

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF AYURVEDA360



**AYURVEDA
360**

**PEER-REVIEWED
BIMONTHLY JOURNAL**



| www.ayurveda360.in/journal

ISSN

PRINT:

3048-7382

ONLINE:

3048-7390

2026

VOLUME 2

ISSUE 4

JANUARY-

FEBRUARY

Aptopadesha Pramana in Ayurveda A Critical Review of Its Epistemological Role and Relevance to Evidence-Based Medicine

Dr. Harshilkumar H. Patel¹, Dr. Neeti R. Mistry², Dr. Ajitsinh K. Gohil³

¹ Third Year Post Graduate Scholar, Department of PG Samhita and Siddhanta, Government Akhandanand Ayurveda College, Ahmedabad. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-6530-8003>

² First Year Post Graduate Scholar, Department of PG Samhita and Siddhanta, Government Akhandanand Ayurveda College, Ahmedabad. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-8576-3852>

³ Assistant Professor, Department of PG Samhita and Siddhanta, Government Akhandanand Ayurveda College, Ahmedabad. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-2030-1786>

Abstract

Introduction: Āptopadeśa Pramāṇa, or authoritative testimony, is recognized in Āyurveda as one of the four valid means of knowledge (Pramāṇa), alongside Pratyakṣa (direct perception), Anumāna (inference), and Yukti (rational application). It serves as a foundational epistemic tool, particularly in contexts where empirical observation is limited.

Methods: This study adopts a critical narrative review approach. Classical Āyurvedic sources, primarily the Tīstrāiṣaṇīya Adhyāya of the Caraka Saṃhitā (Sūtrasthāna XI), along with Cakrapāṇi's Āyurvedadīpikā commentary, were examined to analyze the conceptual basis, defining characteristics, and scope of Āptopadeśa. Relevant contemporary discussions on epistemology and evidence-based medicine were also reviewed for comparative analysis.

Results: Āptopadeśa is described as reliable knowledge derived from an Āpta—an authoritative individual free from bias, ignorance, and personal motives. It is considered particularly important for understanding phenomena beyond direct sensory perception, including metaphysical and causative principles. The analysis indicates that Āptopadeśa functions not as blind acceptance of tradition but as a structured and ethically grounded epistemic process integrated with Pratyakṣa, Anumāna, and Yukti in clinical practice.

Discussion: In modern healthcare contexts, Āptopadeśa may be interpreted as a form of validated expert consensus or classical textual authority that complements empirical evidence. It holds relevance in complex, chronic, and psychosomatic conditions where purely reductionist models may be insufficient. By positioning Āptopadeśa within a rational and integrative framework, Āyurveda demonstrates a pluralistic and sophisticated epistemology that can meaningfully contribute to contemporary evidence-based discourse.

Keywords: Āptopadeśa; Pramāṇa; Epistemology; Caraka Saṃhitā; Evidence-Based Medicine; Āyurveda.

Access this article online

Quick Response Code: 	Website: www.ayurveda360.in/journal
	International Journal of Ayurveda360
	E-ISSN: 3048-7390 Print ISSN: 3048-7382
	Volume 2 Issue 4 : January-February 2026
DOI: https://doi.org/10.63247/3048-7390.vol.2.issue4.5	

Address for Correspondence:

Dr. Harshilkumar H. Patel, Third Year Post Graduate Scholar, Department of PG Samhita and Siddhanta, Government Akhandanand Ayurveda College, Ahmedabad, Email ID: hp8981450@gmail.com

How to cite this article:

Patel HH, Mistry NR, Gohil AK. Aptopadeśa Pramāṇa in Āyurveda: A critical review of its epistemological role and relevance to evidence-based medicine. Int J Ayurveda360. 2026;2(4):1026-1039. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.63247/3048-7390.vol.2.issue4.5>

Manuscript Received	Review Round 1	Review Round 2	Review Round 3	Final Updated Received
27/12/2025	01/01/2026	08/01/2026	17/01/2026	27/01/2026
Accepted	Published	Conflict of Interest	Funding	Similarity Check
01/02/2026	15/02/2026	NIL	NIL	< 1 %

Licensing and Distribution

This work is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0)**. You are free to **share, copy, redistribute, remix, transform, and build upon this work for any purpose, even commercially**, provided that appropriate credit is given to the original author(s) and source, a link to the license is provided, and any changes made are indicated.

License link: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

			
This journal is published under the tradename Ayurveda360 (Publications), registered under UDYAM-KR-27-0044910			

Introduction

Āyurveda articulates its epistemological foundations through the teachings of ancient Ṛṣis as preserved in the classical Saṃhitā texts [1]. The system is grounded in the concept of Pramāṇa, the recognized means of acquiring valid and reliable knowledge [2]. These epistemic tools enable physicians to evaluate both observable phenomena and domains that extend beyond direct sensory perception. Caraka emphasizes that understanding the process of knowledge acquisition is essential for interpreting life, disease, therapeutics, and the broader aims of human existence [3]. Within this framework, Āptopadeśa—authoritative testimony—is identified as a primary source of valid knowledge, transmitted by individuals whose cognition is considered free from bias, attachment, and ignorance [4].

This review situates Āptopadeśa within the broader structure of Āyurvedic epistemology, highlighting its relevance to both theoretical inquiry and clinical reasoning. In contemporary practice, its interpretative value becomes particularly significant in contexts where empirical observation alone may be insufficient. For example, in chronic and psychosomatic conditions, clinicians may rely on classical textual guidance to interpret subjective experiences and

contextual determinants of disease. In such cases, authoritative testimony functions not as unquestioned tradition but as a structured interpretative framework that informs rational clinical judgment.

Despite its centrality within classical epistemology, Āptopadeśa is often viewed within modern evidence hierarchies as non-empirical and therefore secondary to experimental validation. This perception has contributed to its marginalization in academic discourse. However, classical sources present Āptopadeśa not as dogmatic authority but as an ethically grounded and critically examinable source of knowledge. Contemporary scholarship increasingly argues that students and practitioners should be trained to evaluate authoritative testimony systematically, thereby integrating classical knowledge with modern clinical reasoning. Such an approach positions Āptopadeśa as complementary to empirical methods rather than contradictory to them.

Objectives

1. To critically examine the conceptual foundation of Āptopadeśa Pramāṇa as described in the Tistraishaniya Adhyāya of Caraka Saṃhitā (Sūtrasthāna 11).
2. To analyze the defining characteristics of an Āpta based

on classical descriptions and Cakrapāṇi's Āyurvedadīpikā commentary.

3. To evaluate the epistemological validity of Āptopadeśa within the broader framework of the four Pramāṇas.
4. To explore its relevance to contemporary clinical reasoning and evidence-based medicine.

Materials and Methods

This study is designed as a narrative critical review based on classical textual analysis and contemporary interpretative scholarship.

Primary Sources:

The principal reference text for this review is Caraka Saṃhitā, particularly the Tistraishanīya Adhyāya (Sūtrasthāna 11), where Āptopadeśa is discussed as a method of examination (Parīkṣā). Cakrapāṇi Datta's Āyurvedadīpikā commentary was consulted to understand the defining attributes of an Āpta and the epistemic justification of authoritative testimony.

Secondary Sources:

Published scholarly articles, textbooks on Āyurvedic epistemology, and literature discussing evidence-based medicine were reviewed to contextualize the concept within contemporary academic discourse.

Method of Analysis:

A thematic analytical approach was adopted. Relevant Sanskrit passages were examined in their original context and interpreted through classical commentaries. Concepts were then compared with contemporary philosophical and clinical perspectives on evidence and authority in medicine. The analysis focused on identifying points of convergence and divergence between classical epistemology and modern evidence hierarchies.

This integrative methodological framework enables a systematic reinterpretation of Āptopadeśa as a rational epistemic tool rather than a purely traditional or faith-based construct.

Classical Background

In the Tistreṣaṇīya Adhyāya (Sūtrasthāna XI) of the Caraka Saṃhitā, three fundamental human pursuits are described: prāṇeṣaṇā (the desire for life), dhaneṣaṇā (the desire for wealth), and paralokeṣaṇā (the desire for the afterlife). These are not presented merely as existential inclinations but as epistemological concerns requiring systematic inquiry. The chapter extends beyond therapeutic instruction and situates medical knowledge within broader philosophical reflections on life, morality, and post-mortem continuity [5]. In Sūtrasthāna XI, these three eṣaṇās are discussed within the framework of

the nirdeśa catuṣka, highlighting their doctrinal importance [6].

The question of rebirth (punarbhava) generates epistemic tension. Divergent viewpoints are acknowledged: some attribute the origin of life to parental factors, others to inherent nature (svabhāva), karma, or time (kāla). Skeptics privilege only direct perception, whereas others accept scriptural testimony as valid knowledge. This plurality of perspectives establishes the need for a structured method of examination.

To address such uncertainty, Caraka proposes a fourfold epistemological framework [7]: “Everything that exists, whether manifest or unmanifest, is of two kinds—existent and non-existent. Its examination is fourfold: authoritative testimony, direct perception, inference, and rational synthesis.” This formulation establishes a pluralistic theory of knowledge. Reality is not confined to what is perceptible; rather, it encompasses domains accessible through disciplined testimony and reasoned interpretation. By placing āptopadeśa alongside pratyakṣa, anumāna, and yukti, Caraka avoids both uncritical reliance on scriptural authority and reductive empiricism. Instead, he articulates an integrative epistemic structure in which different pramāṇas operate complementarily.

Cakrapāṇidatta’s Āyurvedadīpikā commentary elaborates on this framework. He interprets “sarvam” as including both sat (existent entities) and asat (non-existent entities), and defines parīkṣā as the process of determining the true nature of an object through valid means of knowledge. He further describes the qualifications of an āpta [8].

Those who, through discipline and knowledge, are free from the cognitive disturbances of rajas and tamas, and whose understanding remains clear and unobstructed across past, present, and future, are regarded as āpta, śiṣṭa, and vibuddha. Their statements are considered reliable because they are not compromised by passion, ignorance, or bias.

Cakrapāṇi emphasizes that epistemic authority is grounded in cognitive clarity and ethical integrity. Freedom from attachment, aversion, and delusion removes the primary causes of falsehood. An alternative reading—nirajastamaso mṛṣā na bhavati—reinforces the idea that those untainted by rajas and tamas do not speak untruth.

Exemplars such as Brahmā are cited as paradigmatic authorities [9]. However, in practical human terms, authoritativeness depends upon accurate knowledge combined with detachment from personal motive or prejudice [10].

Thus, āptopadeśa is not mere scriptural assertion but a theory of trustworthy testimony rooted in ethical and cognitive qualification. Within the pramāṇa system, the verbal testimony of such an āpta becomes a valid and independent means of knowledge.

This classical construct continues to hold interpretative significance. Foundational concepts of Ayurveda—

such as doṣa, dhātu, mala, agni, and srotas—originate within authoritative textual transmission and are subsequently examined through perception, inference, and rational clinical application. In this sense, āptopadeśa functions as a hypothesis-generating and norm-setting epistemic source rather than as a substitute for empirical validation.

Table 1. Classical Epistemology and Modern Evidence-Based Medicine: A Comparative Perspective

Aspect	Āptopadeśa	Modern Evidence-Based Medicine (EBM)
Knowledge Origin	Authoritative testimony grounded in cognitive clarity and ethical integrity	Empirical observation and experimental investigation
Epistemic Role	Hypothesis generation and conceptual foundation	Hypothesis testing and validation
Ethical Framework	Intrinsic to the authority (moral and cognitive qualification of the āpta)	Regulated through institutional mechanisms (IRB approval, ethics committees, professional codes)

Table 2. Functional Role of Āptopadeśa Across Clinical, Research, and Ethical Domains

Domain	Function of Āptopadeśa	Mode of Validation
Clinical Practice	Diagnostic orientation and interpretative guidance	Correlation with observation (pratyakṣa) and inference (anumāna)
Research	Source of foundational constructs and hypotheses	Experimental studies and clinical trials
Medical Ethics	Guidance on physician conduct and patient responsibility	Professional codes and regulatory standards

Importance of Āptopadeśa Pramāṇa in Establishing Metaphysical and Ethical Foundations

Within the epistemological framework of Ayurveda, knowledge is

examined through a fourfold methodology consisting of Āptopadeśa (authoritative testimony), Pratyakṣa (perception), Anumāna (inference), and Yukti (reasoned synthesis) [11]. This integrated approach is presented as

sufficient for evaluating both empirical and non-empirical realities. While perceptual and inferential tools address observable phenomena, certain metaphysical doctrines—most notably rebirth (punarbhava)—are established primarily through Āptopadeśa [12].

The acceptance of rebirth is not treated as speculative theology but as a doctrinal conclusion grounded in authoritative cognition. In the classical Ayurvedic model, scriptural testimony does not function independently of reason; rather, it operates in harmony with perception and inference. However, when addressing supra-sensory realities beyond empirical verification, Āptopadeśa assumes epistemic primacy [12].

This metaphysical position directly informs Ayurvedic ethical praxis. The doctrine of karma and rebirth shapes physician conduct, therapeutic intention, and patient counseling. Recognition of karmic continuity encourages responsibility toward present actions and future consequences, thereby integrating moral accountability into clinical engagement [12]. Thus, Āptopadeśa functions not only as a metaphysical validator but also as a guide for ethical medical practice.

Cakrapāṇi's Interpretation in Āyurvedadīpikā

In his commentary, Cakrapāṇi clarifies that the classical author formally concludes the enumeration of valid means of knowledge by affirming rebirth as established through recognized pramāṇas [13]. Importantly, the tradition does not dismiss auxiliary logical tools such as arthāpatti (postulation) or asambhava (impossibility), but it emphasizes those epistemic instruments that are canonically accepted within Ayurveda for reaching definitive conclusions [13].

Cakrapāṇi further elaborates that the testimony of an āpta is rooted in the Vedic corpus and in texts aligned with Vedic principles—composed by competent scholars, accepted by learned communities, and directed toward the welfare of humanity [14]. Thus, Āptāgama encompasses not only the four Vedas but also auxiliary disciplines such as grammar, astrology, and Ayurveda itself, provided they remain non-contradictory to foundational revelation.

From these authoritative sources emerge ethical imperatives—truthfulness, non-violence, austerity, disciplined conduct, and self-restraint—which are presented as causes of both worldly flourishing (abhyudaya) and ultimate liberation (niḥśreyasa) [14]. The doctrine of rebirth therefore acquires both epistemic legitimacy and moral significance through Āptopadeśa [15].

Psychological Purification and Liberation

Classical thought further maintains that liberation from rebirth is contingent upon the attenuation of mental impurities, specifically rajas and tamas [16]. Individuals whose cognition remains clouded by these qualities are described as unfit for transcendence, whereas those who cultivate sattva—clarity and equilibrium—are eligible for liberation as affirmed by scriptural authority [16].

Cakrapāṇi explains that scriptural injunctions concerning liberation apply specifically to individuals who have subdued psychological disturbances; the absence of such purification precludes the attainment of mokṣa [16]. Thus, epistemology, psychology, and soteriology converge within the framework of Āptopadeśa.

Authority of the Sages and Transcendental Cognition

The tradition further attributes the doctrine of rebirth to ancient sages characterized by ethical discipline, detachment from fear, attachment, aversion, greed, and delusion, and mastery over spiritual knowledge and karmic principles [17]. These seers are described as possessing refined cognition unimpeded by psychological defects and as having directly apprehended

transcendental realities through higher states of awareness [18].

Cakrapāṇi underscores that such testimony derives from individuals whose intellects are purified and whose experiential knowledge transcends ordinary sensory limitations [18]. Their declarations therefore qualify as Āptopadeśa—authoritative not merely by tradition but by virtue of cognitive integrity and experiential realization.

Discussion

Within the fourfold framework of Parīkṣā described by Caraka, Āptopadeśa assumes methodological precedence when inquiry extends beyond the domain of sensory or inferential verification [19]. While Pratyakṣa and Anumāna operate effectively within observable and logically deducible realities, metaphysical constructs such as rebirth and karmic continuity require an epistemic instrument capable of transcending empirical limitation [20]. In this respect, Āptopadeśa is positioned not as an alternative to rationality, but as a complementary mode of validated knowledge within the Ayurvedic pramāṇa system.

The epistemological architecture articulated in the Caraka Saṃhitā demonstrates functional differentiation among the pramāṇas. Pratyakṣa provides observational grounding; Anumāna supports inferential reasoning and

theoretical formulation; Yukti integrates principles for clinical application; and Āptopadeśa extends cognition into domains inaccessible to direct perception [21]. This structured pluralism reflects a deliberate intellectual synthesis rather than a hierarchical exclusion of methods. Scriptural authority is therefore embedded within a broader rational matrix, ensuring coherence between textual tradition and experiential reasoning [22].

The present review advances the interpretation that Āptopadeśa serves not merely as preservation of inherited doctrine but as an epistemic bridge between metaphysical thought and contemporary Ayurvedic scholarship [23]. By systematically examining the qualities attributed to the Āpta—freedom from cognitive bias, ethical integrity, clarity of understanding, and experiential realization—the discussion situates classical authority within a framework analogous to modern expectations of intellectual accountability [24]. Such alignment underscores the continuing relevance of pramāṇa theory in academic and clinical discourse.

In applied settings, this integrative model enables practitioners to draw upon authoritative textual insight while engaging empirical assessment and rational planning. For instance, in managing complex

psychosomatic presentations, classical formulations may inform constitutional understanding, whereas observation and inference guide individualized therapeutic strategy [25]. Āptopadeśa in this sense functions as a conceptual compass rather than a substitute for empirical method.

Philosophically, the debate surrounding rebirth reflects broader tensions between materialist skepticism and scriptural affirmation. Caraka's resolution rests on the epistemic credibility of the Āpta—individuals whose cognition is described as free from distortion. Cakrapāṇi's exposition in the Āyurvedadīpikā further refines this construct, emphasizing that authoritative testimony derives its validity from moral discipline, psychological purification, and experiential insight rather than dogmatic assertion [26]. Thus, Āptopadeśa emerges as a structured and ethically grounded epistemic category.

Conclusion

In Caraka Saṃhitā Sūtrasthāna XI, Āptopadeśa functions simultaneously as Pramāṇa (means of valid knowledge) and Parīkṣā (method of examination), particularly in relation to metaphysical doctrines such as rebirth that elude sensory and inferential confirmation. Cakrapāṇi's commentary elucidates the defining characteristics of the Āpta, demonstrating how moral integrity,

cognitive clarity, and experiential realization transform testimony into epistemically valid knowledge.

This classical model exemplifies Ayurveda's pluralistic epistemology, wherein authoritative testimony operates alongside perception, inference, and rational synthesis in a mutually reinforcing system. Rather than opposing empirical inquiry, Āptopadeśa provides a philosophical and ethical framework that contextualizes it.

Future scholarship may focus on developing systematic methodologies

that correlate Āptopadeśa-based principles with observational and inferential research paradigms, particularly in psychosomatic medicine, chronic disease models, and integrative health education. Comparative epistemological studies may further situate Ayurvedic pramāṇa theory within global debates on evidence, authority, and knowledge validation, thereby strengthening its position in contemporary interdisciplinary research discourse.

Declarations

Conflict of Interest: The author declares that they have no conflicts of interest related to this work.

Funding / Financial Support: This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Author Contributions: The author has contributed to the conception, design, data collection, analysis, drafting, and approval of the final manuscript.

Ethical Approval: Not Applicable

Data Availability Statement: The data supporting the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to acknowledge the support of their institution, colleagues, and technical staff who contributed to this work.

Disclaimer / Views and Opinions: The opinions expressed in this article are solely those of the author and do not reflect the views of the International Journal of Ayurveda360 or its editorial board.

AI-Use Declaration: The author declares that no generative AI tools were used to create scientific content, interpret data, or draft any sections of this manuscript. AI-based tools were used solely for minor language and grammar refinements to improve clarity and readability. All scientific content, analysis, and conclusions remain the sole responsibility of the authors.

References:

1. Raha S. Foundational principles of classical Ayurveda research. *J Ayurveda Integr Med.* 2013;4(4):198–205. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.4103/0975-9476.123688>
2. Padashetti SB. Screening the concept of Pramanas and application of Upamana Pramana in Charaka Samhita. *J Ayurveda Integr Med Sci.* 2017;5(4):989–992. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.21760/jaims.v5i04.989>
3. Paul SR, Ray S. A critical analysis on theory of knowledge (epistemology) of Charaka Samhita and its importance in clinical medicine. *Int Res J Ayurveda Yoga.* 2023;6(9):45–55. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.48165/IRJAY.2023.6910>
4. Agniveśa. Carakasamhitā. Sūtrasthāna, Tisraīṣaṇīyādhyāya; 11/3 [Internet]. *Ayurveda360*; cited 12 Jan 2026. Available from: <https://esamhita.ayurveda360.in/charaka/sutrasthana/11-tisraishaniya/>
5. Sonamale SA, Jugale AD. Study on Chatushkas of Charaka Samhita with special reference to Bhesaja Chatushka and its clinical importance. *Ayushdhara.* 2025;12(2):64–67. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.47070/ayushdhara.v12i2.2052>
6. Dwivedi L, Dwivedi BK, Goswami PK. *Charaka Samhita of Maharshi Agnivesha. Prathama Bhaga.* Varanasi: Chowkhamba Krishnadas Academy; 2021. p.249.
7. Jain S, Bithu GS, Shantanu, Marolia P. Pramana: an Ayurveda examination method. *J Ayurveda Integr Med Sci.* 2023;10(4):19. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.21760/jaims.10.4.19>
8. Thakura B. Śrī Brahma-samhitā Prakāśinī commentary – verses 21–30 [Internet].
9. Cakrapāṇidatta. Āyurvedadīpikā (commentary on Carakasamhitā). Sūtrasthāna, Tisraīṣaṇīyādhyāya; 11/26 [Internet]. *Ayurveda360*; cited 12 Jan 2026. Available from: <https://esamhita.ayurveda360.in/charaka/sutrasthana/11-tisraishaniya/>
10. Thakar VJ. Historical development of basic concepts of Ayurveda from Veda up to Samhita. *Ayu.* 2010;31(4). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.4103/0974-8520.82024>
11. Shringagrahika Nyaya in Chakrapani's Ayurveda Dipika commentary. *Anc Sci Life.* 2019. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.4103/0975-9476.249019>
12. Hegde P, Vidyalakshmi K. Critical analysis of Upama in Charaka Samhita Sutra Sthana: an overview. *J Ayurveda Holist Med.* 2023;11(11). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.70066/jahm.v11i11.1112>
13. Shanbhag A, Murtugudde S, Shreevatsa. Pratyaksha Badhakara Bhava – the intention behind invention. *J Ayurveda Integr Med Sci.* 2017;5(4). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.21760/jaims.v5i04.958>
14. Aware DM. Ayurveda view on concept of Pramana: a literary review. *Int J AYUSH.* 2026;5(1):616–620. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.59108/ijayush.v5i1.616>
15. G A. Verbal testimony (Śabda) in Charaka philosophy [Internet]. *Wisdom Library*; 2008. Available from: <https://www.wisdomlib.org/hinduism/essay/philosophy-of-charaka-samhita/d/doc369692.html>
16. Sahu D, Sharma R, Nanda GC, Das D, Debnath S, Hazra J, Chakraborty DN. Contribution of Chakrapani Datta on Charaka Samhita in the context of contemporary development of medical knowledge. *Bio Bulletin.* 2023;13(1):1–5.

17. Mahajan D, Jamwal N. Ayurveda management of mental health disorders with special reference to anxiety. *J Ayurveda Integr Med Sci.* 2024;10(7):31–35. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.21760/jaims.10.7.31>
18. Pramana [Internet]. Hindupedia – the Hindu encyclopedia; 2023. Available from: <https://www.hindupedia.com/en/pramana>
19. Kumar S, Pal GS, Pandey VS. Undrapping the concepts of Samhita under the light of various Nyayas: a literary review. *Int J Ayurveda Pharma Res.* 2023;11(Suppl 4). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.47070/ijapr.v11iSuppl4.2946>
20. Agniveśa. Carakasamhitā. Sūtrasthāna, Tisraīṣaṇīyādhyāya; 11/27 [Internet]. *Ayurveda360*; cited 12 Jan 2026. Available from: <https://esamhita.ayurveda360.in/charaka/sutrasthana/11-tisraishaniya/>
21. Agniveśa. Carakasamhitā. Sūtrasthāna, Tisraīṣaṇīyādhyāya; 11/28 [Internet]. *Ayurveda360*; cited 12 Jan 2026. Available from: <https://esamhita.ayurveda360.in/charaka/sutrasthana/11-tisraishaniya/>
22. Agniveśa. Carakasamhitā. Sūtrasthāna, Tisraīṣaṇīyādhyāya; 11/29 [Internet]. *Ayurveda360*; cited 12 Jan 2026. Available from: <https://esamhita.ayurveda360.in/charaka/sutrasthana/11-tisraishaniya/>
23. Agniveśa. Carakasamhitā. Vimānasthāna, Trividharogaviśeṣavijñānīyādhyāya; 4/9–12 [Internet]. *Ayurveda360*; cited 12 Jan 2026. Available from: <https://esamhita.ayurveda360.in/charaka/vimanasthana/04-trividharogavisheshavijnaniya/>
24. Sonamale SA, Jugale AD. Study on Chatushkas of Charaka Samhita with special reference to Beshaja Chatushka and its clinical importance. *Ayushdhara.* 2025;12(2):64–67. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.47070/ayushdhara.v12i2.2052>
25. Jain S, Bithu GS, Shantanu, Marolia P. Pramana: an Ayurveda examination method. *J Ayurveda Integr Med Sci.* 2023;10(4):19. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.21760/jaims.10.4.19>
26. Thakar VJ. Historical development of basic concepts of Ayurveda from Veda up to Samhita. *Ayu.* 2010;31(4). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.4103/0974-8520.82024>

Open Access: This article is published under a CC BY 4.0 License, permitting unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)