



Research Journal of Pharmaceutical, Biological and Chemical Sciences

Anxiolytic effect of acute administration of ursolic acid in rats

Sudhakar Pemminati, Gopalakrishna HN*, Venkatesh.V, Amritha Rai, Sowjanya Shetty,
Amrita Vinod, Bethi Yugandhar, Ashok K Shenoy

Department of Pharmacology, Kasturba Medical College, Manipal University, Mangalore, Karnataka, India.

ABSTRACT

Anxiety is a cardinal symptom of many psychiatric disorders and an almost inevitable component of many medical and surgical conditions. Indeed it is a universal human emotion, closely allied with appropriate fear presumably serving psychobiologically adaptive purposes. Anxiety is a normal emotional behavior. When it is severe and/or chronic, however, it becomes pathological and can precipitate or aggravate cardiovascular and psychiatric disorders. Although many drugs are available in allopathic medicine to treat anxiety disorders, they produce various systemic side effects. Ursolic acid has been identified as the active principle of *Ocimum sanctum*. From our laboratory we have established the antianxiety, anticataleptic and antidepressant activity of ethanolic extract of leaves of *Ocimum sanctum*. In the present study, we have attempted to evaluate the anxiolytic- activity of ursolic acid in rats by employing, elevated plus maze and bright and dark arena. The rats were divided into five groups, each group containing six animals. The effects of the test drug ursolic acid (at 0.05, 0.1 and 0.2 mg/kg doses), the standard anxiolytic, diazepam (1.0 mg/kg) and control group 14% dimethyl sulfoxide (10ml/kg) were assessed after single dose administration. The results suggest that, ursolic acid exhibited anxiolytic like activity comparable to diazepam

Keywords: anxiolytic, ursolic acid, diazepam, rats

*Corresponding author



INTRODUCTION

Anxiety is a cardinal symptom of many psychiatric disorders and an almost inevitable component of many medical and surgical conditions. Indeed it is a universal human emotion, closely allied with appropriate fear presumably serving psychobiologically adaptive purposes [1]. Anxiety is a normal emotional behavior. When it is severe and/ or chronic, however, it becomes pathological and can precipitate or aggravate cardiovascular and psychiatric disorders. Although many drugs are available in allopathic medicine to treat anxiety disorders, they produce various systemic side effects or exhibit tolerance upon chronic use. In ayurvedic medicine, many plant products have been claimed to be free from side effects and less toxic than synthetic drugs [2].

Ursolic acid is a triterpenoid compound which exists widely in natural plants in the form of free acid or aglycones for triterpenoid saponins [3]. Various plants having ursolic acid as an active ingredient have shown hepatoprotective activity[4]. Ursolic acid has also been implicated in inhibition of lipoxygenase and HL60 leukemic cells[5], inhibition of mutagenesis in bacteria[6], antitumor promotion[7], inhibition of histamine release[8], inhibition of lipid peroxidation and protection against adriamycin toxicity[9], antimicrobial activity[10], inhibition of mouse skin tumorigenesis[11], anti-inflammatory action[12], hypolipidemic and anti-atherosclerotic effects[13], anti-ulcer activity[14], cytotoxicity to leukemia cells[15], and suppression of preneoplastic lesions[16].

Ursolic acid has been identified as the active principle of *Ocimum sanctum*. From our laboratory we have established the antianxiety [17], anticataleptic [18] and antidepressant [19] activity of ethanolic extract of leaves of *Ocimum sanctum*. With this background, in the present study we have investigated the antianxiety effect of ursolic acid in rats using two pharmacologically validated experimental models namely elevated plus maze [20], and bright and dark arena [21].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Animals

Adult male wistar albino rats weighing 150 to 180g (90 to 110 days old) bred in the central animal house of Kasturba Medical College, Mangalore, were used for the study. They were housed in clean, clear, polypropylene cages in groups of four and maintained at $24.0 \pm 2^\circ\text{C}$ with 12 hrs light and dark cycle and had free access to food and water *ad libitum*. Animals were kept in experimental lab for seven days prior to experiment to acclimatize laboratory conditions. Each rat was used only once. Experiments were conducted between 9:00 to 14:00 hrs. The experimental protocol was approved by the Institutional Animal Ethical Committee (IAEC) and the study was conducted according to the Indian National Science Academy Guidelines for the use and care of experimental animals.

Drugs and dosage

Table1. The animals are divided into five groups with six animals in each group

Groups (n = 6)	Treatment	Dose
I	Control – 14% DMSO	10.0 ml/kg
II	Diazepam	1.0 mg/kg
III	Ursolic acid	0.05 mg/kg
IV	Ursolic acid	0.1 mg/kg
V	Ursolic acid	0.2 mg/kg

(n, number of animals in each group)

The test drug, ursolic acid (Sigma Aldrich Chemicals Pvt. Ltd, United Kingdom, HS No. 29181985900), standard anxiolytic drug, Diazepam (Ranbaxy Ltd. India) were suspended in 14% dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) and was administered orally in a dose of 0.05, 0.1 and 0.2 mg/kg. Each drug solution was prepared freshly just before the administration. Drugs and vehicles were administered orally (10 ml/kg). The doses of each drug are selected on the basis of earlier findings with *Ocimum sanctum*[22]. Drugs, dosage and number of animals used per treatment are shown in (Table 1). In acute study, drugs/vehicle was administered 60 min prior to experiment.

APPARATUS

Elevated plus maze

The wooden maze consisted of two open arms (length 50 cmX breadth 10 cm) and two closed arms of the same size (height 40 cm). The arms of the same type were opposite to each other, with a central square of 10 cm. The maze was elevated to a height of 50 cm above the floor.

Bright and dark arena

The apparatus consisted of an open top wooden box. Two distinct chambers, a black chamber (20 X 30 X 35cm) painted black and illuminated with dimmed red light and a bright chamber (30 X 30 X 35 cm) painted white and brightly illuminated with 100W white light source, were located 17 cm above the box. The two chambers were connected through a small open doorway (7.5 X5 cm) situated on the floor level at the centre of the partition.

Behavioral assessment

Each animal was tested initially in plus maze and, then, in bright and dark arena paradigm in a single setting. In acute study 60 min after drug or vehicle administration, each animal was placed in the centre square of the plus maze, facing one of the closed arms. The

number of entries into and the time spent in open and closed arms and the number of rears in each arm in a five-minute period was noted.

Following the elevated plus maze test, the animal was placed at the centre of the brightly lit arena in the bright and dark arena. The number of entries into and the time spent in the bright arena, the number of rears in the bright and dark arenas and the duration of immobility were noted. Following each trial, the apparatus was cleaned with hydrogen peroxide to mask the odour left by the animal in the previous experiment. Hand operated counters and stop watches were used to score the behavior of animals.

Statistical analysis

The data were analysed by one-way ANOVA with drug treatment as the independent factor. Post-hoc comparisons were performed by applying Dunnett’s multiple comparison test. P <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

RESULTS

a. Elevated plus maze

Table 2. Effect of diazepam and ursolic acid on behavior of rats in elevated plus maze

Drug groups (n=6)	Number of open arms entries	Number of total arm entries	Percentage ratio of open/total arm entries	Time spent in open arms(Sec)	Time spent in closed arms(Sec)	Number of rears in open arms
14%DMSO (10.0 ml/kg)	5.66±0.55	12.16±0.98	47.09±3.96	81.33±13.67	163.0±8.30	3.5±0.50
Diazepam (1.0 mg/kg)	5.33±0.21	8.66±0.33*	62.03±3.54**	215.16±12.89**	59.5±13.84**	7.00±1.43*
Ursolic acid (0.05 mg/kg)	5.16±0.40	10.50±0.56	49.23±2.69	97.00±5.42	138.83±7.18	2.50±0.34
Ursolic acid (0.1 mg/kg)	5.83±0.47	10.00±0.85	58.45±1.15*	139.16±12.31**	106.16±11.89**	5.00±0.36
Ursolic acid(0.2 mg/kg)	5.33±0.61	9.83±1.01	56.05±2.21	197.66±4.72**	56.33±1.82**	5.50±0.99
F value	0.33	2.57	4.702	31.63	24.68	4.31

(All values are mean ± SEM; one-way ANOVA followed by Dunnett’s multiple comparison test;*P < 0.05 **P < 0.01)

The results given in table 2 indicate that the diazepam (1.0 mg/kg) treated rats showed a significant increase in the percentile ratio of open arm to total arm entries, time spent in the open arms. They showed a reduction in the time spent in the closed arms. Ursolic acid treated rats exhibited a significant increase in the percentile ratio of open arm to total arm entries (0.1mg/kg), time spent in the open arms (0.1& 0.2 mg/kg) but decrease the time spent in the closed arms (0.1& 0.2 mg/kg).

b. Bright and dark arena

The results given in table 3 indicate that the diazepam (1.0mg/kg) treated rats significantly increased the time spent and the rears in bright arena, and showed significant

reduction in duration of immobility. Ursolic acid (0.1&0.2mg/kg) treated rats showed a significant ($P < 0.01$) reduction in the duration of immobility.

Table 3. Effect of diazepam and ursolic acid on behavior of rats in bright and dark arena

Drug groups (n=6)	Number of bright chamber entries	Time spent in bright chamber (Sec)	Number of rears in bright chamber	Duration of immobility(Sec)
14%DMSO (10.0 ml/kg)	1.00±0.00	4.83±0.60	1.00±0.00	79.50±1.64
Diazepam (1.0 mg/kg)	3.00±0.36	13.50±2.36*	1.83±0.30*	61.00±1.36**
Ursolic acid (0.05 g/kg)	1.50±0.22	5.83±0.70	0±00	74.83±1.32
Ursolic acid (0.1 mg/kg)	1.66±0.33	7.66±2.30	0.50±0.34	72.66±0.84*
Ursolic acid(0.2 mg/kg)	1.83±0.40	9.50±2.76*	0.50±0.34	61.83±2.02**
F value	6.06	2.92	7.34	30.09

(All values are mean ± SEM; one-way ANOVA followed by Dunnett’s multiple comparison test; *P < 0.05 **P < 0.01)

DISCUSSION

The two experimental models of anxiety, elevated plus maze and bright and dark arena, are based on the assumption that unfamiliar, non-protective and brightly lit environmental stress provokes inhibition of normal behavior. This normal behavioral inhibition is further augmented in the presence of fear or anxiety like state.

In the elevated plus maze, the open arms are more fear provoking than the closed arms. The ratio of entries, time spent and rearing behavior in open arms to closed arms reflects the safety of closed arms with relative fearfulness of open arms[20]. The reduction in entry, time spent, rearing in open arms, ratio of open arm to total arm entries and increased defecation are the indications of high level of fear or anxiety.

Anxiolytic drugs increase the proportion of entries, time spent and rearing in open arms. They also increase the ratio of open arm to total arm entries. In the light and dark box paradigm, the brightly lit environment is a noxious environment stressor that inhibits the exploratory behavior of rodents. Reduction in the number of entries, time spent and rearing behavior in the light chamber are regarded as markers of anxiety [21]. Rearing reflects an exploratory tendency of the animal that can be reduced due to a high level of fear [23].

The test compound, ursolic acid, increased the number of entries, time spent and rearing in open arms and also increased the percentile ratio of open arm to total arm entries in the elevated plus maze paradigm. The anti-anxiety effects of ursolic acid in the elevated plus maze were comparable with those following the administration of diazepam in this task i.e, activity and latency ratios increased compared with vehicle.

In bright and dark paradigm, the test drug significantly increased the time spent in light arena, rears in both light and dark arena and transition between chambers. In contrast to the anxiolytic like effects exerted in elevated plus maze, no significant comparable effects were observed in light and dark box paradigm, compared to the standard drug, diazepam. All these behavioral changes in both paradigms are suggestive of decreased fear, decreased aversion to bright light and increased exploratory behavior of the animal.

A possible mechanism by which ursolic acid acts have been postulated: through its GABAergic properties, through inhibition of gamma-aminobutyric acid transaminase (GABA-T) activity and increases GABA levels in the brain[24]. Awad et al in in-vitro assays reported that ursolic acid inhibited GABA-T by 20% at 100ug/ml. Because the increase in GABAergic neurotransmission was associated with reduced anxiety, the behavioral study that has been described in this report was aimed at determining the antianxiety effects of ursolic acid.

However, it requires further studies on ursolic acid to elucidate the possible mechanism involved and its use in human beings.

Acknowledgments

We thank to Manipal University for providing the test compound ursolic acid.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ross JB. Drug therapy of depression and anxiety disorders. In: Laurence L Brunton, John S Lazo, Keith L Parker, editors. Goodman & Gilman's The Pharmacological Basis of Therapeutics, New York: McGraw Hill 2006; pp.452-454.
- [2] Pari L, Maheshwari JU. J Ethnopharmacol 1999; 38:1-5.
- [3] Price KR, Johnson LT and Fenwick GR. CRC Critical Review Food Science and Nutrition 1987; 26:27-135.
- [4] Ma BL. Traditional Medicine and Pharmacology 1986; 2: 28-29.
- [5] Simon A, Najid A, Chulia AJ, Delage C and Rigaud M. Biochimiea et Biophysics Acta 1992; 1125: 68-72.
- [6] Young HS, Chung HY, Lee CK, Park KY, Yokozawa T and Oura H. Biological Pharmacology Bulletin 1994; 17: 990-992.
- [7] Ohigashi H, Takamura H, Koshimizu K, Tokuda H and Ito Y. Cancer Letters 1986; 30: 143-151.
- [8] Tsuruga T, Chun YT, Ebizuka Y and Sankawa U. Chem Pharmacol Bull 1991; 39: 3276-3278.
- [9] Balanehru S and Nagarajan B. Biochem Int 1991; 24: 981-990.
- [10] Collins MA and Charles HP. Food Microbiology 1987; 4: 311-315.
- [11] Huang MT, Ho CT, Wang ZY, Ferraro T, Lou YR, Stauber K, Georgiadis MC, Laskin JD and Conney AH. Cancer Research 1994; 54: 701-708.
- [12] Kosuge T, Yokota M, Sugiyama K, Mure T, Yamazaw H and Yamamoto T. Chem Pharmacol Bull 1985; 33: 5351-5355.



- [13] Parfente'eva EP. Chemical Abstracts 1979; 91: 9279r.
- [14] Gupta MB, Nath R, Gupta GP and Bhargava KP. Indian J Med Res 1981; 73:649-652.
- [15] Lee KH, Lin YM, Wu TS, Zhang DC, Yamagishi T, Hayashi T, Hall IH, Chang JJ, Wu RY, Yang TS. Planta Medica 1988; 54:308-311.
- [16] Ricardo A Furtado, Érlon PR. Toxicol Pathol 2008; 36:576.
- [17] Sudhakar Pemminati, Swati B, Shreyasi C, Chandrasekhar R, GopalaKrishna HN, MRSMPai. Drug Invention Today 2010; 2(2):115-118.
- [18] Sudhakar P, V Nair, P Dorababu, HN Gopalkrishna, Pai MRSMPai. Indian J Pharmacol 2007; 39:87-89.
- [19] Surender Singh, Manesh Taneja, Dipak KM. Indian J Expe Biol 2007; 45:403-412.
- [20] Pellow G, Chopin P, File SE, Briley M. J Neurosci methods 1985; 14:149-167.
- [21] Costall B, Domeney AM, Gerrard PA, Kelly ME, Naylor RJ. J Pharm Pharmacol 1988; 40:302-305.
- [22] Gopala Krishna HN, Sangha RB, Misra N, Pai MRSMPai. Indian J Pharmacol 2006; 38(5):330-335.
- [23] Van der poel AM. Animal Behav 1979; 27:446-450.
- [24] Awad R, Levac D. Can J Physiol Pharmacol 2007; 85:933-942.