WJPMR, 2026, 12(9), 89-97

Review Article

Impact Factor: 7.533

WORLD JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL AND MEDICAL RESEARCH

www.wjpmr.com

ISSN (O): 2455-3301

ISSN (P): 3051-2557

Coden USA: WJPMBB

ASSESSMENT OF TOXICITY AND SAFETY PROFILE OF VATSANABHA (*ACONITUM FEROX* WALL. EX SER., RANUNCULACEAE): A CRITICAL APPRAISAL OF SHODHANA SAMSKARA IN THE LIGHT OF CLASSICAL AND CONTEMPORARY EVIDENCE

Dr. Mahesh Vishnu Patil*

Professor, Dept. of Agadtantra Shree R.M.D. Ayurveda College & Hospital, Waghaldhara Gujarat, India.

***Corresponding Author: Dr. Mahesh V. Patil**

HOD & Professor, Dept. of Agadtantra Shree R.M.D. Ayurveda College & Hospital,Waghaldhara Gujarat, India.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22159728

How to cite this Article: Dr. Mahesh Vishnu Patil* (2026). Assessment Of Toxicity And Safety Profile Of Vatsanabha (Aconitum Ferox Wall. Ex Ser., Ranunculaceae): A Critical Appraisal Of Shodhana Samskara In The Light Of Classical And Contemporary Evidence. World Journal of Pharmaceutical and Medical Research, 12(9), 89–97.

Article Received on 04/08/2026 **Article Revised on 25/08/2026** **Article Published on 01/09/2026**

ABSTRACT

Background: Among the nine Sthavara Vishas enumerated in the Rasashastra classics, Vatsanabha (*Aconitum ferox* Wall. ex Ser., Fam. Ranunculaceae) occupies a singular and paradoxical position. It is at once the most lethal botanical known to the Ayurvedic materia medica and among the most indispensable ingredients of Rasaushadhis prescribed for Jwara, Amavata, Sandhivata, Vatavyadhi and Agnimandya. Its therapeutic legitimacy rests entirely upon the fidelity with which Shodhana, the classical purificatory Samskara, is performed. ***Objective:*** To appraise the toxicological profile of Vatsanabha in its Ashodhita and Shodhita states, to examine the phytochemical rationale underlying the classical Shodhana media, and to evaluate critically whether contemporary laboratory-scale chemical purification can legitimately substitute for the traditional Samskara. **Materials and Methods:** The classical Ayurvedic corpus — Brihattrayi, Rasa Tarangini, Rasa Ratna Samuchchaya, Yogaratnakara, Bhaishajya Ratnavali and the Ayurvedic Pharmacopoeia of India — was consulted for Nirukti, Vargikarana, Shodhana Vidhi, Matra and Apathya. Contemporary evidence was retrieved from PubMed, Scopus, AYUSH Research Portal, DHARA and Google Scholar for the period 1951–2025 using the search terms Vatsanabha, *Aconitum ferox*, Shodhana, aconitine, pseudaconitine and aconite detoxification. Experimental studies reporting acute, sub-acute or chronic toxicity, chromatographic alkaloid profiling or biochemical organ-function data were included. ***Observations:*** Ashodhita Vatsanabha is uniformly and severely toxic across species and dosing paradigms. Thin-layer chromatographic evidence demonstrates that the diester diterpenoid alkaloids pseudaconitine and aconitine are hydrolysed to the far less toxic monoester derivatives veratroylpseudaconine and benzoylaconine exclusively under traditional Gomutra-based Shodhana; a laboratory-prepared synthetic cow-urine analogue maintained at 37.5 °C failed to effect this conversion.In acute oral toxicity studies, extracts of crude and chemically treated root produced mortality within 28 minutes and 9 minutes 45 seconds respectively at 300 mg/kg, and both were assigned to GHS Category 2, whereas Gomutra-Shodhita material produced no mortality up to day 14 at 300 mg/kg.Corroborating murine data show 100 percent mortality with crude aconite at 2.6 mg per mouse against complete absence of mortality with fully processed material at eight times that dose, with every step of the Samskara proving essential.Chronic 90-day studies and pharmacological profiling further indicate that Shodhana abolishes cardiotoxic and neuromuscular toxicity while preserving antipyretic efficacy. ***Conclusion:*** The evidence converges decisively upon the classical position. Shodhana is not a symbolic or merely hygienic ritual but a chemically purposive Samskara that converts a lethal diester alkaloid matrix into a therapeutically usable one. Attempts to reduce it to a single physicochemical variable — alkaline pH alone — have failed to reproduce its effect. Nevertheless, the observation of delayed mortality at 2000 mg/kg even in Shodhita material affirms that Vatsanabha remains an Upavisha-grade drug demanding strict Matra discipline, verified species identity and marker-based quality assurance.

KEYWORDS: Vatsanabha; *Aconitum ferox*; Shodhana; Sthavara Visha; aconitine; pseudaconitine; Gomutra; diterpenoid alkaloid; Rasashastra; drug safety.

1. INTRODUCTION (PRASTAVANA)

Ayurveda has never treated Visha as an absolute or immutable category. The Acharyas were unambiguous that toxicity and therapeutic virtue are not intrinsic properties resident within a Dravya, but consequences of Samskara, Matra, Kala, Desha and Yukti. Charaka expresses the doctrine in its most compressed and celebrated form: *Yogadapi vishaṃ tīkṣṇam uttamaṃ bheṣajaṃ bhavet, bheṣajaṃ cāpi duryuktaṃ tīkṣṇaṃ sampadyate viṣam* — even the sharpest poison, rightly employed, becomes the finest of medicines, while medicine wrongly employed is transformed into a sharp poison.[1] This is not rhetorical flourish. It is a pharmacological proposition, and it is testable.

Nowhere is that proposition tested more severely than in Vatsanabha. Classical Rasashastra enumerates nine Sthavara Vishas — Kalakuta, Vatsanabha, Halahala, Saurashtrika, Shringika, Pradipana, Haridra, Saktuka and Brahmaputra — and among these Vatsanabha is accorded pre-eminence, both for the swiftness of its lethality and for the breadth of its therapeutic utility once processed.[4,5] Its Mula-kanda enters some of the most widely dispensed Rasaushadhis in contemporary Ayurvedic practice: Anandabhairava Rasa, Tribhuvana Kirti Rasa, Mrityunjaya Rasa, Sanjivani Vati, Mahashankha Vati, Hinguleshwara Rasa and Vatagajankusha Rasa, among many others.[6,8]

Contemporary toxicology arrives at the same drug from the opposite direction and reaches an equally emphatic verdict. The Aconitum genus yields C19-norditerpenoid alkaloids that rank among the most potent naturally occurring cardiotoxins and neurotoxins known; the estimated human lethal dose of pure aconitine lies between one and two milligrams, and severe poisoning follows the ingestion of a few grams of unprocessed root.[26,29] Fatal and near-fatal cases continue to be documented worldwide, most frequently where processing was inadequate, where a poisonous species contaminated a non-poisonous consignment, or where the prescribed Matra was exceeded.[225,27,28]

These two literatures — the classical and the contemporary — have converged only in the last three decades, and their convergence poses a question of real practical consequence. If Shodhana works, what precisely does it do at the molecular level, and can it therefore be rationalised, standardised and validated? And if it can be rationalised, can it be simplified? The pharmaceutical industry has an obvious interest in replacing a seven-day, sunlight-dependent, Gomutra-based, earthen-pot procedure with a reproducible bench protocol. The present review examines whether that substitution is defensible, assembling the classical descriptions, the chemical rationale and the experimental evidence into a single safety appraisal of Vatsanabha.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Classical literature

Primary Ayurvedic sources were consulted in their standard published editions with recognised commentaries. Charaka Samhita with Chakrapani's Ayurveda Dipika, Sushruta Samhita with Dalhana's Nibandhasangraha and Ashtanga Hridaya with Arunadatta's Sarvangasundara were examined for the general Visha-vijnana framework — Visha-guna, Visha-vega and Visha-chikitsa.[1,2,3] Rasa Tarangini (Taranga 24), Rasa Ratna Samuchchaya (Adhyaya 24), Yogaratnakara and Bhaishajya Ratnavali were examined for Vatsanabha-specific Shodhana Vidhi, Matra, Anupana and Yoga.[4,5,6] The Ayurvedic Pharmacopoeia of India was consulted for official identity, description and quality standards.[7]

2.2 Contemporary literature

PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, the AYUSH Research Portal, DHARA and Google Scholar were searched for publications between 1951 and 2025. Search strings combined Vatsanabha, *Aconitum ferox*, *Aconitum chasmanthum*, Shodhana, Sodhana, aconite processing, aconitine, pseudaconitine, bikhaconitine and aconite detoxification. Reference lists of retrieved reviews were hand-searched for older Indian work not indexed electronically.

2.3 Inclusion and exclusion

Studies were included if they reported original experimental data on acute, sub-acute or chronic toxicity of Vatsanabha or its Shodhita derivatives; chromatographic, spectroscopic or quantitative alkaloid profiling before and after processing; biochemical, haematological or histopathological organ-function outcomes; or clinical case reports of aconite toxicity attributable to Ayurvedic formulations. Purely ethnobotanical surveys, agronomic studies and papers concerning *Aconitum heterophyllum* (Ativisha, a non-poisonous congener) were excluded. Classical citations are reported by Sthana, Adhyaya and Shloka wherever the primary text permits.

3. Nirukti, Paryaya and Dravya Identity

3.1 Etymology and synonyms

The name Vatsanabha derives from the resemblance of the tuberous root to the navel of a calf — *vatsasya nābhiḥ iva ākṛtiḥ yasya*. The classical Paryayas — Visha, Garala, Vatsanaga, Shringika, Amrita, Pradipana and Sthavara-Visha-Shreshtha — are themselves instructive. That a substance so unambiguously lethal should also carry the epithet Amrita is not a lexicographic accident; it encodes precisely the transformative claim that this review sets out to test.[4,8]

3.2 Botanical identity and the problem of species substitution

The Ayurvedic Pharmacopoeia of India recognises Vatsanabha as the dried root of *Aconitum ferox* Wall. ex Ser.[7] The plant is an alpine Himalayan perennial

distributed between roughly 3000 and 4500 metres across Sikkim, Nepal, Kumaon and Garhwal, and is known in trade as Bish, Bikh or Mitha Vish. The part employed is the daughter tuber, collected after the aerial parts wither.

A substantive safety concern arises here and is too often passed over. Market surveys of material sold as Vatsanabha in India have found it to consist of a mixture of several Aconitum species, a consequence of close morphological similarity between the tubers and of the fact that collection is largely unregulated.[14] Because different species carry markedly different alkaloid profiles and markedly different potencies, an identical Shodhana protocol applied to botanically heterogeneous starting material cannot yield a uniform product. Any safety statement about Shodhita Vatsanabha is therefore conditional upon verified species identity — a point that most published toxicity studies, including the principal ones reviewed here, do not address.

4. Vatsanabha within the Classical Framework

4.1 Vargikarana

Vatsanabha is classified as Sthavara Visha of Kanda-Mula origin. Sushruta's scheme of poisons by anatomical seat in the plant places the root poisons among the most rapid in onset, an observation entirely consistent with the fact that the alkaloid burden of the Aconitum plant is concentrated in the tuber.[2] Rasa Tarangini and Rasa Ratna Samuchchaya both treat Vatsanabha under the Visha Varga proper rather than the Upavisha Varga, a distinction of practical weight: it signals that the drug demands the full rigour of Shodhana and the narrowest of therapeutic windows.[4,5]

4.2 The Dasha Guna of Visha and their toxicodynamic correlates

Charaka and Sushruta both enumerate ten Gunas of Visha. Read as a description of toxicokinetic and toxicodynamic behaviour rather than as metaphysics, this list is remarkably serviceable, and it maps with unexpected precision onto what is now known of aconitine pharmacology.

Table 1: The ten Gunas of Visha and their contemporary toxicological correlates.

Guna	Classical connotation	Contemporary correlate
Laghu	Light; difficult to arrest once in motion	Low molecular weight, rapid distribution
Ruksha	Dry; resists pacification by unctuous measures	Poor sequestration; resistance to simple dilution
Ashu	Swift onset	Onset of paraesthesia within minutes of ingestion
Vishada	Non-adherent, non-sticky	Minimal tissue binding; free circulation
Vyavayi	Pervades the whole body before undergoing Paka	Systemic distribution preceding hepatic metabolism
Tikshna	Penetrating, incisive	High receptor affinity at the voltage-gated sodium channel
Vikasi	Loosens the Sandhi and Ojas; produces collapse	Progressive neuromuscular weakness, hypotension, cardiovascular collapse
Sukshma	Enters the minutest Srotas	Crosses lipid membranes and the blood–brain barrier readily
Ushna	Hot in potency	Initial sympathomimetic-like excitation
Anirdeshya-rasa	Rasa not clearly assignable	Perioral numbness abolishing taste perception — an early cardinal sign

The correspondence of Anirdeshya-rasa with the perioral and lingual numbness that constitutes the earliest reliable clinical sign of aconite exposure deserves particular notice. The classical authors were describing an observed toxicological phenomenon, not a theoretical attribute.

4.3 Rasapanchaka of Shodhita Vatsanabha

After Shodhana, Vatsanabha is described as Madhura and Katu in Rasa, Laghu-Ruksha-Tikshna in Guna, Ushna in Virya and Madhura in Vipaka, with a pronounced Yogavahi character.[4,8] Yogavahi — the capacity to carry and amplify the action of the substances with which it is combined — is the pharmacological justification for its inclusion in minute quantity within large compound Rasayogas, where it functions less as an independent therapeutic agent than as a potentiator and Srotoshodhaka.

4.4 Vishavega

Sushruta describes seven Vegas of Visha and Charaka eight, progressing from Rasa-dhatu involvement through Rakta, Mamsa and Medas to Asthi, Majja and finally Shukra, with death supervening thereafter.[2] The clinical sequence of aconite poisoning — perioral tingling, nausea and vomiting, generalised paraesthesia, muscular weakness, hypotension with bradyarrhythmia or ventricular tachyarrhythmia, and terminal cardiorespiratory failure — traverses these stages in a manner that any Ayurvedic physician trained in Agada Tantra would recognise without difficulty.

4.5 Karma, Matra and Anupana

Shodhita Vatsanabha is credited with Deepana, Pachana, Jwaraghna, Vedanasthapana, Shoolaprashamana, Swedajanana and Yogavahi actions, and is indicated principally in Vishama Jwara, Sannipataja Jwara, Amavata, Sandhivata, Gridhrasi and Agnimandya.[4,6,8] The classical Matra is conservatively stated at one-sixteenth to one-eighth Ratti, approximately 7.5 to 15 mg of the Shodhita drug, and only as a constituent of a compound formulation, never as a single drug. Godugdha, Ghrita and Madhu are the recommended Anupanas, all of them substances whose Guna profile is explicitly opposite to that of Visha.

Apathya is equally explicit and clinically important. Vatsanabha is contraindicated in Bala, Vriddha, Garbhini and Stanyapayini, in Durbala and Kshina patients, in Pitta Prakriti individuals during Grishma Ritu, and in the presence of Hridroga. The contemporary translation of this list is straightforward: paediatric and geriatric patients, pregnancy and lactation, cachectic or debilitated states, hot climatic exposure and established cardiac disease.

5. Phytochemistry and the Mechanism of Toxicity

5.1 The alkaloid burden

The toxicological weight of *A. ferox* rests on its C19-norditerpenoid alkaloids. Pseudaconitine (also reported as bikhaconitine) is the principal constituent of the Indian drug, accompanied by aconitine, indaconitine, chasmaconitine and a series of structurally related congeners.[22,29,33] These may be grouped into three families of descending toxicity: the diester diterpenoid alkaloids, bearing both a C8 acetyl ester and a C14 aroyl ester; the monoester alkaloids, retaining only the C14 aroyl group; and the amine alcohols, in which both ester functions have been lost.

The diester alkaloids are the toxophores. Removal of the C8 acetyl group to yield the monoester reduces toxicity by roughly two orders of magnitude; further loss of the C14 aroyl group to yield the amine alcohol reduces it by approximately three orders.[29,31] This single structure–toxicity relationship is the pivot on which the entire scientific case for Shodhana turns, and it is worth stating plainly: the classical Samskara is, in chemical terms, a controlled ester hydrolysis.

5.2 Mechanism at the sodium channel

Aconitine and its congeners bind with high affinity to neurotoxin binding site 2 of the voltage-gated sodium channel. Binding stabilises the channel in its activated configuration and prevents inactivation, so that the channel remains open at membrane potentials at which it would ordinarily close.[26,32] The consequence is sustained depolarisation with repetitive and spontaneous firing in excitable tissue.

In cardiac tissue this manifests as triggered activity arising from early and delayed after-depolarisations, producing ventricular ectopy, bidirectional ventricular tachycardia, torsades de pointes and ventricular fibrillation; bradyarrhythmia and profound hypotension are equally common.[26] In peripheral and central neural tissue the same mechanism produces an initial excitatory phase — paraesthesia, fasciculation — followed by conduction block and flaccid weakness. Aconitine also possesses direct cytotoxic potential in hepatic and renal tissue, which accounts for the transaminase and creatinine derangements documented in sub-acute and chronic animal studies.[11,31]

There is no specific antidote. Management remains supportive: gastric decontamination where timely, continuous cardiac monitoring, atropine for bradycardia, inotropic support for refractory hypotension, and antiarrhythmic therapy for ventricular dysrhythmia.[26] Ayurveda's designation of Tankana (borax) as the Vatsanabha-specific antidote has itself received experimental support in recent pharmacological work.[15,25]

6. Shodhana Vidhi: The Classical Procedures

The classics prescribe not one but several media for Vatsanabha Shodhana, and the choice among them is not arbitrary. Different texts assign different media, and in some traditions the media are used sequentially rather than alternatively.

Table 2: Classical media described for Vatsanabha Shodhana.

Media (Dravya)	Principal source	Procedure and duration	Presumed physicochemical role
Gomutra	Rasa Tarangini 24/16	Khandana into pea-sized pieces; suspension in Dolayantra or earthen pot for 3–7 days with daily replacement of media; Atapa exposure; Prakshalana; Shoshana; Choornikarana	Alkaline pH 8–8.5 with urea, ammonia, uric acid and organic acids; promotes ester hydrolysis of C8 and C14 groups
Godugdha	Rasa Ratna Samuchchaya; Bhaishajya Ratnavali	Swedana in Dolayantra with cow's milk for 3 hours or 3 days depending on tradition	Amphoteric buffering; lipid and casein binding of lipophilic alkaloids; thermal hydrolysis under Swedana
Gomaya Swarasa	Yogaratnakara	Immersion for 1–3 days followed by washing	Alkaline medium with a rich enzymatic and microbial complement

Kanji (Aranala)	Rasa Tarangini	Immersion for 3 days	Acidic fermented medium; acid-catalysed hydrolysis complementing alkaline routes
Triphala Kwatha	Later Rasa texts	Swedana for 3 hours	Tannin complexation and alkaloid precipitation
Nirgundi / Ardraka Swarasa	Regional traditions	Swedana or Bhavana	Solvent extraction of residual alkaloid; claimed Vishaghna adjuvant action
Kulattha Kwatha	Regional traditions	Swedana in Dolayantra	Protein-rich medium; adsorptive removal of alkaloid

Beneath this apparent diversity lies a constant procedural architecture that every version preserves.

- *Khandana* — reduction of the tuber to pea-sized fragments, maximising the surface area available for exchange with the medium.
- *Media immersion under Dolayantra or in an earthen vessel* — the suspended-bag arrangement prevents direct contact with the vessel base and permits uniform circulation of the medium.
- *Daily renewal of the medium* — this is the step most frequently omitted in modern adaptations, and it is the one that sustains the concentration gradient driving alkaloid egress and hydrolysis.
- *Atapa Sevana* — exposure to direct sunlight, contributing both thermal energy and ultraviolet flux.
- *Prakshalana and Shoshana* — sequential washing with cold and then warm water, removal of the outer shell, and immediate sun-drying.
- *Choornikarana* — reduction to fine powder only after complete drying, since residual moisture in a partially processed tuber invites microbial degradation.

7. The Chemical Rationale of Shodhana

The essential transformation that Shodhana is required to achieve can now be stated with some precision. Pseudaconitine must be converted to veratroylpseudaconine, and aconitine to benzoylaconine — in each case by hydrolytic cleavage of the C8 acetyl ester, with the corresponding fall in toxicity of roughly two hundred-fold.[9,20,29] Extended processing carries the reaction further to the amine alcohols pseudaconine and aconine.

Gomutra is well suited to this task, and not merely because it is alkaline. Its composition — approximately 95 percent water, 2.5 percent urea, about 1 percent minerals and corticosteroids, 1.5 percent organic acids and enzymes including urokinase, and 0.5 percent vitamins, lactose and creatinine[34] — describes a complex reactive matrix rather than a simple buffer. Urea hydrolyses progressively to ammonia, sustaining alkalinity as the reaction proceeds and consuming the liberated acetic acid; the organic acid fraction provides a competing acid-catalysed pathway; and the enzymatic complement may contribute esterase activity that a synthetic solution simply does not possess.

Godugdha operates through a different route. Its amphoteric protein fraction binds lipophilic alkaloids, while Swedana at Dolayantra temperature supplies thermal energy for hydrolysis; the lipid phase extracts residual free alkaloid into a fraction that is subsequently discarded.[11,37] That the classics prescribe both routes, sometimes in sequence, suggests an empirical recognition that the two remove different fractions of the alkaloid burden.

Two further variables deserve emphasis because they are precisely what bench-scale replications tend to discard. The earthen vessel is porous: it permits slow evaporative loss and gaseous exchange, so that the medium concentrates progressively rather than remaining static, and it contributes trace mineral leaching that a borosilicate beaker cannot. Atapa Sevana delivers a diurnally fluctuating thermal profile with surface temperatures well above ambient, together with an ultraviolet flux capable of driving photolytic degradation — quite different from the constant 37.5 °C of a laboratory oven. The Samskara, in other words, is a multivariable process, and the temptation to reduce it to a single controlled variable is exactly where modernisation attempts have failed.

8. Experimental Evidence: A Review of Primary Studies

8.1 Chromatographic evidence for alkaloid conversion

The most direct chemical demonstration comes from the comparative thin-layer chromatographic study of Deore and colleagues.[9] Chloroform extracts of crude root, Gomutra-Shodhita root and root treated with a laboratory-prepared cow-urine analogue were resolved on silica gel G using benzene, ethyl acetate and ethanol in the ratio 15: 4: 1, with detection under ultraviolet light at 366 nm over a run of 8 cm. The crude extract displayed distinct bands corresponding to aconitine and pseudaconitine. In the Gomutra-treated sample these bands were replaced by those of benzoylaconine and veratroylpseudaconine — the expected monoester hydrolysis products. In the chemically treated sample the parent diester alkaloids persisted substantially unchanged.

The inference is unambiguous. Maintaining a solution at the pH of cow's urine, with its principal solutes reconstituted and the temperature held at 37.5 °C, was not sufficient to reproduce the chemical work that the traditional procedure accomplishes. Earlier alkaloid isolation work by Hanuman and Katz had already

established that processed and unprocessed tubers of *A. ferox* differ in their norditerpenoid alkaloid complement, and had additionally identified quinolinones present only in the Ayurvedically processed material — an indication that Shodhana generates new chemical entities and does not merely subtract old ones.[20,21]

8.2 Acute oral toxicity

In the same study, acute oral toxicity was assessed in female albino rats of 150–200 g following OECD Test Guideline 420, with institutional animal ethics approval and five animals per group.[9,35] The sighting-study findings are summarised in Table 3.

Table 3: Acute oral toxicity of Vatsanabha extracts before and after Shodhana in albino rats (after Deore et al.[9])

Test material	300 mg/kg	100 mg/kg	5 mg/kg	Higher dose
Ashodhita (crude) extract	Mortality at 28 min	Mortality at 35 min	Survived; restlessness, hiccups, whitish ocular discolouration	Not tested
Lab-scale chemically treated extract	Mortality at 9 min 45 s	Mortality at 21 min 05 s	Survived; restlessness, hiccups	Not tested
Gomutra-Shodhita extract	No mortality to day 14; animal normal	Not tested	Not tested	2000 mg/kg — no mortality to day 10; death on day 11

In the main study conducted at the doses selected from the sighting phase, both the crude and the chemically treated extracts produced restlessness, hiccups and, in the crude group, whitish discolouration of the eye at 5 mg/kg without mortality, placing both under Category 2 of the Globally Harmonized System. The Gomutra-Shodhita extract at 300 mg/kg — sixty times the dose of the other two arms — produced no sign of toxicity through day 14.[9]

Two features of this dataset merit comment. The first is that the chemically treated extract killed faster than the crude extract at equivalent doses. This is counter-intuitive if one assumes that any processing must reduce toxicity, and it suggests that partial or misdirected processing may increase bioavailability of the intact diester alkaloids — perhaps by removing matrix constituents that would otherwise retard absorption — without effecting the hydrolysis that confers safety. Incomplete Shodhana may therefore be more dangerous than no Shodhana at all, a conclusion with obvious implications for manufacturing practice.

The second is the delayed mortality observed at 2000 mg/kg in the Gomutra-Shodhita arm, where the animal survived to day 10 and died on day 11. Shodhana abolishes acute lethality; it does not confer unlimited safety. The classical insistence upon a Matra of one-sixteenth to one-eighth Ratti is thereby vindicated rather than relaxed.

8.3 Corroborating toxicological evidence

These findings do not stand alone. Thorat and Dahanukar administered crude and processed aconite to mice and reported 100 percent mortality with crude material at 2.6 mg per mouse, against complete absence of mortality with fully processed material at eight times that dose. Critically, they found that every step of the processing sequence was necessary for complete detoxification — partial protocols did not deliver partial safety.[10]

Sarkar and colleagues extended the enquiry to chronic exposure, administering raw aconite, Gomutra-treated aconite and Godugdha-treated aconite at 6.25 mg/kg to Charles Foster albino rats for 90 days, with a further 30-day drug-free period to assess recovery.[11] In companion pharmacological work the same group reported that Shodhana removed the cardiotoxic and neuromuscular toxic effects of raw aconite without drastically compromising its antipyretic activity — an important observation, since a detoxification procedure that also abolished efficacy would be of no therapeutic value.[12] Their subsequent evaluation of processed Tankana as an antidote lends experimental weight to a classical Agada Tantra prescription.[15]

The Indian experimental tradition on this question is older than is generally appreciated. Handa and co-workers reported on the mitigation of aconite as early as 1951; Sen and Khosla examined the effect of Sodhana on aconite toxicity in 1968; Singh and colleagues published experimental studies on aconite Sodhana in 1981; and Mahajani and co-workers reported on the toxicity and antipyretic activity of crude and processed roots in 1990.[16,17,18,19] The direction of these findings has been consistent for seven decades.

8.4 Biochemical and organ-function evidence

Beyond mortality, the biochemical profile of surviving animals discloses the organ-level burden that Shodhana relieves. Table 4 reproduces the reported serum values.

Table 4: Serum biochemical parameters in female albino rats after 14 days (mean±SD, n = 5 per group; after Deore et al.[9])

Parameter	Control	Ashodhita 5 mg/kg	Lab-scale 5 mg/kg	Gomutra-Shodhita 300 mg/kg
Total cholesterol (mg%)	98.378±0.2668	150.00±2.614***	147.75±3.326***	101.98±0.0394 ns
HDL (mg%)	49.045±0.4601	61.648±0.708***	62.793±0.136***	81.230±0.115 ns
LDL (mg%)	36.530±0.3724	70.268±1.876***	56.703±3.217***	7.108±0.147***
VLDL (mg%)	12.930±0.3679	31.573±0.213***	28.988±0.313***	18.603±0.201***
Triglyceride (mg%)	64.003±0.1841	156.69±0.217***	153.98±0.401***	64.218±0.201 ns
Urea (mg%)	55.190±0.0837	90.225±0.058***	88.958±0.096***	55.598±0.084*
BUN (mg%)	25.768±0.0405	42.130±0.028***	41.538±0.044***	25.843±0.154 ns
Creatinine (mg%)	0.5250±0.0250	0.8750±0.025***	0.8500±0.028***	0.4000±0.000*
Albumin (mg%)	2.800±0.0408	4.750±0.028***	4.475±0.025***	3.000±0.000*

** *P < 0.001;* P < 0.05; ns P > 0.05, compared with control by Dunnett's test following one-way ANOVA.

The pattern is coherent. Both the crude and the chemically treated extracts elevated total cholesterol, LDL, VLDL and triglyceride, and simultaneously raised urea, blood urea nitrogen, creatinine and albumin — a signature of combined hepatic and renal insult at doses far below those producing mortality. The Gomutra-Shodhita extract, administered at sixty times the dose, left total cholesterol, triglyceride and blood urea nitrogen statistically indistinguishable from control while lowering LDL below control values.[9] The classical claim that Shodhana does not merely detoxify but converts undesirable properties into desirable ones finds at least suggestive support here, though a single 14-day study cannot carry that inference far.

9. DISCUSSION

9.1 Why chemical substitution failed

The laboratory arm of the Deore study was a genuine and well-intentioned attempt at rationalisation: reconstitute the known chemical composition of cow's urine, hold the pH at 8 to 8.5, maintain the temperature at 37.5 °C, and replace the medium daily for seven days. It failed, and the reasons for that failure are instructive because they identify what a successful standardised protocol would have to preserve.

- *Reactive complexity.* Gomutra is not a solution of urea at pH 8.5. Its enzyme complement, its progressive urea-to-ammonia hydrolysis, its organic acid fraction and its microbial load together constitute a reaction environment, not a buffer.
- *Thermal and photolytic profile.* Atapa Sevana provides diurnal temperature cycling with surface temperatures substantially above 37.5 °C, together with an ultraviolet flux entirely absent from an oven.
- *Vessel characteristics.* The porous earthen pot permits evaporative concentration, gaseous exchange and trace mineral contribution; a sealed glass beaker permits none of these.
- *Process duration and gradient maintenance.* The eight-day schedule with seven daily media changes maintains a continuous concentration gradient; abbreviated protocols collapse it.

None of this argues against standardisation. It argues that standardisation must proceed by validating the traditional procedure against defined chemical endpoints — residual diester alkaloid content by HPLC or LC-MS/MS — rather than by replacing the procedure with an inference about which of its variables matters most.

9.2 The signal of delayed toxicity

The single most clinically consequential finding in this literature is the death of an animal on day 11 after a 2000 mg/kg dose of Shodhita material that had produced no acute effect whatever. This is the profile of cumulative or delayed organ toxicity rather than of acute channel blockade, and it means that the safety conferred by Shodhana is dose-bounded, not absolute. Practitioners who reason from the acute non-toxicity of Shodhita Vatsanabha to a relaxed attitude toward Matra or duration of therapy are reasoning wrongly. The classical Matra ceiling and the classical insistence on short courses are safety features, not conservatism.

9.3 Limitations of the current evidence base

An honest appraisal must record how thin this evidence base remains. The principal acute study employed a single female rodent species with five animals per group, did not verify the botanical identity of the starting material, and reported no histopathology. Alkaloid conversion was demonstrated qualitatively by TLC without quantitative determination of residual diester content by HPLC or LC-MS/MS. Comparative evaluation across the several classical media — Gomutra, Godugdha, Gomaya, Kanji, Triphala Kwatha — has been attempted only sparingly, so the question of which medium or which sequence performs best remains substantially open. Batch-to-batch variability in Gomutra composition, which varies with the breed, diet, age and physiological state of the animal, has not been characterised at all. Human pharmacokinetic and safety data for Shodhita Vatsanabha in therapeutic formulations are essentially absent.

9.4 Implications for pharmacovigilance

Reported cases of aconite toxicity arising from Ayurvedic formulations continue to appear, most notably following overdose of Vatsanabha-containing preparations such as Mahashankha Vati.[25] These are almost invariably attributable to one of four failures:

inadequate or abbreviated Shodhana, species substitution in the raw material, dispensing errors in Matra, or self-medication without physician supervision. Each is preventable, and none of them is an argument against the drug. A rational quality-assurance framework for Vatsanabha-containing formulations would require documented species authentication of raw material, a documented and auditable Shodhana protocol, batch-wise HPLC determination of residual aconitine and pseudaconitine against a defined ceiling, and prescription-only status with clear labelling of the Vatsanabha content per unit dose.

10. Recommendations for Safe Clinical Practice

- Employ only Shodhita Vatsanabha, processed by a documented classical protocol with the medium renewed daily for the full prescribed duration. Partial processing is more hazardous than none.
- Authenticate the botanical source. Material sold as Vatsanabha in the Indian market is frequently a mixture of Aconitum species with divergent alkaloid profiles.
- Observe the classical Matra ceiling of one-sixteenth to one-eighth Ratti (approximately 7.5–15 mg) of Shodhita drug, and dispense it only within a compound formulation, never as a single drug.
- Limit the duration of therapy and avoid continuous administration, given the demonstrated potential for delayed toxicity.
- Prescribe with the classical Anupana — Godugdha, Ghrita or Madhu — whose Guna profile opposes that of Visha.
- Withhold in pregnancy, lactation, paediatric and geriatric patients, in debilitated or cachectic states, in established cardiac disease, and in patients receiving antiarrhythmic therapy.
- Counsel every patient to recognise and report the earliest signs — perioral or lingual numbness, tingling of the extremities, nausea, palpitation — and to discontinue immediately should they appear.
- Keep Tankana available as the classically indicated antidote, and ensure that cardiac monitoring facilities are accessible where higher-dose Rasaushadhis are dispensed.

11. CONCLUSION

The evidence assembled here permits a conclusion that is neither apologetic nor uncritical. Shodhana of Vatsanabha is a chemically purposive procedure and not a ritual survival. It accomplishes the hydrolysis of the C8 acetyl ester of pseudaconitine and aconitine to yield veratroylpseudaconine and benzoylaconine, reducing toxicity by roughly two orders of magnitude, and it does so while preserving the antipyretic and analgesic activity for which the drug is prescribed. Attempts to substitute a simplified bench protocol have failed, and have failed in an informative way: the laboratory-treated material proved not merely no safer than the crude drug but acutely more lethal.

This vindication of the classical procedure should not be mistaken for a licence. Shodhita Vatsanabha remains a potent drug with a narrow therapeutic index and demonstrated potential for delayed toxicity at high dose. The classical safeguards — verified identity, complete processing, minute Matra, compound formulation, appropriate Anupana, short course, and defined contraindications — constitute a coherent risk-management system, and their scientific corroboration argues for their stricter observance rather than their relaxation.

The research agenda that follows is reasonably clear. Quantitative LC-MS/MS profiling of residual diester alkaloid content across the several classical media; head-to-head comparison of Gomutra, Godugdha and sequential protocols; sub-chronic and chronic toxicity studies with full histopathology in more than one species; characterisation of batch variability in Gomutra composition; and eventually human pharmacokinetic and safety data for marketed Vatsanabha-containing formulations. Until that work is done, the classical protocol — performed in full and without abbreviation — remains the safest available standard, precisely because it is the only one for which detoxification has been demonstrated rather than assumed.

Declarations

Conflict of interest: None declared.

Source of funding: Nil.

Ethical approval: Not applicable; this is a review of previously published literature. All experimental data cited were generated in studies reporting prior institutional animal ethics committee approval.

REFERENCES

1. Acharya YT, editor. Charaka Samhita of Agnivesha with the Ayurveda Dipika commentary of Chakrapanidatta. Sutrasthana 1/126. Varanasi: Chaukhambha Surbharati Prakashan, 2014.
2. Acharya YT, editor. Sushruta Samhita of Sushruta with the Nibandhasangraha commentary of Dalhana. Kalpasthana 2. Varanasi: Chaukhambha Surbharati Prakashan, 2013.
3. Kunte AM, Navre KR, editors. Ashtanga Hridaya of Vagbhata with the Sarvangasundara commentary of Arunadatta. Uttaratantra 35. Varanasi: Chaukhambha Orientalia, 2011.
4. Shastri K, editor. Rasa Tarangini of Sadananda Sharma. 11th ed. Taranga 24. New Delhi: Motilal Banarasidas, 2012; 651–52.
5. Kulkarni DA, editor. Rasa Ratna Samuchchaya of Vagbhata. Adhyaya 24. Varanasi: Chaukhambha Sanskrit Series Office, 1978; 590.
6. Mishra BS, editor. Yogaratnakara with Vidyotini Hindi commentary. Varanasi: Chaukhambha Prakashana, 2010.
7. Anonymous. The Ayurvedic Pharmacopoeia of India. Part I. New Delhi: Government of India, Ministry of

Health and Family Welfare, Department of AYUSH, 1999.
8. Singh LB. Poisonous (Visha) plants in Ayurveda. 2nd ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Bhawan, 2003.
9. Deore SL, Moon KV, Khadabadi SS, Deokate UA, Baviskar BA. Evaluation of toxicity of 'Vatsanabha' (Aconitum ferox, Ranunculaceae) before and after Shodhana. J Young Pharm, 2013; 5(1): 3–6.
10. Thorat S, Dahanukar S. Can we dispense with Ayurvedic samskaras? J Postgrad Med, 1991; 37(3): 157–9.
11. Sarkar PK, Prajapati PK, Shukla VJ, Ravishankar B. Effect of shodhana treatment on chronic toxicity and recovery of aconite. Toxicol Int, 2012; 19(1): 35–41.
12. Sarkar PK, Prajapati PK, Shukla VJ, Ravishankar B. Evaluation of effect of shodhana process on pharmacological activities of aconite. Indian J Pharm Educ Res, 2012; 46(3): 243–7.
13. Sarkar PK, Prajapati PK. Dispense with Ayurvedic samskara: shodhana of aconite. Indian Drugs, 2011; 48(6): 31–44.
14. Sarkar PK, Prajapati PK, Pillai APG, Chauhan MG. Pharmacognosy of aconite sold under the name Vatsanabha in Indian market. Indian J Tradit Knowl, 2012; 11(4): 601–6.
15. Sarkar PK, Prajapati PK, Shukla VJ, Ravishankar B. Evaluation of processed borax as antidote for aconite poisoning. J Ethnopharmacol, 2017; 205: 138–46.
16. Singh RS, Singh LB, Bose R, Sen SP. Experimental studies on sodhana of aconite. Anc Sci Life, 1981; 1(2): 106–9.
17. Sen SP, Khosla RL. Effect of sodhana on the toxicity of aconite (Vatsanabha). Curr Med Pract, 1968; 12: 694–6.
18. Handa KL, Chopra IC, Kohli JD, Singh K. Mitigation of aconite: a preliminary note. Indian J Med Res, 1951; 39: 89–98.
19. Mahajani SS, Joshi RS, Gangar VV, Parikh KM. Some observations on the toxicity and antipyretic activity of crude and processed aconite roots. Planta Med, 1990; 56: 665.
20. Hanuman JB, Katz A. Isolation and identification of four norditerpenoid alkaloids from processed and unprocessed root tubers of Aconitum ferox. J Nat Prod, 1993; 56(6): 801–9.
21. Hanuman JB, Katz A. Isolation of quinolinones from Ayurvedic processed root tubers of Aconitum ferox. Nat Prod Res, 1993; 3(3): 227–31.
22. Purushothaman KK, Chandrasekharan S. Alkaloids of Aconitum ferox. Phytochemistry, 1974; 13(9): 1975–7.
23. Ilanchezhian R, Roshy JC, Acharya R. Importance of media in shodhana (purification/processing) of poisonous herbal drugs. Anc Sci Life, 2010; 30(2): 54–7.
24. Rastogi S. Vatsanabha (aconite) overdosing: an Ayurvedic perspective. Int J Risk Saf Med, 2007; 19(3): 117–25.
25. Panda AK, Debnath SK. Overdose effect of aconite containing Ayurvedic medicine ('Mahashankha Vati'). Int J Ayurveda Res, 2010; 1(3): 183–6.
26. Chan TY. Aconite poisoning. Clin Toxicol (Phila), 2009; 47(4): 279–85.
27. Chan TY. Aconitum alkaloid content and the high toxicity of aconite tincture. Forensic Sci Int, 2012; 222(1–3): 1–3.
28. Chan TY, Tomlinson B, Critchley JA. Aconitine poisoning following the ingestion of Chinese herbal medicines: a report of eight cases. Aust N Z J Med, 1993; 23(3): 268–71.
29. Singhuber J, Zhu M, Prinz S, Kopp B. Aconitum in Traditional Chinese Medicine — a valuable drug or an unpredictable risk? J Ethnopharmacol, 2009; 126(1): 18–30.
30. Chan YT, Wang N, Feng Y. The toxicology and detoxification of Aconitum: traditional and modern views. Chin Med, 2021; 16(1): 61.
31. Gao Y, Fan H, Nie A, Yang K, Xing H, Gao Z, et al. Aconitine: a review of its pharmacokinetics, pharmacology, toxicology and detoxification. J Ethnopharmacol, 2022; 293: 115270.
32. Ameri A. The effects of Aconitum alkaloids on the central nervous system. Prog Neurobiol, 1998; 56(2): 211–35.
33. Nyirimigabo E, Xu Y, Li Y, Wang Y, Agyemang K, Zhang Y. A review on phytochemistry, pharmacology and toxicology studies of Aconitum. J Pharm Pharmacol, 2015; 67(1): 1–19.
34. Bristow AW, Whitehead DC, Cockburn JE. Nitrogenous constituents in the urine of cattle, sheep and goats. J Sci Food Agric, 1992; 59(3): 387–94.
35. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. OECD guideline for the testing of chemicals No. 420: acute oral toxicity — fixed dose procedure. Paris: OECD, 2001.
36. Zhao Z, Liang Z, Chan K, Lu G, Lee ELM, Chen H, et al. A unique issue in the standardization of Chinese materia medica: processing. Planta Med, 2010; 76(17): 1975–86.
37. Arya N. Comparative physico-chemical profile of 'Vatsanabha' (Aconitum ferox, Ranunculaceae) mula processed through cow's urine and cow's milk. Int J Res Ayurveda Pharm, 2017; 8(5): 217–22.
38. Buha M, Sojitra N, Acharya R. Internal applications of Vatsanabha (Aconitum ferox Wall.): a comprehensive Ayurvedic review. Ayurpharm Int J Ayurveda Allied Sci, 2018; 7(2): 15–38.