WJPMR, 2026, 12(4), 67-76

Review Article

Impact Factor: 7.555

WORLD JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL AND MEDICAL RESEARCH

www.wjpmr.com

ISSN (O): 2455-3301
ISSN (P): 3051-2557
Coden USA: WJPMBB

RASA AUSHADHI AND THE GUT MICROBIOME: EXPLORING THE UNCHARTED INTERFACE BETWEEN BHASMA ADMINISTRATION AND INTESTINAL MICROBIAL ECOLOGY — A CONCEPTUAL AND HYPOTHESIS-GENERATING REVIEW

Dr. Amit Kumar*[1], Dr. Varun Kumar[2], Dr. Himanshu Saini[3]

[1,2,3]PG Scholar, Department of Rasa Shastra and Bhaishajya Kalpana, [State Ayurvedic College and Hospital], [Lucknow], India.

***Corresponding Author: Dr. Amit Kumar**

PG Scholar, Department of Rasa Shastra and Bhaishajya Kalpana, [State Ayurvedic College and Hospital], [Lucknow], India. **DOI:** https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19330940

How to cite this Article: Dr. Amit Kumar*[1], Dr. Varun Kumar[2], Dr. Himanshu Saini[3]. (2026). Rasa Aushadhi and The Gut Microbiome: Exploring The Uncharted Interface Between Bhasma Administration And Intestinal Microbial Ecology - A Conceptual And Hypothesis-Generating Review. World Journal of Pharmaceutical and Medical Research, 12(4), 67–76.

Article Received on 12/02/2026 **Article Revised on 12/03/2026** **Article Published on 01/04/2026**

ABSTRACT

Background: Bhasma — the incinerated herbo-metallic preparations of Rasa Shastra — are ingested orally and must, by anatomical necessity, traverse the human gastrointestinal tract before exerting systemic therapeutic effects. The gut microbiome, a dynamic ecosystem of trillions of microorganisms, occupies precisely this transit zone and is now recognised as a pivotal determinant of drug bioavailability, immune regulation, and intestinal homeostasis. Despite this fundamental anatomical overlap, no systematic investigation or conceptual framework has been published addressing the interaction between Bhasma preparations and the gut microbial ecosystem. **Objective:** The present review aims to construct a hypothesis-driven conceptual framework — drawing from classical Ayurvedic pharmacology, modern microbiome science, heavy metal–microbiota interaction research, and nanomedicine — to explore plausible mechanisms through which Bhasma preparations may influence gut microbial ecology, and conversely, how the microbiome may shape Bhasma bioavailability and therapeutic outcomes. **Methods:** Classical Ayurvedic texts including Charaka Samhita, Sushruta Samhita, Ashtanga Hridayam, Rasa Tarangini, and Rasa Ratna Samuccaya were reviewed alongside contemporary literature from PubMed, Google Scholar, DHARA, Frontiers in Nutrition, and Nature journals on gut microbiome, heavy metal–microbiota interactions, and nanomedicine. **Results:** Classical Ayurveda provides implicit recognition of gut microbial ecosystems through the concept of Agni and Grahani physiology, though without explicit microbial nomenclature. Contemporary science demonstrates that ingested metals — including mercury, iron, copper, zinc, silver and arsenic — exert profound, concentration-dependent, and speciation-dependent effects on gut microbial composition. Classical Shodhana and Marana processes transform these metals into nanoparticulate, organo-metallic complexes that may interact with the microbiome fundamentally differently than their raw or ionised counterparts. Five mechanistic pathways of potential Bhasma–microbiome interaction are proposed. **Conclusion:** The Bhasma–gut microbiome interface represents a scientifically compelling, clinically significant, and entirely uncharted domain of inquiry. The present article offers a research framework and calls for systematic experimental investigation to explore this novel frontier.

KEYWORDS: Bhasma, Gut Microbiome, Rasa Shastra, Heavy Metal–Microbiota Interaction, Agni, Nanomedicine, Dysbiosis, Ayurvedic pharmacology, Mercury, Iron Bhasma, Gut–Drug Axis.

1. INTRODUCTION

The human gut is simultaneously the most pharmacologically active and the most microbiologically complex zone of the human body. Hosting an estimated **10^{14}** microorganisms — spanning bacteria, archaea, fungi, protozoa and viruses — the gut microbiome has emerged in twenty-first century biomedical science as a virtual organ in its own right, profoundly influencing host metabolism, immune development, intestinal barrier integrity, neurotransmitter production and the bioavailability of orally administered therapeutics.[1,2] The dominant bacterial phyla — Firmicutes, Bacteroidetes, Actinobacteria and Proteobacteria — maintain a dynamic equilibrium whose disruption, termed dysbiosis, has been causally linked to inflammatory bowel disease, metabolic syndrome, neuropsychiatric conditions and cancers.[3,4]

Into this complex microbial environment, any orally administered drug must pass before reaching systemic circulation. The implications of this passage are now well-recognised for conventional pharmaceuticals — drugs alter the microbiome, and the microbiome in turn metabolises drugs, activates prodrugs, and modulates their absorption and distribution. This bidirectional drug–microbiome axis has begun to reshape pharmacological thinking globally.[5]

Bhasma — the incinerated, nanoparticulate herbo-metallic preparations central to Rasa Shastra — are orally administered and therefore must traverse this same microbial environment. Composed of processed metals and minerals including Parada (mercury), Lauha (iron), Tamra (copper), Swarna (gold), Rajata (silver), Abhraka (mica), Vanga (tin) and Yasada (zinc), Bhasma preparations contain metallic constituents whose interactions with intestinal microorganisms are biologically and chemically significant. It is now well established in environmental toxicology and pharmacology that heavy metals exert profound effects on gut microbial community structure, diversity, and metabolic function — effects that are highly dependent on the chemical speciation, oxidation state, particle size, surface chemistry, and concentration of the metal in question.[6,7]

The critical pharmaceutical insight from Rasa Shastra is that Bhasma preparations represent *processed* metal-mineral complexes — not raw toxic metals. Elaborate Shodhana (purification) and Marana (incineration) processes transform the parent metal into an organo-metallic nanoparticulate matrix that is claimed to be biocompatible, non-toxic, and therapeutically active in nano-range doses. This is fundamentally distinct from the heavy metal exposures studied in toxicological and environmental research. The question of how the gut microbiome responds to *classically processed* Bhasma nanoparticles — and how the microbiome in turn influences their therapeutic efficacy — has never been systematically addressed in the published literature.[8,9]

This review represents a first attempt to construct a conceptual framework for this scientifically unexplored interface, drawing from: (1) classical Ayurvedic understanding of gastrointestinal physiology and microbiota-relevant concepts; (2) contemporary microbiome science; (3) the rapidly growing literature on heavy metal–gut microbiome interactions; and (4) nanomedicine research on metal nanoparticle–biological interactions. We propose five mechanistic hypotheses and identify a priority research agenda for this emerging field.

2. METHODS

This is a hypothesis-generating review article employing a dual-track literature strategy. Track 1 encompassed classical Ayurvedic primary texts: *Charaka Samhita, Sushruta Samhita, Ashtanga Hridayam, Rasa Tarangini, Rasa Ratna Samuccaya, Rasendra Chintamani, Rasendra Sara Sangraha, Rasapaddhati*, and *Bhaishajya Ratnavali*. Track 2 encompassed contemporary peer-reviewed scientific literature sourced from PubMed, Google Scholar, DHARA (Digital Helpline for Ayurveda Research Articles), AYUSH Research Portal, Frontiers in Nutrition, Nature, Science, Cell Host and Microbe, and the Journal of Ayurveda and Integrative Medicine. Search terms included: *"gut microbiome heavy metals"*, *"mercury gut bacteria"*, *"iron microbiome interaction"*, *"silver nanoparticles gut flora"*, *"Bhasma nanomedicine"*, *"Ayurveda microbiome"*, *"Agni gut microbiota"*, and combinations thereof. Articles in English or with available English translations were included without date restriction. A narrative, integrative synthesis approach was applied.

3. CLASSICAL AYURVEDIC CONCEPTS: IMPLICIT RECOGNITION OF MICROBIAL ECOLOGY

While Ayurvedic classical texts pre-date the germ theory of disease and the science of microbiology by centuries, several foundational concepts within the Ayurvedic physiological model demonstrate remarkable conceptual alignment with modern understanding of the gut microbiome — suggesting that ancient physicians were observing microbiome-mediated phenomena without the tools to identify their microbial basis.

3.1 Agni and Gut Microbial Metabolism

The concept of *Agni* (metabolic and digestive fire) occupies a central position in Ayurvedic physiology. Charaka Samhita declares: *"Agnina eva hi yat kinchit pacyate dehadharanam"* — everything that sustains the body is processed through Agni.[10] Modern microbiology identifies gut bacteria as primary fermenters and metabolisers of dietary substrates, producing short-chain fatty acids (SCFAs), vitamins (B12, K2), bile acid biotransformations, and numerous bioactive compounds. The classical description of *Jatharagni* (central digestive fire) as the master determinant of health and disease maps conceptually onto the aggregate metabolic function of the gut microbiome. Impaired Agni (*Agnimandya*) producing systemic disease correlates with dysbiosis and its downstream immune and metabolic consequences.[11,12]

3.2 Grahani and Intestinal Microenvironment

The *Grahani* (the anatomical zone corresponding to the duodenum and proximal small intestine) is described in Charaka Samhita as the seat of Agni and the primary site of *Pachana* (digestion) and *Vivecana* (separation of nutrients from waste). Classical descriptions of Grahani Roga (malabsorption disorders) — characterised by alternating bowel habits, impaired assimilation, and depletion of tissue nutrition — closely mirror the clinical consequences of small intestinal dysbiosis and microbiome disruption now studied in conditions such as SIBO (small intestinal bacterial overgrowth), IBS-D, and coeliac disease.[13,14]

3.3 Krimi and Pathogenic Microorganisms

Classical Ayurvedic texts describe *Krimi* — micro-organisms or worm-like entities — as pathogenic inhabitants of the gastrointestinal tract. Acharya Charaka in Krimi Chikitsa categorises intestinal Krimis by their origin, location, and disease-producing capacity.[15] While this classical taxonomy does not correspond precisely to modern microbial classification, the recognition of micro-organismal agents within the intestinal lumen — and their capacity to produce disease when imbalanced — is a conceptual precursor to the modern understanding of pathobiont-commensal balance within the gut microbiome.

3.4 Yogavahi and Drug-Microbiome Co-processing

The classical property of *Yogavahi* assigned to properly processed Bhasma — the capacity to carry and deliver the pharmacological properties of co-administered substances to their site of action — may represent an early recognition of what modern science terms microbiome-mediated drug transformation and targeted delivery. The gut microbiome can biotransform both the Bhasma metal matrix and any simultaneously administered herbal anupana (vehicle), potentially producing bioactive metabolites that contribute to the therapeutic outcome.[16,17]

4. BHASMA AS NANOPARTICULATE ORGANO-METALLIC ENTITIES: PHARMACEUTICAL CONTEXT

Before exploring Bhasma–microbiome interaction, it is essential to establish the physicochemical identity of Bhasma as it enters the gastrointestinal tract, since the biological effects of metals are profoundly dependent on their chemical form.

4.1 Physicochemical Transformation During Processing

The successive processes of Shodhana (purification) and Marana (incineration through multiple Puta cycles) transform raw metals into organo-metallic nanoparticulate complexes. X-ray diffraction (XRD) and transmission electron microscopy (TEM) studies have confirmed that major Bhasmas — Swarna, Lauha, Tamra, Abhraka and Makshika Bhasma — exhibit particle sizes in the nanometre range (typically 5–50 nm), distinct from the micron-range particles of their raw metallic precursors.[18,19]

Critically, Bhasma nanoparticles are *organo-metallic* complexes: integration of biological molecules from Bhavana dravyas (herbal levigation media) during processing results in an organic coating on the metal surface that fundamentally alters surface chemistry, charge (zeta potential), hydrophobicity, and biological reactivity. These surface modifications are likely to govern how the gut microbiome perceives and responds to Bhasma nanoparticles — a consideration entirely absent from environmental heavy metal toxicology.[20,21]

4.2 Bhasma vs. Raw Metal: Critical Distinctions for Microbiome Research

The following distinctions are fundamental to any hypothesis regarding Bhasma–microbiome interaction:

- **Speciation:** Raw metals exist as free ions or metallic forms with high cellular penetrance and toxicity. Bhasma metals are oxidised, sulphidated, or carbonate-complexed through processing, producing forms with altered solubility and bioavailability.
- **Particle size:** Raw metals are bulk materials. Bhasma nanoparticles exhibit enhanced surface-to-volume ratios, altered dissolution kinetics, and size-dependent cellular uptake — all parameters critical to microbe–metal interaction.
- **Surface coating:** The organo-metallic surface created by herbal Bhavana processing may modulate microbial binding, uptake, and toxicity relative to chemically synthesised metal nanoparticles of equivalent size.
- **Dose:** Classical Bhasma doses (62.5–250 mg/day) represent profoundly lower metal loads than those employed in most toxicological studies of heavy metal–microbiome interaction, making direct extrapolation from toxicology studies inappropriate.

5. CONTEMPORARY SCIENCE: HEAVY METAL–GUT MICROBIOME INTERACTIONS

The rapidly growing field of metal–microbiome interaction provides the closest available experimental evidence base from which to extrapolate towards Bhasma-specific hypotheses. While direct data on Bhasma–microbiome interactions is absent, the following summarises current knowledge on the gut microbial effects of metals present in major Bhasma preparations.

5.1 Mercury (Parada) and the Gut Microbiome

Mercury — the foundational element of Rasa Shastra pharmacology through its central role in Kajjali synthesis — has been studied extensively for its microbiome effects in environmental toxicology. Inorganic mercury exposure in animal models has been consistently associated with intestinal dysbiosis, disruption of tight junction proteins (claudin-1, occludin, ZO-1, JAM-1), increased intestinal permeability, and alterations in neurotransmitter-producing microbial populations.[22,23]

Mercury also uniquely interacts with specific microbial populations through the bacterial *mer* operon system, which encodes mercury resistance genes (including MerA and MerB) enabling bacterial reduction of ionic mercury to less toxic elemental form, and demethylation of methylmercury. Certain sulphate-reducing bacteria and methanogens carrying the *hgcAB* gene cluster can perform the reverse reaction — methylation of inorganic mercury — producing the more toxic organic methylmercury form.[24] The critical question for Rasa Shastra is whether classically processed Kajjali (HgS nanoparticles) — fundamentally different in speciation from ionic Hg^{2+} — activates these same microbial pathways, or whether the sulphide matrix renders it inert to microbial processing.

5.2 Iron (Lauha) and the Gut Microbiome

Iron is a universally required cofactor for microbial growth, and its luminal concentration is a major determinant of gut microbial community composition. Iron-dependent pathogenic bacteria — including *Escherichia coli, Salmonella* spp., and *Clostridium* spp. — outcompete commensal Lactobacillaceae and Bifidobacteriaceae for luminal iron under conditions of excess iron availability.[25] Lauha Bhasma (processed iron), indicated for Pandu (anaemia) and hepatic disorders, introduces iron into the gastrointestinal lumen in a nano-oxidised form. Whether this promotes beneficial erythropoiesis without concurrently expanding pathogenic microbial populations — as has been observed with conventional iron supplementation — is a clinically and pharmacologically significant open question.[26]

5.3 Copper (Tamra) and the Gut Microbiome

Copper exhibits well-documented, broad-spectrum antimicrobial properties, exploited industrially in antimicrobial surfaces and medically in wound management. At intestinal concentrations relevant to supplementation, copper significantly reduces populations of Lactobacillus, Bifidobacterium, and Faecalibacterium prausnitzii while selectively promoting copper-resistant Proteobacteria.[27] Tamra Bhasma (processed copper), indicated for Yakrit Vikara (hepatic disorders), Prameha (metabolic disorders) and Kustha (dermatological conditions), delivers copper nanoparticles to the intestinal lumen. The antimicrobial activity of copper — classical and modern sources agree on this property — may be partially mediated through selective microbial suppression in the gut, though this hypothesis requires direct experimental testing.

5.4 Silver (Rajata) and the Gut Microbiome

Silver nanoparticles (AgNPs) have been studied extensively for their antimicrobial properties and their effects on gut microbiota. Studies demonstrate that AgNPs reduce overall microbial diversity, preferentially suppress Gram-negative bacteria through disruption of cell membrane integrity and interference with respiratory chain enzymes, and alter SCFA production profiles.[28] Rajata Bhasma — confirmed by scanning electron microscopy (SEM) and ICP-AES to contain silver in nanoparticulate form — shares the nanosilver identity of studied AgNPs but differs in surface chemistry due to herbal Bhavana processing. Whether Rajata Bhasma demonstrates equivalent broad-spectrum antimicrobial effects on commensal gut flora, or whether its organic surface coating attenuates these effects, represents a direct experimental hypothesis arising from the present review.[29]

5.5 Arsenic (Hartala/Arsenical Preparations) and the Gut Microbiome

Several Rasa Shastra preparations incorporate processed arsenic compounds (Shuddha Hartala — purified orpiment). Chronic arsenic exposure in environmental contexts is associated with alterations in Firmicutes: Bacteroidetes ratio, reduction in SCFA-producing commensal bacteria, increased gut permeability, and exacerbation of inflammatory signalling.[30] Purified and processed arsenic Bhasma, administered in classical therapeutic doses far below environmental exposure levels, may produce microbiome effects of qualitatively different character from toxicological exposures — but this remains entirely uninvestigated.

Table 1: Summary of Known Gut Microbiome Effects of Major Bhasma-Constituent Metals.

Metal	Bhasma	Key Gut Microbial Effects (Environmental Exposure)	Effect on Microbial Diversity	Research Status Re: Bhasma
Mercury (Hg)	Kajjali / Parada Bhasma	Dysbiosis, tight junction disruption, mer operon activation, neurotransmitter alterations	Decreased; Collinsella ↑ as pathobiont	No data on processed HgS nanoparticles
Iron (Fe)	Lauha Bhasma	Promotes Proteobacteria; suppresses Lactobacillaceae; iron acquisition by pathogens	Decreased diversity with excess iron	No Bhasma-specific data; conventional iron supplementation studied
Copper (Cu)	Tamra Bhasma	Broad antimicrobial; reduces Faecalibacterium prausnitzii; promotes Proteobacteria	Decreased at high concentrations	Classical antimicrobial properties documented; no microbiome studies
Silver (Ag)	Rajata Bhasma	Disrupts membrane integrity; reduces SCFA production; broad Gram-negative suppression	Significantly reduced	SEM confirmed nanoparticles; no gut microbiome study
Zinc (Zn)	Yasada Bhasma	Dose-dependent effects; increases Firmicutes; alters SCFA profiles; potential prebiotic-like at low dose	Variable; dose-dependent	No Bhasma-specific data

Gold (Au)	Swarna Bhasma	Relatively inert; possible immunomodulation; selectively inhibits specific pathogenic species	Minimal change; immunomodulatory	No microbiome data; immunological properties studied
Arsenic (As)	Processed Hartala	Firmicutes:Bacteroidetes ratio shift; SCFA reduction; intestinal permeability increase	Markedly decreased	No data at therapeutic (trace) doses

6. FIVE MECHANISTIC HYPOTHESES FOR BHASMA–GUT MICROBIOME INTERACTION

Based on the foregoing synthesis of classical Ayurvedic pharmacology and contemporary metal–microbiome science, we propose five mechanistic hypotheses to guide future experimental investigation. These are not mutually exclusive and may operate simultaneously in complex interplay.

Hypothesis 1: Bhasma as a Selective Microbial Modulator — The 'Microbial Agni' Hypothesis

Classical Rasa Shastra attributes *Agnideepana* (stimulation of metabolic fire) and *Deepana-Pachana* (digestive stimulation) as core properties of Bhasma preparations — particularly those used in Grahani Roga (malabsorption). We hypothesise that a significant component of this *Agnideepana* effect may be mediated through selective modulation of gut microbial populations.[31,32]

Specifically, Bhasma nanoparticles at therapeutic concentrations may preferentially suppress dysbiotic, fermenting, and gas-producing microbial populations (including methanogenic archaea and sulphate-reducing bacteria) that contribute to *Ama* formation (incompletely digested, toxic intestinal residues), while sparing or potentially promoting SCFA-producing commensals. This selective modulation would manifest clinically as improved digestive capacity, reduced bloating, and normalised bowel function — precisely the classical indications of Bhasma therapy in Grahani.

Hypothesis 2: Microbiome-Mediated Biotransformation of Bhasma — The 'Microbial Anupacaya' Hypothesis

The gut microbiome is now established as a major site of drug biotransformation, capable of activating prodrugs, inactivating active compounds, and generating novel bioactive metabolites from ingested substances.[33] We hypothesise that gut microbial enzymes and metabolic activities biotransform Bhasma metal species within the intestinal lumen — potentially:

- Reducing higher oxidation state metal species to lower oxidation states with altered solubility and absorption
- Methylating certain metal species (particularly mercury) to organic forms with distinct pharmacokinetics
- Chelating metal ions through microbial siderophore production, altering free metal concentration
- Modifying the organo-metallic surface coating through microbial protease and oxidase activity, altering the interaction of Bhasma with intestinal epithelium

If confirmed, this hypothesis would establish the gut microbiome as a pharmacokinetic variable in Bhasma therapy — implying that individuals with different microbiome compositions (reflecting Prakriti, dietary pattern, disease state, and geographic origin) may demonstrate fundamentally different therapeutic responses to identical Bhasma doses.[34]

Hypothesis 3: Bhasma Particle Size and Surface Chemistry as Determinants of Microbial Selectivity — The 'Sukshma' Hypothesis

Classical Ayurveda mandates that properly prepared Bhasma must achieve *Sukshmatva* (fineness/subtlety) as a prerequisite for therapeutic application. Modern analytical studies confirm that this *Sukshmatva* corresponds to nanometre-range particle dimensions. Research in nanomedicine and environmental science demonstrates that the biological effects of metal nanoparticles on microorganisms are highly size-dependent: nanoparticles below ~20 nm exhibit markedly greater antimicrobial activity than larger counterparts of equivalent composition due to enhanced cell membrane penetration and increased surface-to-volume ratio.[35]

We hypothesise that classical quality criteria for Bhasma — particularly *Varitaratva* (floating on water), *Rekhapurnata* (penetrating fingerprint lines), and *Slakshnata* (complete smoothness) — serve as indirect classical indicators of nanoparticle formation, and that these size parameters are critical determinants of selective microbial interaction. Properly prepared Bhasma, meeting classical *Pariksha* criteria, may produce fundamentally different microbiome effects than improperly prepared, coarser preparations — providing a pharmacological rationale for the classical insistence on rigorous quality standards.[36]

Hypothesis 4: Pathya-Apathya as Microbiome-Optimising Dietary Protocol — The 'Prebiotic Regimen' Hypothesis

Classical Bhasma therapy is invariably prescribed alongside strict dietary guidelines (Pathya-Apathya). Pathya foods during Bhasma therapy — aged rice (Purana Shali), barley preparations (Yavagu), buttermilk (Takra), warm water, and cumin (Jeeraka) preparations — share several characteristics of modern prebiotic and microbiome-optimising dietary regimens: they are low in simple sugars, high in resistant starches, thermally processed for easy digestibility, and rich in specific phytochemicals.[37]

We hypothesise that the Pathya diet accompanying Bhasma administration functions as a microbiome pre-conditioning protocol, establishing an intestinal environment favourable to selective Bhasma-induced microbial modulation. Conversely, the classical prohibition of Abhishyandi foods (congesting, heavy foods rich in simple sugars) during Bhasma therapy may reflect empirical recognition that dysbiosis-promoting dietary patterns would counter the therapeutic microbial modulation sought by Bhasma administration.[38]

Hypothesis 5: The Microbiome as a Safety Modulator of Bhasma Therapy — The 'Microbial Detoxification' Hypothesis

Probiotic microorganisms — particularly lactic acid bacteria (LAB) strains — have demonstrated capacity to bind, sequester, and facilitate fecal elimination of heavy metals through biosorption, bioaccumulation, and biotransformation mechanisms.[39] Research has shown that certain probiotic bacteria can reduce mercury bioaccumulation in animal models, and that a probiotic-supplemented diet reduced arsenic and mercury levels in pregnant women and children.[40]

We hypothesise that the classical requirement for pre-treatment digestive preparation (Deepana-Pachana) and specific anupana (vehicle) selection before Bhasma administration serves in part to condition a gut microbial environment with enhanced metal-sequestration capacity, thereby reducing the systemic bioavailability of any potentially toxic metal species while preserving the bioavailability of therapeutically intended complexes. This hypothesis would provide a mechanistic basis for the classical safety precautions surrounding Bhasma therapy and suggest that microbiome status is a determinant of Bhasma safety — an individualised factor with major implications for precision Ayurvedic pharmacology.

Table 2: Summary of Proposed Hypotheses for Bhasma–Gut Microbiome Interaction.

#	Hypothesis Name	Classical Basis	Modern Scientific Analogue	Predicted Outcome
H1	Microbial Agni: Bhasma as selective microbial modulator	Agnideepana, Deepana-Pachana properties of Bhasma	Antimicrobial metal nanoparticle effects on dysbiotic populations	Selective suppression of dysbiotic microbes; SCFA-producer preservation
H2	Microbial Anupacaya: Microbiome biotransforms Bhasma	Yogavahi; site-specific action of Rasaushadhi	Drug–microbiome pharmacokinetic axis; microbiome-mediated prodrug activation	Microbiome composition determines Bhasma therapeutic response
H3	Sukshma: Particle size governs microbial selectivity	Varitaratva, Rekhapurnata — classical nanofineness criteria	Size-dependent antimicrobial activity of metal nanoparticles	Classical quality standards directly predict microbiome selectivity
H4	Prebiotic Regimen: Pathya as microbiome pre-conditioner	Pathya-Apathya dietary protocols during Bhasma therapy	Prebiotic dietary patterns; resistant starch and microbial diversity	Pathya optimises gut environment for Bhasma's selective action
H5	Microbial Detoxification: Microbiome modulates Bhasma safety	Deepana-Pachana pre-treatment; anupana selection; Shodhana safety rationale	Probiotic biosorption/sequestration of heavy metals	Healthy microbiome = reduced metal bioaccumulation = enhanced safety

7. AGNI, PRAKRITI AND INDIVIDUAL MICROBIOME VARIABILITY

One of the most scientifically exciting implications of the Bhasma–microbiome framework concerns the longstanding Ayurvedic doctrine of individual constitutional variability through *Prakriti* (body constitution). Classified into Vata, Pitta and Kapha predominant types, Prakriti-based individualisation governs drug selection, dosage and therapeutic approach in classical Ayurveda.[41]

Contemporary metagenomics research has begun to demonstrate microbiome differences across Prakriti types. A landmark study by Chauhan et al. analysing the gut and oral microbiomes of 272 individuals across Prakriti types found significant differences in microbial genus composition — Vata individuals showing dominance of *Prevotella*, Pitta individuals showing higher *Bacteroides* populations, and Kapha individuals showing distinct Firmicutes patterns.[42]

If Prakriti-based gut microbiome differences are confirmed by larger studies, this finding carries profound implications for Bhasma therapy: individuals of different Prakriti may exhibit different microbial biotransformation of Bhasma metals, different safety profiles in terms of microbial metal sequestration, and different therapeutic responses. This would provide a contemporary microbiological basis for the classical Ayurvedic insistence on Prakriti-based individualisation of Rasaushadhi therapy — a principle that has long defied modern pharmacological explanation.[43]

8. IMPLICATIONS FOR BHASMA SAFETY DEBATE

The safety of Bhasma preparations — particularly those containing mercury, lead, or arsenic — has been the subject of intense international scientific and regulatory debate. Several studies have documented elevated heavy metal levels in poorly manufactured or adulterated Rasa Shastra preparations, raising legitimate public health concerns.[44] However, a mechanistically important variable that has been entirely absent from this safety debate is the role of the gut microbiome as an active determinant of metal bioavailability and toxicity.

Environmental and clinical studies consistently demonstrate that gut microbiome composition modulates the absorption, accumulation, and systemic toxicity of heavy metals through: chelation by microbial biofilm exopolysaccharides, metal sequestration by biosorption onto microbial cell walls, biotransformation to less bioavailable species, and competitive exclusion of metal ions from intestinal epithelial transporters.[45,46]

From this perspective, the classical Ayurvedic requirement for rigorous Shodhana and Marana processing may serve a dual function: first, to chemically transform the metal into a less toxic, more biocompatible nanoparticulate form; and second, to produce a form whose interaction with the gut microbiome activates protective microbial metal-sequestration mechanisms rather than toxic metal uptake pathways. An individual with a robust, diverse microbiome — as promoted by the classical Pathya dietary guidelines — may be substantially more protected from residual metal toxicity than an individual with dysbiosis.[47]

This microbiome-dependent safety variable may partly explain why Bhasma preparations, when properly prepared and administered with appropriate dietary protocols, appear clinically safe in traditional practice — while the same preparations administered without attention to patient gut health and dietary protocol may produce adverse outcomes.

9. PROPOSED RESEARCH FRAMEWORK

To systematically investigate the hypotheses proposed in this review, we recommend the following phased research programme:

Phase I: In vitro Characterisation

- Preparation of standardised Bhasma samples (Lauha, Tamra, Rajata, Swarna Bhasma) meeting classical quality criteria; physicochemical characterisation by XRD, TEM, DLS, and zeta-potential measurement
- Agar diffusion and microbroth dilution assays of Bhasma preparations against representative gut commensals (Lactobacillus acidophilus, Bifidobacterium longum, Faecalibacterium prausnitzii) and opportunistic pathogens (E. coli, Staphylococcus aureus, Candida albicans)
- Anaerobic batch fermentation models (simulating colonic conditions) to assess Bhasma effects on SCFA production and microbial community composition using 16S rRNA metagenomics.

Phase II: Ex vivo and Animal Studies

- Murine model studies with standardised Bhasma doses, assessing gut microbiome changes (16S rRNA sequencing), intestinal permeability markers (FITC-dextran assay), and inflammatory cytokine profiles at 4 and 8 weeks
- Comparison of microbiome effects of classically processed Bhasma versus raw metal controls and chemically synthesised nanoparticles to distinguish Bhasma-specific effects from generic metal nanoparticle effects
- Germ-free mouse experiments to quantify the contribution of microbiome to Bhasma metal bioavailability using ICP-MS tissue analysis

Phase III: Clinical Investigations

- Metagenomics profiling of Bhasma-treated patients (e.g., Lauha Bhasma for anaemia, Panchamrita Parpati for Grahani) versus matched controls before and after treatment — stool 16S rRNA and shotgun metagenomics
- Correlation of microbiome composition with therapeutic response outcomes to identify microbiome biomarkers predictive of Bhasma efficacy
- Prakriti-stratified microbiome analysis in Bhasma-treated cohorts to test the hypothesis that constitutional variability predicts microbiome-mediated pharmacological response

10. RESEARCH GAPS AND LIMITATIONS OF CURRENT EVIDENCE

The principal limitations of the present review must be explicitly acknowledged. No direct empirical data on Bhasma–gut microbiome interaction currently exists; the framework presented is entirely conceptual and hypothesis-generating. The extrapolation from environmental heavy metal toxicology to Bhasma pharmacology involves significant assumptions regarding speciation, dose, and biological context that require direct experimental validation.

Furthermore, the gut microbiome is a highly dynamic, individually variable ecosystem — making generalised predictions difficult. Factors including geographic origin, dietary pattern, concurrent medications, age, sex, disease status, and prior antibiotic exposure all significantly influence baseline microbiome composition and are likely to moderate Bhasma–microbiome interactions.[48]

The absence of validated, germ-free animal models specifically designed for Ayurvedic drug research, the lack of standardised Bhasma reference materials for experimental use, and the methodological challenges of classical quality verification in experimental settings represent additional practical barriers to be addressed in future research design.

11. CONCLUSION

The intersection of Rasa Shastra pharmacology and gut microbiome science represents one of the most intellectually fertile and clinically consequential uncharted territories in contemporary Ayurvedic research. Every orally administered Bhasma preparation must traverse a gastrointestinal ecosystem of trillions of microorganisms before exerting its intended systemic effects — and this traversal cannot be pharmacologically trivial.

This review has demonstrated that: (1) classical Ayurvedic physiology contains conceptual parallels to modern microbiome science through Agni, Grahani, Krimi and Yogavahi; (2) Bhasma preparations exist as organo-metallic nanoparticles with metallic constituents that are known to exert profound effects on gut microbial communities; (3) the nature of these effects in the context of classically processed, nano-sized, organo-coated Bhasma metals is fundamentally distinct from — and not directly predictable from — environmental heavy metal toxicology data; and (4) five plausible mechanistic pathways of Bhasma–microbiome interaction can be articulated from available evidence.

We propose that the gut microbiome is a pharmacologically active variable in Bhasma therapy: it may mediate part of the therapeutic effect, determine individual variability in treatment response, provide a protective safety mechanism, and be modulated by the classical Pathya dietary regimens that accompany Bhasma administration. These are testable, experimentally accessible hypotheses that could be investigated with existing methodological tools.

Rasa Shastra scholars are uniquely positioned to lead this interdisciplinary enquiry, combining classical textual expertise with engagement from microbiologists, analytical chemists, pharmacologists and clinical researchers. The scientific yield from investigating this interface would benefit not only Ayurvedic practice but would contribute to the broader global understanding of how the gut microbiome shapes the pharmacology of mineral and metallic therapeutics.

REFERENCES

1. Thursby E, Juge N. Introduction to the human gut microbiota. Biochemical Journal, 2017; 474(11): 1823-1836. doi:10.1042/BCJ20160510
2. Soman C, Thomas JS. Ayurvedic Insights into Gut Microbiome Dynamics — On Trayopastambha Perspective. Journal of Ayurveda and Integrated Medical Sciences, 2024; 9(7): 1-8.
3. Shreiner AB, Kao JY, Young VB. The gut microbiome in health and disease. Current Opinion in Gastroenterology, 2015; 31(1): 69-75.
4. Ranade A, Gayakwad S, Chougule S, Shirolkar A, Gaidhani S, Pawar SD. Gut microbiota: metabolic programmers as a lead for deciphering Ayurvedic pharmacokinetics. Current Science, 2020; 119(3): 451-461.
5. Tirumalapura Vijayanna S, Mane S, Bhalerao S, Sitaram SJ. Ayurvedic therapies to target the microbiome: evidence and possibilities. Journal of Ayurveda and Integrative Medicine, 2024; 30(2): 76-83.
6. Claus SP, Guillou H, Ellero-Simatos S. The gut microbiota: a major player in the toxicity of environmental pollutants. NPJ Biofilms Microbiomes, 2016; 2(1): 1-11.
7. Guo H, Zeng X, Li T, Huang Y, Liu C, Chen H, et al. Major heavy metals and human gut microbiota composition: a systematic review with nutritional approach. Journal of Health, Population and Nutrition, 2025; 44(1): 1-15. doi:10.1186/s41043-025-00750-4
8. Sarkar PK, Chaudhary AK. Ayurvedic bhasma: the most ancient application of nanomedicine. Journal of Scientific and Industrial Research, 2010; 69: 901-905.
9. Chaudhary A, Singh N. Contribution of world health organization in the global acceptance of Ayurveda. Journal of Ayurveda and Integrative Medicine, 2011; 2(4): 179-186.
10. Agnivesa. Charaka Samhita. Ed. Trikamji Vaidya Jadavaji. 5th ed. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Sansthan; 2001. Chikitsa Sthana, Chapter 15.
11. Tripathi JS, Singh RH. The concept of Grahani in Ayurveda and its relevance to modern gastroenterology. Ancient Science of Life, 2010; 29(4): 3-8.
12. Pole S. Ayurvedic Medicine: The Principles of Traditional Practice. London: Elsevier, 2006.
13. Charaka. Charaka Samhita. Trans. Sharma RK, Dash B. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Series; 2003. Nidana Sthana, Chapter 6 — Grahani Nidana.
14. Surawicz CM, Stepan C. Irritable bowel syndrome: a chronic sequela of acute gastroenteritis. Gastroenterology, 2007; 132(1): 458-460.
15. Agnivesa. Charaka Samhita. Chikitsa Sthana, Chapter 7 — Krimi Chikitsa. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Sansthan, 2001.
16. Misra BS. Ayurveda Rasashastra. 14th ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Bhavan, 2017.
17. Sadananda Sharma. Rasa Tarangini. 11th ed. Ed. Shastri K. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2009.
18. Chaudhary A. Ayurvedic bhasma: nanomedicine of ancient India — its global contemporary perspective. Journal of Biomedical Nanotechnology, 2011; 7(1): 68-69. doi:10.1166/jbn.2011.1205

19. Wadekar MP, Rode CV, Bendale YN, Patil KR, Prabhune AA. Preparation and examination of a gold-based Indian traditional drug: Swarna Bhasma. Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis, 2005; 37(1): 21-30.
20. Gaikwad RM, Shinde SV, Gaikar VG. Nanotechnology in medicine: leads from Ayurveda. Journal of Pharmacy and Bioallied Sciences, 2016; 8(1): 1-6. PMC4766787
21. Mukherjee PK, Harwansh RK, Bahadur S, Banerjee S, Kar A, Chanda J, et al. Development of Ayurveda: tradition to trend. Journal of Ethnopharmacology, 2017; 197: 10-24.
22. Zhao Y, Zhou C, Wu C, Guo X, Hu G, Wu Q, et al. Subchronic oral mercury caused intestinal injury and changed gut microbiota in mice. Science of the Total Environment, 2020; 721: 137639. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.137639
23. Shuai L, Shi-Yu Q, Xue-Ting L, Hong-Yan W, Yi-Yang J, Ying-Ying H. Exposure to mercury (Hg) compromises intestinal barrier integrity by reducing expression of intercellular junction proteins. Heavy Metal–Gut Microbiota Interactions: Probiotics Modulation and Biosensors Detection. Biosensors, 2025; 15(3): 188.
24. Rothenberg SE, Wagner CL, Hamidi B, Alekseyenko AV, Azcarate-Peril MA. Longitudinal changes during pregnancy in gut microbiota and methylmercury biomarkers, and reversal of microbiota changes after delivery. Frontiers in Microbiology, 2019; 10: 1-18.
25. Dostal A, Chassard C, Hilty FM, Moretti D, Plumb J, Geurts L, et al. Iron depletion and repletion with ferrous sulfate or electrolytic iron modifies the composition and metabolic activity of the gut microbiota in rats. Journal of Nutrition, 2012; 142(2): 271-277.
26. Jaeggi T, Kortman GA, Moretti D, Chassard C, Holding P, Dostal A, et al. Iron fortification adversely affects the gut microbiome, increases pathogen abundance and induces intestinal inflammation in Kenyan infants. Gut., 2015; 64(5): 731-742.
27. Molteni C, Abicht HK, Solioz M. Killing of bacteria by copper surfaces involves dissolved copper. Applied and Environmental Microbiology, 2010; 76(12): 4099-4101.
28. Wilding LA, Nguyen MV, Crum CM, Chuong TT, Ackerson CJ. Comparing nanosilver physicochemical properties to toxicological risk: A review. NanoImpact, 2016; 3-4: 10-22.
29. Sachin V, Bhagwat VU, Khadkikar P. Physicochemical characterization and antibacterial activity of Rajata Bhasma and silver nanoparticles. AYU, 2017; 38(1-2): 29-33. PMC5541471
30. Lu K, Mahbub R, Fox JG. Xenobiotics: interaction with the intestinal microflora. ILAR Journal, 2015; 56(2): 218-227.
31. Vagbhata. Ashtanga Hridayam. Trans. Murthy KRS. Varanasi: Krishnadas Academy; 2000. Sutrasthana, Chapter 13.
32. Sushruta. Sushruta Samhita. Trans. Murthy KRS. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Orientalia, 2004. Sutrasthana.
33. Spanogiannopoulos P, Bess EN, Carmody RN, Turnbaugh PJ. The microbial pharmacists within us: a metagenomics view of xenobiotic metabolism. Nature Reviews Microbiology, 2016; 14(5): 273-287.
34. Barroso MV, Cattani-Cavalieri I, Nuñez FJ, Lanzetti M. Do gut microbiota influence pulmonary pharmacology? Pulmonary Pharmacology and Therapeutics, 2022; 73: 102110.
35. Maheshwari RK. Nanoparticle characteristics of Kajjali and Bhasma preparations: a review. Ancient Science of Life., 2013; 32(3): 147-151.
36. Sarkar PK, Prajapati PK, Shukla VJ, Ravishankar B. Pharmaceutical standardization of Lauha Bhasma: an approach to quality control. Journal of Pharmaceutical Biology, 2012; 2(1): 1-11.
37. Zhang P. Influence of foods and nutrition on the gut microbiome and implications for intestinal health. International Journal of Molecular Sciences, 2022; 23(17): 9588.
38. Wen L, Duffy A. Factors influencing the gut microbiota, inflammation, and type 2 diabetes. Journal of Nutrition, 2017; 147(7): 1468S-1475S.
39. Cao J, Xu H, Liu Y, Jiang Z, Fang W, Li T. Harnessing probiotic microbiota and their exopolysaccharides to mitigate heavy metal toxicity. Probiotics and Antimicrobial Proteins, 2024. doi:10.1007/s12602-024-10281-9
40. Bisanz JE, Enos MK, Mwanga JR, Changalucha J, Burton JP, Gloor GB, Reid G. Randomized open-label pilot study of the influence of probiotics and the gut microbiome on toxic metal levels in Tanzanian pregnant women and school children. mBio., 2014; 5(5): e01580-14.
41. Sushruta. Sushruta Samhita. Shareerasthana, Chapter 4 — Prakriti Vichaya. Trans. Murthy KRS. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Orientalia, 2004.
42. Chauhan NS, Pandey R, Mondal AK, Gupta S, Verma MK, Jain S, et al. Western Indian rural gut microbial diversity in extreme prakriti endo-phenotypes reveals differences in gut microbiota composition in terms of F/B ratio. Frontiers in Microbiology, 2018; 9: 118.
43. Dhiman KS. Prakriti (Ayurvedic concept of constitution) and gut microbiome: a bidirectional relationship. Journal of Ayurveda and Integrative Medicine, 2022; 13(1): 100552.
44. Saper RB, Kales SN, Paquin J, Burns MJ, Eisenberg DM, Davis RB, et al. Heavy metal content of Ayurvedic herbal medicine products. JAMA, 2004; 292(23): 2868-2873.
45. Monachese M, Burton JP, Reid G. Bioremediation and tolerance of humans to heavy metals through microbial processes: a potential role for probiotics.

Applied and Environmental Microbiology, 2012; 78(18): 6397-6404.
46. Diaz-Bone R, van de Wiele T. Biotransformation of metal(loid)s by intestinal microorganisms. Pure and Applied Chemistry, 2009; 81(2): 355-372.
47. Breton J, Daniel C, Dewulf J, Pothion S, Froux N, Sauty M, et al. Gut microbiota limits heavy metals burden caused by chronic oral exposure. Toxicology Letters, 2013; 222(2): 132-138.
48. El Aidy S, Van den Bogert B, Kleerebezem M. The small intestine microbiota, nutritional modulation and relevance for health. Current Opinion in Biotechnology, 2015; 32: 14-20.
49. Vagbhata. Rasa Ratna Samuccaya. Ed. Atrideva Gupta. Varanasi: Krishnadas Academy, 1999.
50. Govinda Das. Bhaishajya Ratnavali. Ed. Misra BS. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Bhavan, 2005.