Journal of Dravyaguna and Bhaishajya Vigyan

P-ISSN: 3078-7769
E-ISSN: 3078-7777
JDBV 2025; 2(1): 09-11
www.dravyagunajournal.com
Received: 20-06-2025
Accepted: 23-07-2025

Dr. Verender Kumar
MD (Ayu.) Dravyaguna,
Ayurvedic Medical Officer,
AYUSH Arogya Kendra,
Jhunir, District Mansa,
Department of AYUSH,
Government of Punjab, India

Corresponding Author:
Dr. Verender Kumar
MD (Ayu.) Dravyaguna,
Ayurvedic Medical Officer,
AYUSH Arogya Kendra,
Jhunir, District Mansa,
Department of AYUSH,
Government of Punjab, India

Drug Identification in Ayurveda: From Classical Principles to Modern Pharmacognosy: A Review

Verender Kumar

DOI: https://www.doi.org/10.33545/dravyaguna.2025.v2.i2.A.17

Abstract
Accurate identification of medicinal drugs is foundational to the safety and efficacy of Ayurvedic therapeutics. Classical Indian texts (Charaka, Suśruta, Nighantu literature) emphasized knowledge of a drug's origin, season, habitat and organoleptic features, but short textual descriptions relied heavily on field training and oral traditions. Over centuries, lexicons and commentators (Bhāvaprakāsha, Bhaishajya Ratnavali) augmented these guidelines, while modern pharmacognosy has introduced objective morphological, microscopic and chemical analyses. Contemporary quality assurance integrates organoleptic and macroscopic examination with microscopy, physicochemical assays, chromatographic fingerprinting and molecular methods (DNA barcoding), together with Good Agricultural and Collection Practices (GACP). This review traces historical perspectives, summarizes classical and modern identification parameters, examines current analytical tools and regulatory frameworks, and highlights challenges—vernacular ambiguity, adulteration, and loss of habitat. Strengthening practitioner training, adopting orthogonal authentication strategies and enforcing GACP/GMP will improve raw-drug reliability and preserve traditional knowledge within evidence-based practice.

Keywords: Drug identification, Ayurveda, pharmacognosy, organoleptic, DNA barcoding, GACP

Introduction
Identification of crude drugs is an essential preliminary step before any medicinal use. In Ayurveda, precise knowledge of a drug's identity (nomenclature, morphology, habitat and properties) governs correct selection, appropriate dosage and therapeutic outcome. Classical authorities warned that mistaken identity may render a medicine ineffective or harmful; Charaka explicitly instructs examination of nature, quality, growth habitat, season and collection methods prior to administration [1]. Historically, short textual descriptions sufficed because pupils learned plants in situ under the tutelage of experienced teachers. Contemporary shifts in education, commercialization of raw materials and complex supply chains have made accurate identification more demanding, requiring scientific methods alongside traditional skills. This review synthesizes classical doctrines and modern pharmacognostic methods for drug identification, evaluates advances and limitations, and suggests practical measures to strengthen authenticity assurance for Ayurvedic raw drugs.

Review of Literature
Classical sources and traditional principles
Vedic literature contains scattered plant observations but lacks systematic drug-identification manuals; later classical treatises provide pragmatic guidance. Charaka highlights pre-administration scrutiny of a drug's origin, seasonality and processing because unfamiliar materials may act as toxins or weapons if misused [1]. Suśruta recommends consulting foresters, cowherds and experienced practitioners for accurate local identifications and documents morphological descriptions of several important plants and Soma varieties [2]. Lexicons (Nighantu texts, especially Bhāvaprakāsha and Bhaishajya Ratnavali) catalog synonyms, morphological cues and substitutes (pratinidhi dravya) for scarce species — an approach that prioritises therapeutic action (*karma*) when exact species are unavailable [3, 4].

Transition to organized descriptions

From the late 19th century, scholars such as Dymock and Chopra initiated scientific surveys of indigenous drugs, culminating in modern Dravyaguna texts that combine botanical morphology with Ayurvedic attributes [5]. The 20th century saw systematic pharmacognostic studies and the emergence of discipline-specific texts and curricula that formalised macroscopic and microscopic descriptors for crude drugs [6].

Modern analytical approaches

Contemporary pharmacognosy employs a layered (orthogonal) strategy — organoleptic and macroscopic assessment, microscopy, physicochemical tests, chromatographic fingerprinting (TLC/HPTLC/HPLC), spectroscopic profiling (UV-Vis, FTIR, NMR) and, more recently, DNA-based barcoding — to confirm botanical identity and detect adulteration [7–9]. WHO's GACP guidelines emphasize good collection and documentation practices to preserve identity from field to pharmacy [10].

Methodology

This narrative review synthesizes classical textual prescriptions (selected translations and secondary analyses) and contemporary scientific literature retrieved from PubMed, PubMed Central, Google Scholar and institutional publications up to 2025. Search terms included: "drug identification Ayurveda", "pharmacognosy organoleptic microscopy", "Bhavaprakasha drug identification", "GACP medicinal plants", and "DNA barcoding herbal authentication". Priority was given to sources that described identification parameters, classical verses with commentaries, and empirical papers illustrating modern authentication workflows. Thematic extraction focused on (a) classical identification criteria, (b) macroscopic/organoleptic parameters, (c) microscopic and physicochemical tests, (d) chromatographic/molecular methods, and (e) regulatory and practical challenges.

Results

Classical identification parameters

Classical authors recommended assessing provenance (desha), season (kala), habit (swabhava), organoleptic properties (rasa, gandha, sparsha), and correct plant part. Narahari Paṇḍita's seven principles (Rudhi, Swabhava, Desoktiya, Lanchana, Upama, Veeryena, Itarathva) formalize diverse mnemonic criteria used for reliable recognition [3]. Bhāvaprakāsha and Bhaishajya Ratnavali provide species-level markers and substitute lists (e.g., Ashtavarga substitutes) that reflect empirical knowledge of pharmacological similarity [4].

Macroscopic and organoleptic evaluation

Macroscopic features — shape, size, color (external/internal), markings (furrows, annulations), fracture type, and texture — remain first-line criteria. Organoleptic tests (taste, smell, tactile impressions) are descriptive and widely used in field screening. Classical examples include Haritaki fruit described as smooth, hard, round and heavy (sinking in water) — traits still used in field selection [3].

Microscopy and physicochemical analyses

Microscopy reveals diagnostic features: vessel patterns, medullary rays, starch grains, trichomes, stone cells and other cell types that uniquely identify species or plant parts. Physicochemical tests (ash values, extractive values, moisture, volatile oil content, refractive index) quantify quality parameters and detect adulteration or exhausted material.

Chromatography, spectroscopy and molecular tools

Chromatographic fingerprints (HPTLC/HPLC) establish chemical profiles and marker compounds; spectroscopic data provide additional chemotype fingerprints. DNA barcoding and PCR-based assays identify species even when morphology is lost (powders/exhausted drugs) and detect substitution or contamination, forming a robust complement to morphological methods [7,9].

Standards, practices and policies

WHO GACP and national pharmacopeial standards guide cultivation, collection, documentation, and testing protocols to maintain identity and traceability from source to finished product [10]. Indian institutions (CCRAS, PLIM, CSIR) and universities have developed pharmacopoeial monographs and reference standards to operationalise these guidelines.

Discussion

Strengths of combining traditional and modern methods

Classical experience provides ecological, phenological and organoleptic knowledge that is inexpensive and field-practical. Modern pharmacognostic and molecular techniques add objectivity, sensitivity and the ability to authenticate processed materials. The orthogonal approach — combining multiple complementary methods — reduces false identifications and uncovers adulteration that would escape any single technique [7, 9].

Persistent challenges

Several practical problems hinder accurate identification:

a) **Vernacular Synonymy and Homonymy:** many species share a local name, and a single species may be known by multiple names across regions.
b) **Adulteration and Substitution:** intentional or inadvertent substitution (including exhausted drugs or powdered fillers) complicates authentication.
c) **Loss of Habitat:** scarcity of genuine plant material forces use of substitutes.
d) **Limited Field Expertise:** commercialization has distanced collectors and traders from traditional taxonomic knowledge [3,11]. DNA methods can identify species in processed samples but require validated reference libraries and may not reflect chemotype or potency differences.

Regulatory and capacity issues: GACP and pharmacopeial monographs set standards but require enforcement, laboratory capacity, and traceability mechanisms throughout supply chains. Small-scale collectors and manufacturers often lack access to testing facilities; thus, field-deployable rapid assays and training programs are essential. Documentation and voucher specimen systems are practical steps that ensure reproducibility and legal traceability.

Recommendations

1. **Adopt orthogonal authentication:** combine organoleptic, microscopic, chemical and molecular assays as routine for high-risk or high-value drugs.

2. **Strengthen training:** incorporate field botany and pharmacognosy in Ayurvedic curricula to reconsolidate hands-on identification skills.
3. **Promote GACP and voucher systems:** ensure collectors record source data and deposit voucher specimens in recognized herbaria.
4. **Develop regional reference libraries:** build DNA barcode and chromatographic libraries for commonly used Ayurvedic species to support rapid authentication.
5. **Support decentralised testing:** invest in portable microscopy, thin-layer chromatography kits and simple molecular assays for regional quality hubs.

Conclusion

Drug identification in Ayurveda has progressed from concise classical prescriptions—reliant on apprenticeship in natural habitats—to a sophisticated, multidisciplinary practice that blends traditional observational skills with modern pharmacognostic, chromatographic and molecular methods. Each approach contributes unique strengths: classical knowledge directs practical field assessment and substitution logic, while modern science supplies objectivity and capacity to test processed or powdered materials. To ensure safety, efficacy and preservation of traditional pharmacopeia, an integrated framework—training, GACP adherence, orthogonal testing and accessible reference databases—is required. Only through combining the best of classical insight and contemporary technology can the authenticity and therapeutic integrity of Ayurvedic crude drugs be reliably maintained.

References

1. Ayurlog. Ayurvedic drug standardization [Internet]. 2015 [cited 2025 Jan 30]. Available from: https://www.ayurlog.com/Archive/april_june/issue_2015/2015030304.pdf
2. Rare Book Society of India. *Sushruta Samhita: English translation* [Internet]. n.d. [cited 2025 Jan 30]. Available from: https://rarebooksocietyofindia.org/book_archive/Sushruta%20Samhita%201.pdf
3. Bhavamishra. *Bhavaprakasha Nighantu (Haritakyadi Varga)*. Various editions.
4. Kunte SV. Review of dravyas from Bhavaprakasha Nighantu. *AIRJATA J* [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2025 Jan 30]. Available from: https://airjata.org/index.php/airjata/article/download/146/66/428
5. Dymock W, Warden C, Hooper D. *The book of Indian plants*. 1881.
6. Sarker SD, van Staden J. Pharmacognosy in modern pharmacy curricula. *Pharmacogn Rev*. 2012;6(12):1–8. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3371443/
7. Narayana SKK, *et al*. Integrating macro-microscopy, DNA barcoding and HPTLC for quality assessment of berberine-containing botanicals. *J Herb Anal* [Internet]. 2025 [cited 2025 Jan 30]. Available from: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12540061/
8. Muyumba NW, *et al*. Quality control of herbal drugs and preparations: Methods and challenges. *Trends Herb Qual*. 2021;4(2):101–19. doi:10.1016/j.thq.2021.04.003
9. Nazar N, *et al*. Integrating DNA barcoding within an orthogonal approach for plant authentication. *Phytochem Anal*. 2025. doi:10.1002/pca.3466
10. World Health Organization. *WHO guidelines on good agricultural and collection practices (GACP) for medicinal plants* [Internet]. Geneva: WHO Press; 2003 [cited 2025 Jan 30]. Available from: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9241546271
11. Bhavana KR. Medical geography in Charaka Samhita. *J Ayurveda*. 2014;5(2). Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4492020/