

# **Medical Laboratory Technology Journal**

4 (1), 2018, 16-20 Received 2018-05-23; Received in revised form 2018-06-25; Accepted 2018-06-25 Available online at : http://ejurnal-analiskesehatan.web.id

# LIME SOAP AS BACTERIA REDUCER

## Ratih Dewi Dwiyanti, Leka Lutpiatina

Medical Laboratory Technology Poltekkes Kemenkes Banjarmasin Mistar Cokrokusumo Street 4a Baniarbaru Indonesia. e-mail: Ratihdewi262@yahoo.co.id

Abstract: Some people in South Kalimantan have used river water to fulfill their daily needs include washing the utensils. Wash the cutlery use river water can cause disease transmission. Squeezed lime has an antibacterial effect in inhibiting bacterial growth. Antibacterial dishwashing soap is effective in reducing pathogenic bacteria. This research is to know the difference of bacterial amount on the variation of contact time with soap. Know the difference of bacteria on the variation of concentration of lime soap and soap without lime. The study used the experimental method with pretest and posttest with control design. The independent variables are a lime soap with a concentration of 40%, 50%, 60% and variable of contact time 30 second, 60 second and 90 seconds. The dependent variable is the number of bacteria on the dinnerware of a dinner plate. The data obtained in this study is the data of measurement of the number of bacteria on the dinner plate. Data analyzed by Kruskal-Wallis test. MPN coliform examination of river water showed results >2400 CFU/ml sample. There were no significant differences in treatment with contact time variation of 30 seconds, 60 seconds and 90 seconds. The significance value is 0.796 (> 0.05). There were significant differences in the treatment of lime soap with concentration variations of 40%, 50%, 60%, and soap without lime. The value of significance is 0,000 (<0.05).

Keywords: Soap; Lime; Number of bacteria

#### INTRODUCTION

that 1.6 million people die each year from diar- idents of Banjarmasin defecate (BAB) in the rheal diseases due to lack of access to safe Martapura River cause the level of contaminadrinking water and basic sanitation. 90% of tion of Escherichia coli bacteria exceeds above whom are children under the age of 5, espe- the threshold (Rahmatullah, 2015). cially in developing countries. Some of the barriers include prevention of contamination, gens are bacteria (eg Escherichia coli, Salmosanitation, and disinfection needed to effec- nella typhi, Vibrio cholerae), viruses (eg adetively prevent the spread of waterborne dis- novirus, enterovirus, hepatitis, rotavirus), and eases (Boutilier et al., 2014).

countries covering many provinces, most still tion and impede child growth. (Boutilier et.al, rely on water sources from river water alt- 2014). hough the microbiological quality of river water does not meet health requirements. South Ka- are still included in one of the largest diseases limantan is a province that is nicknamed the of which the incidence is relatively high. This city of a thousand rivers because of the many situation is supported by environmental facrivers in this province, people in some cities tors, especially the poor condition of basic sanuse river water for everyday purposes espe- itation, such as the use of water for daily purcially bathing, washing, latrines. One of the poses that do not meet the requirements.

largest rivers in South Kalimantan is the Marta-The World Health Organization reports pura River located in Banjarmasin, still the res-

The most common water-borne pathoprotozoa (eg Giardia). These pathogens cause Indonesia is one of the developing child mortality and also contribute to malnutri-

Diarrheal diseases in South Kalimantan

The limited supply of clean water in some dis- against Staphylococcus aureus bacteria that is tricts in south Kalimantan causes some people (29.00 ± 0.82) mm using soap with the essenstill use river water to meet daily needs such tial oil content of lemon (Rozi M, T.N. Saifullah as bathing, washing, latrines and washing S., and Indravudha P. 2013). kitchen utensils including cutlery. Washing the cutlery using river water can cause disease known the effectiveness of soap with lime transmission. Although people already use squeeze content in reducing the number of dish soap but possibly because the river water bacteria, if the is used in washing using river used is still contaminated with microorgan- water in the washing model commonly used by isms.

tion, the people who live in the watershed, es- is made in the solid form to reduce the number pecially the Martapura River use the river wa- of bacteria in the cutlery washed by using river ter to wash dishes. How to wash dishes done water. This study aims to determine the effecby accommodating the river water in the basin, tiveness of contact time, and concentration of Plates that have been cleaned with soap and lemon soap in decreasing the number of bacsponge are then rinsed with river water in the teria in the utensil washed with water Martafirst basin and rinsed again using the second pura river. basin water. The dish soap commonly used by the Martapura River community is a solid form. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Necessary natural ingredients that are cheap and easy to obtain in the environment method with pretest and posttest with control where living, natural materials that grow a lot research design. The research material used around South Kalimantan and have the ability is Lime squeeze. The research material obto reduce the microorganisms that contami- tained from Banjarbaru market. The sample of nate the tools - the cutlery washed with river the study is the dinnerware covering dinner water.

herbal plants for cough medicine, eliminating tion of 40%, 50%, 60% and variable of contact the fishy smell of the equipment. Several stud- time 30 second, 60 second and 90 seconds. ies have shown that lime squeeze can be used The variable is bound to the number of bacteas an antibacterial agent. Based on research ria on the dinnerware of a dinner plate. Lauma et al (2015) squeeze of lime squeeze has an antibacterial effect in inhibiting the has done with 40%, 50% and 60% concentragrowth of Staphylococcus aureus bacteria. tion using Texopon 10 gr / 100 ml distilled wa-Aghnia research (2014) squeeze of lime ter, XLS 5 gr / 100 ml distilled water, NaCl 10 squeeze has antimicrobial activity against gr / 100 ml distilled water, and lime squeeze Escherichia coli bacteria. Rahardjo (2012) re- as per concentration in a stir until homogenevealed that lime squeeze as a decontaminant ous (Syafruddin, Kurniasih E., 2013). The agent effectively decreases the amount of Sal- MPN (Most Probable Number) coliform examimonella and Escherichisa coli bacteria thor- nation of martapura river water has used 555 oughly on the chest of broiler chickens.

pathogenic tive reducing in (Kusumaningrum, et al., 2002). Antibacterial soap products are proven to significantly re- been using dinner plates of the same size. duce bacteria by 98% (Holah JT, Hall KE., Group one washed with tap water and lemon 2006). The greatest antibacterial activity with a soap concentration of 40%, 50%, 60% with a 28 ± 1.80 mm inhibitory zone resulted in a variation of contact time 30 seconds, 60 secstudy of soap inhibition with the addition of es- onds and 90 seconds. The second group was sential oil of lime by 4% to Staphylococcus au- washed using river water and lemon soap conreus bacteria (Aprivani D, TN Saifullah S., and centrations of 40%, 50%, 60% with contact Indrayudha I, 2013). Another study also pro- time variation of 30 seconds, 60 seconds and duced a similar thing that is a radical zone 90 seconds.

Based on the above description has not the Martapura River area community. It is nec-As a result of the temporary observa- essary to research the use of lemon soap that

This research uses a pure experimental plates of the same size. The independent vari-Lime is one of the most widely known ables are the lemon soap with the concentra-

The preparation of lemon squeeze soap varieties. The medium used Lactose broth Antibacterial dishwashing soap is effec- (Merck) double strength and single strength, bacteria Brilliant Green Lactose Broth (Merck)

Examination Numbers bacteria have

The third group washed with tap water and plain soap with variations of contact time 30 seconds, 60 seconds and 90 seconds. The fourth group has washed with river water and soap without lime with variations of contact time of 30 seconds, 60 seconds and 90 seconds. Work on the four groups performed repetition five times.

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The results of MPN coliform examination of river water showed results> 2400 CFU / ml sample. Treat dishwashing with plain soap and lemon squeeze soap 40%, 50%, 60% concentration. Contact time 30 seconds, 60 seconds and 90 seconds. Water used for rinsing in washing using tap water and Martapura River water. The resulting data can be seen in the table as follows

Table 1. Number of bacteria Treatment Lime Soap Concentrate 40% with Tap Water

Repetition	Number of bacteria (/ml sampel) on the Contact Time		
repetition	30	60	90
	seconds	seconds	seconds
1	120	250	100
2	420	0	150
3	30	30	160
4	140	2080	470
5	100	110	370

Table 2. Number of bacteria Treatment Lime Soap Concentrate 50% with Tap Water

Repetition	Number of bacteria (/ml sampel) on the Contact Time		
Repetition	30	60	30
	seconds	seconds	seconds
1	310	60	1350
2	30	130	960
3	90	50	320
4	160	40	80
5	590	510	1180

Table 3. Number of bacteria Treatment Lime Soap Concentrate 60% with Tap Water

Repetition		er of bacter on the Con	`
	30	60	30
	seconds	seconds	seconds
1	21240	36453	5465
2	30	310	1360
3	60	10360	950
4	50	1190	280
5	0	1895	250

Table 4. Number of bacteria Treatment Lime Soap Concentrate 40% with Water River

Depetition	Number of bacteria (/ml sampel) on the Contact Time		
Repetition	30	60	90
	seconds	seconds	seconds
1	760000	1110	730
2	512000	450	760
3	680000	1520	2720
4	536000	970	450
5	602000	250	980

Table 5. Number of bacteria Treatment Lime Soap Concentrate 50% with Water River

Repetition	Number of bacteria (/ml sampel) on the Contact Time		
Repetition	30	60	30
	seconds	seconds	seconds
1	280000	8300	10300
2	1340	144000	3590
3	3480	4500	3780
4	104000	650	260
5	66000	3300	1450

#### Table 6. Number of bacteria Treatment Lime Soap Concentrate 60% with Water River

Repetition		er of bacte on the Con	`
	30	60	30
	seconds	seconds	seconds
1	1310	340	430
2	330	500	15200
3	380	1160	9510
4	420	670	250
5	870	1210	330

# Table 7. Number of bacteria Treatment Soapwith Tap Water

Depetition	Number of bacteria (/ml sampel) on the Contact Time		
Repetition	30	60	30
	seconds	detik	seconds
1	10	1204000	6800
2	370	6280	8400
3	60	1090	864000
4	330	3405	21800
5	230	970	1710

Depetition		er of bacte on the Con	
Repetition	30	60	30
	seconds	seconds	seconds
1	488000	48000	22000
2	476000	26550	344000
3	712000	18400	24300
4	664000	82000	2000
5	731000	12500	3900

Table 8. Number of bacteria Treatment Soap
with Water River

Based on the data in the table above is done data normality test using Shapiro-Wilk of the protein structure of the bacterial cell is test first, to determine whether the data used disrupted resulting in the escape of macro normal distribution or not. The result of data molecules and ions from the cell. The cells will normality test analysis by using Shapiro-Wilk lose their shape so that the lysis and damage. test, it can be stated that the data is not nor- While flavonoids have bacteriostatic or bacterimally distributed although data transformation cidal properties depending on their concentrahas been done. The next test is a non- tion, inhibiting bacterial growth by interacting parametric Kruskal-Wallis test.

lemon soap and soap without lime with contact Wulan, 2008). This is because DNA or RNA time in the test using Kruskal Wallis showed a plays an important role in the normal cell life significance value of 0.796 (> 0.05), which process. This means any interference that ocmeans there is no significant difference in curs in the formation or on the function of the treatment with contact time variation of 30 sec- substance can cause total damage to the cell onds, 60 seconds and 90 seconds.

The number of bacteria of soap treatment of various concentration and soap with- squeeze show obstacles to certain bacteria. out lime with Kruskal Wallis test showed a sig- The results of the experiment showed that renificance value of 0.000 (<0,05), meaning that sistance to Staphylococcus aureus bacteria at there is significant difference to the number of concentrations of 25%, 50%, 75% and 100% germ of soap treatment of various concentra- with inhibitory zones inhibit the growth of tion and soap without lime.

tration of lemon soap and soap without lime, 6.167mm, 7.7mm and 10.5mm. then Mann Whitney test. Mann Whitney test results showed no difference in each treatment that the increase of inhibited drag zone at conacross all concentrations of lemon soap, and centrations of 12.5%, 25%, 50%, and 75% there was a difference in 40% lemon soap with the measurement of the diameter of the treatment with soap without lime, 50% concen- zones the average inhibition is 8.5mm, 16mm, trated lemon soap with soap without lime, 60% 19.5mm, and 23.5mm. lemon soap plain soap.

and river water tested using Mann Whitney ing PDAM water and river water. Water taps shows a significance value of 0.000 (<0.05), are water that has been through the promeaning that there is a significant difference to cessing, so the possibility of bacteria in the the tap water and river water.

difference in the number of bacteria washing form> 2400 CFU / ml to allow the results of rewith lemon soap with lemonless soap (tables 7 search using this river water to produce more & 8). The ability of an antibacterial agent to bacteria. inhibit the life of microorganisms depends on

the concentration of antibacterial agents. This means that the amount of antibacterial ingredients in a germ environment will determine the life of the exposed bacteria. In this study the concentration value used 40%, 50% and 60%.

Bacterial growth can be inhibited by the essential oils and flavonoids present in the lime. The essential oil works by denaturing the bacterial cell protein and destroving the cell's cvtoplasmic membrane. The denatured protein loses physiological activity and instability in the cell wall increases cell permeability, the transport function becomes active, the control directly with DNA, causing bacterial DNA to be Number of bacteria after washing with damaged so that the bacteria die (Sumono & (Rahayu & Winiati, 2000).

Several other studies on lemon Staphylococcus aureus bacteria in vitro by Ra-To know the difference of each concen- zak (2013) which is formed at 5.167mm,

The results of the experiment showed

This study shows that there are differ-The Water Treatment Gaps of tap water ences in the number of bacteria on treats uswater does not exist or minimal. Martapura riv-The results showed that there was a er water used shows the results of MPN coli-

### CONCLUSION

treatment with contact time variation of 30 seconds. 60 seconds and 90 seconds with a significance value of 0.796 (> 0.05). There were significant differences in the treatment of lemon soap with concentration variations of 40%, 50%, 60% and soap without lime with a signifi- Sumono, A., & Wulan, A. (2008). Dental cance value of 0.000 (<0.05). There is no effective concentration of lemon soap and effective contact time to decrease the number of bacteria.

### REFERENCES

- Aghnia H.S. (2014). Aktivitas antimikroba Air Perasan Jeruk Nipis (Citrus aurantifolia) terhadap Escherichia coli Secara In Vitro.
- Boutilier M.S.H, Lee J, Chambers V, Venkatesh V, Karnik R. (2014). Water Filtration Using Plant, PLoS ONE, 9(2), e89934.
- Brillian B. (2014). Salmonella infections -Human - Medicine. Universitas Syiah Kuala.
- Holah J.T, Hall K.E. (2006). The effect of an antibacterial washing-up liquid in reducing dishwater aerobic plate counts: Lett Appl Microbiol, 42(5), 532-7.
- Kusumaningrum H.D. Van Putten MM. Rombouts. F., & RR, Beumer. (2002). Effects of antibacterial dishwashing liquid on foodborne pathogens and competitive microorganisms in kitchen sponges. J Food Prot. 65(1), 61–5.
- Lauma et al. (2015). Uji Efektivitas Perasan Air Jeruk Nipis (Citrus aurantifolia S) Terhadap Pertumbuhan Bakteri Staphylococcus aureus Secara In Vitro. PHARMA-CON Jurnal Ilmiah Farmasi-UNSRAT, 4 (4).
- Rahardjo, A. H. D. (2012). Efektivitas Jeruk Nipis dalam Menurunkan Bakteri Salmonella Dan Escherichia coli Pada dada Karkas Ayam broiler. Indonesian Journal Of Applied Science (IJAS), 2(3).
- Rahayu, P., & Winiati. (2000). Aktivitas Antimikroba Bumbu Masakan Tradisional. Journal of Medicinal Plant Research., 4.
- Rahmatullah. (2015). Sungai Martapura Tercemar. Banjarmasin Post.
- Razak A, Djamal A, Revilla G. (2013). Uji Daya Hambat Air Perasan Jeruk Nipis (Citrus aurantifolia) Terhadap Pertumbuhan Bakteri Staphylococcus aureus Secara in

vitro. Jurnal Kesehatan Andalas.

- There were no significant differences in Rozi M, T. N. Saifullah S. Indrayudha P. (2013). Formulasi sediaan sabun mandi transparan minvak Atsiri ieruk nipis (citrus aurantifolia) dengan cocamid dea Sebagai Universitas surfaktan. Muhammadivah Surakarta.
  - Jurnal. The use of bay leaf (Eugenia polyantha Wight) in dentisty. Dental Jurnal, 41.
  - Syafruddin, & Kurniasih, E. (2013). Aplikasi minyak nilam sebagai bahan aditif sabun transparan antiseptik. Jurnal MANTEKH, 5(1).