. C. J. Packia Lekshmi, N. Sowmia, S.Viveka, J. Raja Brindha, S. Jeeva. The inhibiting
251 effect of *Azadirachta indica* against dental pathogens. *Asian J. Plant Sci. Res.* 2012; 2 (1):
252 6-10.
- 253 16. Marjan Nassiri Asl, Hossein Hosseinzadeh. Review of Pharmacological Effects of
254 *Glycyrrhiza* sp. and its Bioactive Compounds. *Phytother Res.* 2008; 22:709–724.
- 255 17. Jain P, Sontakke P, Walia S, Yadav P, Biswas G, Kaur D. Assessment of the efficacy of
256 licorice versus 0.2% chlorhexidine oral rinse on plaque-induced gingivitis: A randomized
257 clinical trial. *Indian J Oral Health Res* 2017;3:15-8.
- 258 18. John M.Moran.Chemical plaque control-prevention for the masses. *Periodontol* 2000.
259 1997; 15; 109-117.
- 260 19. Kausik Biswas, Ishita Chattopadhyay, Ranajit K. Banerjee, UdayBandyopadhyay.
261 Biological activities and medicinal properties of neem (*Azadirachta indica*).*Current*

- 262 Science. 2002; 82(11): 1336-1345.
- 263 20. Vijay Singh Jatav, Santosh K Singh, Pankaj Khatri, Ashish K Sharma. Recent
264 Pharmacological Trends of Glycyrrhiza glabra Linn. IJPFR. 2011; 1(1): 170-185.
- 265 21. Nayak Aarati, Nayak Ranganath N, G. Soumya, B. Bhat Kishore, KudalkarMithun.
266 Evaluation of antibacterial and anticandidial efficacy of aqueous and alcoholic extract of
267 Neem (Azadirachta indica) An in vitro study. IJRAP. 2011; 2 (1): 230-235.
- 268 22. Maragathavalli.S, Brindha. S, Kaviyarasi N.S, B. Annadurai, Gangwar S.K. Antimicrobial
269 activity in leaf extract of neem (Azadirachta indica Linn). I.J.S.N. 2012; 3(1):110-113.
- 270 23. Widowati Siswomihardjo, Siti Sunarintyas Badawi, Masahiro Nishimura, TaizoHamada.
271 The difference of antibacterial effect of neem leaves and stick extracts. Int Chin J Dent.
272 2007; 7: 27-29.
- 273 24. M.D.Mohashine Bhuiyan, Michiko Nishimura, Seishi Matsumura, TsutomuShimono.
274 Antibacterial effects of the crude Azadirachta indica, neem bark extracts of Streptococcus
275 sobrinus. Pediatric Dental Journal. 1997; 7(1): 61-64.
- 276 25. Prashant GM, Chandu GN, Murulikrishna KS, Shafi ulla MD. The effect of mango and
277 neem extract on four organisms causing dental caries: Streptococcus mutans,
278 Streptococcus salivavius, Streptococcus mitis, and Streptococcus sanguis: An in vitro
279 study. Indian J Dent Res. 2007; 18(4):148-51.
- 280 26. Manoj M. Nitalika, Kailas C. Munde, Balaji V. Dhore, Sajid N. Shikalgar. Studies of
281 antibacterial activities of Glycyrrhiza glabra root extract. Int J Pharmtech Res. 2010; 2(1):
282 899-901.
- 283 27. M.H.Shirazi, R.Ranjbar, S.Eshraghi, G.Sadeghi, N.Jonaidi, N.Bazzaz. An evaluation of
284 antibacterial activity of Glycyrrhiza glabra extract on the growth of Salmonella, Shigella
285 and ETEC E.coli. J Biol sci. 2007; 7(5):827-829.

- 286 28. Vivek K Gupta, Atiya Fatima, UzmaFaridi, Arvind S. Negi, Karuna Shanker, Kumar J.K,
287 Neha Rahuja, Suaib Luqman, Brijesh S. Sisodia, Dharmendra Saikia, DarokarM. Suman
288 P.S, Khanuja. Antimicrobial potential of Glycyrrhiza glabra roots. Journal of
289 Ethnopharmacology. 2008; 116: 377–380.
- 290 29. W. W. Briner, F. Grossman, R. Y. Buckner, G. F. Rebitski, T. F. Sox, R. F. Setser, M.
291 L.Ebert. Assessment of susceptibility of plaque bacteria to Chlorhexidine after six months
292 oral use. J Periodontal Res. 1986; Suppl:53-59.
- 293 30. W. G. Wade, M. Addy. In vitro Activity of a Chlorhexidine containing mouthwash against
294 Subgingival bacteria. J Periodontol. 1989; 60:521-525.
- 295 31. T.D.Hennessey. Some antibacterial properties of Chlorhexidine.JPeriodontalRes.1973; 8
296 (12):61-67.
- 297 32. Sigrun Eick, Susann Goltz, Sandor Nietzsche, Holger Jentsch, Wolfgang Pfister. Efficacy
298 of chlorhexidine digluconate–containing formulations and other mouthrinses against
299 periodontopathogenic microorganisms. Quintessence Int. 2011; 42:687–700.

300 **FIGURES:**



301

Fig. 1: Neem and Liquorice extracts

Fig. 2: Mixing of ingredients with stirrer



302

Fig. 3: Filtering the prepared mouthwash

303

Fig. 4: Neem and liquorice mouthwashes in opaque bottles

304

305



306

Fig. 5: Dispensing BHI broth into tubes

307



Fig. 6: Serial dilution of the drug

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322 Table: 1: In vitro analysis:

Streptococcus mutans											
S.N	Mouthwash	100 µg/ml	50 µg/ml	25 µg/ml	12.5 µg/ml	6.25 µg/ml	3.125 µg/ml	1.6 µg/ml	0.8 µg/ml	0.4 µg/ml	0.2 µg/ml
1.	Neem	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
2.	Liquorice	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
3.	Chlorhexidine	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Lactobacillus											
1.	Neem	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	R	R	R
2.	Liquorice	S	S	S	S	S	S	R	R	R	R
3.	Chlorhexidine	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	R	R	R
Streptococcus sanguis											
1.	Neem	S	S	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
2.	Liquorice	S	S	S	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
3.	Chlorhexidine	S	S	S	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Actinomyces naeslundii											
1.	Neem	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	R	R	R
2.	Liquorice	S	S	S	S	S	S	R	R	R	R
3.	Chlorhexidine	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	R	R	R

323 S-Sensitive; R-Resistant

324