

***IN VITRO* STUDIES ON *STEVIA REBAUDIANA* FOR
STEVIOL GLYCOSIDE PRODUCTION**

PRATIBHA GUPTA



**CENTRE FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND TECHNOLOGY
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI
HAUZ KHAS, NEW DELHI-110016 (INDIA)
APRIL 2012**

©Indian Institute of Technology Delhi (IITD), New Delhi, 2012

***IN VITRO* STUDIES ON *STEVIA REBAUDIANA* FOR
STEVIOL GLYCOSIDE PRODUCTION**

By

PRATIBHA GUPTA

CENTRE FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND TECHNOLOGY

Submitted

In fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

to the



**INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI
HAUZ KHAS, NEW DELHI-110016 (INDIA)
APRIL 2012**

Dedicated
to
My family

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled "***In vitro* studies on *Stevia rebaudiana* for Steviol glycoside Production**" submitted by Pratibha Gupta has been prepared under our guidance in accordance to the rules and regulation of Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, India. The research report and results presented in thesis have not been submitted for any degree or diploma in any other institute or university.

(Prof. Satyawati Sharma)

Centre for Rural Development and Technology
Indian Institute of Technology Delhi
Hauz Khas, New Delhi
INDIA

(Dr. Sanjay Saxena)

Micropropagation Technology Park
The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI)
TERI Gram, Gual Pahari
Gurgaon, Haryana
INDIA

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It gives me great pleasure and moment of immense satisfaction and opportunity for me to express my sense of deep gratitude towards my supervisor Prof. Satyawati Sharma, who has given me wonderful opportunity to do research work under her guidance. I am deeply indebted to her for expert supervision, precious suggestions, constant motivation and invaluable help throughout the course of present work and successful completion of this thesis.

I take this esteemed opportunity in expressing my profound regards to my co-supervisor Dr. Sanjay Saxena (Micropropagation Technology Park, The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI), Gual Pahari, Haryana) for providing me green house facility. I am indebted for his valuable guidance and untiring attention which he bestowed on me right from the inception to the successful completion of this endeavor.

It gives me great pleasure to express my sincerest gratitude to Prof. S. N. Naik (Head), Centre for Rural Development and Technology, IIT Delhi for providing me required facilities and encouragement throughout the completion of research work. I am very much grateful to faculty members, Prof. P. L. Dhar, Prof. Rajendra Prasad, Prof. Santosh Satya, Prof. V. K. Vijay, Dr. V. M. Chariyar and other faculty members of the centre for their constant encouragement and moral support. I would like to extend my gratitude to the committee members Prof. A. K. Srivastava (Chairperson), Dr. Anushree Malik (Internal expert) and Prof. S. K. Khare (External expert) for their valuable time, comments and expert suggestions during discussions to improve my thesis.

I sincerely thanks to Arbro Pharmaceutical Ltd. Kirti Nagar, Delhi (India) for providing me their lab facilities for HPLC analysis. Without their support I would not have been able to complete my thesis.

I wish to express my cordial thanks to staff members of CRDT, IIT Delhi for their assistance and help related to equipment, information, services and resources.

I owe special thanks to Dr. Kirti Srivastava, Dr. Manoj Goyal, Dr. Seema Mishra and Dr. Ashutosh Murkute for their valuable suggestions, assistance and moral support at various stages of my research experiments.

I am indeed very grateful to my seniors and colleagues Dr. Prashant Rout, Dr. Parvaiz Ahmad, Dr. Kaviraj Pradhan, Dr. Ashwani Kumar, Dr. Ram Chandra Pradhan, Ms. Monica Verma, Ms. Kalpana Arora, Ms. Aditi Gupta, Mr. Abhishek Sharma, Ms. Nishu Khurana, Ms. Lalita Sharma, Mr. Lalit Mohan Bal, Mr. Narendra Sahoo, Ms. Surbhi Goyal, Ram Kumar and Mewa Lal for their suggestions and help during my experiments.

I am extremely grateful to my friend Mr. Navin Kumar, whose unconditional support, valuable suggestions and encouragement enabled me not only to complete my work in time but has also given a wide horizon and vision for future.

I am very much grateful to my friends Ms. Priya Sonkar, Dr. Leela Kaur, Mr. Vivek, Mr. Madhav, Dr. Sukhdeep Kaur, Ms. Neelam Rani, Ms. Mayuri Chabukdhara, Ms. Shruti Trivedi, Ms. Hashmi Fatima, Ms. Anamica Tripathi, and Ms. Shashikala Chauhan and all my friends who always made me feel happy when everything went wrong. Their support and love has major contribution in wading through all the difficult circumstances of my work.

I am grateful to the Department of Science and Technology (DST) for providing me financial help in the form of Young Scientist and Ministry of Human Resource and Development (MHRD) to provide me institute fellowship from IIT Delhi.

I am forever indebted to my entire family for their encouragement and support. I am very much thankful to my respected parents (Smt. Sursati Devi and Dr. Harish Chandra Gupta) for their endless love and belief in me. The love showered by my brothers (Mr. Kedar Nath Gupta, Mr. Gyan Prakash Gupta and Mr. Ved Prakash Gupta) and Bhabhi's (Ms. Deepmala Sahu and Ms. Rohini Gupta) always encouraged me to overcome the hardship in my life. It's their love, affection and blessed care that has helped me to move ahead in difficult time and complete my work successfully.

Finally, I thank the almighty God for his blessings which made this thesis possible.

(Pratibha Gupta)

ABSTRACT

Stevia rebaudiana (Bertoni) has attracted economic and scientific interests due to its sweetness and therapeutic properties present in leaves. The sweetening compounds found mainly in the leaves are Steviol glycosides (SGs), with Stevioside being the most abundant, followed by Rebaudioside A. These SGs are non-fermentative, low-calorific, non-toxic and flavor enhancing sweeteners. This shows the advantages of *Stevia* over other artificial sweeteners as an ingredient for the food industry, thereby making *Stevia* a more suitable substitute for saccharine in different drinks, beverages and bakery products. *Stevia* also offers therapeutic benefits having anti-hyperglycemic, anti-hypertensive, and immuno-modulatory effects. These beneficial effects focused the importance of *Stevia*, however, plants raised through seeds varied widely due to its heterozygous nature, therefore, affecting the overall Stevioside content.

To avoid such problems and to improve the yield of Stevioside, it is necessary to propagate a genetically homogeneous population from a selected elite plant of desirable characters. For this, plant tissue culture (PTC) is found to have potential alternative approach for the production of advantageous medicinal compounds from plants and cell culture. Keeping all these facts in consideration, the present study was conducted on "*In vitro* studies on *Stevia rebaudiana* for SGs production". The work was focused on; (1) to develop an efficient protocol for micropropagation using axillary branching (2) the development and optimization of culture conditions for callus and suspension culture (3) the effect of elicitors (NaCl, Na₂CO₃, Proline and Polyethylene glycol (PEG)) on *in vitro* cultured shoots, callus and suspension culture for their growth (biomass yield i.e., fresh weight and dry weight) and on SGs production (4) evaluation of Stevioside and Rebaudioside A in *in vitro* cultured shoots, callus and suspension culture using HPLC technique.

For micropropagation studies, the application of growth regulators (cytokinin alone and in combination with auxin) showed a promoting effect on shoot multiplication and rooting. It was noticed that cytokinins especially kinetin (*Kn*) produced best results. Hence, a protocol was standardized taking different concentrations of *Kn* (1-10 mg l⁻¹) and it was observed that nodal explants cultured on Murashige and Skoog (MS) medium + 4.0 mg l⁻¹ *Kn* was the best medium for shoot multiplication. Also, for rooting ½ strength MS medium + 0.05 mg l⁻¹ IBA + 0.05% activated charcoal produced best results. For hardening, mixture of soil and agropeat (3:1) was found to be best. Among different explants (leaves, nodes and *in vitro* raised roots) tested for callus induction, leaves explant showed better response. However, combination of auxins (0.75 mg l⁻¹ NAA + 1.0 mg l⁻¹ 2,4-D) with MS media were found to be suitable for callus induction while for development and multiplication, MS medium with 2.0 mg l⁻¹ NAA (i.e. maintenance media) showed superior results. Further, suspension culture developed through calli obtained from maintenance media demonstrated good growth followed by S-shaped growth curve.

The effect of different elicitors (NaCl, Na₂CO₃, Proline and PEG) on *in vitro* cultured shoots, callus and suspension culture were studied. *Stevia* shoots showed maximum stress with PEG followed by Na₂CO₃. However, lower concentrations of NaCl and Proline could be tolerated by explants with shoot growth. A significant reduction in shoot growth (i.e., shoot length, number of shoots/node and multiplication fold) was noticed with increased concentrations of elicitors tested. Similarly, a significant reduction in callus biomass (i.e., fresh weight and dry weight) and growth index (GI) was observed with different concentrations of elicitors tested. However, in case of salts (NaCl, Na₂CO₃), continuous decline in biomass and GI was observed with their increased concentrations. In contrast, with optimum concentrations of Proline (5 mM) both biomass and GI were increased while at further higher concentrations (≥7.5 mM) negative effect was seen. However, in case of PEG, only fresh weight content increased upto 5% PEG, whereas dry weight and GI reduced

significantly at all concentrations of PEG. In case of suspension culture, all parameters studied (i.e., fresh weight, dry weight and moisture content) were affected with increased concentrations of salts (NaCl and Na₂CO₃). Proline upto 5 mM concentration increased the fresh weight, dry weight and moisture content and after that negatively affected the results. Similarly, fresh weight increased upto 5% PEG while at further higher concentrations significant reduction was observed. Also, with all concentrations of PEG moisture content increased while dry weight decreased.

SGs analysis of *in vivo* and *in vitro* grown plants, callus and suspension culture (with and without elicitors) was done. In case of field grown plants, maximum production of total SGs (Stevioside and Rebaudioside A) were found in the cultivar procured from Maharashtra (9.26%) followed by Haryana A (8.74%), Haryana B (7.82%) and Uttarakhand (6.33%) plants. Leaves obtained from *in vitro* shoots showed maximum amount of SGs (2.60%) with 0.025% Na₂CO₃ followed by 5 mM Proline (1.65%), 0.10% NaCl (1.25%) and 5% PEG (1.15%), which were 3.3, 2, 1.6 and 1.5 times higher than control (0.79%), respectively. Further, in case of callus, optimum concentrations of each salt i.e., 0.10% NaCl and 0.025% Na₂CO₃ produced 5.3 and 5.6 times higher SGs (1.43% and 1.51%) while 2.5 mM Proline and 5% PEG produced 4.0 and 7.0 times higher SGs (1.09% and 1.83%) than control (0.27%), respectively. Similarly, in case of suspension culture, with optimum concentrations of each, 0.10% NaCl and 0.025% Na₂CO₃, 5 mM Proline and 5% PEG produced 2.61%, 5.14% 5.03% and 6.38% SGs respectively, which were 1.9, 3.8, 3.7 and 4.7 times higher than control, respectively.

Hence, it can be concluded that protocol developed for mass propagation and callusing will be helpful for high frequency regeneration, somaclonal variation and genetic engineering experiments. Also, it was found that the application of abiotic elicitors and appropriate culture conditions can enhance the production of secondary metabolites in *in vitro* raised *Stevia* shoots, callus and suspension culture.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i-ii
ABSTRACT	iii-v
CONTENTS	vi-x
LIST OF FIGURES	xi-xiii
LIST OF TABLES	xiv-xvi
LIST OF PLATES	xvii-xix
ABBREVIATIONS	xx
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1-11
1.1. Scope of work	8
1.2. Objectives	11
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE	12-56
2.1. <i>Stevia</i> plant description and related aspects	12
2.1.1. Botanical distribution and Taxonomy	12
2.1.2. Chemical constituents	14
2.1.3. Physical factors affecting <i>Stevia</i> cultivation	16
2.1.4. Applications of <i>Stevia</i>	18
2.1.5. Biosynthesis of Steviol glycosides	19
2.1.6. Transportation and storage of Steviol glycosides	23
2.1.7. Safety of <i>Stevia</i> sweeteners	24
2.2. <i>In vitro</i> studies of <i>Stevia</i>	25
2.2.1. Micropropagation	25
2.2.2. Callus and suspension culture	31

2.3. <i>In vitro</i> secondary metabolite production in <i>Stevia</i> and other medicinal plants	34
2.4. Effect of stress on plants, callus and suspension culture on growth and secondary metabolite production	36
2.4.1. Effect of salts	42
2.4.2. Effect of Proline and Polyethylene glycol	44
2.5. Biochemical analysis for SGs production in <i>Stevia</i> shoots, callus and suspension culture	51
2.5.1. Extraction of SGs	51
2.5.2. Techniques used for SGs analysis	53
CHAPTER 3: MATERIALS AND METHODS	57-73
3.1. <i>In vitro</i> studies	57
3.1.1. Explants/ Study material	57
3.1.2. Micropropagation studies	57
3.1.3. Callus culture studies	63
3.1.3.1. Callus induction	64
3.1.3.1.1. Callus induction from leaves	64
3.1.3.1.2. Callus induction from nodal explants	64
3.1.3.1.3. Callus induction from root explants	65
3.1.3.2. Callus development / multiplication	65
3.1.4. Suspension culture studies	66
3.1.5. Effect of elicitors (NaCl, Na ₂ CO ₃ , Proline and PEG) on <i>Stevia</i> shoots, callus and suspension culture	66
3.1.5.1. Micropropagation	66
3.1.5.2. Callus and suspension culture	67

3.1.6. Data analysis	67
3.2. Biochemical analysis for Steviol glycosides (SGs)	70
3.2.1. Extraction procedure	70
3.2.1.1. Extraction of Stevia leaves grown in field for SGs analysis	70
3.2.1.2. Extraction from in vitro leaves, callus and suspension culture	71
3.2.2. Preparation of standard	72
3.2.3. Preparation of mobile phase	72
3.2.4. HPLC analysis	73
3.2.4.1. Chromatographic system	73
3.2.4.2. Analytical condition	73
3.2.5. Quantitative estimation	73
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS	74-173
4.1. <i>In vitro</i> studies	74
4.1.1 Development of Micropropagation protocol	74
4.1.1.1. Surface sterilization and culture initiation	74
4.1.1.2. Shoot multiplication	78
4.1.1.2.1. <i>Effect of Cytokinins</i>	78
4.1.1.2.2. <i>Effect of cytokinin and auxin in combination</i>	83
4.1.1.3. Rooting	85
4.1.1.3.1. <i>Effect of IBA on rooting</i>	86
4.1.1.3.2. <i>Effect of Activated charcoal (AC) on rooting</i>	88
4.1.1.4. Hardening and transplantation	90
4.1.2. Callus and Suspension culture	92
4.1.2.1. Callus induction	93

4.1.2.1.1. From <i>Stevia</i> leaves	94
4.1.2.1.1.1. <i>Effect of Auxins</i>	94
4.1.2.1.1.2. <i>Effect of Cytokinin</i>	96
4.1.2.1.1.3. <i>Effect of combination of cytokinins and auxin</i>	97
4.1.2.1.1.4. <i>Effect of combination of auxins</i>	99
4.1.2.1.1.5. <i>Standardization of 2,4-D and NAA</i>	100
4.1.2.1.2. From nodal explants	101
4.1.2.1.2.1. <i>Effect of Auxins</i>	101
4.1.2.1.2.2. <i>Effect of cytokinins</i>	103
4.1.2.1.2.3. <i>Effect of cytokinins and auxin combination</i>	104
4.1.2.1.3. From root explants	105
4.1.2.2. Callus development and multiplication	107
4.1.2.2.1. Effect of auxins	107
4.1.2.2.1.1. <i>Auxins on leaf induced callus</i>	107
4.1.2.2.1.2. <i>Auxins on node induced callus</i>	108
4.1.2.2.1.3. <i>Auxins on root induced callus</i>	109
4.1.2.2.2. Effect of different strength of MS medium	110
4.1.2.3. Suspension culture development	111
4.1.3. Effect of elicitors (NaCl, Na₂CO₃, Proline and PEG) on <i>Stevia</i> shoots, callus and suspension culture	113
4.1.3.1. Effect of elicitors on <i>in vitro</i> raised <i>Stevia</i> shoots	114
4.1.3.1.1. <i>Effect of Salts (NaCl and Na₂CO₃)</i>	114
4.1.3.1.2. <i>Effect of Proline and Polyethylene glycol</i>	120
4.1.3.2. Effect of elicitors on callus culture	125
4.1.3.2.1. <i>Effect of salts (NaCl and Na₂CO₃)</i>	126

4.1.3.2.2. <i>Effect of Proline and Polyethylene glycol</i>	130
4.1.3.3. Effect of salts and elicitors on suspension culture	134
4.1.3.3.1. <i>Effect of Salts (NaCl and Na₂CO₃)</i>	134
4.1.3.3.2. <i>Effect of Proline and PEG</i>	139
4.2. Biochemical analysis for Steviol glycosides (SGs)	144
4.2.1. Steviol glycosides (SGs) in <i>Stevia</i> plants grown <i>in vivo</i>	146
4.2.2. SGs in <i>in vitro</i> raised leaves treated with and without elicitors (NaCl, Na ₂ CO ₃ , Proline and Polyethylene glycol)	148
4.2.2.1. <i>Effect of Salts (NaCl and Na₂CO₃)</i>	148
4.2.2.2. <i>Effect of Proline and PEG</i>	151
4.2.3. Production of SGs in callus and suspension culture treated with and without elicitors (NaCl, Na ₂ CO ₃ , Proline and Polyethylene glycol)	154
4.2.3.1. SGs in callus culture treated with and without elicitors	155
4.2.3.1.1. <i>Effect of salts (NaCl and Na₂CO₃)</i>	155
4.2.3.1.2. <i>Effect of Proline and PEG</i>	158
4.2.3.2. SGs in suspension culture treated with and without elicitors	161
4.2.3.2.1. <i>Effect of salts (NaCl and Na₂CO₃)</i>	164
4.2.3.2.2. <i>Effect of Proline and PEG</i>	166
4.2.4. SGs content in <i>in vivo</i> and <i>in vitro</i> cultured <i>Stevia</i> leaves, callus and suspension culture	170
CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE SCOPE	174-183
REFERENCES	184-229
APPENDICES	232-252
CURRICULUM VITAE	