

**BENIGN PROSTATIC HYPERPLASIA ATTENUATION AND
CYTOTOXIC EFFECTS OF *Lonchocarpus griffonianus* G. DON
(FABACEAE) STEM AND ROOT BARKS**

BY

DANIEL AKPE-EFIAK AMBE

PG/PHA/1614425



**DEPARTMENT OF PHARMACOGNOSY
FACULTY OF PHARMACY
UNIVERSITY OF BENIN
BENIN CITY
NIGERIA**

AUGUST, 2023

BENIGN PROSTATIC HYPERPLASIA ATTENUATION AND CYTOTOXIC
EFFECTS OF *Lonchocarpus griffonianus* G. DON (FABACEAE) STEM AND
ROOT BARKS

BY

DANIEL AKPE-EFIAK AMBE

PG/PHA/1614425

DEPARTMENT OF PHARMACOGNOSY

FACULTY OF PHARMACY

UNIVERSITY OF BENIN

BENIN CITY

NIGERIA

AUGUST, 2023

BENIGN PROSTATIC HYPERPLASIA ATTENUATION AND CYTOTOXIC
EFFECTS OF *Lonchocarpus griffonianus* G. DON (FABACEAE) STEM AND
ROOT BARKS

BY

DANIEL AKPE-EFIAK AMBE

PG/PHA/1614425

A THESIS WRITTEN IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PHARMACOGNOSY AND SUBMITTED
TO THE POSTGRADUATE STUDIES IN IN FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT
FOR THE DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY DEGREE (PhD) IN PHARMACOGNOSY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF BENIN, BENIN-CITY, NIGERIA

AUGUST, 2023

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that this project was carried out by DANIEL AKPE-EFIAK AMBE of the Department of Pharmacognosy, Faculty of Pharmacy, University of Benin, Benin-city, Nigeria.

Professor Buniyamin A. Ayinde
DVC Academic (Ekehuan campus)
(Supervisor)

Date

Dr (Mrs) Josephine O. Ofeimun
(Co-supervisor)

Date

Dr (Mrs) Josephine O. Ofeimun
Ag. Head of Department

Date

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to the Eternal God that granted me the grace to finish this work, and my beautiful and talented wife Pharm. (Mrs.) Ima Daniel Ambe, my gifted children (Prosperity Daniel Ambe, Akpe Daniel Ambe (Jnr) and Love Daniel Ambe).

To my late parents, Chief Akpe Daniel Ambe and Mrs. Arit Akpe Daniel Ambe

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply grateful to the Almighty God for his benevolence and grace sufficient for me to finish the work. I return all the glory to him.

I am also grateful to my supervisor for sharing a part of his knowledge and experience with me. Through his tutelage, I am now a better person than I was before. Thank you, Prof.

I appreciate Dr (Mrs.) Josephine Ofeimun for her teachings, guidance, robustness and perfection during the program.

Prof. (Dr) Iqbal Choudhary's contributions from the International Center for Biological and Chemical Sciences are deeply acknowledged for analyzing (Cytotoxic and NMR analysis) my samples free of charge.

The University of Uyo is also acknowledged for allowing me to acquire more degrees. Thank you, Prof. Akeneren Essien, Prof. Olorunfemi Eseyin, Prof. Paul Nwafor and many others too numerous to mention.

Special appreciation goes to the Department of Pharmacognosy, University of Benin staff. My wonderful friends Mr Ugwu Kingsley, Mrs Florence Adesina, Dr Osamuyi Uwunarongie, Dr Rose Imade, Mallam Abdul-hafiz Sanni, "High Chief" Chijoke Samuel and others I have failed to mention due to space constraints.

I want to acknowledge the contributions of Dr Emmanuel Odion, the acting Head of the Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry. He has been a wonderful mentor, a father, and a light

in the dark for me and others. May the Almighty God reward you both on Earth and in Heaven. Amen. The patience, prayers and tolerance of my wife and children are deeply acknowledged and appreciated. Those cold and long nights, loneliness and many more things you all fought without letting go due to my unavoidable absence, during the course of the program, have made me who I am today. I will not take these sacrifices for granted. May God grant you all eternal grace to reap the fruit of this seed. Amen.

Thank you Mrs. Emem Bassey Edet for your sacrifices when I was on the bench. You took the pain comes sunshine and during rainfall to get samples and lots more. May the Lord reward you bountifully. Amen.

TABLE OF CONTENT

1.1 Historical perspective of natural products	1
1.2 Natural products from medicinal plants	1
1.3 Cancer	6
1.3.1 Tumor	6
1.3.2 Cancerous tumor	6
1.4 Causes of tumours and cancerous tumours	
1.4.1 Occupational causes due to exposure to susceptible chemicals	7
1.4.2 Virus and parasite as causes of cancer	10
1.4.3 Wood dust and alcohol	10
1.5 Treatment options for cancer	10
1.5.1 Drug treatment	11
1.5.2 Radiotherapy	11
1.5.3 Surgical intervention	11
1.5.4 Immunotherapy	11
1.5.5 Alternative medicine in cancer management	12
1.6. Reproductive organ related tumour and cancer	12
1.6.1 Epidemiology of BPH, prostate and uterine cervix cancer	12
1.7 Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia (BPH)	13
1.7.1 Pathophysiology of BPH	13

1.7.1.1 Role of androgens.	14
1.7.1.2 Role of estrogen	15
1.7.1.3 Inflammation	15
1.7.2 Risk factors BPH	16
1.7.2.1 Obesity	16
1.7.2.2 Diet	16
1.7.2.3 Genetics	17
1.7.3 Diagnosis	17
1.7.3.1 Physical examination of the prostate.	17
1.7.3.2 Urinalysis	16
1.7.3.3 Prostate-specific antigen test.	18
1.7.3.4 Renal function test	18
1.7.3.5 Urinary tract imaging.	19
1.7.4 Management of Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia	19
1.7.4.1 Watchful waiting	19
1.7.4.2 Pharmacotherapy	20
1.7.4.3 Surgical intervention	21
1.7.5 Emerging therapies	22

1.7.5.1 β -3-adrenoceptor agonists	22
1.7.5.2 muscarinic receptor antagonists	22
1.7.5.3 CB1-cannabinoid receptors	23
1.7.5.4 Prostanoid receptor EP2	23
1.7.5.5 Endothelin ETB receptor	23
1.7.5.6 Phosphodiesterase PDE5 receptor	24
1.7.5.7 RhoA/Rho kinase	24
1.7.5.8 Nitric oxide	25
1.7.6 Plants with anti-BPH activity	25
1.7.6.1 <i>Serenoa repens</i> (Arecaceae)	25
1.7.6.2 <i>Pygeum africanum</i> (Rosaceae)	28
1.7.6.3 <i>Urtica dioica</i> (Urticaceae)	29
1.7.6.4 <i>Secale cereal</i> (Poaceae)	30
1.7.6.5 <i>Cucurbita pepo</i> L (Cucurbitaceae)	30
1.7.6.6 <i>Glycine max</i> (L.) Merr. (Fabaceae)	31
1.7.7 Isolated plant secondary metabolites with anti-BPH activity	32
1.7.7.1 Lycopene	32
1.7.7.2 β -Sitosterol	32

1.7.8 Triterpenoids with antitumor activity	32
1.7.8.1 Lupane-type pentacyclic triterpenoid	32
1.7.8.2 Oleanane-type pentacyclic triterpenoids	33
1.7.8.3 Ursane-type pentacyclic triterpenoids	34
1.7.8.4 Cork-type pentacyclic triterpenoids	34
1.7.8.5 Lanostane-type tetracyclic triterpene compounds	34
1.8 Prostate carcinoma	39
1.8.1 Pathophysiology of prostate carcinoma	39
1.8.2 Risk factors	40
1.8.3 Drugs used for the management of prostate cancer	40
1.8.3.1 Cabazitaxel	40
1.8.3.2 Abiraterone Acetate	40
1.8.3.3 Enzalutamide	41
1.8.3.4 Sipuleucel-T	41
1.8.4 Selected medicinal plants with activities against prostate cancer	43
1.8.4.1 <i>Kalanchoe gastonis-bonnieri</i> (Crassulaceae)	43
1.8.4.2 <i>Acacia hydaspica</i> (Fabaceae)	44
1.8.4.3 <i>Trimeria grandifolia</i> (Malpighiaceae)	44
1.8.4.4 <i>Euphorbia triaculeata</i> (Euphorbiaceae)	44

1.8.4.5 <i>Thevetia peruviana</i> (Apocynaceae)	44
1.8.5. Isolated compounds with activity against prostate cancer	45
1.9. <i>In vitro</i> model systems used in prostate tumour studies	47
1.9.1 DU-145	47
1.9.2 PC ₃	47
1.9.3 LNCaP	48
1.9.4 C4-2B	48
1.9.5 LAPC-4	48
1.9.6 LAPC 9	44
1.9.7 VCaP	49
1.9.8 MDA PCa 2a/2b	49
1.9.9 RWPE-2	49
1.9.10 PIN	49
1.10 <i>In vivo</i> model systems for the studies of prostate cancer	50
1.10.1 TRAMP	50
1.10.2 LADY	51
1.10.3 Metastatic models	51
1.10.4 Cancer cell injection via the tail vein	51
1.11 Cervical uteri cancer	51
1.11.1 Epidemiology of cervical cancer	51
1.11.2 Pathophysiology of uterine cervical cancer	51
1.11.3 Pathogenesis of uterine cervix cancer	53

1.11.4 Etiology	54
1.11.5 Assessment of cervical cancer	54
1.11.6 Management of cervical cancer	54
1.11.7 Drug treatment of cervical cancer	55
1.11.7.1 Cisplatin	55
1.11.7.2 Paclitaxel	56
1.11.7.3 Ifosfamide	56
1.11.7.4 Methotrexate	57
1.11.8 Medicinal plants with activity against uterine cervix carcinoma	59
1.11.8.1 <i>Cannabis sativa</i> (Cannabaceae)	59
1.11.8.2 <i>Abrus precatorius</i> (Fabaceae)	59
1.11.8.3 <i>Achyranthes bidentate</i> (Amaranthaceae)	59
1.11.8.4 <i>Rosa damascena</i> (Rosaceae)	59
1.11.8.5 <i>Coryphantha robbinsorum</i> W.Earle (Cactaceae)	60
1.12. Taxonomic description of <i>Lonchocarpus griffonianus</i> (Baill) Dunn	62
1.13 The genus <i>Lonchocarpus</i>	62
1.14 Botanical description of <i>Lonchocarpus griffonianus</i>	62
1.5 Ethno-medicinal uses of <i>Lonchocarpus griffonianus</i>	62

JUSTIFICATION OF THE STUDY	64
AIM AND OBJECTIVES	65
CHAPTER TWO	
2.1 Laboratory Materials and Equipment	66
2.2 Chemicals and reagents	66
2.3. Plant collection and identification	66
2.4 Drying of plant materials 2.5. Extraction	67
2.5. Extraction	67
2.6 Preliminary activity evaluation of LGSB and LGRB extracts	67
2.6.1 Acquisition of experimental animal (<i>Raniceps raninus</i>)	67
2.6.2 Cytotoxic activity assay using <i>Raniceps raninus</i> model	67
2.6.3 Evaluation of growth-suppression activity using the <i>Sorghum bicolor</i> model	68
2.7 Acute toxicity study	68
2.8 Partitioning of the LGSB extract	69
2.9 Biological screening of the aqueous and solvent fractions	69
2.9.1. Cytotoxic activity assay using <i>Raniceps raninus</i> model	69
2.9.2 Evaluation of growth-suppression activity using the <i>Sorghum bicolor</i> model	70
2.10 Vacuum liquid chromatography (VLC) of the bioactive DCM fraction	70

2.10.1 Thin layer chromatography of the VLC fractions of bioactive DCM	71
2.10.3 Vacuum liquid chromatography (VLC) of the AQ fraction	71
2.10.4 Thin layer chromatography of the VLC fractions of AQ	71
2.11.1 Biological evaluation of bulked VLC fractions of the bioactive DCM fraction	72
2.11.2 Biological evaluation of bulked VLC fractions of the AQ fraction	72
2.13.1 Column Chromatography (GCC) of bioactive VLC fraction “A”	72
2.13.2 TLC analysis and bulking of column chromatography eluates	73
2.13.3 Column chromatography of the bulked column fraction “G”	73
2.13.4 Column chromatography of the bulked column fraction J	74
2.14 Determination of melting point of the isolated compounds LO1 and LO2	75
2.15 Biological activity evaluation of the isolated compounds	76
2.15.1 Antiproliferative activity evaluation of LO1	76
2.15.2 MTT assay of LO1 and LO2	76
2.16 Spectroscopic analysis of the isolated compounds and structure elucidation	77
2.17 Anti testosterone-induced BPH evaluation of LGSB extract and LO1 in rats model	77
2.17.1 Experimental animals	77
2.17.2 Experimental design	77
2.17.3 Measurement of serum testosterone, PSA and estradiol levels	80

2.17.4.1 ELISA test for prostate specific antigen (PSA)	80
2.17.4.2 ELISA test for testosterone	80
2.17.4.3 ELISA test for estradiol	81
2.17.5 Histological examination of the animal's prostate tissues	81
2.18 Statistical analysis	82
CHAPTER THREE	
RESULTS	86
3.1 Yield of extracts and solvent fractions	86
3.2 Preliminary biological evaluation	88
3.2.1 Result of cytotoxic effect of LGSB on <i>Raniceps raninus</i>	88
3.2.2 Result of cytotoxic effect of LGRB on <i>Raniceps raninus</i>	90
3.2.3 Result of growth inhibition effect of LGSB extract	92
3.2.4 Result of growth inhibition effect of LGRB extract	94
3.3 Acute toxicity study	96
3.4.1 Cytotoxic effect of DCM fraction of methanol extract of LGSB	98
3.4.2 Cytotoxic effect of AQ fractions of methanol extract of LGSB	100
3.4.3 Growth inhibition effect of DCM fraction of methanol extract of LGSB	102
3.4.4 Growth inhibitory effect of the AQ fraction of methanol extract of LGSB	104

3.4.5 Growth inhibition effects of LGSB extract VLC bulked fractions on <i>Sorghum bicolor</i> radicles	106
3.5 Spectroscopic analysis of compound LO1	108
3.5.1 ¹ H-NMR [CDCl ₃ 600 MHz]	108
3.5.2: Correlated-spectroscopy (COSY)	110
3.5.3: Mass spectrometry (MS)	111
3.5.4: Melting point of LO1	112
3.5.5: The name and structure of LO1	114
3.5.6 Growth inhibition effects of LO1 on <i>Sorghum bicolor</i> radicles	116
3.6 Spectroscopic analysis of compound LO2	118
3.6.1 ¹ H-NMR [CDCL ₃ 500 MHz]	118
3.6.2: Correlated-spectroscopy (COSY)	120
3.6.3: Mass spectroscopy (MS)	121
3.6.4: Melting point of LO2	122
3.6.5: The name and structure of LO2	124
3.7 MTT assay result of the isolated compounds (Lupeol and β-sitosterol)	126
3.8.1 Effect of LGSB extract and lupeol on the weight of prostate gland of rat	128
3.8.2 Effect of LGSB extract and lupeol on the volume of rat prostate	130

3.8.3 Effect of LGSB extract and lupeol on the prostate index (PI) of rat	132
3.8.4 Effect of LGSB extract and lupeol on PSA of rat	134
3.8.5 Effect of LGSB extract and lupeol on testosterone level of rat	136
3.8.6 Effect of LGSB extract and lupeol on testosterone/ estradiol (T/E ₂) ratio of rat	138
3.9 Histopathology analysis result	140
3.9.1 Histopathology result of the normal group	141
3.9.2 Histopathology result of the 100 mg/kg group	143
3.9.3 Histopathology result of the 200 mg/Kg group	145
3.9.4 Histopathology result of the 400 mg/Kg group	147
3.9.5 Histopathology result of lupeol (5 mg/Kg) group	149
3.9.6 Histopathology result of the extract (200 mg/kg) + finasteride (5 mg/kg) group	151
3.9.7 Histopathology result of finasteride at 5 mg/kg group	153
3.9.8 Histopathology result of the BPH (negative control) group	155
CHAPTER FOUR	
Discussion	157
CHAPTER FIVE	
Conclusion	172
References	173
Appendices	203

LIST OF FIGURES

Page number

Figures 1.1: structures of some compounds isolated from medicinal plants used at various times to treat different disease conditions.	4
Figure 1.2: structures of some compounds isolated from medicinal plants used at various times to treat different disease conditions.	5
Figure 1.3: Structures of some compounds that can cause tumour or cancerous tumour	8
Figure 1.4: structures of some compounds with anti-BPH activity	27
Figure 1.5: The structure of usoric acid	29
Figures 1.6: Structures of some triterpene compounds with antitumour activity	32
Figures 1.7: Structures of some triterpene compounds with antitumour activity	36
Figures 1.8: Structures of some triterpene compounds with antitumour activity	37
Figure 1.9: Structures of some triterpene compounds with antitumour activity	38
Figures 1.10: a-c: Histopathological features showing PIN	42
Figure 1.13: Structure of some compounds used to treat prostate cancer	46
Figure 1.12: Structure of enzalutamide used to treat prostate cancer	43

Figures 1.13: Structures of some common drugs used to treat prostate cancer	46
Figures 1.14: Structures of some common drugs used to treat uterine cervical cancer	58
Figure 1.15 <i>Lonchocarpus griffonianus</i> in its natural habitat (Urueoffong/Oruko community)	61
Figure 2.1: Schematic representation of the partitioning of the LGSB extract and activity evaluation of the solvent fractions.	83
Figure 2.2: Schematic representation of VLC of the bioactive DCM fraction.	84
Figure 2.3: Schematic representation of GCC of the bioactive VLC bulked fraction “A”	85
Figure 3.1 Cytotoxic screening of LGSB on <i>Raniceps raninus</i> tadpole.	89
Figure 3.2 Cytotoxic screening of LGRB on <i>Raniceps raninus</i> tadpole	91
Figures 3.3: Growth inhibitory effect of the crude extract of LGSB on <i>Sorghum bicolor</i> radicle.	93
Figure 3.4: Growth inhibitory effect of the crude extract of LGRB on <i>Sorghum bicolor</i> radicle.	95
Figure 3.5: Cytotoxic effect of the dichloromethane (DCM) fraction of methanol extract of LGSB on <i>Raniceps raninus</i> tadpole	99
Figure 3.6: Result of cytotoxic effect of the aqueous fraction (AQ) of methanol extract of LGSB on <i>Raniceps raninus</i> tadpole.	100

Figure 3.7: Growth inhibition effects of the DCM fraction on <i>Sorghum bicolor</i> radicle.	103
Figure 3.8: Growth inhibitory effects of the Aqueous fraction (AQ) on <i>Sorghum bicolor</i> radicle.	105
Figure 3.9: Growth inhibitory effects of fraction “A” on <i>Sorghum bicolor</i> radicle.	107
Figure 3.10: The structure and name of LO1	115
Figure 3.11: Growth inhibition effect of LO1 on <i>Sorghum bicolor</i> radicle.	117
Figure 3.12: The structure and name of LO2	125
Figure 3.13: Effect of LGSB extract and compound lupeol on weight of rat prostate The values are expressed as mean±SEM.	132
Figure 3.14: Effect of LGSB extract and lupeol on the volume of rat prostate.	134
Figure 3.15: Effect of LGSB extract and lupeol on prostate index of rat.	136
Figure 3.16: Effect of LGSB extract and lupeol on PSA of rat.	139
Figure 3.17: Effect of LGSB extract and lupeol on testosterone level of rat.	141
Figure 3.18: Effect of LGSB extract and lupeol on T/E ₂ ratio of rat.	143
Figure 3.19: Photomicrograph of prostatic sections from the control group showing normal prostate gland histoarchitecture with regular size acini.	146
Figure 3.20: Photomicrograph of prostatic sections from 100 mg/kg dose of the extract treatment group showed a mild reduction in hyperplasia and hypertrophy.	148

Figure 3.21: Photomicrograph of prostatic sections of the 200 mg/kg dose treatment group showed a mild squamous metaplasia of the prostate gland.	150
Figure 3.22: Photomicrograph of prostate sections from 400 mg/kg dose of the extract treatment group showed marked reduction in hyperplasia and hypertrophy.	152
Figure 3.23: Photomicrograph of prostatic sections from the lupeol (5 mg/kg) treatment group shows marked reduction in hyperplasia and hypertrophy	154
Figure 3.24: Photomicrograph of the prostatic sections of the extract (200 mg/kg) + finasteride (5 mg/kg) group show an irregular acinar shape.	156
Figure 3.25: Photomicrograph of prostatic sections of the positive control group revealed mild squamous metaplasia of the prostate	158
Figure 3.26: Photomicrograph of prostatic sections from the untreated negative control group shows irregular acinar shape with papillary projection into the lumen.	160
Figure 4.1: The fragmentation pattern of lupeol	165
Figure 4.2: The fragmentation pattern of β -sitosterol	165

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Solvent system combination for column chromatography of fraction “A”	73
Table 2.2: Solvent system combination for column chromatography	74
Table 2.3: Solvent system combination for column chromatography	75
Table 2.4: Experimental design showing treatment groups and administration	79
Table 3.1: Percentage yield of extracts and solvent fractions	87
Table 3.2: Result of oral acute toxicity of LGSB extract	97
Table 3.3 ¹ H NMR (400 MHz) chemical shifts pattern of LO1	109
Table 3.4: Melting point of LO1	113
Table 3.5 ¹ H NMR (400 MHz) chemical shifts pattern of LO2	119
Table 3.6: Melting point of LO2	123
Table 3.7: Cytotoxic effect of compounds isolated from LGSB against human cancer cell lines	127

ABSTRACT

Rising incidences of benign and cancerous tumours, such as benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH) and prostate cancer, coupled with the unpleasant side effects of current therapy, suggest a need to search for new drug molecules. The stem bark of *Lonchocarpus griffonianus* G. Don (*Fabaceae*) is an important medicinal plant used in Nigeria to treat BPH and other tumour-related ailments. No pharmacological study on the use of the plant for treating BPH has been reported. This study aimed to investigate the protective effect of *L. griffonianus* (LG) on BPH.

Two organs (stem and root barks) of LG were identified, collected, pulverized and extracted with absolute methanol (99 %) using a Soxhlet extractor. Comparative preliminary biological evaluations were done on the *L. griffonianus* stem bark (LGSB) extract and root bark (LGRB) extracts using two benchtop assays (cytotoxic and antiproliferative). The acute toxicity of the LG stem bark extract was done using a modified Lorke's method. The extract was subjected to Vacuum Liquid Chromatography (VLC) and Gravity Column Chromatography (GCC) to obtain two isolated compounds, LO1 and LO2. The compounds were subjected to MS and 1D NMR analysis for identification. The isolated compounds (LO1 and LO2) were subjected to cytotoxic evaluation on human prostate (PC3) and uterine cervical cancer (Hela) cell lines using a 3-(4, 5-dimethyl thiazolyl-2)-2, 5-diphenyltetrazolium bromide (MTT) assay. Anti-BPH evaluation was done on the extract and LO1 using testosterone-induced BPH in the rat model. BPH was induced by the administration of testosterone propionate (4 mg/kg, s.c., in olive oil) for 28 days. LGSB extract (100, 200 and 400 mg/kg), LO1 (5 mg/kg), LGSB extract (200 mg/kg)+finasteride (5 mg/kg) and finasteride (5 mg/kg) were orally administered daily. On day 29, the rats were sacrificed under anaesthesia and blood was collected via the abdominal aorta. The collected blood was centrifuged, and the serum was separated. The serum was analyzed for biochemical parameters such as prostate-specific antigen (PSA), testosterone and estradiol. The prostate was harvested for histological examination. The wet weight and volume of the prostate were taken. The prostate index (PI) was calculated. All data were expressed as mean \pm SEM (standard error of the mean) and were compared using analysis of variance (ANOVA),

The result of preliminary evaluations indicated that the LGSB extract has a higher activity ($100 \pm 0.00\%$ mortality at 80 $\mu\text{g/mL}$) than the LGRB extract ($3.33 \pm 1.29\%$ at 80 $\mu\text{g/mL}$). Acute toxicity results revealed no mortality in both phases after oral administration with $\text{LD}_{50} > 5000$ mg/kg. LO1 and LO2 significantly inhibited the multiplication of PC3 and Hela cells *in vitro*.

The LGSB extract treatment significantly ($p < 0.0001$) reduced prostate weight, volume and prostate index in rats induced with testosterone. There was a significant ($p < 0.001$ and $p < 0.0001$) lowering of testosterone in the serum of the animals. The dose of 100 and 400 mg/kg body weight of the extract caused a 79.26% (0.28 ± 0.06) reduction in the testosterone concentration of rats serum. The Prostate-Specific Antigen (PSA) level in the serum was significantly ($p < 0.01$ and $p < 0.001$) reduced in comparison with the negative control. The dose of 400 mg/kg body weight of the extract caused a 70.28% (0.74 ± 0.18) reduction in the PSA of rats. There was no significant difference in the estradiol result obtained for the study. The histopathological presentation revealed that the extract ameliorated testosterone's effect on prostate histomorphology's architecture. The results of the study demonstrated that the crude extract and lupeol isolated from the extract attenuated rat prostate enlargement. Two bioactive phytosterols (LO1 and LO2) were characterized as lupeol and β -sitosterol and showed cytotoxic activity against human prostate and uterine cervical cancer cell lines. The ethnomedicinal usage of *L. griffonianus* for the treatment of BPH was validated by this study.