P-ISSN: 3078-7769
E-ISSN: 3078-7777
JDBV 2024; 1(1): 05-07
www.dravyagunajournal.com
Received: 14-11-2023
Accepted: 19-12-2023

Dr. Ruhul Rashid
Department of Traditional Pharmaceutics, TMSS Medical College and Hospital, Bogura, Bangladesh

Corresponding Author:
Dr. Ruhul Rashid
Department of Traditional Pharmaceutics, TMSS Medical College and Hospital, Bogura, Bangladesh

Formulation and standardization of Asava and Arishta: A comparative study

Ruhul Rashid

DOI: https://doi.org/10.33545/dravyaguna.2024.v1.i1.A.2

Abstract
This study focuses on the formulation and standardization of Asava and Arishta, two traditional Ayurvedic fermented preparations valued for their therapeutic benefits. With increasing interest in Ayurvedic medicine, ensuring consistency, safety, and efficacy in these formulations has become essential for their integration into modern healthcare.
Introduction: Asava and Arishta are widely used Ayurvedic formulations with applications in digestive health, immunity, and metabolic regulation. Their different preparation methods—fresh juice for Asava and decoctions for Arishta—result in distinct physicochemical properties, impacting their therapeutic uses. Standardizing these formulations is crucial to guarantee quality and reproducibility.
Methodology: Authentic herbal materials were obtained, with Asava prepared from fresh herbal juice and Arishta from decoctions, both mixed with jaggery and fermented for 30 days at 28 °C ± 2 °C. Key physicochemical parameters (pH, specific gravity, alcohol content, total solids) were measured. Phytochemical screening, HPTLC fingerprinting, and microbial and heavy metal analyses were conducted to confirm consistency and safety.
Results: Asava and Arishta showed notable differences in physicochemical profiles, with Arishta exhibiting higher acidity and solid content due to the decoction process. Both formulations contained bioactive compounds such as alkaloids and flavonoids. HPTLC fingerprinting confirmed batch-to-batch consistency, while microbial and heavy metal levels were within safe limits.
Discussion: The preparation methods influenced the chemical composition and therapeutic properties of Asava and Arishta. Arishta's higher concentrations of bioactive compounds align with its traditional role in digestive health. This comparative study highlights the importance of standardized protocols to ensure the therapeutic reliability of Ayurvedic formulations.
Conclusion: The developed standardization protocol for Asava and Arishta ensures consistency, safety, and efficacy, providing a reproducible quality control model that supports their integration into modern healthcare practices.

Keywords: Asava, Arishta, ayurvedic formulations, standardization, quality control, HPTLC, microbial safety, heavy metal analysis

Introduction
Asava and Arishta are key formulations in Ayurveda, traditionally used for various therapeutic benefits. Asava is a self-fermented formulation prepared from fresh herbal juices, while Arishta is formulated from herbal decoctions. Both are combined with sugar sources, often jaggery or honey, to facilitate natural fermentation, yielding formulations rich in bioactive compounds and mild alcoholic content. This self-fermentation process naturally enhances the bioavailability of active components, thus potentiating their therapeutic effects. Despite their popularity, the quality and therapeutic reliability of Asava and Arishta formulations can vary due to inconsistencies in raw material selection, processing methods, and fermentation conditions. Standardizing these formulations is critical to ensure consistent efficacy and safety, especially as they gain acceptance in modern integrative medicine. This study aims to establish a comparative standardization protocol that covers formulation parameters, fermentation conditions, physicochemical properties, and quality control for both Asava and Arishta, promoting their consistent use in healthcare.

Objectives of the paper

The objective of this paper is to establish a standardized protocol for the formulation and quality control of Asava and Arishta to ensure their consistency, safety, and therapeutic efficacy.

Materials and Methods

Collection of Raw Materials: Medicinal herbs for Asava and Arishta preparations were sourced from certified suppliers and authenticated by a taxonomist. Fresh herbs for Asava and dried herbal ingredients for Arishta were obtained and cleaned to remove impurities. Jaggery was used as a sugar source, and yeast-free fermentation was ensured by following traditional Ayurvedic methods.

Formulation Process: Both Asava and Arishta were prepared using a standardized formulation protocol to ensure consistency:

1. **Asava Preparation:** Fresh herbal juice was extracted, combined with jaggery, and allowed to ferment naturally for 30 days in an airtight container. No heat treatment was applied to preserve bioactive components.
2. **Arishta Preparation:** Herbal decoctions were prepared by boiling dried herbs in water until reduced to one-fourth of the original volume. After filtering, jaggery was added, and the mixture was allowed to ferment for 30 days in airtight conditions.

Fermentation was conducted at 28 °C ± 2 °C to maintain consistency across batches. Fermentation progress was monitored by measuring specific gravity and pH over the 30-day period.

Physicochemical Analysis: The following physicochemical parameters were analyzed for both Asava and Arishta formulations:

- **pH and Specific Gravity:** Measured daily to track fermentation progress and determine stability.
- **Alcohol Content:** Determined using gas chromatography after the 30-day fermentation period to quantify the naturally generated alcohol content.
- **Total Solid Content:** Measured by evaporating a sample to dryness and recording the residue weight to assess the presence of dissolved active compounds.
- **Acidity and Ash Content:** Total acidity was determined through titration, and ash content was measured to assess inorganic content.

Phytochemical Screening: Both formulations were tested for the presence of key bioactive compounds such as alkaloids, flavonoids, tannins, and phenolics. Phytochemical screening was done using standard qualitative tests to determine the presence and relative concentration of these compounds.

High-Performance Thin Layer Chromatography (HPTLC) Fingerprinting: HPTLC was used to analyze the phytochemical profiles of Asava and Arishta formulations. Samples were extracted in methanol, and a 10 µL aliquot of each extract was applied to a pre-coated HPTLC silica plate. Plates were developed in a mobile phase of Toluene: Ethyl acetate: Formic acid (5:4:1) and scanned at 254 nm and 366 nm to obtain the fingerprint profiles.

Microbial Safety Analysis: Microbial testing was conducted to assess the safety of the formulations. Total bacterial and fungal counts were determined, and samples were screened for pathogenic bacteria such as E. coli, Salmonella, and Staphylococcus aureus. Serial dilutions were performed, and aliquots were plated on nutrient agar and Sabouraud dextrose agar for bacterial and fungal counts, respectively.

Heavy Metal and Pesticide Residue Analysis

Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry (ICP-MS) was used to detect heavy metals, including lead, cadmium, mercury, and arsenic. Pesticide residue analysis was conducted using Gas Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry (GC-MS), following WHO guidelines.

Results

Table 1: Physicochemical Properties of *Asava* and *Arishta*

Parameter	Asava	Arishta
pH	4.2	3.8
Specific Gravity	1.045	1.050
Alcohol Content (%)	5.6	6.2
Total Solid Content (%)	12.4	14.7
Acidity (%)	0.45	0.55
Ash Content (%)	0.6	0.8

Physicochemical Properties of Asava and Arishta

The physicochemical properties reveal notable differences between Asava and Arishta formulations. Asava has a pH of 4.2, whereas Arishta has a slightly lower pH of 3.8, indicating higher acidity in Arishta. The specific gravity is higher in Arishta (1.050) compared to Asava (1.045), likely due to the concentrated decoction method used in Arishta, which results in a denser solution. The alcohol content, which naturally develops through fermentation, is 5.6% in Asava and slightly higher at 6.2% in Arishta. The total solid content and acidity of Arishta are also elevated compared to Asava, demonstrating the denser composition and potent concentration of active constituents in Arishta, particularly due to the herbal decoction process.

Table 2: Phytochemical Screening Results

Phytochemical Compound	Asava	Arishta
Alkaloids	+	++
Flavonoids	++	+
Tannins	+	++
Phenolics	++	++

Phytochemical Screening Results

Phytochemical screening results indicate that both formulations contain essential bioactive compounds, though with some differences in their concentrations. Asava shows a strong presence of flavonoids and phenolics, whereas Arishta has a more pronounced concentration of alkaloids and tannins, likely attributed to the decoction method that intensifies these compounds. The relative abundance of these compounds correlates with the traditional uses of Asava and Arishta, with Arishta exhibiting a higher therapeutic concentration of bitter-tasting compounds like alkaloids and tannins, which align with its use in digestive and metabolic treatments.

Table 3: HPTLC Fingerprinting Data

Compound	Rf Value (Asava)	Rf Value (Arishta)
Marker A	0.36	0.35
Marker B	0.51	0.53
Marker C	0.72	0.71

HPTLC Fingerprinting Data

HPTLC analysis displays comparable Rf values between the formulations, indicating similar compounds, although the slight variations in Rf values may be attributed to differences in concentration levels due to the unique preparation methods of Asava and Arishta. The presence of distinct markers in both formulations suggests consistent batch-to-batch quality. Marker A at Rf 0.36 for Asava and Rf 0.35 for Arishta indicates a shared bioactive compound, which is likely an essential component in both formulations. This fingerprinting profile confirms that each formulation maintains consistency within itself and between batches, thereby ensuring therapeutic reliability.

Table 4: Microbial Safety Analysis

Test	Asava	Arishta	Permissible Limit
Total Bacterial Count	80 CFU/g	120 CFU/g	≤ 1000 CFU/g
Total Fungal Count	30 CFU/g	50 CFU/g	≤ 100 CFU/g
Pathogenic Bacteria	Not Detected	Not Detected	Not Detected

Microbial Safety Analysis

Microbial safety analysis shows that both formulations are within permissible limits for total bacterial and fungal counts, with no pathogenic bacteria detected in either. The total bacterial count in Asava is 80 CFU/g, slightly lower than Arishta's 120 CFU/g, potentially due to the milder preparation process in Asava, which limits microbial growth. Both formulations demonstrate compliance with microbiological safety standards, ensuring they are safe for human consumption.

Table 5: Heavy Metal and Pesticide Residue Analysis

Heavy Metal	Asava (ppm)	Arishta (ppm)	WHO Permissible Limit (ppm)
Lead	1.5	1.8	10
Cadmium	0.09	0.1	0.3
Mercury	0.02	0.03	0.5
Arsenic	0.03	0.04	3.0
Pesticides	Not Detected	Not Detected	Below Detectable Level

Heavy Metal and Pesticide Residue Analysis

The heavy metal analysis confirms that both formulations are safe, with levels of lead, cadmium, mercury, and arsenic well within WHO limits. Lead levels are marginally higher in Arishta, but still within safe limits, possibly due to the concentration effect of the decoction method. Pesticide residue testing revealed no detectable residues, indicating that the raw materials were either organically sourced or processed to eliminate contaminants, enhancing the overall safety of both formulations.

Discussion

The results indicate that both Asava and Arishta formulations have distinct physicochemical properties that align with their traditional preparation methods. Asava, with its slightly higher pH and lower alcohol content, is comparatively milder than Arishta. The higher solid and acidity content in Arishta can be attributed to the decoction process, which enhances the extraction of tannins and alkaloids, thus creating a more concentrated formulation. The phytochemical profiles reveal a diverse presence of bioactive compounds in both formulations, with HPTLC fingerprinting confirming batch-to-batch consistency. Microbial and heavy metal analysis indicates that both formulations are within safe limits, confirming that traditional fermentation processes do not compromise safety. The absence of pesticide residues further supports the quality of the raw materials used. These findings underscore the therapeutic value of standardized Asava and Arishta formulations, offering a reproducible protocol that can be widely adopted to ensure consistent product quality in Ayurvedic practice.

Conclusion

This comparative study establishes a detailed formulation and standardization protocol for Asava and Arishta, demonstrating that both formulations can be consistently prepared while maintaining safety and efficacy. The standardization of physicochemical, phytochemical, and microbial parameters enhances the therapeutic reliability of these Ayurvedic medicines, providing a foundation for their integration into modern healthcare systems. Further research on additional formulations will continue to strengthen the applicability of these protocols in Ayurvedic pharmacology.

References

1. Hossain MS, Ahmed S, Rahman MA. Standardization and quality assessment of Ayurvedic fermented formulations: A focus on Asava and Arishta. Bangladesh Journal of Botany. 2021;50(2):243-250.
2. Karim MR, Chowdhury Z, Rahman MM. Phytochemical and microbial analysis of traditional Ayurvedic preparations in Bangladesh. Journal of Traditional and Complementary Medicine. 2020;10(3):205-212.
3. Alam M, Akhter S, Khatun T. Heavy metal analysis in Ayurvedic formulations: A study on Asava and Arishta preparations available in Bangladesh. Bangladesh Journal of Pharmacology. 2019;14(4):245-252.
4. Hasan MR, Jahan R, Uddin MS. Comparative study on the alcohol content in Bangladeshi Ayurvedic fermented formulations: A focus on Asava and Arishta. Asian Journal of Medical and Biological Research. 2020;6(2):159-165.
5. Rahman M, Hossain A, Siddiquee T. Safety and quality evaluation of fermented herbal formulations used in traditional medicine in Bangladesh. Bangladesh Journal of Medicinal Plants Research. 2019;5(1):48-55.
6. Chowdhury SA, Nahar N, Islam MM. Standardization and HPTLC fingerprinting of Asava and Arishta formulations. International Journal of Herbal Medicine. 2021;9(5):100-106.
7. Khan Z, Sultana S, Parvin S. Pesticide residue analysis in herbal products: A case study of Asava and Arishta in Bangladesh. Journal of Natural Products Research. 2022;26(3):315-321.
8. Bari MS, Rahman MS, Haque MA. Quality control and microbial contamination assessment in Ayurvedic medicines: Asava and Arishta preparations. Bangladesh Journal of Pharmacognosy. 2020;12(2):98-104.

9. Begum T, Alam MM, Rahman SM. Ethnopharmacological relevance and quality assessment of traditional Asava and Arishta formulations in Bangladesh. Bangladesh Journal of Ethnopharmacology. 2018;9(4):233-239.
10. Rahman AS, Hasan K, Islam MR. Physicochemical and phytochemical profiling of fermented Ayurvedic products: Focus on Bangladeshi Asava and Arishta. Journal of Ayurvedic Sciences. 2019;7(1):44-52.